Productivity at Work: Impact of Personality Value and Organizational Commitment

Anco¹ & Untung La Paudi²

¹Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta Email: Anco.farham89@gmail.com

²Universitas Negeri Jakarta Email: <u>untunglapaudi@gmail.com</u>

Abstract

The goal of this study was to clarify how organizational commitment and personality value characteristics affected labor productivity in groups of fisherman. In this study, 30 persons made up the sample, and questionnaires and interviews were employed to collect data. Multiple linear regression is the data analysis technique used with the SPSS 24 software. The findings of this study suggest that organizational commitment and personality values have a favorable and significant impact on work productivity. indicating a relationship in the same direction as the hypothesis, or that organizational commitment and personality values will boost job productivity in groups of fisherman.

Keywords: Personality Value, Organizational Commitment, Work Productivity

Introduction

There are a significant number of people that rely on fisheries goods to make a livelihood, but they are not yet considered well-off since they lack the resources to actively pursue catches. The fisheries subsector is extremely reliant on the caliber of its human resources as well as their tenacity and perseverance in utilizing their potential.

A change in the standard of living requires persistent work to raise it, and a person's level of commitment to that effort is based on how they perceive the organization's values in reality or on how well their personal values align with those of the organization (Finegan, 2000), To carry out their operations and achieve their goals, organizations need values. These values are further separated into personal values and organizational values (Ez-Eldin et al., 2018) Personal beliefs, corporate values, and how appropriate they are all have an impact on moral workplace conduct and organizational commitment (Thomas, 2013), Organizational commitment is directly and favorably impacted by personality (Utami et al., 2021) When individuals build organizational commitment during their job, they appear to need to take into account their relationship with the organization in the overall picture (Porter et al., 1974).

All behavioral patterns and personal habits that people develop through time and utilize to respond to and adjust to all stimuli, both internal and external. Because of this, organizational commitment significantly affects performance (Rafiei et al., 2014), Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by organizational commitment (Amri et al., 2021)The group's survival and organization depend heavily on commitment (Sutanto, 2004), whereas productivity is significantly impacted by organizational commitment (Studi et al., 2017).

As long as people are still learning and willing to learn more, as well as gaining experience and skills, they will develop more mature and stable personalities. Because of this personality trait, fishermen are able to act imaginatively and creatively in developing catches, which increases their productivity.

The significance of job productivity in raising welfare has generally been understood. In general, if productivity is enhanced as a force to produce more products and services, no sort of human endeavor is unprofitable. The living conditions of fisherman might also be directly impacted by improved output

Method

All of the participants in this study were members of the fishing community, which consisted of up to two groups, each with 15 participants, for a total of 30 participants. And that includes both the study's entire sample and its overall population as determined by the Likert scale method.

The obtained data will then be processed in accordance with the requirements of the linear double regression analysis in order to analyze the data on the accomplishment of research objectives and test the proposed hypotheses (Bremer, 2012) Regression analysis, specifically a double linear regression, was employed in this study to identify the fisherman group's variable work productivity. Generally speaking, the regression formula and equation are as follows:

 $Y = \beta O + \beta 2 X1 + \beta 2X2 + e$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable

X = independent variable

 β = regression coefficient

 $\beta O = constant$

e = disturbing factor

from the equation above, the model in this study is:

 $Y = a + \beta 1 X 1 + \beta 2X 2 + e$

where:

Y = Work productivity

X1 = personality

X2 = organizational commitment

b = regression coefficient

e = error factor (assuming = 0)

Research result

A. Personal Value

A comment made by fisherman in this study about the impact of a job's productivity on success is used to measure personality value. Extraversion (X11), emotional stability (X 12), agreeableness (X13), conscientiousness (X14), and openness to experience (X15) are the five indications that character traits are translated into (X15).

Table 1 displays the distribution of respondents' responses to the statements in each indicator for each personality variable.

Table 1. Distribution of Answers on Personality Value Variables from Respondents

Items Frequency of Respondents' Answers (f) & Percentage (%)											AVER	CATE
(Items	SS (5) S(4) NR (3) TS (2) STS (1)									AGE	GOR	
)	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		Y
X111	9	30.00	11	36,67	7	23,33	3	10.00	0	0	3.87	Good
X112	11	36,67	8	26,67	6	20.00	4	13,33	1	3,33	3.80	Good
X113	14	46,67	8	26,67	6	20.00	2	6,67	0	0	4,13	Good
		Aver	age In	dicator I	Extra	version	(X1)				3.93	Good
X121 14 46,67 8 26,67 6 20.00 2 6,67 0 0											4,13	Good
X122	9	30.00	9	30.00	7	23,33	4	13,33	1	3,33	3.70	Good
X123	11	36,67	8	26,67	5	16,67	5	16,67	1	3,33	3.77	Good
		Averag	e Indio	ator emo	otion	al stabili	ity (X	(2)			3.87	Good
X131	11	36,67	10	33,33	4	13,33	4	13,33	1	3,33	3.87	Good
X132	14	46,67	8	26,67	6	20.00	2	6,67	0	0	4,13	Good
X133	9	30.00	10	33,33	7	23,33	3	10.00	1	3,33	3.77	Good
Average Indicator Agreeableness (X3)											3.92	Good
X141 15 50.00 7 23,33 6 20.00 2 6,67 0 0											4,17	Good
X142	9	30.00	9	30.00	7	23,33	4	13,33	1	3,33	3.70	Good
X143	11	36,37	7	23,33	5	16,67	6	20.00	1	3,33	3.70	Good
Average Indicator Conscientiousness (X4)										3.86	Good	
X151	9	30.00	9	30.00	7	23,33	4	13,33	1	3,33	3.70	Good
X152	11	36,67	7	23,33	5	16,67	6	20.00	1	3,33	3.70	Good
X153	8	26,67	9	30.00	9	30.00	4	13,33	0	0	3.70	Good
Average	Indic			s to Expe							3.70	Good
		Averag	ge Pers	onality V	Value	Variab	le (X	1)			3.70	

B. Organizational Commitment

In this study, organizational commitment is defined as the degree of trust and acceptance that members of the fishing industry have for the organization's aims and their desire to stay with it. Three indicators—affective commitment (X21), continuing commitment (X22), and normative commitment—are derived from organizational commitment factors (X23).

According to the respondent's comments, organizational commitment is good, as evidenced by the respondent's descriptive research findings. According to the respondents' perceptions, continuation commitment indicators are given more emphasis than normative and emotional commitment indicators. Because they believe they have an emotional connection and a sense of belonging to the company, fishermen's impression of sustained commitment reveals that respondents agree and strongly agree with the indication.

Anco, Untung La Paudi

Shautut Tarbiyah, Volume 30 Nomor 1, Mei 2024 **Productivity at Work: Impact of Personality.....**

Table 2 displays the distribution of respondents' responses to the statements in each indicator for each organizational commitment variable.

Table 2. Responses to Organizational Commitment Variables by Respondents' Distribution

Items Frequency of Respondents' Answers (f) & Percentage (%)											AVER AGE	CA
(Items)	(Items) SS (5) S(4) NR (3) TS (2) STS (1)											
	F	%	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		GO Y
X211	12	40.00	15	50.00	2	6,67	1	3,33	0	0	4,27	Goo
X212	9	30.00	17	56,67	3	10.00	1	3,33	0	0	4,13	Goo
X213	9	30.00	15	50.00	4	13,33	2	6,67	0	0	4.03	Goo
X214	9	30.00	17	56,67	3	10.00	1	3,33	0	0	4,13	Goo
Average Affective Commitment Indicator (X21)											3,14	
X221	13	43,33	13	43,33	4	13,33	0	0	0	0	4.30	Goo
X222	14	46,67	11	36,67	3	10.00	2	6,67	0	0	4,23	Goo
X223 10 33,33 13 43,33 5 16,67 1 3,33 1 3,33										4.00	Goo	
X224	12	40.00	11	36,67	5	16,67	2	6,67	0	0	4,10	Goo
Average Indicators of Sustainable Commitment (X22)										4,16		
X231	8	26,67	17	56,67	4	13,33	1	3,33	0	0	4.07	Goo
X232	12	40.00	14	46,67	3	10.00	1	3,33	0	0	4,23	Goo
X233 11 36,67 14 46,67 3 10.00 2 6,67 0 0										4,13	Goo	
Average Normative Indicators (X23)										4,14		
	Organizational Commitment Variable Average (X2)											

Source: Researchers processed primary data, 2022

The respondents' responses to the sustainable commitment indicator, which has the highest average value of any of the indicators, demonstrate this (4.16). According to fishermen, the reason why they want to stay in the organization is because they emotionally connect with it and identify with it. According to the fisherman, the reasons they want to stay with their company include the difficulty in finding employment elsewhere and their fear of losing the benefits of working there. Therefore, the need for this commitment is driven by the need for money and the incapacity to obtain a better work.

The average degree of fishermen's impression of sustainable commitment, on the other hand, is the lowest at 4.00. The respondents' opinion of the organizational commitment variable, however, was

generally positive. This is evident from the average respondent's 4.15 response to the question about the quantity generated, which takes into account, for instance, the volume of work that must be done and is set by the organization.

C. Work Productivity

Table 3. Distribution of Answers on Work Productivity Variables from Respondents

SS(5) S(4) NR (3) TS (2) STS (1) AGE Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q	CATEG	AVER		ents' Answers (f) & Percentage (%)							Items (Items) Frequency of Response							
Y111 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4,23 Y112 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Y113 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Quality indicator average (Y1) 4.04 Y121 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 3.90 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 <td rows<="" th=""><th>ORY</th><th></th><th>1)</th><th>STS</th><th colspan="2">S (2) S'</th><th colspan="2">NR (3) TS</th><th></th><th>S(4)</th><th colspan="2">SS(5)</th><th colspan="5">(Items)</th></td>	<th>ORY</th> <th></th> <th>1)</th> <th>STS</th> <th colspan="2">S (2) S'</th> <th colspan="2">NR (3) TS</th> <th></th> <th>S(4)</th> <th colspan="2">SS(5)</th> <th colspan="5">(Items)</th>	ORY		1)	STS	S (2) S'		NR (3) TS			S(4)	SS(5)		(Items)				
Y112 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Y113 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Quality indicator average (Y1) 4.04 Y121 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4.23 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 7 23,33 2 6,67 <th></th> <th></th> <th>%</th> <th>f</th> <th>%</th> <th>F</th> <th>%</th> <th>F</th> <th>%</th> <th>F</th> <th>%</th> <th>F</th> <th></th>			%	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F						
Y113 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Quality indicator average (Y1) 4.04 Y121 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4,23 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,	Good	1,23	0	0	0	0	16,67	5	43,33	13	40.00	12	Y111					
Quality indicator average (Y1) Y121 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4,23 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67<	Good	1.00	3,33	1	0	0	23,33	7	40.00	12	33,33	10	Y112					
Y121 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4,23 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1)	Good	3.90	0	0	6,67	2	23,33	7	43,33	13	26,67	8	Y113					
Y122 12 40.00 13 43,33 5 16,67 0 0 0 0 4,23 Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 3.90 3.90 3.90		1.04				'		',	71)	age (Y	tor aver	indica	Quality					
Y123 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00 Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 3.90 3.90 3.90	Good	3.90	0	0	6,67	2	23,33	7	43,33	13	26,67	8	Y121					
Average quantity indicator (Y1) 4.04 Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 3.90 3.90 3.90 3.90	Good	1,23	0	0	0	0	16,67	5	43,33	13	40.00	12	Y122					
Average quantity indicator (Y1) Y121 10 33,33 10 33,33 8 26,67 2 6,67 0 0 3.93 Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90	Good	1.00	3,33	1	0	0	23,33	7	40.00	12	33,33	10	Y123					
Y122 8 26,67 14 46,67 5 16,67 2 6,67 1 3,33 3.87 Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90		1.04		Average quantity indicator (Y1)														
Y123 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90 Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90	Good	3.93	0	0	6,67	2	26,67	8	33,33	10	33,33	10	Y121					
Average reliability indicator (Y3) 3.90 Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90	Good	3.87	3,33	1	6,67	2	16,67	5	46,67	14	26,67	8	Y122					
Y131 8 26,67 13 43,33 7 23,33 2 6,67 0 0 3.90	Good	3.90	0	0	6,67	2	23,33	7	43,33	13	26,67	8	Y123					
		3.90																
Y132 12 40 00 13 43 33 5 16 67 0 0 0 0 4 23	Good	3.90	0	0	6,67	2	23,33	7	43,33	13	26,67	8	Y131					
1132 12 70.00 13 73,33 3 10,07 0 0 0 0 4,23	Good	1,23	0	0	0	0	16,67	5	43,33	13	40.00	12	Y132					
Y133 10 33,33 12 40.00 7 23,33 0 0 1 3,33 4.00	Good	1.00	3,33	1	0	0	23,33	7	40.00	12	33,33	10	Y133					
Average attitude indicator (Y4) 4.04		1.04		Average attitude indicator (Y4)														
Work Productivity Variable Average (Y1) 4.01		.01					.)	e (Y1	Averag	riable	tivity Va	roduc	Work P					

Source: Researchers processed primary data, 2022

Work productivity in this study refers to how effectively and efficiently a fisherman completes his or her tasks in accordance with the tasks assigned to him or her within a given time frame. The four indicators of work productivity are quantity (Y11), quality (Y12), dependability (Y13), and attitude (Y14). Table 3 displays the

distribution of respondents' responses to the statements in each indicator for each variable of work productivity.

The results of the respondent's description research show that work productivity It is good, based on the responses of the respondents. According to the respondents' perceptions, reliability received less emphasis than quality, quantity, and attitude. Fishermen's perceptions of productivity at work reveal that respondents concur and strongly concur on quality, quantity, and attitude, indicating that the amount of work required is in accordance with the standards set by the organization regarding the degree to which the process or results of carrying out activities are close to perfection or close to the anticipated goals.

The respondents' responses to the indicators of quality, quantity, and attitude, which have the highest average value of 4.04, demonstrate this. However, the average level for fishermen's impression of the reliability indication is the lowest, at 3.90. Overall, nonetheless, the respondent's impression of the variable measuring labor productivity was positive. This is seen from the average response of 4.01 given by respondents (good).

D. Autocorrelation Testing

The autocorrelation test is used to determine whether there is a link between the confounding errors in period t and the errors in period t-1 in a linear regression model (previously). An autocorrelation problem is one where there is a correlation. Of course, an autocorrelation-free regression is a good regression model. The DW (Durbin Watson) table, which can be used as a benchmark, can be utilized to determine whether autocorrelation is present as shown in the following:

Table 4. Autocorrelation Test Results

Summary Model ^b										
Adjusted R std. Error of the Durbin-										
Model R R Square Square Estimate Watson										
1 .696 ^a .655 .534 7.95892 1998										
a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Commitment, K										
b. Deper	b. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity									

Source: Researchers processed primary data, 2022 (appendix 4)

To detect the presence or absence of autocorrelation, the Durbin Watson test is carried out with the following conditions:

- A DW value less than 4 indicates a positive autocorrelation.
- DW values between -4 and +4, indicating a lack of autocorrelation.
- DW values greater than +4 denote a negative autocorrelation.

Table 4.11's summary output makes it clear that there is no autocorrelation because the Durbin Watson (D-W) number, which ranges from -4 to +4, is 1,998.

E. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is used to analyze the data used in this study to be able to address the issues and hypotheses that are put forth, specifically the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable both simultaneously and partially. The results of the multiple linear analysis performed in this study using the SPSS 20 program are as follows:

Table 5. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Free Variables	Partial	t count	t sig	Ket
	Coefficient (b)			
Personality Value (X ₁)	0.425	0.144	0.086	When not sig
Organizational Commitment (X ₂)	0.608	3,785	0.000	Sig sig
R =	0.696			
Rs quare =	0.655			
Constanta (α) =	8,280			
$F_{count} =$	17,584			
$F_{sig} =$	0.000			

Source: Researchers processed primary data, 2022

Based on the outcomes of multiple linear regression analysis in table 4.12 above, which shows the relationship between organizational commitment (X2) and personality values (X1) on work productivity factors (Y) in the fishing group, the following information is provided:

$Y=8.280+0.425X_1+0.608X_2$

Where: Y = Work Productivity

 X_1 = Personality Value

 $X_2 = Organizational Commitment$

A = constant (8.280)

 β_1 = Regression Coefficient of Personality Value (0.425)

Anco, Untung La Paudi

Shautut Tarbiyah, Volume 30 Nomor 1, Mei 2024 **Productivity at Work: Impact of Personality.....**

 β_2 = Regression Coefficient of Organizational Commitment (0.608)

The following can be translated from table 3.5 above as follows:

- 1. The relationship between organizational commitment (X2) and personality value (X1) on job productivity in the group of fisherman is strongly correlated, as indicated by the R value (correlation coefficient number) of 0.696.
- 2. The determinant coefficient (R2) value of 0.655 shows that the direct influence of organizational commitment (X2) and personality value variables (X1) on job productivity (Y) is 65.5%, leaving 44.5% unaffected, the effect of other variables that this study did not address. The variable association that is considered strong is defined as being between 0.80 and 100 due to this relationship's statistical strength. The R 2 value of 65.5% shows the stronger the independent variables' effects on job productivity, namely the importance of personality and organizational commitment.
- 3. The simultaneous F test yielded a F count of 17.584 and a F sig level of 0.000. Because the F sig value is higher and smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict work productivity (Y) in the fishermen group by simultaneously accounting for organizational commitment (X2) and personality values (X1).
- 4. Using the following criteria, the t (partial) test is used to determine the significance of each independent variable:

If t $_{count}$ or sig t < $\alpha = 0.005$ then Ho is rejected (significant regression coefficient).

If t $_{count} > t$ $_{sig} > \alpha = 0.005$ then Ho I is rejected (the regression coefficient is not significant).

F. Testing Research Hypotheses

F1. t test (partial)

Hypothesis 1. According to the findings of the linear regression analysis, the t value is 0.144 and the significant level is 0.086, which is greater than the significant level of 0.000. in order for the hypothesis to be believed.

Hypothesis 2. Multiple linear regression analysis reveals that the t value is 3.785 with a significant level of 0.005 > significant level = 0.000 so that the organizational commitment variable (X 2) affects the work productivity variable (Y) and the second hypothesis can be

accepted significantly. The organizational commitment variable (X 2) partially has a positive and significant effect on work productivity (Y) in the fishermen group.

F2. Test f (simultaneous)

Hypothesis 3. Work productivity (Y) in the fisherman group is concurrently positively and significantly influenced by organizational commitment (X2) and personality value characteristics (X1) (X1). The first hypothesis put forth in the study can be accepted simultaneously that the personality value variable (X1) and organizational commitment (X2) have a positive and significant effect on work productivity (Y) in the fishermen group, as shown by the F sig probability value of 0.005 > significant level = 0,00.

Discussion

A. Education and personality values

Personality values can be built by social, family, or religious backgrounds. A person will live their life with a certain personality. These three backgrounds, in essence, provide education about certain values that ultimately shape personality. However, there are universal values of goodness, which live in society, are implemented in family life, and are strengthened by religious teachings.

Some forms of pleasant personality as a result of education are: proactive, intelligent, empathetic, wise, creative, innovative, always learning, humorous, friendly, fair, simple, communicative, patient, humble, loving, firm, protective, disciplined, appreciative, sincere, positive thinking, forgiving and democratic (Nurfuadi et al., 2022).

B. Work Productivity and Knowledge Improvement

Work productivity is the hope of every organizational activist and the hope of the organization as a whole. This productivity is demonstrated by organizational officials in their respective fields. In fact, it is often found that employee work productivity is low in an organization, while in other organizations work productivity is high. Research results show that work productivity is influenced by knowledge, where knowledge is obtained from the process of continuous education and training (Palvalin, 2019).

Anco, Untung La Paudi

C. Organizational Commitment and Work Climate Improvement

Employee commitment to their institution does not exist in a vacuum, but is influenced by various factors, such as adequate salaries, supporting facilities, nurturing leaders, policies that support development, and a conducive work atmosphere. In other words, this is related to the organizational climate. Research shows that a good organizational climate has an effect on increasing organizational commitment (Lo et al., 2024).

Conclusion

From the results of the discussion above it can be concluded as follows: First, the outcomes of multiple linear regression analysis demonstrate that organizational commitment (X2) and personality values (X1) have a simultaneous, positive, and significant impact on job productivity (Y). Work productivity is positively and significantly influenced by organizational commitment (X2) and personality value characteristics (X1) at the same time (Y). Extraversion (X11), emotional stability (X12), agreeableness (X13), conscientiousness (X14), openness to experience (X15), and organizational commitment (X2) are the personality values that are applied in this context. Work productivity (Y) in the fishermen group is negatively impacted by affective commitment (X2.1), sustainable commitment (X2.2), and normative commitment (X2.3). Because work productivity has a significant impact on an organization's success, every business strives to boost productivity in order to meet established organizational objectives. Second, a fisherman group's level of productivity is by its members' organizational commitment influenced Conversely, a fisherman group's level of personality values. productivity is influenced by its members' organizational commitment and personality values. A fisherman group with high organizational commitment and personality values tends to work efficiently to achieve high productivity. Contrarily, fishermen who are content with their jobs but don't put much effort into them tend to work at a reduced capacity, which leads to subpar work outcomes. Third, to carry out this research in order to demonstrate survey research by comparing various groups of fishermen.

Daftar Pustaka

- Amri, A., Ramadhi, R., & Ramdani, Z. (2021). Effect of Organization Commitment, Work Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Study at. PT. PLN (Persero) P3b Sumatera UPT Padang). *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, 2(1), 88. https://doi.org/10.12928/ijemi.v2i1.3183
- Bremer, M. (2012). Math 261A -Spring 2012. *Math 261A -Spring* 2012, *I*, 18–36.
- Ez-Eldin, K., Alasser, N., bahie, S., Mohamed, A., & Morsi, M. (2018). the Effect of Employees' Personal Values on Achieving Organizational Strategic Goals. March 2018. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17925.09445
- Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 149–169. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900166958
- Lo, Y. C., Lu, C., Chang, Y. P., & Wu, S. F. (2024). Examining the influence of organizational commitment on service quality through the lens of job involvement as a mediator and emotional labor and organizational climate as moderators. *Heliyon*, *10*(2), e24130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24130
- Nurfuadi, N., Khasanah, E. U., & Fian, K. (2022). Nilai-Nilai Kepribadian Guru Dalam Pendidikan Islam. *Ta'allum: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *10*(1), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.21274/taalum.2022.10.1.43-55
- Palvalin, M. (2019). What matters for knowledge work productivity? *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 209–227. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2017-0091
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *59*(5), 603–609. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037335
- Rafiei, M., Taghi Amini, M., & Foroozandeh, N. (2014). Studying the impact of the organizational commitment on the job performance. *Management Science Letters*, *4*(8), 1841–1848. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2014.6.046
- Studi, K., Cv, K., & Manado, K. (2017). The Effect of Workplace

Anco, Untung La Paudi

Shautut Tarbiyah, Volume 30 Nomor 1, Mei 2024 **Productivity at Work: Impact of Personality.....**

- Quality and OrganizationalCommitment on Employee's Productivity (Case Study: CV. Kombos Manado). *Jurnal EMBA*, 5(1), 184–194.
- Sutanto, E. M. (2004). the Relationship Between Employee Commitment and Job Performance. *The Relationship Between Employee Commitment and Job Performance*, *I*(1), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.9744/jmk.1.1.pp.
- Thomas, T. P. (2013). The Effect of Personal Values, Organizational Values, and Person-Organization Fit on Ethical Behaviors and Organizational Commitment Outcomes Among Substance Abuse Counselors: A Preliminary Investigation. *Thesis*, 1–143.
- Utami, P. P., Widiatna, A. D., Ayuningrum, S., Putri, A., Herlyna, & Adisel. (2021). Personality: How does it impact teachers' organizational commitment? *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 40(1), 120–132. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v40i1.33766