

# THE INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP, ATTITUDE OF WORK AND WORK MOTIVATION TOWARD PRODUCTIVITY OF LECTURERS OF ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF NORTH SUMATERA

Candra Wijaya<sup>1</sup>, Saiful Akhyar Lubis<sup>2</sup>, Ojak Manurung<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer at State Islamic University North of Sumatra Medan

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer at State Islamic University North of Sumatra Medan

<sup>1</sup> Writer is Ph.D student at State Islamic University North of Sumatra Medan

**Abstract.** This study aims to address the problems of the seven proposed hypotheses, which include: 1) Does organizational culture directly influence work motivation ?; 2) Does spiritual leadership directly influence work motivation ?; 3) Does work attitude directly influence work motivation ?; 4) Does the organizational culture affect work productivity ?; 5) Does spiritual leadership affect work productivity?; 6) Does work attitude affect work productivity ?; and 7) Does work motivation affect work productivity? The population in this study were all lecturers in nine faculties in the Islamic University of North Sumatra, totaling 332 people with a total sample of 186 people taken using the Krejci table. The research instrument was a questionnaire with a Likert scale. The research data is processed and analyzed by path analysis path analysis. The results of the analysis show that: 1) Organizational culture has a direct effect on the work motivation of lecturers by 4.4%; 2) Spiritual leadership directly affects work motivation by 8.4%; 3) Work attitude directly influences lecturer work motivation by 3.7%; 4) Organizational culture directly influences work productivity by 5.1%; 5) Spiritual leadership affects the productivity of lecturers' work is 8%; 6) Work attitude influences lecturer work productivity by 10.5%; 7) Organizational culture indirectly influences the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 1.1%; 8) Spiritual leadership has an indirect influence on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 2%; 9) Work attitude gives an indirect effect on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 1.5%; 10) Work motivation directly influences lecturer work productivity by 5.9%, and 11) The total (simultaneous) effect of organizational culture, spiritual leadership, work attitude and work motivation together on the work productivity of lecturers at the Islamic University of North Sumatra by 50, 6%, while the rest comes from other factors outside the variables used in this study.

**Keywords:** Organizational Culture, Spiritual Leadership, Work Attitude, Work Motivation and Work Productivity.

## I. Introduction

The lecturer as a professional educator and as a scientist has a very strategic role and has the main task of transforming, developing and disseminating knowledge and being able to increase productivity in producing scientific and research work, as one of the main tasks of a lecturer. This expectation was not fulfilled as expected, empirical facts in the field showed that lecturer research productivity tends to be left behind because the knowledge transfer activity is emphasized more on teaching than research. Besides that the high teaching load makes lecturers less time in conducting research so lecturers tend to allocate time the old one just to prepare teaching material in class. The low ability of lecturers in research is also a challenge in building a research culture in Indonesia, Limited facilities also become obstacles to research growth in Indonesia. There are still many libraries that are not equipped with up to date journal databases, laboratories and equipment that are not yet automated, and funding and rewards for conducting research that is not considered to be worth it. (2016).

The above conditions are not far from the reality that occurred at the Islamic University of North Sumatra (UISU) which was established on January 7, 1952 which was originally named the Indonesian Islamic Academy (equivalent to class III high school part A), then changed to Indonesian Islamic College (PTII), and finally changed again to the Islamic University of North Sumatra as it is today, (2017: 12), although based on the results of the ranking of the Menristek Dikti in 2017 places the Islamic University of North Sumatra (UISU) as a Private University in the first or number one in the Kopertis Region 1 and ranked 124 nationally (2020).

The data above shows that UISU locally has positioned itself as a private tertiary institution (PTS) that should be considered, but nationally UISU continues to be expected to increase its work productivity, especially in terms of improving the quality of human resources, student affairs, institutions and research and publications as instruments for measuring productivity UISU work on one side and lecturer productivity on the other.

An understanding of the factors driving the productivity of lecturers is important to know. This happens because universities as one of the elements in the National Education System have a responsibility in educating the life of the nation, especially related to the results of quality research to solve problems of humanity and nationality. In addition, universities are institutions that are dedicated not only to spread knowledge but also to create new knowledge through research.

Lecturer work productivity is basically influenced by mental attitude in the form of work motivation, work discipline and work ethics, education, skills, management of Pancasila industrial relations, income and health levels, social security, social environment and work climate, production facilities, technology and opportunities for achievement. (2017: 12) Colquit, Lepine, and Wesson, (2009: 8) in the form of a model called the Integrative Model of Organization Behavior confirms that individual outcomes that are considered to influence behavior performance and organizational commitment consist of: job satisfaction, stress, motivation, trust, justice and ethics, as well as learning and decision making. Meanwhile, individual mechanisms are influenced by organizational mechanisms consisting of, organizational culture and organizational structure, group mechanisms, consisting of leadership styles and behaviors, leadership power and influence, team processes, team characteristics, and individual characteristics, consisting of: personality and cultural values and abilities.

Mc. Shane and Glinow, (2007: 24) develop a model of organizational behavior. The model they developed was known as the Model of Individual Behavior and Results. This model shows four factors that affect individual work performance or productivity, namely motivation, ability, role, perception and situation factors. According to Shane and Glinow if these four factors weaken then individual performance or productivity will decrease. Motivation, abilities, roles, perceptions and factors of this situation are determined by individual characters in the form of values. In the Phase II Basic Organizational Behavior model developed by Robbins, (2003: 34) it is explained that individual performance can be seen from productivity, absenteeism, employee turnover, citizenship, satisfaction. According to him individual performance is influenced by behaviors at the level of (1) individuals in the form of biographical characteristics, personality and emotions, values and attitudes, abilities, perceptions, motivations, individual learning and decision making, (2) groups of change and stress, communication, conflict, power and politics, work teams, group structure, leadership and trust and group decision making, and (3) organizational systems in the form of organizational culture, organizational structure, work design and technology, and human resource policies and practices. All factors at each level of this analysis interact with each other and influence individual performance.

Benardin and Russel, (1993: 40) explain the determinants of the size of productivity are knowledge, skills, competencies (abilities), attitudes, and behaviors. Furthermore, Gomes, (2003: 160) also explained the factors that influence work productivity are: (1) knowledge, (2) skill / expertise, (3) ability, (4) attitude, and (5) behavior. Based on the views of Sedarmayanti, Colquit, Shane and Glinow, Slocum and Hellriegel, Benardin and Russel and Gomes above, it can be explained that organizational culture, spiritual leadership, work attitude and work motivation are the determining variables for efforts to increase lecturer work productivity.

Organizational culture is a determining factor for work motivation and work productivity of lecturers. Culture is defined as the order of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religions, time, roles, relationships, space, concepts of the universe, material objects and possessions that are acquired by large groups of people from generation to generation through individual efforts and groups, (2003: 18) Culture tells employees how things are done and what is important, besides containing what may or may not be done so that it can be said to be a guideline used to carry out organizational activities. Lunenburg and Ornstein, (2004: 89-90) emphasized that organizational culture influences employee performance, organizational effectiveness, organizational structural processes and many other management or administrative processes such as motivation, leadership, decision making, communication, and change.

Leadership also influences work motivation and work productivity of lecturers. According to Sondang Siagian, (2002: 62), leadership is the ability of a person to influence others in this case his subordinates, in such a way that other people want to do the will of the leader even though that person may not be liked. Then according to Hasibuan, (2012: 169) a leader is someone with leadership authority directing his subordinates to do part of his work in achieving goals. So that leadership is someone who has the nature to be able to use his authority to be able to direct his subordinates to do some of his work in achieving organizational goals. While leadership according to Alan Keith, (2002: 3), is interpreted as creating a way for people to contribute in creating something extraordinary. So that the conclusion is leadership is one of the organizational functions that allows someone to be able to influence others to be able to do a job for the achievement of an organizational goal.

In relation to spiritual leadership, the leadership that brings the worldly dimension to the spiritual dimension (divinity) and relies more on spiritual intelligence in leadership activities, Tobroni, (2005: 6). Spiritual leadership is leadership that strongly maintains ethical values and upholds spiritual values. Spiritual leadership (Spiritual Leadership), is not about intelligence and skills in mere leadership. But it also upholds the values of truth, honesty, integrity, credibility, wisdom, compassion, which form a role in stimulating members to get involved together in efforts to realize the ideals of the school, Tzong, (1999: 249) Ethical-based spiritual leadership religious encourage the emergence of honesty of heart, fairness, self-recognition, focus on pious deeds, and not spiritualism that is not dogmatic, work more efficiently, arouse the best in oneself and others, openness to accept change, discipline that remains flexible, relaxed and smart, and humility. The success of a spiritual leader is not determined by one person or several people. That success is precisely the result of a joint between the leadership and the people they lead. The leader will not do much without the participation he leads. Conversely, people who are led, will not effectively carry out their duties and obligations without control, deployment, and cooperation with the leadership.

From this statement, it is worth Hadari and Nawawi, (2006: 36) states that the success of leadership is determined by the ability to control a number of people, becoming a team or team that is compact. A leader can perform a variety of ways in the activity of influencing or motivating others or subordinates to take actions that are always directed towards the achievement of organizational goals. This has the consequence that every leader is obliged to pay serious attention to fostering, mobilizing, directing all the potential teachers in their environment in order to realize the volume and workload that is directed to the goal. Leaders need to make a real coaching of the teacher so that it can lead to job satisfaction and motivation and organizational commitment so that it leads to high performance.

In line with this Robbins, (2003: 362) through The Path - Goal Model suggests that performance and job satisfaction are influenced by two situations, namely environmental factors that are outside the control of subordinates which includes the task structure, formal authority system and work group while the factors being controlled is a personal characteristic that includes a locus of control, experience and ability, and from these two factors the behavior exhibited by the leader is to provide encouragement by providing guidance, training, support and rewards. The results of research that are in line with the views of the experts above were conducted by Thayib, Christiananta, & Eliyana, (2013: 1-16) which proved that spiritual leadership has an influence on work performance.

Another factor that is considered to have influenced the work productivity of lecturers is the work attitude they have related to the willingness to work together, be able to accept additional assignments, and work in a team. The existence of a good working attitude among lecturers at a tertiary institution such as: working in team work will encourage to carry out the tasks assigned to the lecturer to complete it well besides, a positive work attitude is expected to bring about an attitude of cohesiveness and of course with the emergence of this organizational success will be easily achieved ie production output (productivity). This is in line with research conducted by Sukirman, (2007: 234), Nasrun and Tri Bodro Astuti, (2012: 21) concluding that work attitudes affect work productivity. This means that if the work attitude is further improved, work productivity will also increase.

Motivation also affects the work productivity of lecturers. Motivation is the driving force from within that causes people to do something or try to meet needs. Motivation first arises because the needs are not satisfied (unsatisfied need) and then cause tension (tension), the tension as drives (drives) that lead to the selection of actions (search behavior), so that needs are met satisfactorily, and ultimately can reduce tension, (Robbins, (2009: 662).

Motivation is the will to do, which is the ability or drive in human beings that causes it to act, think and speak in a certain way for certain targets, (Richard, (1995: 352). Motivation is related to psychological processes that reflect the interaction between attitudes, needs, perceptions and decisions that occur in a person. In the context of the organization, motivation is interpreted as a willingness to spend a high level of effort toward organizational goals conditioned by its ability to meet individual needs. Hoy & Miskel, (2001: 72) states that basically work performance or productivity itself is the result of a combination of ability and motivation. Mc.Clalland's research explains that there is a correlation between achievement motivation and work performance, and Mahateru explained that the main key to performance lies in motivation to work, Chalpin also mentioned that achievement motivation is (1) a person's desire to achieve success, (2) a person's desire to involve themselves in a task, (3) a desire to successfully carry out a difficult task. Likewise, the results of Glover & Bruning's research explain that individuals who have high achievement motivation will always work hard to succeed without expecting rewards or praise.

Wibowo, (2012: 32) states that motivation can certainly affect work performance or productivity, although it is not the only factor that shapes it. In the A Job Performance Model of Motivation model developed by Robert Kraitner and Angelo Kinichi, (2012: 310) it is shown how motivated behavior influences performance. The model states that workers will be more directly motivated if they believe that their performance will be recognized and valued.

Empirical facts of research conducted by Purnama, (2008) concluded that there is an influence of work motivation variables on employee work productivity amounted to 0.502 (50%). The results of this study indicate that an increase or decrease in work motivation variables will have a direct impact with an increase or decrease in work productivity variables. If the better the implementation of work motivation, the higher the work productivity obtained. This is in accordance with the opinion of Hasibuan, (2002: 153) that motivation is an expertise, in directing employees and organizations to want to work successfully, so that employees' desires are achieved while achieving organizational goals. Klinger and Nanbaldin as quoted by Faustino Cardoso Gomes, (2003: 160) stated that: "... productivity is a multiplication function of employee effort (effort), which is supported by high motivation, with employee ability (ability), obtained through training- practice. Work motivation is an inseparable part to produce employee work productivity so that it can expedite employee work. In accordance with the opinion of J. Ravianto, (1988: 12) which states that a person's productivity is influenced by various factors both related to that person and outside factors, such as education, skills, discipline, attitudes and work ethics, motivation, salary and health, technology, management and opportunity for achievement.

It is clear that motivation has an influence on productivity where if the motivation of an employee is good then the company's productivity will increase, and vice versa if the motivation of an employee is low then the productivity of the company will decrease. Although motivation is not the only factor that affects productivity but motivation has an important role and influence in increasing work productivity.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a quantitative study with a correlational design approach. The place of research was conducted at the Islamic University of North Sumatra with the lecturer as a thorough object. Research time is planned since the research paradigm. The population in this study were all lecturers in nine faculties in the Islamic University of North Sumatra, totaling 332 people. The sample was 186 people. Research data were collected using a Likert scale model questionnaire. Data analysis was performed by path analysis

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The direct influence of organizational culture on work motivation.

The first finding is that organizational culture shows a positive and significant influence on work motivation with a magnitude of 4.4%. The findings of this study show that the organization and culture that is embraced should be able to increase satisfaction for the people in it, in line with this opinion Winardi (2003: 54), Abdillah (2019:99-111) emphasize that an organization needs to create a good climate to achieve increased work, knowledge and satisfaction .

Based on the opinion above, work situations and conditions that can fulfill everything related to the needs, desires and expectations can be in the form of values, attitudes and beliefs adopted by the organization or commonly known as organizational culture. The university as an organization needs to build an effective organizational culture, this is considering the organizational culture is the glue and unifying members and determining how to perceive, think and act on the work environment and even organizational culture can also be interpreted as values, attitudes, beliefs, habits and expectations of all individual members of the organization starting from the top leadership to the front

lines, so that there is no activity that can break away from this organizational culture and in turn will foster harmony of work within the organization which will ultimately provide work motivation for people at the university.

#### **The direct influence of spiritual leadership on work motivation.**

The second finding, spiritual leadership, shows a positive and significant influence on work motivation with a magnitude of 8.4%. So, spiritual leadership has a direct positive effect on work motivation where 8.4% of changes in work motivation can be determined by spiritual leadership.

Leadership plays an important role in motivating individuals or employees. Motivational activities carried out by a leader are directed at: a) encouraging members of the organization to work and act. Without motivation the lecturer will not act, move and work either for himself or the organization. Only labor or followers have work motivation used by leaders to work. Therefore, the leader's main task is to build the desire, willingness and enthusiasm or motivation of his followers to work, act and move to realize the leader's vision and mission. High and low lecturers' work motivation determines the level of effort and various lecturers' behavior; b) increase the level of efficiency of lecturers and organizations. Lecturers who are motivated to carry out their work reduce the cost of supervision because they do not need to be governed and supervised to carry out their routine tasks. Lecturers who are motivated to carry out their duties will work optimally not only work to simply meet the minimum performance standards. High performance lecturers produce work productivity or high organizational performance; c) labor stability. Lecturers who have high work motivation have job satisfaction, work ethic, work discipline, and high morale. Lecturers who have such characteristics are less likely to leave the organization moving to another organization and will work until retirement. Thus, the quantity and quality of the organization's workforce will be stable.

#### **The direct effect of work attitude on work motivation.**

The third finding namely work attitude shows a positive and significant influence on the work motivation of lecturers with a magnitude of 3.7%, this finding empirically confirms that work attitudes felt by lecturers become an inseparable part of increasing work motivation. According to Kartono, (2006: 297) argues that attitude is an organization of cognitive, emotional and moments of will that is specifically influenced by past experiences, so that they are dynamic and give direction to each employee's behavior. The working attitude of a lecturer is the tendency of a lecturer to respond to likes or dislikes to his work, which in turn is expressed in the form of actions or behaviors regarding his profession. The response and behavior of a lecturer to his work can be expressed in the form of trust and satisfaction with his work and in the form of behavior displayed in carrying out his work assignments.

#### **The direct influence of organizational culture on work productivity.**

The fourth finding namely organizational culture shows a positive and significant effect on work productivity with a magnitude of 5.1%.

So, organizational culture has a direct positive effect on the work productivity of lecturers, where 5.1% of changes in work productivity can be determined by organizational culture.

Work productivity does not just appear but must be grown and stimulated through the creation of a strong organizational culture. Organizational culture is a set of values, norms, perceptions and behaviors that are created and developed by an organization / company to overcome problems, both internal integration problems and external adaptation issues. As a unity of ideas, the culture of an organization also functions as a guideline for members to behave and act, or contains a prohibition to take an action in facing an environmental challenge.

#### **The direct influence of spiritual leadership on work productivity.**

The findings of these five studies empirically prove that spiritual leadership affects the productivity of lecturers' work with a magnitude of 8%. This empirical fact shows that spiritual leadership is considered as an important factor that determines the success of an organization. Good leadership in an organization can increase the work productivity of lecturers, and vice versa. During this time, the transactional and transformational leadership mainstream emphasizes more on aspects of character and behavior. The results of research on the theory of leadership behavior can be concluded that none of the leadership theories that guarantee the possibility of success as a leader. This is because so far, the existing leadership models still view that the nature of leadership is a mandate from humans and not a mandate from God and also humans. Members in an organization are driven by material and altruistic appeal by ignoring exemplary values. Consequently, productivity / performance achieved is solely aimed at achieving organizational goals and not human responsibility to God.

#### **The direct effect of work attitude on work productivity.**

The sixth findings of this study empirically prove that work attitude directly influences lecturer work productivity with a magnitude of 10.5%. In addition, the findings of the nine studies also show empirically that work attitudes indirectly affect the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 0.015. Thus, work attitude indirectly determines changes in work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 1.5%.

This empirical fact shows that the work attitude displayed by the lecturers is considered as an important factor that is crucial for increasing work productivity. This is in line with what was stated by Sedarmayanti, (2001: 15) which confirms that productivity is strongly influenced by factors as follows: 1). Work attitude, 2). Skill level, 3). The relationship between workforce and organizational leadership, 4). Productivity management, 5) Workforce efficiency, and 6). Entrepreneurship.

#### **The direct influence of organizational culture on work productivity through work motivation.**

The findings of the seven studies also show empirically that organizational culture has an indirect influence on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 0.011. Thus, organizational culture indirectly to determine changes in work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 1.1%.

The results of this study confirm that organizational culture and work motivation are supporting factors for achieving high work productivity for lecturers. A strong organizational culture and high work motivation can also increase work productivity. Because the success of a work productivity will also be influenced by management in an organization such as universities, faculties and study programs within the Islamic University of North Sumatra. To achieve this, high work productivity is needed from all elements of the University including lecturers.

### **The direct influence of spiritual leadership on work productivity through work motivation.**

The eight findings of this study also showed empirically that spiritual leadership had an indirect influence on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 0.020. Thus, spiritual leadership indirectly determines changes in work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 2%.

This empirical fact shows that spiritual leadership is considered as an important factor that determines the success of an organization. Good leadership in an organization can increase the work productivity of lecturers, and vice versa. So that the productivity of the lecturers continues to increase from time to time, the spiritual leadership model which is paraded by leaders in the university, faculty and study program areas should also be directed at efforts to increase the work motivation of the lecturers.

### **The direct effect of work attitude on work productivity through work motivation.**

The ninth findings of this study empirically prove that work attitudes indirectly affect the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation of 0.015. Thus, work attitude indirectly determines changes in work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 1.5%.

This empirical fact shows that the work attitude displayed by the lecturers is considered as an important factor that is crucial for increasing work productivity. This is in line with what was stated by Sedarmayanti, (2001: 12) which confirms that productivity is strongly influenced by factors as follows: 1). Work attitude, 2). Skill level, 3). The relationship between workforce and organizational leadership, 4). Productivity management, 5) Workforce efficiency, and 6). Entrepreneurship.

### **The direct effect of work motivation on work productivity.**

The tenth findings of this study empirically prove that work motivation directly affects the productivity of lecturers' work with a magnitude of 5.9%. This finding means that the effect of the implementation of work motivation on work productivity is 5.9%. The remaining 94.4% is determined by other factors such as education and training, nutrition and health, income levels and social security, work environment and climate, skills, satisfaction, supervision, technology, management, government policy, work experience, investment, relationships industrial, licensing, monetary, fiscal, and others. Ravianto, (1994: 14). These results indicate that the increase or decrease in work motivation variables will have a direct impact with the increase or decrease in work productivity variables.

### **Simultaneous influence between organizational culture, spiritual leadership, work attitude and work motivation together on work productivity.**

The eleventh findings of this study indicate the magnitude of the total (simultaneous) influence of organizational culture, spiritual leadership, work attitude together towards the work productivity of the lecturers of the Islamic University of North Sumatra as a whole reaching 50.6%, while the rest is determined by other factors beyond the variables used in this research. The findings of this study are in line with the theory previously stated that lecturer work productivity is basically influenced by mental attitudes in the form of work motivation, work discipline and work ethics, education, skills, management of Pancasila industrial relations, level of income and health, social security, social environment and work climate, production facilities, technology and opportunity for achievement. (Sedarmayanti, (2001: 12) Colquit, Lepine, and Wesson in the form of a model called the Integrative Model of Organization Behavior confirms that individual outcomes that are considered to influence performance behavior and organizational commitment consist of: job satisfaction, stress, motivation, trust, justice and ethics, as well as learning and decision making, meanwhile, individual mechanisms are influenced by organizational mechanisms consisting of, organizational culture and organizational structure, group mechanisms, which consist of leadership style and behavior, leadership power and influence, team processes, team characteristics, as well as individual characteristics, consisting of: personality and cultural values and abilities.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the data and analysis results that have been presented, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Organizational culture directly influences the work motivation of lecturers is 4.4%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in lecturers' work motivation of 4.4% are determined by organizational culture.
2. Spiritual leadership has a direct effect on work motivation at 8.4%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work motivation of lecturers by 8.4% are determined by spiritual leadership.
3. Work attitude directly influences the work motivation of lecturers is 3.7%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work motivation of lecturers by 3.7% are determined by work attitude.
4. Organizational culture has a direct effect on work productivity by 5.1%. This means that changes (increases or decreases) that occur in the work productivity of lecturers by 5.1% are determined by organizational culture.
5. Spiritual leadership influences the work productivity of lecturers is 8%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in lecturer work productivity of 8% are determined by spiritual leadership.
6. Work attitude influences the work productivity of lecturers is 10.5%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work productivity of lecturers by 10.5% are determined by work attitude.
7. Organizational culture provides an indirect influence on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 1.1%. This means that changes (increases or decreases) that occur in lecturers' work productivity of 1.1% are determined by organizational culture through work motivation.
8. Spiritual leadership gives an indirect effect on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 2%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work productivity of lecturers by 2% are determined by organizational culture through work motivation.
9. Work attitude gives an indirect effect on the work productivity of lecturers through work motivation is 1.5%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work productivity of lecturers by 1.5% are determined by organizational culture through work motivation.
10. Work motivation has a direct effect on the work productivity of lecturers is 5.9%. This means that changes (increase or decrease) that occur in the work productivity of lecturers by 5.9% are determined by work motivation.

11. The total (simultaneous) effect of organizational culture, spiritual leadership, work attitude and work motivation together on the work productivity of lecturers at the Islamic University of North Sumatra by 50.6%, while the rest comes from other factors outside the variables used in this study.

## References

- [1] Abdillah and A. Sulaiman. 2019. The contribution of work motivation and Communication toward teachers' Performance at Muhammadiyah 02 Tanjung sari medan. *Managere: Indonesian Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 01 No. 01, p. 99-111.
- [2] Bateman, Thomas S dan Snell, Scott A. 2004. *Management The New Competitive Landscape*. New York: Mc Graw - Hill / Irwin
- [3] Bernardin, John H. dan Russel, Joy E. A. (1993). *Human Resources Management*. Singapore: McGraw Hill Inc
- [4] Cardoso Gomes, Faustino. 2003. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Andi Offset.
- [5] Dewan Produktivitas Nasional. 1986 *Orientasi Produktivitas dan Ekonomi Jepang: Apa yang harus dilakukan Indonesia*, dalam J. Ravianto. Universitas Indonesia: Lembaga Sarana Informasi Usaha dan Produktivitas.
- [6] Drucker, Peter F. 2002. *Professionals' Productivity*, Copyright by ProQuest Company
- [7] DuBrin, Andrew J. 2003. *Essential of Management*. Sixth Edition. USA: Thomson South Western
- [8] Dwivedi, R. S. 1981. *Dynamic of Human Behavior at Work*. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing
- [9] George, Jennifer M & Jones, Gareth R. 1996. *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*, New York: addison wesley Publishing Co.
- [10] Giacalone, R.A. & Jurkiewicz,C.L. 2003. *Toward a Science of Workplace Spirituality*, Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance. New York.
- [11] Gomes, Faustino Cardoso. 2003. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Andi
- [12] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2003. *Organisasi dan Motivasi Dasar Peningkatan Produktivitas*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- [13] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2002. *Managemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Jakarta; Bumi Aksara.
- [14] Hendricks, Gay dan Kate Ludeman. 1996. *The Corporate Mystic: A Guidebook for Visionaries with Their Feet on the Ground*. New York.: Bantam Book.
- [15] Hofstede, Geert. 1986. *Culture's Consequences, International Differences in Work – Related Values*. London: Sage Publications.
- [16] Horton, Sylvia. 2000. *Introduction the Company Movement. Its Origins and Impact on The Public Sector*. The Internastional Journal of Public Sector Management, vo. 13. No. 4.
- [17] Hoy, Wayne K. dan Miskel, Cecil H. (1991). *Educational Admistration: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [18] James, Robins G. dan Jones, Barbara J. (1986). *Komunikasi yang Efektif untuk Pemimpin, Pejabat dan Usahawan*. Jakarta: Pedoman Ilmu Jaya.
- [19] Jason A, J Colquitt, Lepine, Jeffery A. & Wesson, Michael J. (2009). *Organizational Behavior Improving Performance and Commitment in the Work Place*. New York :Mc Graw-Hill.
- [20] Koontz, Harold.et.all. (1990). *Management, a System and Contingency Analysis of Managerial Function*. Tokyo: Megraw Hill, Kogakusha.
- [21] Louis W, Fry, Vitucci, Steve; Cedillo, Marie. (2005). *Spiritual Leadership and Army Transformation: Theory, Measurement and Establishing a Baseline*. Leadership Quarterly, 16(5).
- [22] McClelland, David C. 1976. *The Achieving Sociaty*. New York : A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- [23] Nawawi, Hadari dan Hadari, Martini. 1990. *Kepemimpinan Yang Efektif*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press
- [24] Nawawi, Hadari. 2006 *Kepemimpinan Mengefektifkan Organisasi*, Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press,
- [25] Newell, Clarence A. 1978. *Human Behavior in Educational Administration* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- [26] Owens, Robert G. 1991. *Organizational Behavior in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Inc.
- [27] Ravianto, J. 1986. *Produktivitas dan Manajemen: Kumpulan Kertas Kerja*. Jakarta: Lembaga Sarana Informasi Usaha dan Produktivitas.
- [28] Ravianto, J. 1994. *Produktivitas dan Manusia Indonesia*. Jakarta: SIUP.
- [29] Rawls, John. 1997. *A Theory of Justice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- [30] Richardson, Helen. 2002. *How Do You Measure Productivity*. Copyright by ProQuest Company.
- [31] Robbins, Stephen P. 1994. *Teori Organisasi: Struktur, Desain dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Arcan.
- [32] Robbins, Stephen P. & Timothy A. Judge. 2009. *Organizational Behavior*. 13 Th Edition, USA: Pearson International Edition, Prentice Hall.
- [33] Robbin, Stephen P. dan DeCemzo, David. 2003. *Fundamentals of Management, Essential Concepts and Applications*. Fourth Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
- [34] Russel, Robert S. dan Taylor, Bernard W. 1998. *Operations Management Focusing on Quality and Competitiveness*. Second Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [35] Sedarmayanti. 1996. *Tata Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja. Suatu Tinjauan dari Aspek Ergonomi atau Kaitan antara Manusia dengan Lingkungan Kerjanya*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- [36] Sedarmayanti. 2001. *Sumber Daya Manusia Dan Produktifitas Kerja*, (Bandung: Mandar Maju).
- [37] Sheridan, Andrew May, 1997. *Think Globally and Act Locally, Competencies for Global management*. Career Development International.
- [38] Winardi, J. 2003. *Teori Organisasi dan Pengorganisasian*, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo.
- [39] Wirawan. 2013. *Kepemimpinan : Teori, Psikologi, Perilaku Organisasi, Aplikasi dan Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.