Analysis of effect of leadership style, work motivation and work ability to employee satisfaction in increasing performance of harvesters
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Abstract. The purpose of research was to analyze the effect of leadership style, motivation and ability on work satisfaction in improving harvesting performance of harvesters in Bukit Sentang, Padang Mandarsah, Dalu-dalu and Dawas plantation of Indonesia Oil Palm Research Institute (IOPRI). The analytical method used in this research is the analysis of correlation and linear regression with path analysis. The results of the research showed that simultaneous leadership style, work motivation and work ability had an effect on job satisfaction, as well as leadership style, work ability and job satisfaction had an effect on job performance. Partially, leadership style and work ability have a significant positive effect, but work motivation does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. While work ability has a significant positive effect, but leadership style and job satisfaction have no significant effect on job performance. The percentage of direct effect of leadership style was 33.41% on job satisfaction, while work ability was only 6.81% and work motivation was 1.44%. The percentage of direct effect of work ability is 17.56% on work performance, while the leadership style is 1.90% and work ability is 1.23%.

1. Introduction
Oil Palm is one of the commodities of plantation products which has an important role in economic activities in Indonesia, especially for the provision of employment and as a source of state income [1]. In its management, to obtain high productivity of oil palm plants is influenced by: genetic factors, the environment, the treatment of technical culture, and including human resources (HR) specifically harvesters. Harvesting is one of the important activities in the management of oil palm plantations. Good crop management and high crop production potential will be meaningless if the harvest is not carried out optimally. The success of the harvest is supported by harvesters' knowledge of harvest preparation, harvest maturity criteria, crop rotation, harvest system, and harvest facilities [2]. The workers in this case harvesters have an important role in determining the quality and quality of the fruit harvested. Errors in harvesting due to negligence of harvest workers such as cutting raw fruit, the fruits left on circle and harvesting places (TPH) and so on will cause the quality of harvested bunches to be low [3].
Human resources play a very important role in the processes and activities of an organization / company because human resources carry out activities in the form of planning, implementation and control of each organization's activities / companies to achieve the expected goals. Human resources (HR) in the form of labor in the company is the key to the success of an organization / company, which will design, install, operate and maintain an integral system of the organization / company [4].

As a research institute, the Indonesia Oil Palm Research Institute (PPKS) has several oil palm production estates as a research and revenue forum. The locations of oil palm plantations managed by PPKS are found in several regions, namely North Sumatra, Riau, South Sumatra and West Kalimantan. The estate used as research objects are Bukit Sentang and Padang Mandarsah (North Sumatra), Dalu-dalu (Riau) and Dawas (South Sumatra). For the area, production and achievements of oil palm plantation harvesters in 2017 and 2018 in the PPKS which are the study locations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Area, production, productivity of oil palm plants, number of harvesters and achievements of harvesters in 2017 and 2018.

| Estate       | 2017          | 2018          |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
|              | Total area (ha) | amount of harvester | Average harvest performance (ton/hk) | Total area (ha) | amount of harvester | Average harvest performance (ton/hk) |
| Dawas        | 456.80        | 26            | 1.42          | 456.80        | 34            | 2.19          |
| Bukit Sentang| 394.74        | 25            | 1.34          | 389.92        | 26            | 1.02          |
| Dalu-dalu    | 235.33        | 14            | 1.79          | 235.15        | 11            | 1.94          |
| Padang Mandarsah | 367.57  | 20            | 1.29          | 397.27        | 20            | 1.40          |

Based on Table 1, above can be seen the area, production and productivity of oil palm plants as well as harvesting performance of harvesters in 2017 and 2018. The highest yields in 2017 were Dalu-dalu estate of 1.79 tons/ha and the lowest was Padang Mandarsah of 1.29 tons/ha. For 2018 the highest Dawas is 2.19 tons/hk and the lowest Bukit Sentang is 1.02 tons/hk. Then some of the estate in Table 1, have a harvest performance that is still less than optimal, where the harvest norm for plants > 5 years is 1.5 tons / day.

Based on several reference above, this study was to determine the effect of leadership style, motivation and work ability on job satisfaction in increasing the performance of harvesters in Dawas, Dalu-Dalu, Padang Mandarsah and Bukit Sentang estate, PPKS. The purpose of this study was to analyze the influence of leadership style, motivation and work ability on job satisfaction in improving employee performance.

2. Method
The type of research used for this study is correlational research. This research was conducted with the aim of detecting and seeing to what extent the variables on a factor are related or correlated with one or more other factors based on the correlation coefficient [10]. In this study we will examine the relationship between variables of leadership style, work motivation, and work ability on job satisfaction in improving the performance of harvesters in the Dawas, Dalu-Dalu, Padang Mandarsah and Bukit Sentang estate, PPKS. The data used in this study are as follows:

a. Primary data: primary data is data obtained directly from data sources, namely from harvesting power in Dawas, Padang Mandarsah, Dalu-Dalu and Bukit Sentang estates, PPKS.
b. Secondary data: i.e. data adapted from the study of documentation, data held by Dawas, Padang Mandarsah, Dalu-Dalu and Bukit Sentang, PPKS.

Sources of data, instruments and how to retrieve data in this study are as follows:
a. Questionnaire: questionnaire is a form of data collection instrument in a written question format that is equipped with a column where the respondent will write the answer to the question directed at him [10].

b. Documentation study: Documentation study is a secondary data collection process. This study collects data and information from estate / company documents and various literatures relating to work performance.

The research instrument used for primary data collection was a questionnaire based on the indicators of each variable. Questionnaire questions (represent perceptions) are arranged based on indicators of each variable. The question scale used is the Linkert Scale.

3. Results and discussions
3.1. Results
3.1.1. Normality test results. To test whether the observations of data spread normally or not can be done by testing the histogram. From the results of histogram analysis, the distribution histogram curve obtained from the dependent variable of work performance and job satisfaction. The purpose of normally distributed data is that data will follow the normal distribution form. Normal data distribution if the data is centered on the average and median. The results of the output with the SPSS version 24 program with the histogram test show a normal distribution pattern where the curve shows the graph following the distribution of the normal curve.
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**Figure 1.** Distribution curve for normality test with histogram test (left) and distribution curve for normality test with histogram test (right).

3.1.2. Results of multicollinearity tests. Multicollinearity test aims to test whether the regression model found a correlation between independent variables. A good regression model should not have a correlation between the independent variables. From the results of the multicollinearity test, the following data are obtained (performance as dependent variable):

| No | Dependent Variable | Independent Variable | VIF Value | Tolerance Value | Description |
|----|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|
| 1  | Job Satisfaction   | Leadership Style      | 1.728     | 0.579           | Free multicoll |
|    |                    | Work Motivation       | 1.509     | 0.663           | Free multicoll |
|    |                    | Work Ability          | 1.851     | 0.540           | Free multicoll |
| 2  | Work Performance   | Leadership Style      | 2.855     | 0.350           | Free multicoll |
|    |                    | Work Ability          | 1.939     | 0.516           | Free multicoll |
|    |                    | Job Satisfaction      | 3.307     | 0.302           | Free multicoll |

Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.
The results of the data in Table 2 showed that the value if VIF of the independent variables were all included in the category (1 < VIF < 10), which means that there is no multicollinearity in all dependent variables. This is also supported by the tolerance value of the multicollinearity test obtained, which is generally tolerance > 0.1, which means there is no multicollinearity between the dependent variables.

### 3.1.3. Autocorrelation test results
A good regression model is free from autocorrelation. To detect autocorrelation, Durbin-Watson is tested. The autocorrelation test aims to test whether the linear regression model has a correlation between residual variations in the previous period (t-1). The following are the results of the autocorrelation test for Model Equation 1 (job satisfaction as an independent variable) in Table 3 below this:

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------|----------|------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .841* | .707     | .692             | 1.589         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Ability, Work Motivation, Leadership Style.
b. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction.
Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 3, above can be seen the value of Durbin-Watson Model Equation 1 showed that the d value obtained is 1.589. With a significance level of 5%, it can be seen that k = 3 and n = 60 dU values of 1.6518 and dL of 1.5144. Then it can be concluded that dL < d < dU, where it is inconclusive or inconclusive.

The following are the results of the autocorrelation test for Model Equation 2 (job satisfaction as an independent variable) in Table 4. below this:

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------|----------|------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .606* | .368     | .334             | 2.683         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, Work Ability, Leadership Style.
b. Dependent Variable: Work performance.
Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 4, above can be seen the value of Durbin-Watson Model Equation 2 showed that the d value obtained is 2.683. With a significance level of 5%, it can be seen that k = 3 and n = 60 dU values of 1.6518 and dL of 1.5144. Then it can be concluded d > dU, where there is no positive autocorrelation.

### 3.1.4. Results of hypothesis test
The coefficient of determination test aims to find out how much the ability of the independent variable affects the independent variables. The calculation method to get the Determination Coefficient (KD) using the SPSS version 24 program in summaryb table mode in the R square column according to Table 5, and Table 6.

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .841* | .707     | .692             | 2.44444                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Ability, Work Motivation, Leadership Style.
b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction.
Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 5, it can be seen the correlation coefficient R for equation 1 is 0.841, which means that the independent variable on the dependent variable has a strong correlation. The value of R ranges from 0 to 1, the value closer to 1 indicates that the relationship that occurs is getting stronger, whereas the value is getting closer to 0, the relationship that occurs is weak.

The coefficient of determination (KD) is obtained by the formula KD = r^2 x 100%. So KD for equation 1 is KD = 0.707 X 100% = 70.7%, which means that 70.7% of job satisfaction (Y1) harvest
power in Bukit Sentang, Padang Mandarsah, Dalu-Dalu, and Dawas is influenced by leadership style (X1), work motivation (X2), work ability (X3), while 29.3% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

Table 6. The coefficient of determination for equation 2.

| Model Summaryb | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|----------------|---|----------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1              | .606a | .368     | .334             | 2.68470                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, Work Ability, Leadership Style.
b. Dependent Variable: Work performance.

Based on Table 6, it can be seen the correlation coefficient R for equation 2 is 0.606 which means that the independent variable on the dependent variable has a strong correlation / correlation. The coefficient of determination (KD) for equation 2 is KD = 0.368 X 100% = 36.8%, which means that 36.8% of the work performance (Y1) of harvest power in the Bukit Sentang estate, Padang Mandarsah, Dalu-Dalu, and Dawas is influenced by leadership style (X1), work ability (X3), job satisfaction (Y1), while 63.2% was influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

3.1.5. Results of simultanous significance test (F test). The F test is used to determine whether there is an effect of (simultaneous) independent variables (free) on the dependent variable (bound). The results of simultaneous significance tests in the Equation 1 Model can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Simultaneous significance test results model equation 1.

| ANOVAa | Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.| |
|---------|-------|---------------|----|-------------|-------|-----|---|
| 1       | Regression | 808.234      | 3  | 269.411     | 45.088 | .000b| |
|         | Residual   | 334.616      | 56 | 5.975       |       |     | |
|         | Total      | 1142.850     | 59 |             |       |     | |

a. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction.
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Ability, Work Motivation, Leadership Style.

Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 7, it can be seen the results of the ANNOVA test or F test for equation 1, where the calculated F value is 45.088 with a significance level (Sig.) 0.000 <0.05 (significance level of 5%), then Ho is rejected and H3, H4, and H5 are accepted. This means that the variables of leadership style, work motivation and work ability simultaneously influence job satisfaction. The results of simultaneous significance tests in Model Equation 2 can be seen in Table 8 below this.

Table 8. Simultaneous significance test results model equation 2.

| ANOVAa | Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.| |
|---------|-------|---------------|----|-------------|-------|-----|---|
| 1       | Regression | 234.557      | 3  | 78.186      | 10.848 | .000b| |
|         | Residual   | 403.626      | 56 | 7.208       |       |     | |
|         | Total      | 638.183      | 59 |             |       |     | |

a. Dependent Variable: Work performance.
b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction, Work Ability, Leadership Style.

Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 8, it can be seen the results of the ANNOVA test or F test for equation 2, where the calculated F value is 10.848 with a significance level (Sig.) 0.000 <0.05 (significance level of 5%), then H0 is rejected and H1, H2, and H6 are accepted. This means that the variables of leadership style, work ability and job satisfaction simultaneously influence work performance.

3.1.6. Results Of Partial Significance Test (t Test). The t statistical test is used to determine the effect of one independent variable individually in explaining the variation of the dependent variable. To test
whether \( H_1 \) is accepted or rejected is to compare \( t_{\text{count}} \) to \( t_{\text{table}} \). If \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \) then \( H_0 \) is rejected and \( H_1 \) is accepted, and vice versa. Based on the statistical test \( t \) that has been done, in Table 9 the following shows the results of the partial significance test for Model Equation 1.

### Table 9. Test results of partial significance of equation model 1.

| Model   | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | \( t \)   | Sig. |
|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------|------|
|         | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta     |      |
| 1 (Constant) | -4.787                     | 2.624                     | -1.825   | .073 |
| Leadership style | .671                      | .110                      | .578     | 6.082 | .000 |
| Work motivation   | .150                       | .110                      | .120     | 1.356 | .180 |
| Work ability     | .456                       | .172                      | .261     | 2.650 | .010 |

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction.
Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 9, it can be seen the results of the partial significance test or \( t \) test for Equation 1 with a confidence level of 95\% (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)) produce the value of \( t_{\text{count}} \) for each variable as follows (calculation \( t_{\text{count}} \) with SPSS version 24):

1. Leadership Style Variable (\( X_1 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 6.082 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05 which means that leadership style has a significant effect on job satisfaction.
2. Work Motivation Variable (\( X_2 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 1.356 < t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and a significance level of 0.180 > 0.05, which means that work motivation does not significantly influence job satisfaction.
3. Working Capability Variable (\( X_3 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 2.650 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and significance level 0.010 < 0.05 which means that work ability has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

Based on Table 9, the regression equation for Model Equation 1 is obtained as follows: \( \text{Job satisfaction (} Y_1 \text{)} = 0.609 X_1 + 0.307 X_3 + 0.549 \epsilon_1 \).

Based on the statistical test \( t \) that has been done, then in Table 10, the following shows the results of the partial significance test for Model Equation 2.

### Table 10. Test results of partial significance of equation model 2.

| Model   | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | \( t \)   | Sig. |
|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------|------|
|         | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta     |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 9.198                     | 2.794                     | 3.292    | .002 |
| Leadership style | .120                      | .156                      | .138     | .768 | .446 |
| Work ability     | .548                       | .193                      | .419     | 2.833 | .006 |
| Work satisfaction | .083                      | .144                      | .111     | .576 | .567 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work performance.
Source: SPSS processed data, 2019.

Based on Table 10, it can be seen the results of the partial significance test or \( t \) test for Equation 2 with a confidence level of 95\% (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)) produce the value of \( t_{\text{count}} \) for each variable as follows (calculation \( t_{\text{count}} \) with SPSS version 24):

1. The Leadership Style Variable (\( X_1 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 0.768 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and the significance level of 0.446 > 0.05 which means that the leadership style does not have a significant effect on work performance.
2. Job Capability variable (\( X_3 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 2.833 < t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and significance level 0.006 < 0.05, which means that work motivation has a significant effect on work performance.
3. Variable Job Satisfaction (\( Y_1 \)): \( t_{\text{count}} = 0.576 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.00324 \), and significance level 0.567 < 0.05, which means that work ability does not significantly influence work performance.

Based on Table 10, the regression equation for Model Equation 1 is obtained as follows: \( \text{Work performance (} Y_2 \text{)} = 0.581 X_3 + 0.814 \epsilon_3 \).
From the results of the partial significance test of Model Equation 1 and Model Equation 2, the path coefficients can be described as follows:

3.1.7. Results of influence hypothesis test. To see the effect of each dependent independent variable can be either direct or indirect influence. Calculating the effect of these variables is obtained from the t test table (beta column) in both equation 1 and equation 2.

3.1.7.1 Direct effect (DE). To calculate the direct effect (DE) for each independent and dependent variable, the following formula is used:

- Effect of leadership style variables on job satisfaction $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1 = 0.578$ (contribution of leadership style directly affects job satisfaction = $0.578^2 \times 100\% = 33.41\%$).
- Effect of work motivation variables on job satisfaction $X_2 \rightarrow Y_1 = 0.120$ (contribution of work motivation directly affects job satisfaction = $0.120^2 \times 100\% = 1.44\%$).
- Effect of variable work ability on job satisfaction $X_3 \rightarrow Y_1 = 0.261$ (the contribution of work ability directly affects job satisfaction = $0.261^2 \times 100\% = 6.81\%$).
- Effect of leadership style variables on work performance $X_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = 0.138$ (contribution of leadership style directly influences work performance = $0.138^2 \times 100\% = 1.90\%$).
- Effect of work ability variables on work performance $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2 = 0.419$ (contribution of work ability directly affects work performance = $0.419^2 \times 100\% = 17.56\%$).
- Effect of variable job satisfaction on job performance $Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = 0.111$ (contribution to job satisfaction directly affects work performance = $0.111^2 \times 100\% = 1.23\%$).

3.1.7.2 Indirect effect (IE). To calculate the indirect effect (IE) for each independent and dependent variable, the following formula is used:

- Effect of leadership style variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.578 \times 0.1110) = 0.0642$.
- Effect of work motivation variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.120 \times 0.1110) = 0.0133$.
- Effect of work ability variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_3 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.261 \times 0.1110) = 0.0289$.

3.1.7.3 Total effect. To calculate the total effect for each independent and dependent variable, the following formula is used:

- Effect of leadership style variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.578 + 0.1110) = 0.689$ (effect of leadership style on work performance through job satisfaction of 68.9\%).
- Effect of work motivation variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.120 + 0.1110) = 0.231$ (the effect of work motivation on work performance through job satisfaction by 23.1\%).
- Effect of work ability variables on work performance through job satisfaction $X_3 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2 = (0.261 + 0.1110) = 0.372$ (the effect of work ability on work performance through job satisfaction by 37.2\%).

3.1.8. Results of correlation test. Correlation between variables in model 1 with variable leadership style, work motivation, ability to work with job satisfaction can be seen in Table 11. In interpreting correlation figures between variables, the following criteria are used [11]:

- $0 - 25$ : Correlation is very weak (considered non-existent).
- $> 0.25 - 0.50$ : Correlation is quite strong.
- $> 0.50 - 0.75$ : Strong correlation.
- $> 0.75 - 1.00$ : Correlation is very strong.

### Table 11. Correlation value between variables in model equation 1.

| Correlations | Leadership style | Work ability | Job satisfaction | Work performance |
|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
|              |                  |              |                  |                  |
Correlation between variables in model 1 with variable leadership style, work motivation, ability to work with job satisfaction can be seen in Table 12.

**Table 12. Correlation value between variables in model equation 2.**

| Variable                  | Leadership style | Work ability | Job satisfaction | Work performance |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Leadership style**     | 1                | .621**       | .800**           | .487**           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000             | .000         | .000             | .000             |
| N                        | 60               | 60           | 60               | 60               |
| **Work ability**         | .496**           | 1            | .545**           | .549**           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000             | .000         | .000             | .000             |
| N                        | 60               | 60           | 60               | 60               |
| **Job satisfaction**     | .621**           | .545**       | 1                | .685**           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000             | .000         | .000             | .000             |
| N                        | 60               | 60           | 60               | 60               |
| **Work performance**     | .800**           | .549**       | .685**           | 1                |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000             | .000         | .000             | .000             |
| N                        | 60               | 60           | 60               | 60               |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

From Table 11, we can see the level of correlation for each variable in the equation model 1. Furthermore, the correlation for each variable is interconnected and the correlation of each variable with the variables obtained for the model equation 2 is presented in Table 12.

**Table 13. The level of correlation for each variable with other variables.**

| No | Correction variable                        | Correction value | Signification (Sig.)               | Correlation criteria |
|----|-------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | Leadership style and job satisfaction     | 0.800            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Very strong          |
| 2. | Leadership style and work ability         | 0.621            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong               |
| 3. | Leadership style and work motivation      | 0.496            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong enough        |
| 4. | Work motivation and job satisfaction      | 0.549            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong               |
| 5. | Work motivation and work ability          | 0.545            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong               |
| 6. | Work ability and job satisfaction         | 0.685            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong               |
| 7. | Leadership style and work performance     | 0.487            | Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01)         | Strong enough        |
8. Work ability and work performance 0.581 Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01) Strong
9. Job satisfaction and work performance 0.509 Signifikan (0.000 < 0.01) Strong

3.2. Discussion
Based on the results of the study, simultaneously the significance value F for the equation 1 model is 0.000 <0.05, so it can be concluded that the variables of leadership style, work motivation and work ability together have a significant effect on job satisfaction. Based on the results of the study, simultaneously the significance value of F for the equation 2 model is 0.000 <0.05, so it can be concluded that the variables of leadership style, work ability and job satisfaction together have a significant effect on job performance.

3.2.1. The effect of leadership style on work achievement. The results of testing the first hypothesis (H1) partially (t test) showed that leadership style did not significantly influence the work performance of oil palm plantation harvesters. The leadership style in oil palm plantations does not affect the work performance of harvesters.

3.2.2. The effect of work ability on work achievement. The results of testing the second hypothesis (H2) partially (t test) shows that work ability has a significant effect on the work performance of oil palm plantation harvesters. This shows that increasing the capacity of harvesters will improve work performance in oil palm plantations. The findings of this study are in accordance with the results of a study from [9], that work ability and work motivation affect performance by 30%, also [12], that work ability has a significant effect on performance, which means every increasing work capacity will improve employee performance.

3.2.3. Effect of leadership style on work satisfaction. The results of testing the third hypothesis (H3) partially (t test) shows that the leadership style has a significant effect on job satisfaction from the oil palm plantation harvesters. This shows that leadership styles can improve job satisfaction and ultimately improve work performance. This is in accordance with the results of [13] that leadership styles have a significant influence on work motivation, employee performance and job satisfaction.

3.2.4. Effect of work motivation on work satisfaction. The results of testing the fourth hypothesis (H4) partially (t test) shows that work motivation does not significantly influence the job satisfaction of oil palm plantation harvesters. This shows that the work motivation given does not have a significant effect on increasing job satisfaction for oil palm plantation harvesters. The findings of this study are not in accordance with [15] study that leadership roles, motivation and organizational commitment have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction.

3.2.5. The effect of work ability on work satisfaction. The results of testing the fourth hypothesis (H5) partially (t test) shows that work ability has a significant effect on job satisfaction. This shows that the work ability is able to increase the job satisfaction of oil palm plantation harvesters. The findings of this study are consistent with the research of [16], where there is a direct influence on the ability of employee job satisfaction 0.063, the indirect effect of ability through motivation on job satisfaction is 0.091, so the total effect is 0.154. Also according to [17] where work ability and motivation directly have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

3.2.6. Effect of work satisfaction on work performance. The results of testing the fourth hypothesis (H6) partially (t test) shows that job satisfaction does not significantly influence work performance. This shows that job satisfaction does not affect the work performance of oil palm plantation harvesters. The findings of this study are not in accordance with [18] study that the role of employee performance is more influenced by job satisfaction than work motivation and organizational culture.
4. Conclusions
Based on the results of discussion and testing of the above research, conclusions can be drawn as follows:
1. Simultaneously, the equation 1 model proves that leadership style, work motivation and work ability have a significant effect on job satisfaction. For the model equation 2 proves that leadership style, work ability and job satisfaction have a significant effect on job performance.
2. Partially, equation 1 proves that leadership style variables and work ability have a significant positive effect, while work motivation does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. In equation 2 proves that work ability has a significant positive effect, while leadership style and job satisfaction have no significant effect on job performance.
3. The magnitude of the influence of variables that directly influence job satisfaction shows that leadership style has the highest percentage of 33.41%, while work motivation is 1.44% and work ability is only 6.81%. For variables that have a direct effect on work performance, the habwa of work ability has the highest percentage of 17.56%, while the leadership style is 1.90% and work ability is only 1.23%.
4. The magnitude of the intervening effect of variables in this study found that the influence of leadership style on work performance through job satisfaction was 68.9%, for the effect of work motivation on work performance through job satisfaction by 23.1%, the effect of work ability on work performance through job satisfaction by 37.2%.
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