



Research/Review

# Influence of Commitment, Reward, and Punishment on Employees Performance at DAMRI Lampung

Muhamad Yusrizal <sup>1\*</sup>, Nova Mardiana <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Management Department, University of Lampung, Indonesia : [yusrizalmlp@gmail.com](mailto:yusrizalmlp@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Management Department, University of Lampung, Indonesia

\* Corresponding Author : Muhamad Yusrizal

**Abstract:** This study explores the impact of organizational commitment, rewards, and punishment on employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung, a branch of the state-owned enterprise specializing in land transportation services for passengers and cargo. The research arises from the necessity to improve employee performance by leveraging both internal and external motivational factors, including employee loyalty, reward systems, and disciplinary actions. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected through a structured survey distributed to 168 active employees of the organization. The collected data were then analyzed using multiple linear regression through SPSS version 24. The study found that organizational commitment and rewards have a significant and positive influence on employee performance. These findings support the proposed hypotheses and highlight the importance of fostering employee loyalty and implementing an effective reward system to boost performance outcomes. In contrast, the analysis revealed that punishment does not have a significant positive effect on employee performance. This suggests that punitive measures alone may not be effective in encouraging desired work behaviors or improving overall performance. Based on these findings, it is recommended that Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung prioritize initiatives that strengthen organizational commitment and develop a fair, transparent, and performance-based reward system. Such efforts are likely to enhance employee motivation and productivity. Additionally, the current approach to punishment should be critically evaluated to determine its role and effectiveness in supporting performance goals. A more constructive disciplinary framework may be needed to align with modern human resource management practices. This study contributes to the broader understanding of performance management in state-owned enterprises, especially in the transportation sector.

**Keywords:** DAMRI Lampung, Employee Performance, Organizational Commitment, Punishment, Reward.

Received: May 30, 2025;

Revised: June 30, 2025;

Accepted: July 31, 2025;

Online Available: August 02, 2025

Curr. Ver.: August 02, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.  
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

In the increasingly competitive landscape of the transportation sector, Perum DAMRI, a state-owned enterprise providing public transport services in Indonesia, is compelled to enhance its adaptability in technology, innovation, and human resource management. Facing competition from private and state-owned operators such as PO Sinar Jaya, Puspa Jaya, and Rosalia Indah, DAMRI must improve service quality and operational efficiency. Effective human resource management is essential in fostering loyal, high performing employees contribute significantly to organizational success. As performance becomes a critical indicator of effectiveness, companies must prioritize recruiting, developing, and retaining talented employees in response to dynamic environmental changes. High-performing employees play a pivotal role in sustaining competitive advantage [1].

Organizational commitment is a key factor influencing employee performance, as individuals with higher commitment levels tend to demonstrate greater loyalty and effort toward achieving organizational goals. [2]classify commitment into three components: affective, continuance, and normative. Employees with strong affective commitment, for instance, are emotionally attached to the organization and are more motivated to contribute positively.

When workers feel appreciated and involved in decision-making, they are more inclined to aim for excellence. Thus, management should adopt strategies that foster employee commitment, such as offering career development opportunities and actively seeking employee input.

An effective reward system contributes significantly to improving worker performance by recognizing achievements and reinforcing motivation and commitment. According to [3], rewards serve as a form of appreciation that supports the development of a professional workforce aligned with job demands. In the transportation sector, such as at DAMRI, timely and relevant rewards strengthen positive behavior and encourage continuous innovation in service delivery. Therefore, it is crucial for management to design a reward system that not only acknowledges outcomes but also values the efforts and processes undertaken by employees.

Fair and constructive punishment significantly influences employee discipline and performance. Rather than serving solely as a punitive measure, punishment functions as a corrective tool aimed at improving behavior and raising work standards. When employees recognize that their actions carry consequences, they tend to make more careful decisions, which leads to greater discipline and enhanced performance. The synergy between reward and punishment systems is essential for achieving optimal employee outcomes. When both are applied in a balanced and complementary manner, they foster a productive work environment. [4] highlights that the combination of effective rewards and fair punishments enhances employee motivation and discipline, encouraging accountability and responsibility in the workplace.

At Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung, the reward system includes annual recognition for outstanding employee performance. According to Ms. Nopy Kartika Sari, an HR staff member, awards are given in categories such as exemplary employee, creative employee, and dedicated employee, typically in the form of certificates and gift packages. These recognitions are often presented during special occasions like DAMRI's anniversary celebrations. Although the reward program sometimes triggers feelings of jealousy among staff, it is also intended to motivate others to enhance their performance. On the other hand, the punishment system is implemented gradually and systematically to maintain discipline. Initial violations are addressed through verbal warnings, followed by a series of written warnings (SP1 to SP3). If no improvement is observed, the final stage (SP3) may lead to termination of employment. This system aims to deter misconduct while ensuring company operations remain unaffected.

Employee performance in the transportation industry, such as at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung, directly affects both operational efficiency and service quality. Over the past three years, DAMRI has experienced notable revenue growth due to improvements in service strategy, driver competence, and human resource development. The company utilizes Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to objectively assess both individual and organizational performance, aligning it with strategic goals. While most employees exhibit strong commitment, some still display poor attendance and a lack of responsibility, particularly among drivers, which can negatively impact company reputation and morale. To address these issues, DAMRI employs a combined system of rewards and punishments, along with targeted supervision and discipline enforcement. According to HR staff member Nopy Kartika Sari, these strategic efforts aim to create a productive and professional work environment. This study, therefore, seeks to explore the impact of organizational commitment, reward, also punishment on workers performance, offering theoretical insights and practical recommendations for human resource management.

## 2. Preliminaries or Related Work or Literature Review

### Organizational Commitment

The term organizational commitment describes a person's affiliation and participation, along with their desire to remain a part of it [5], [6]. [7] describe it as a voluntary act beyond formal obligations that significantly enhances organizational efficiency. Similarly, [8] views it as the degree to which individuals define themselves through the organization and show no intention of leaving it. An organization plays a crucial role in meeting employees' psychological needs, as optimal contribution is not solely driven by material rewards but also by emotional support and a sense of security.

### Reward

In a competitive work environment, companies implement reward systems to boost employee performance and retain top talent. Rewards aim to enhance motivation, productivity, and loyalty, often proving more effective than punishment. [3] defines reward as a form of appreciation aimed at developing a professional workforce aligned with job demands, involving balanced efforts in planning, organizing, utilizing, and maintaining human resources to ensure effective and efficient task execution. [9] adds that rewards, whether tangible or intangible, are given, intentionally or unintentionally, by organizations in recognition of employees' potential, contributions, or adherence to positive values, serving as a means to fulfill specific needs.

### **Punishment**

Punishment refers to the imposition of negative or unpleasant consequences in response to undesirable behavior. It serves as a corrective measure intended to improve employee performance, uphold organizational rules, and provide a deterrent effect [10]. Punishment functions as a behavioral modification tool applied when actions deviate from accepted norms. According to [11], punishment is a sanction imposed on employees for failing to meet job expectations as outlined in their employment agreement. These expectations are established at the start of employment and are detailed in formal company regulations that employees are contractually obligated to follow.

### **Employees Performance**

Performance management integrates goal setting, evaluation, and development to ensure employee performance aligns with organizational strategy [10]. Performance reflects the quality and effectiveness of an employee's work in fulfilling assigned tasks [12]. A positive work environment and aligned expectations between supervisors and subordinates are crucial for optimal outcomes. According to [13], performance is the measurable success of task execution within a given timeframe. Therefore, management must understand the factors influencing performance to implement appropriate policies for improvement [14]. Effective performance management requires ongoing supervision, evaluation, and feedback.

### **Hypothesis**

Organizational commitment reflects employees' emotional attachment and loyalty to their workplace, which significantly influences performance, retention, and overall productivity. Highly committed employees tend to be responsible, motivated, and aligned with organizational goals, fostering a positive and collaborative work environment. Conversely, low levels of commitment may lead to turnover. Empirical studies, such as those by [15], [16], verify that organizational commitment has a positive-substantial effect on worker performance.

**H1: Organizational commitment has a positive significant effect on employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung.**

Reward is an effective management tool for enhancing employee performance, encompassing forms of recognition. By acknowledging employee contributions, rewards serve as a key motivator that strengthens extrinsic motivation and encourages improved performance. Previous studies, including [17], [18], confirm the strong positive impact of reward systems on employee performance and discipline. Properly implemented reward mechanisms not only directly influence performance but also indirectly through improved work discipline.

**H2: Reward commitment has a positive significant effect on employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung.**

Punishment refers to organizational actions aimed at correcting employee behavior that violates established rules or standards. Its impact on performance can vary depending on its fairness, consistency, and how it is perceived by employees. Studies by [19], [20] found that both reward and punishment significantly influence employee performance. While rewards enhance motivation through recognition, punishment (when applied fairly) is viewed as constructive feedback that encourages improvement. Though both variables positively affect performance, reward tends to have a stronger influence.

**H3: Punishment has a positive significant effect on employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung.**

### 3. Proposed Method

#### Research Design

The research employs a descriptive quantitative approach, as defined by [21], to explain organizational commitment, reward, punishment, and employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung. The research was conducted at the company's Bandar Lampung branch, involving 168 permanent employees as the full population sample. Primary data were collected through questionnaires adapted from validated sources, including [2] for organizational commitment, [8] for rewards, and punishment, also employee performance indicators [22]. A Likert scale to quantify responses, and secondary data were obtained through literature review. This combination of methods ensures the comprehensive and objective measurement of each variable.

#### Operational Definitions

**Table 1.** Operational Definition.

Variable	Definition	Indicator	Scale
Organizational Commitment (X1)	An individual's emotional attachment, identity, and involvement with the organization, as well as their strong desire to stay a member of it, are all considered forms of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1997).	1. Affective 2. Continuance 3. Normative  (Allen & Meyer, 1997)	Likert
Reward (X2)	Reward is a form of recognition provided by a manager based on job performance, where employees receive compensation such as wages or salaries in return for their contributions (Wibowo, 2017).	1. Intrinsic Reward 2. Ekstrinsic Reward  (Wibowo, 2017)	Likert
Punishment (X3)	Punishment refers to a disciplinary measure intended to correct the performance of employees who violate rules, uphold existing regulations, and serve as a lesson to the violator (Mangkunegara in Bintoro & Daryanto, 2017).	1. Minimize errors 2. Apply stricter penalties 3. Provide explanation with the punishment 4. Deliver punishment promptly after proven violation  (Sondang Siagian in Dindara Darwis, 2020)	Likert
Employee Performance (Y)	Performance management is the process of aligning goal setting, evaluation, and development into a unified system to ensure employee performance supports the company's strategic objectives (Robbins, 2015)	1. Quality 2. Quantity 3. Timeliness 4. Effectiveness 5. Independence  (Robbins, 2015)	Likert

#### Instrument Testing and Hypothesis Analysis

This study conducted several statistical tests to ensure data quality and evaluate the proposed hypotheses. The validity where all questionnaire items had correlation values above the critical  $r$ -table value, confirming that each item accurately measured its intended variable [21]. Reliability was assessed by Cronbach's Alpha, with the variables scoring  $> 0.70$ , indicating consistent and dependable instruments [23]. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test yielded significance values greater than 0.05, suggesting it is normal. For hypothesis testing, the  $t$ -test was used to assess the partial effects of organizational commitment, reward, and punishment on employee performance. It revealed that both organizational commitment and reward significantly affected performance, while punishment did not show a significant effect, indicating partial support for the research hypotheses [24].

### 4. Results and Discussion

#### Testing Result

A questionnaire is valid if its items measure the intended variables, with  $r$ -count  $>$   $r$ -table and  $KMO > 0.5$ . This study showed  $KMO$  values above 0.85 for all variables, confirming item validity for further analysis.

**Table 2.** Validity Test.

Variable	Item	KMO-MSA	Loading Factor	Result
Organizational Commitment (X1)	X1.1	0,856	0,688	Valid
	X1.2		0,846	
	X1.3		0,709	
	X1.4		0,736	
	X1.5		0,810	
	X1.6		0,576	
	X1.7		0,532	
	X1.8		0,586	
	X1.9		0,580	
	X1.10		0,573	
	X1.11		0,533	
	X1.12		0,617	
	X1.13		0,650	
	X1.14		0,566	
	X1.15		0,534	
	X1.16		0,598	
	X1.17		0,530	
	X1.18		0,631	
	X1.19		0,528	
	X1.20		0,631	
	X1.21		0,834	
	X1.22		0,603	
	X1.23		0,655	
	X1.24		0,568	
Reward (X2)	X2.1	0,937	0,725	Valid
	X2.2		0,780	
	X2.3		0,856	
	X2.4		0,801	
	X2.5		0,811	
	X2.6		0,782	
	X2.7		0,636	
Punishment (X3)	X3.1	0,956	0,695	Valid
	X3.2		0,822	

Variable	Item	KMO-MSA	Loading Factor	Result
Employee Performance (Y)	X3.3	0,972	0,803	Valid
	X3.4		0,700	
	X3.5		0,851	
	X3.6		0,685	
	X3.7		0,786	
	X3.8		0,709	
	Y.1		0,696	
	Y.2		0,641	
	Y.3		0,731	
	Y.4		0,863	
Y.5	0,818			
Y.6	0,728			
Y.7	0,815			
Y.8	0,672			
Y.9	0,645			
Y.10	0,681			

Reliability measures the consistency of a questionnaire. If responses to a questionnaire stay consistent throughout time, it is deemed dependable. Using Cronbach’s alpha via SPSS, variables are reliable if  $\alpha > 0.70$ . This study showed very high reliability: organizational commitment (0.915), reward (0.964), punishment (0.956), and employee performance (0.972).

**Table 3.** Reliability Test.

Variable	Item	Cronbach’ s Alpha	Cronbach’ s Alpha If Item Deleted	Result
Organizational Commitment (X1)	X1.1	0,915	0,909	Reliable
	X1.2		0,908	
	X1.3		0,909	
	X1.4		0,911	
	X1.5		0,908	
	X1.6		0,912	
	X1.7		0,913	
	X1.8		0,911	
	X1.9		0,912	
	X1.10		0,909	
	X1.11		0,912	
	X1.12		0,912	
	X1.13		0,913	
	X1.14		0,914	
	X1.15		0,914	
	X1.16		0,912	
	X1.17		0,912	

Variable	Item	Cronbach' s Alpha	Cronbach' s Alpha If Item Deleted	Result
	X1.19		0,913	
	X1.20		0,912	
	X1.21		0,908	
	X1.22		0,913	
	X1.23		0,912	
	X1.24		0,910	
Reward (X2)	X2.1	0,964	0,947	Reliable
	X2.2		0,945	
	X2.3		0,947	
	X2.4		0,947	
	X2.5		0,946	
	X2.6		0,945	
	X2.7		0,945	
Punishment (X3)	X3.1	0,956	0,958	Reliable
	X3.2		0,960	
	X3.3		0,957	
	X3.4		0,958	
	X3.5		0,959	
	X3.6		0,958	
	X3.7		0,961	
	X3.8		0,958	
Employee Per- formance (Y)	Y.1	0,972	0,969	Reliable
	Y.2		0,969	
	Y.3		0,969	
	Y.4		0,970	
	Y.5		0,969	
	Y.6		0,968	
	Y.7		0,969	
	Y.8		0,968	
	Y.9		0,969	
	Y.10		0,969	

Finding out if the regression model's residuals are regularly distributed is the goal of the normality test. If the significance value is less than or equal to 0.05, the residual is regarded as regularly distributed. This study used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with a 0.05 significance level via SPSS 27. According to the test results, all variables had Sig. 0.094, which suggests the data are regularly distributed.

**Table 4.** Normality Test.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstd Resid
N		168
Normal <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	0,0000000
	Std. Dev	71.66523795
Dif	Abs	0,064
	+	0,034
	-	-0,064
Stat		0,064
Sig.		0,094

**Quantitative Analysis**

**Table 5.** Multiple Regression Test.

Model		Unstd Coef		Std. Coef	t	Prob	T-Test
		B	e	B			Result
1	(Constant)	211.568	33.478		6.320	0,001	Significant
	Organizational Commitment	0.130	0.047	0.203	2.793	0.006	
	Reward	0.127	0.057	0.161	2.213	0.028	
	Punishment	-0.162	0.044	-0.266	-3.659	0.001	

The research employed multiple linear regression to examine the influence of organizational commitment, reward, and punishment on employee performance, using SPSS 27 for data processing.

$$Y = a - 0.106X_1 - 0.035X_2 + 0.024X_3 + e \tag{1}$$

The regression equation  $Y = a - 0.106X_1 - 0.035X_2 + 0.024X_3 + e$  indicates that organizational commitment ( $X_1$ ) and reward ( $X_2$ ) have a negative influence on employee performance ( $Y$ ), while punishment ( $X_3$ ) shows a slight positive effect. Specifically, an increase in organizational commitment or reward is associated with a decrease in performance by 0.106 and 0.035 units respectively, whereas an increase in punishment corresponds to a 0.024 unit rise in performance.

T-test results show all three hypotheses are supported. Organizational commitment ( $b = 0.203$ ;  $p = 0.006$ ) and reward ( $b = 0.161$ ;  $p = 0.028$ ) have a positive significant effect, while punishment ( $b = -0.266$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) show a negative effect, indicating it does not positively impact performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung.

**Discussion**

**The Influence of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance**

Employee emotional attachment, loyalty, and active involvement in achieving the organization's goals, is reflected in organizational commitment[25]. The results of this study show that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung ( $b = 0.203$ ;  $p = 0.006$ ), supporting Hypothesis I.

This aligns with prior research by [15], which high organizational commitment enhances employee performance through improved teamwork and communication. Employees with strong affective commitment tend to identify themselves with the organization and willingly strive to support its success [2], [6], [8], [26].

### **The Influence of Reward on Employee Performance**

Rewards are intended to enhance employee performance and organizational stability, ultimately benefiting the company. [3] defines rewards as recognition for employees' efforts and achievements, aimed at fostering a professional workforce. In this study, confirms that rewards ( $X_2$ ) have positive significant impact on employee performance (Y), with  $b = 0.161$ ,  $p = 0.028$ , and  $t\text{-value} (2.213) > t\text{-table} (1.654)$ , thereby supporting Hypothesis II. This indicates that higher rewards correlate with improved performance at Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung. Both financial and non-financial rewards (such as promotions, recognition, or vacation benefits) can boost employee motivation and loyalty. [9] emphasizes that rewards may be tangible or intangible and serve to acknowledge positive contributions while fulfilling employees' intrinsic needs. Therefore, reward systems not only drive productivity but also help retain high-performing employees by reinforcing positive behavior and encouraging consistent excellence.

### **The Influence of Punishment on Employee Performance**

Punishment is defined as a sanction given to employees who fail to perform their tasks as instructed [11]. Based on the t-test from multiple linear regression analysis, the punishment variable ( $X_3$ ) showed a negative and significant effect, with  $b = -0.266$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , and  $t\text{-value} (-3.659) < t\text{-table} (-1.654)$ , indicating support for Hypothesis III. However, this negative relationship suggests that excessive punishment may reduce performance. When sanctions are imposed without guidance or support, employees may work under pressure, avoid risks, and lack motivation for innovation. This leads to decreased productivity and morale [27], [28]. [29] adds that frequent punishment correlates with lower performance, as employees become disengaged. Thus, punishment should be applied fairly and combined with open communication and coaching to foster improvement and maintain motivation. A balanced approach (integrating discipline with development) is key to optimizing its effectiveness in improving employee performance.

## **5. Conclusions**

The study concludes that Perum DAMRI Bandar Lampung employees' performance is positively-significantly impacted by organizational dedication and rewards, while punishment shows a significant but negative influence. Higher commitment and better rewards are linked to improved employee performance, emphasizing the need for organizations to foster engagement and provide meaningful recognition. In contrast, excessive or poorly managed punishment may harm performance, highlighting the importance of balanced disciplinary approaches. However, the study is limited by the use of self-reported questionnaires, which may not fully reflect actual behavior, and by the narrow focus on only three variables, excluding other influential factors. Future research is encouraged to include a broader range of performance determinants and involve larger, more diverse samples across different organizational settings to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

## **References**

- [1] R. A. Mariam, "Pengaruh Gaya dan Budaya terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Asuransi Jasa Indonesia," Skripsi, Univ. Diponegoro, 2009.
- [2] N. J. Allen and J. P. Meyer, \*Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application\*. California: Sage Publications, 1997.
- [3] T. Hani Handoko, \*Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia\*. Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2011.
- [4] M. G. Aamodt, \*Industrial/Organizational Psychology: An Applied Approach\*, 8th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2016.
- [5] S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, \*Organizational Behavior\*, 17th ed. Pearson Education, 2017.

- [6] M. Yusuf and H. Syarif, *\*Komitmen Organisasi\**. Makassar: Nas, 2018.
- [7] H. Al-Jabari and I. Ghazzawi, "Organizational Commitment," *\*Social Science\**, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 78–85, 2019.
- [8] Wibowo, *\*Manajemen Kinerja\**. Depok: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2017.
- [9] J. Shields, *\*Managing Employee Performance\**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [10] T. Bintoro and D. Daryanto, *\*Manajemen Penilaian Kinerja\**. Malang: Gava Media, 2017.
- [11] I. Fahmi, *\*Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia\**. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2017.
- [12] R. Sembiring, "Pengaruh motivasi terhadap kinerja," *\*Jurnal Nasional\**, vol. 1, no. 14, 2020.
- [13] R. B. Esthi and Y. N. Marwah, "Kinerja karyawan," *\*Jurnal Ekonomi\**, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 130–137, 2020.
- [14] T. Efnita, "Motivasi dan disiplin terhadap kinerja karyawan," *\*JIM UPB\**, vol. 6, no. 2, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.33884/jimupb.v6i2.683.
- [15] R. Datul and B. S. Sunuharyo, "Pengaruh komitmen organisasional terhadap kinerja karyawan," *\*Jurnal Bisnis\**, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 111–118, 2018.
- [16] R. Muis, Jufrizen, and I. Fahmi, "Pengaruh budaya dan komitmen terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Pegadaian," *\*Jurnal Ekonomi\**, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2018.
- [17] Y. Emelianova, "Impact of Reward System on Employee Performance," Bachelor's thesis, Normet Ltd., 2019.
- [18] F. N. Dihan and F. Hidayat, "Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja karyawan," *\*JBTI\**, vol. 11, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.18196/bti.111126.
- [19] E. Panekenan, J. Tumbuan, and F. Rumokoy, "The influence of reward and punishment toward employee's performance," *\*Jurnal EMBA\**, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 471–480, 2019.
- [20] A. D. Nugroho, "Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Business Training," *\*Jurnal Entrepreneurship\**, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 4–14, 2015.
- [21] Sugiyono, *\*Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif\**. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2018.
- [22] S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, *\*Perilaku Organisasi\** (Terjemahan). Jakarta: Salemba Empat, 2015.
- [23] I. Ghozali, *\*Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25\**, ed. 9. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2018.
- [24] S. Santoso, *\*Konsep SPSS\**. Jakarta: PT Komputindo, 2014.
- [25] G. R. Madison, A. K. Ward, and J. Royalty, "CSR, organizational commitment, and employer-sponsored volunteerism," *\*Jurnal Business\**, vol. 3, no. 1, 2012.
- [26] R. Wahyuni, H. Irfani, and R. Mariana, "Kinerja pegawai ditinjau dari perilaku cyberloafing dan komitmen organisasi," *\*Psyche 165 Journal\**, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 240–245, 2020.
- [27] A. Wahyudi, "Strategi penerapan punishment dan dampaknya terhadap disiplin kerja," *\*Jurnal Sumber Daya Manusia\**, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 30–38, 2020.
- [28] E. Sutrisno, *\*Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia\**. Jakarta: Kencana, 2020.
- [29] O. R. Rahmat, "Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja karyawan," *\*Jurnal Ilmiah\**, vol. 3, no. 2, 2021.