

The Role of Collaborative Leadership in Moderating Demotivational and Indiscipliner Behavior towards Private Higher Education Employee Performance in the City of Palembang in the New Normal Era

Dian Yulistarini^A, Edward^B, Syahmardi Yacob^C, Tona Aurora^D

Abstract

The emergence of employee demotivation and disciplinary behavior in the new normal era is due to the many new rules that need to be adjusted. A new managerial strategy is needed for higher education governance such as leaders who have skills and a strong mindset so that organizations are successful in dealing with fast-paced conditions. The leadership model that is considered suitable for the new normal era is collaborative leadership. A leadership model that has dependence between members and leaders in coordinating activities so that the organization can respond quickly to existing issues and adapt to fast-paced changes. The research method used a quantitative approach and involved 380 respondents. The analytical methods used are validity test, reliability test, classical assumption test, statistical test and MRA test using SPSS 26.0 and SEM AMOS 26.0. Based on the results of research on the relationship between demotivating variables (X1) indiscipline (X2) and performance (Y) in the new normal era, p values were obtained of 0.609 and 0.410, Critical Ratio (CR) values of 0.511 and -2.045, which means that variables X1 and X2 are not significant and H0 in this study was rejected. So that there is no relationship between demotivating (X1) and disciplinary (X2) behavior on employee performance (Y) in the new normal era. In demotivating and disciplinary variables moderated by collaborative leadership on performance, pvalues of 6.306 and 8.471 were obtained and showed a CR of 1.96 so that significant results were obtained. The relationship between collaborative leadership as a moderator of demotivating and indiscipline behavior is proven to have a positive influence and strengthen employee performance in the new normal era.

Keywords: *Demotivation, Indiscipline, Performance, Collaborative Leadership.*

INTRODUCTION

The Covid-19 pandemic outbreak has affected the existence of human resources in an organization in carrying out their duties and functions (Wanta et al., 2022). This rapid change in the work system has led to demotivation and disciplinary attitudes resulting in a

^AUniversitas Jambi, Indonesia, Email: dian_yulistarini@univ-tridinanti.ac.id

^BUniversitas Jambi, Indonesia

^CUniversitas Jambi, Indonesia

^DUniversitas Jambi, Indonesia

decrease in employee performance. There has been a change in the service model within higher education institutions which has changed the way of work and also the work culture so that a new managerial strategy is also needed for higher education governance. Employees as individuals in an organization aside from being very important assets, they are also a resource that must be owned and managed properly (Ronald et al., 2020). Leaders as factors that can move individuals are urgently needed to support organizational readiness to face new normal changes because many systems need to be adjusted, especially work patterns, namely from WFO (Work From Office) to WFH (Work From Home), then return to WFO. It takes a leader who is able to lead the organization towards the best goals. The author observes that the topic of leadership has become a topic that is quite relevant today, especially in the current new normal era.

Based on the results of the study by Williams et al. (2020) the Covid-19 pandemic resulted in reduced social interaction, economic losses, and changes in routine resulting in psychological and emotional impacts, such as demotivation, loss of meaning and decreased self-esteem. With this condition, a leader is required to be able to improve his skills in managing the organization so that it continues to run according to its goals. For this reason, leaders are needed who can work together constructively with stakeholders to participate and help maintain work interactions that have been well established. A good leader model is one who can work together and is able to influence someone so that they are willing to work together and collaborate with them to achieve goals, namely with mutually beneficial and effective cooperation. This leadership model is a feature of collaborative leadership.

According to Peter G. Northouse (2016) collaborative leadership is a leadership model in an organization that has dependence between leaders and members with one another in coordinating their activities in achieving the goals set by the organization so that the organization can respond quickly and adapt to constant change. and fast. In his study [HYPERLINK \l "Allen \(2016\)](#) revealed that collaborative/team-based organizations have faster response capabilities due to their more responsive organizational structure, which relies on teamwork and utilizes new technology to enable ease of communication across space and time. This study shows that the function of the leader as a manager in managing human resources in the organization plays an important role. Employees who have problems with motivation and discipline will have an impact on losing commitment or interest in work. Therefore, a strategy is needed to limit demotivating and indiscipline behavior through organizational strengthening to encourage acceptable behavior. Organizational authority held by leaders is a good model, synergizes and collaborates with subordinates by providing moral education, adopting behaviors such as punishment, high supervision and encouraging provide referrals to capable personnel such as counselors or similar. For this reason, the important role of a leader who builds

good relations with the team can weaken the emergence of employee demotivation and disciplinary behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Effect of Demotivating Behavior on Employee Performance

In research conducted by Albalawi and Al-Hoorie (2021), it was found that demotivating behavior tends to focus on identifying discrete factors that cause this behavior to arise. Considers that one's abilities are innate, and therefore individual failure is a threat to individual self-confidence and self-esteem. Research by Wihardja et al. (2021) revealed that demotivating behavior can be seen by changes in attitude such as not wanting to work with others, not wanting to volunteer, always arriving late, going home early and not being present without any explanation, extending rest periods, not meeting assignment dates, not following the rules, not enthusiastic, physically exhausted, and blaming each other so that employee performance can decrease. Research Hassaskhah et al. (2015) identified three constructs of demotivating behavior that were prominent among individuals, namely: (1) institutional factors, (2) significant other related factors and (3) individual factors. The results of this study indicate significant differences between seniority levels in terms of motivation. Research by Dieleman and Kleinau (2017) found that the factors that lead to demotivating behavior are insufficient financial incentives, inadequate infrastructure and opportunities for continuing educational/professional development, excessive workload, discontinuous human resource management practices and aggression at work. Denyro Kohar et al. (2013) in their research found that the factor that has the greatest weight in motivating project workers is inadequate work income. The relationship between work motivation and demotivation that can affect performance is that with high motivation it can maximize work performance, conversely high demotivating behavior can reduce work performance. Motivation and demotivation are influenced by many factors, so there is no standard that can be used to measure and compare the level of motivation from one place to another.

Disciplinary Behavior Has an Influence on Employee Performance

Research by Kwabe and Nasiru (2020) found that their research revealed that employees' low self-concept due to constant negative labels from leaders causes them to delay work. The findings also show that anxiety and lack of attention from leaders, drug and alcohol abuse lead to disciplinary action. Odebode (2020) in his research stated that using an approach to overcome indiscipline behavior by providing examples of behavior that can be accepted by employees, is considered a good and successful solution. Thus, leaders must be good role models, provide moral education, adopt behaviors such as punishment, and high supervision to curb indiscipline. Research Kocakulah et al. (2016) stated that decreased performance can be caused by disciplinary behavior, employee absences which can have a major impact on office

finances, morale, and other factors. Ifeoma's research (2012) states that the causes of indiscipline are related to bad habits and defiance which can be individual, community and organizational based. Possible solutions identified for indiscipline are leadership patterns and increased moral education. Meanwhile, in his research, Lochan (2010) states that tolerance strategies to limit indiscipline do not have a significant effect on one's performance, so it is recommended to improve existing strategies and approaches to deal with indiscipline.

The Effect of Collaborative Leadership on Employee Performance

Research conducted by Kwabe and Nasiru (2020) recommends that leaders must set an example by showing a positive attitude towards their subordinates; there is also a need for employees to get more attention and care from the leadership. Leadership is an important factor in an organization. The essence contained in leadership is decision making. If a leader's decision making is effective, it will be able to increase motivation, which in turn will support the realization of employee performance. Motivation is an important aspect of achieving performance, because only with strong motivation, someone will be able to carry out their activities properly. The increasing motivation in employees, it will automatically increase the work discipline of employees. On the other hand, if a demotivating behavior has arisen within the employee, then this will indirectly lead to disciplinary behavior. According to Murni (2020) leadership style strengthens the influence of discipline on employee performance. Discipline is an HRM function that becomes a benchmark to measure or find out whether other HR functions as a whole have been implemented properly or not. It was argued that there is a positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee performance with leadership style as a moderating variable (Ihsan, 2021; Hartanto & Widajanti, 2011).

If leadership is effective, it will increase the motivation and work discipline of high employees, then this will have an impact on the realization of optimal performance. In other words, if leadership, motivation, and work discipline increase, employee performance will also increase. Conversely, if leadership, motivation, and work discipline decrease, employee performance will also decrease. For this reason, the authors suspect that there is a significant influence of collaborative leadership which mediates demotivating and indisciplined work behavior on employee performance in private tertiary institutions in the city of Palembang.

Collaborative Leadership Moderates the Effect of Demotivating Behavior on Employee Performance

Research Hariyati et al. (2021) revealed that demotivating behavior during the Covid-19 pandemic was caused by concerns about the workload and the uncomfortable work environment during the Covid-19 pandemic. Variables related to nurse job satisfaction during

the COVID-19 pandemic are coaching and motivation. Analysis from researchers found that there was a lot of turnover during the pandemic, it is necessary to have support from the leadership to provide social support to ensure retention of employee performance because this outbreak makes employees afraid of being exposed to Covid-19, psychological pressure, job dissatisfaction and intention to resign. Szabo et al. (2020) revealed in their research that demotivating behavior is obtained from poor employee appraisal, both in the form of wages, especially in praise, appreciation and recognition at work. These factors are not only from top management, but also from direct supervisors at work. And the employees themselves. This research introduces several actions that can be taken by leaders in collaboration with employees so that they contribute to increasing employee motivation and performance.

Collaborative Leadership in Moderating the Influence of Disciplinary Behavior on Employee Performance

According to Murni (2020) leadership style strengthens the influence of discipline on employee performance. Discipline is an HRM function that becomes a benchmark to measure or find out whether other HR functions as a whole have been implemented properly or not. Based on the statement above, work discipline must be owned by every employee and must be cultivated among employees so that it can support the achievement of organizational goals because it is a manifestation of compliance with work rules and also as self-responsibility. Discipline implementation based on awareness will create a harmonious condition. This harmonious condition must be manifested in harmony between the obligations and rights of employees. This proves that employee discipline has an influence on employee performance. Punishment is needed in increasing discipline and educating employees to obey all the rules. Punishment must be fair and strict against all employees. With justice and firmness, the target of punishment will be achieved.

Regulations without being accompanied by strict punishments for violators are not an educational tool for employees. Therefore good employee work discipline will accelerate office goals, while declining discipline will become a barrier and slow down the achievement of office goals. It was argued that there is a positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee performance with leadership style as a moderating variable (Ihsan, 2021; Hartanto & Widajanti, 2011). If leadership is effective, it will increase employee motivation and high work discipline, so this will have an impact on achieving optimal performance. In other words, if leadership, motivation, and work discipline increase, employee performance will also increase. Conversely, if leadership, motivation, and work discipline decrease, employee performance will also decrease. For this reason, the authors suspect that there is a significant influence of collaborative leadership which moderates demotivating and indisciplined work behavior on

employee performance in private tertiary institutions in the city of Palembang.

METHOD

The method used is the preferred reporting item method for systematic reviews. This method is a form of research methodology that answers certain research questions by collecting, assessing and summarizing all evidence that is in accordance with predetermined eligibility criteria or a research method to identify, evaluate and interpretation of all relevant research results related to certain research statements, certain topics or phenomena of concern to. The literature search was limited to journal articles published in the last ten years. Testing the research instrument was carried out by testing the validity and reliability using SPSS 26. Further hypothesis testing will be carried out using multiple regression to determine the direct effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, while to determine whether there is a moderating effect is carried out by interacting the independent variable with the moderating variable using MRA using AMOS 26.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the results of testing the direct effect on the hypothesis, the following calculations are obtained:

Table 1. Performance Linearity Test Results for Demotivating Behavior ANOVA Table

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
y * x1	Between (Combined) Groups	1950.855	32	60.964	1.341	.107
	Linearity	207.892	1	207.892	4.574	.033
	Deviation from Linearity	1742.963	31	56.225	1.237	.185
	Within Groups	15771.945	347	45.452		
	Total	17722.800	379			

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

Based on the results of the linearity test, it is known that the Sig. deviation from linearity value indicates that there is a significant linear relationship between the demotivating variable and performance, this is indicated by the significant value of 0.300 greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. The results of the linearity test above also show that the F_{count} value is 1.114 which is smaller than the F_{table} value of 1.74.

Table 2. Results of the Performance Linearity Test on Disciplinary Behavior
ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
y * x2	Between Groups	(Combined)	1927.684	25	77.107	1.728	.018
		Linearity	812.729	1	812.729	18.215	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	1114.956	24	46.456	1.041	.412
Within Groups			15795.116	354	44.619		
Total			17722.800	379			

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The results of the linearity test in Table 2 show that there is a significant linear relationship between disciplinary variables and employee performance, this is indicated by the results of a significant value of 0.018 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$. The results of the linearity test above also show that the F_{count} value is 1.799 which is smaller than the F_{table} value of 1.79.

Table 3. Results of the Performance Linearity Test on Collaborative Leadership
ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
y * z	Between Groups	(Combined)	3783.675	31	122.054	3.047	.000
		Linearity	2580.339	1	2580.339	64.420	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	1203.336	30	40.111	1.001	.468
Within Groups			13939.125	348	40.055		
Total			17722.800	379			

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The results of the linearity test in Table 3 show that there is a significant linear relationship between collaborative leadership variables and employee performance, this is indicated by the results of a significant value of 0.645 greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. The results of the linearity test above also show that the F_{count} value is 0.822 which is smaller than the F_{table} value of 1.95.

Table 4. Multicollinearity Analysis Value for each Variable
Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	19.563	2.111		9.267	.000		
X1	.074	.046	.077	1.624	.105	.988	1.012
X2	.094	.065	.075	1.457	.146	.851	1.174
Z	.343	.050	.348	6.810	.000	.857	1.167

a. Dependent Variable: y

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The data requirements can be regressed, so the data tolerance value is greater than 0.1, so the data does not have multicollinearity.

Conversely, if it is less than 0.1, multicollinearity occurs and the data cannot be regressed. Furthermore, when viewed from the VIF value and it is found that the VIF value is less than 10, the data does not occur multicollinearity, conversely if the data is greater than 10, the calculation data occurs multicollinearity. From the calculation of the data on demotivation, indiscipline, collaborative leadership and performance variables, it is found that the data does not have multicollinearity. It is known that the tolerance value ranges from 0.851 – 0.988 which means that the data does not have multicollinearity. Likewise, when viewed from the VIF value, it shows that the data is smaller than 10 which is at a value of 1.012 – 1.174, which means the data can be regressed.

Furthermore, an Outlier test is used to find out whether there are extreme values from the research, if there are extreme values, it is necessary to transform the data or remove the data from the study so as not to cause bias in the research results. Evaluation of outliers can be seen from the Mahalonobis distance in the output of the AMOS program, if the Mahalonobis d-Squared value is greater than the Chi-square value with a degree of freedom (df) of the number of variables at a significance level of 0.05 then the data indicates an outlier. The magnitude of the chi-square with df 430 = 4280.891. From Mahalonobis d-Squared the output results in the table show that the largest Mahalonobis d-Squared value is 222.883 which is smaller than the Chi-square value of 4280.891. Thus, it can be concluded that the data in this study are free from outliers and the data can be continued on the goodness of fit test.

Table 5. Demotivating Behavior Goodness of Fit Index on Performance moderated by Collaborative Leadership

Goodness of Fit Index	Nilai Cut-off	The calculation results	Information
<i>Chi-Square</i>	Expected small	1316.043	x^2 with df = 492 is 1316.043 Less Good
<i>Sig. Probability</i>	≥ 0.05	0.000	Not good
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.126	Not good
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.580	Not good
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.521	Not good
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	2.673	Not good
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.634	Not good
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.553	Not good

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

Obtained the results of the overall model fit test obtained an unfavorable value. So that the model as a whole can be stated not not fit. Based on the results of data processing and evaluation of the model, it turned out that all the goodness of fit criteria used showed unfavorable results, meaning that the model did not fit the data. This means that the conceptual model developed has not been fully supported by facts. From the results of modifications made by

connecting indicators that have the potential to reduce the value of goodness of fit, values are obtained as shown in the following table.

Table 6. Goodness of Fit Results of Demotivating Behavior Modification on Performance moderated by Collaborative Leadership

Goodness of Fit Index	Nilai Cut-off	The Calculation Results	Information
Chi-Square	Expected small	681.543	χ^2 with df = 483 is 681.543 Fairly Good
Sig.Probability	≥ 0.05	0.00	Not good
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.067	Pretty good
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.736	Pretty good
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.680	Pretty good
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.472	Good
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.897	Good

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The results of the modified calculations in Table 6 show that the goodness of fit criteria for Demotivating Behavior on Performance moderated by Collaborative Leadership have been fulfilled because the scores tend to be good. So, it can be said that the model is acceptable, which means there is a match between the model and the data.

Table 7. Goodness of Fit Index Disciplinary Behavior on Performance moderated by Collaborative Leadership

Goodness of Fit Index	Nilai Cut-off	The Calculation Results	Information
Chi-Square	Expected small	1099.599	χ^2 with df = 431 is 1099,599 Not good
Sig.Probability	≥ 0.05	0.000	Not good
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.121	Not good
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.616	Not good
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.559	Not good
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	2.551	Not good
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.709	Not good
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.627	Not good

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The results of the overall model fit test were obtained at RMSEA > 0.01, namely 0.121 which has a good value. So the model as a whole is not fit. Based on the results of data processing and evaluation of the model, it turned out that all the goodness of fit criteria used showed unfavorable results, meaning that the model did not fit the data. This means that the conceptual model developed has not been fully supported by facts. From the results of modifications made by connecting indicators that have the potential to reduce the value of goodness of fit, values are obtained as shown in the following table.

Table 8. Modified Goodness of Fit

<i>Goodness of Fit Index</i>	Nilai Cut-off	The Calculation Results	Information
Chi-Square	Expected small	831.440	χ^2 with df = 427 is 831.440 Fairly Good
Sig. Probability	≥ 0.05	0.00	Not Good
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.095	Pretty Good
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.680	Pretty Good
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.629	Pretty Good
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.947	Good
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.822	Pretty Good

Source: Primary data processed by researchers (2023)

The results of the modified calculations in Table 8 show that the goodness of fit criteria for disciplinary behavior on performance moderated by Collaborative Leadership have been fulfilled because the score tends to be good. So it can be said that the model is acceptable, which means there is a match between the model and the data. So that from the data processing of the independent and dependent variables which are moderated by the collaborative leadership variable, it can be said that the entire model is acceptable, which means that there is compatibility between the model and the research data.

The next test is to do a causality test to find out the accuracy of the variables and the interrelationships between variables. The Standard Estimate (SE) value at the output of AMOS 26.0 shows the value of the regression coefficient of influence between variables, while the probability value shows the effect between variables. The variable is declared significant if the probability value is less than 0.05. Following are the test results presented in Table 8.

Table 9. Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Track			C.R.	P	Result
H ₁	Y	<---	X1	0511	0.609	Rejected
H ₂	Y	<---	X2	- 2.045	0.41	Rejected
H ₃	Y	<---	INTERX1	6.306	***	Accepted
H ₄	Y	<---	INTERX2	8.471	***	Accepted

Description: a. X1 affects Y (H1) b. X2 has an effect on Y (H2) c. X1 affects Y moderated by Z (H3) d. X2 has an effect on Y moderated by Z (H4) The table above explains the significant effect on each variable as follows

The Relationship between Demotivating Behavior (X1) and Performance (Y) in the New Normal Era

H₀ = There is a relationship between Demotivating Behavior on Employee Performance (Y)

H₁ = There is no negative and significant relationship between Demotivating Behavior (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

It is known that if the p-value < 0.05 then the indicator variable can be said to be significant, and vice versa if the p-value ≥ 0.05 then

the indicator variable is said to be insignificant. The probability value on demotivating behavior (X1) is 0.609 which indicates a p-value ≥ 0.05 so that the result is that X1 is not significant. The level of significance can also be seen from the Critical Ratio (CR) value, if the CR value is > 1.96 then the variable is said to be significant and vice versa. The CR value on demotivating behavior (X1) is 0.511 which indicates $CR < 1.96$ so the result is that X1 is not significant. This means that the data collected did not succeed in proving the link between demotivating behavior and performance, and it does not mean that demotivating behavior does not affect performance, but that the sample data failed to prove this relationship. So that the H0 hypothesis in this study was rejected, which means that there is no relationship between demotivating behavior (X1) on employee performance (Y) in the new normal era.

The results of this study are in line with previous research conducted by Rosmaini and Tanjung (2019); and (Mulyadi and Pancasasti 2021) that motivational variables partially have a negative effect on employee performance variables. Extrinsic motivation has a negative and insignificant effect on employee performance. Work motivation is a potential power that exists within a human being, which can affect the results of one's performance positively or negatively. Work motivation is owned by every human being, but there are some people who work more actively than others. Most people want to work harder if there are no obstacles to realizing what is expected.

The Relationship between Disciplinary Behavior (X2) and Performance (Y) in the New Normal Era

H0 = there is a relationship between disciplinary behavior (X2) and employee performance (Y) H2 = there is a negative but not significant relationship between disciplinary behavior (X2) and employee performance (Y)

It is known that if the p-value < 0.05 then the indicator variable can be said to be significant, and vice versa if the p-value ≥ 0.05 then the indicator variable is said to be insignificant. The probability value of disciplinary behavior (X2) is 0.41 which indicates a p-value ≥ 0.05 so that the result is that X1 is not significant. The level of significance can also be seen from the Critical Ratio (CR) value, if the CR value is > 1.96 then the variable is said to be significant and vice versa. The CR value for disciplinary behavior (X2) is -2.045 which indicates $CR < 1.96$ so that the result is that X1 is not significant. This means that the data collected failed to prove the link between disciplinary behavior and performance, and it does not mean that disciplinary behavior has no effect on performance, but that the sample data failed to prove this relationship. So that the H0 hypothesis in this study was rejected, which means that there is no relationship between disciplinary behavior (X1) on employee performance (Y) in the new normal era. Previous research conducted by Mulyadi and Pancasasti (2021) also proved that

disciplinary behavior partially did not have a significant effect on employee performance.

Relationship between Demotivating Behavior (X1) Moderated by Collaborative Leadership (Z1) to Performance (Y) in the New Normal Era

H0 = There is a relationship between Demotivating Behavior (X1) moderated by Collaborative Leadership to Employee Performance (Y)

H3 = There is a positive relationship and significant between Demotivating Behavior (X1) moderated by Collaborative Leadership (Z1) on Performance (Y)

It is known that if the p-value < 0.05 then the indicator variable can be said to be significant, and vice versa if the p-value ≥ 0.05 then the indicator variable is said to be insignificant. The probability value on disciplinary behavior shows a p-value < 0.05 so the result is that demotivating behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on employee performance is significant. The level of significance can also be seen from the Critical Ratio (CR) value, if the CR value is > 1.96 then the variable is said to be significant and vice versa. The CR value on Demotivating Behavior moderated by Collaborative Leadership on Performance is 6.306 which indicates $CR > 1.96$ so the result is that X1 is significant. So it means that the data collected succeeded in proving the link between demotivating behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on performance, and it means that demotivating behavior moderated by collaborative leadership has an effect on performance in the new normal era of the Covid-19 Covid-19 pandemic, so that the hypothesis H0 in this study is accepted which means there is a relationship between demotivating behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on performance.

Relationship between Disciplinary Behavior (X2) moderated by Collaborative Leadership (Z) to Performance (Y) in the new normal era

H0 = There is a relationship between Disciplinary Behavior (X2) moderated by Collaborative Leadership to Employee Performance (Y)

H4 = There is a negative relationship and significant between Disciplinary Behavior (X2) moderated by Collaborative Leadership on Employee Performance (Y)

It is known that if the p-value < 0.05 then the indicator variable can be said to be significant, and vice versa if the p-value ≥ 0.05 then the indicator variable is said to be insignificant. The probability value of demotivating and disciplinary behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on employee performance shows a p-value < 0.05 so the result is that disciplinary behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on employee performance is significant. The level of significance can also be seen from the Critical Ratio (CR) value, if the CR value is > 1.96 then the variable is said to be significant and vice versa.

The CR value for indiscipline moderated by collaborative leadership on employee performance is 8.471 which indicates $CR > 1.96$ so that significant results are obtained. So it means that the data collected succeeded in proving the link between indiscipline moderated by collaborative leadership on employee performance, and it means that disciplinary behavior moderated by collaborative leadership has an effect on performance in the new normal era, so that the hypothesis H0 in this study is accepted, which means there is a relationship between disciplinary behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on performance. In line with research conducted by Hartanto and Widajanti (2011), Murni (2020); and Ihsan (2021) and that there is a positive and significant influence of leadership style as a moderating variable on motivation and discipline on employee performance.

CONCLUSION

In the relationship between demotivating variables (X1) indiscipline (X2) and performance (Y) in the new normal era, p values were obtained of 0.609 and 0.410. The Critical Ratio (CR) values are 0.511 and -2.045 which means that the variables X1 and X2 are not significant and H0 in this study is rejected. So that there is no relationship between demotivating (X1) and disciplinary (X2) behavior on employee performance (Y) in the new normal era. In demotivating and disciplinary variables which are moderated by collaborative leadership on performance, a significant p-value of 0.05 is obtained. The significance level of the collaborative leadership variable that moderates the demotivating and disciplinary variables on employee performance is 6.306 and 8.471 which indicates a CR of 1.96 so that significant results are obtained. So that the hypothesis H0 in this study is accepted, which means that there is a relationship between demotivating and disciplinary behavior moderated by collaborative leadership on performance. Collaborative leadership has a positive influence in the new normal era in moderating demotivating and indiscipline behavior and strengthening employee performance.

REFERENCES

- Albalawi, F. H., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2021). From Demotivation to Remotivation: A Mixed-Methods Investigation. *SAGE Open*, 11(3), 21582440211041101.
- Asiyai, R. I. (2012). Indiscipline in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Types, Causes and Possible Solutions. *African Journal of Education and Technology*, 2(1), 39-47.
- Dieleman, M., & Kleinau, E. (2017). Factors Influencing Retention, Job Satisfaction, and Motivation among Jordanian Health Workers. *Annals of Global Health*, 83(1).
- Egitim, S. (2021). Collaborative Leadership in English Language Classrooms: Engaging Learners in Leaderful Classroom Practices and Strategies. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-21.

- Hartanto, S., & Widjanti, E. (2011). Pengaruh Disiplin dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai dengan Kepemimpinan sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *J. Manaj. Sumberd. Mns*, 5(1), 34-41.
- Hassaskhah, J., Mahdavi Zafarghandi, A., & Fazeli, M. (2015). Reasons for Demotivation across Years of Study: Voices from Iranian English Major Students. *Educational Psychology*, 35(5), 557-577.
- Ihsan, M., SARI, V. N., & Putra, R. A. (2021). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Gaya Kepemimpinan sebagai Variabel Moderating pada PT. P&P Lembahkaret. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Emor (Ekonomi Manajemen Orientasi Riset)*, 4(2), 190-203.
- Kocakulah, M. C., Kelley, A. G., Mitchell, K. M., & Ruggieri, M. P. (2016). Absenteeism Problems and Costs: Causes, Effects and Cures. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 15(3), 89-96.
- Kohar, W. D., & Amelina, S. (2013). Model Pengukuran Tingkat Motivasi dan Demotivasi Pekerja Proyek Konstruksi di Surabaya. *Jurnal Dimensi Pratama Teknik Sipil*, 2(2).
- Kwabe, U. D., & Nasiru, M. The Effect of Indiscipline on Organizational Leadership: Case Study of Mubi North Local Government Council. *Ijiras.Com* 7 (5).
- Lochan, D. (2010). *Students' Perceptions of Indiscipline at Three Primary Schools in One Educational District in Central Trinidad* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Mulyadi, A., & Pancasasti, R. (2022). Upaya Meningkatkan Kinerja Karyawan melalui Motivasi. *Technomedia Journal*, 7(1 Juni), 11-21.
- Murni, E. (2020). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan dalam Memoderasi Hubungan Disiplin dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Unit Pelaksana Teknis Daerah (UPTD) Balai Kesehatan dan Olahraga Masyarakat dan Pelatihan Kesehatan (BKOM DAN PELKES) Provinsi Sumatera Barat.
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Sage publications.
- Odebode, A. A. (2020, April). Views of Nigerian Teachers on Strategies for Curbing Indiscipline: Implications for Counselling Practices. In *Elementary School Forum (Mimbar Sekolah Dasar)* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 30-42). Indonesia University of Education. Jl. Mayor Abdurachman No. 211, Sumedang, Jawa Barat, 45322, Indonesia. Web site: <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/mimbar/index>
- Regen, R., Johannes, J., Edward, E., & Yacob, S. (2020). Employee Development Model and an Assessment on the Perspectives of Work Behavior, Motivation, and Performance: Experience from the Government of Kerinci Regency and the City of Sungai Penuh, Jambi Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, 9(2), 59-69.

- Rosmaini, R., & Tanjung, H. (2019). Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 1-15.
- Setianingrum, R., Hariyati, R. T. S., Pujasari, H., Novieastari, E., & Fitri, D. (2021). Kepuasan Kerja Perawat Pelaksana di Masa Pandemi Covid-19 dan Variabel yang Berhubungan. *Journal of Telenursing (JOTING)*, 3(2), 565-577.
- Szabo, S., Mihalčová, B., Lukáč, J., Gallo, P., Čabinová, V., & Vajdová, I. (2020). Demotivation of Medical Staff in the Selected Health Facility in Slovakia. *E a M: Ekonomie a Management* 23 (2): 83-95. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2020-2-006>.
- Wanta, F. T., Trang, I., & Taroreh, R. N. (2022). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kantor Inspektorat Kabupaten Minahasa Tenggara di Masa Pandemi COVID-19. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 10(1), 113-122.
- Wihardja, H., Arif, Y. K., & Lina, R. N. (2021). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Motivasi Kerja Perawat Pelaksana dalam Merawat Pasien Covid-19 di RS X, Banten. *Jurnal Sehat Mandiri*, 16(1), 131-142.
- Williams, S. N., Armitage, C. J., Tampe, T., & Dienes, K. (2020). Public Perceptions and Experiences of Social Distancing and Social Isolation during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A UK-Based Focus Group Study. *BMJ open*, 10(7), e039334.