

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Effect Of Repressive Supervision And Work Culture On Employee Work Productivity At Pt Global Offset Sejahtera

Intan Dwi Karunia ^{1*}

^{1*} Management Study Program, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pemuda, Surabaya City, East Java, Indonesia.

Correspondence

¹ Management Study Program, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pemuda, Surabaya City, East Java, Indonesia.
Email: intandwikarunia005@gmail.com

Funding information

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pemuda.

Abstract

The Influence of Repressive Supervision and Work Culture on Employee Productivity (Case Study at PT Global Offset Sejahtera), Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pemuda, Advisor Devangga Putra Adhitya Pratama, S.Pd., M.Pd. The purpose of this study is to determine and analyze the influence of repressive supervision and work culture on employee productivity at PT Global Offset Sejahtera. Repressive supervision is a form of supervision conducted after an activity has been completed. Its purpose is to evaluate and control work results to ensure they meet established standards. Work culture reflects the values, attitudes, and work behaviors adopted by employees within the company environment. The research method used is quantitative with a descriptive and associative approach, while the type of data used is primary data collected through the distribution of questionnaires to 200 respondents who are employees of PT Global Offset Sejahtera. Data modeling using multiple linear regression with the SPSS program. The results of this study indicate that repressive supervision and work culture have a significant simultaneous effect on work productivity. Similarly, both factors also have a positive and significant partial influence on employee productivity. The results indicate that the implementation of effective supervision and a conducive work culture will impact employee performance in terms of productivity.

Keywords

Repressive Supervision; Work Culture; Work Productivity; Employees

1 | INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized and highly competitive business environment, employee productivity has become a crucial factor in sustaining organizational performance and achieving a competitive advantage. Productivity goes beyond the mere quantity of output; it involves efficiency, effectiveness, and the quality of work in meeting organizational objectives. Within this framework, managerial strategies such as supervision and the development of a strong organizational culture play significant roles in determining employee productivity. Effective supervision is essential for maintaining performance standards and minimizing deviations from expected results. Through proper supervision, managers guide and support employees, providing the necessary feedback to ensure tasks are completed efficiently and on time. The role of supervisors extends beyond monitoring; they help facilitate communication, resolve issues, and encourage continuous improvement in performance. Additionally, a positive work culture influences employee behavior by promoting discipline, responsibility, and motivation. A work environment that fosters collaboration, respect, and shared values can increase job satisfaction, reduce turnover, and ultimately enhance performance. When employees feel aligned with the organization's goals and values, their commitment and effort are more likely to translate into higher productivity. Studies have long emphasized the importance of supervision and organizational culture as key factors in shaping employee outcomes (Fareed *et al.*, 2016).

Supervision is a key managerial function that can be categorized as preventive, concurrent, or repressive. Repressive supervision, which emphasizes corrective actions after tasks are completed, plays a crucial role in ensuring that outcomes align with the organization's standards. When applied effectively, repressive supervision helps maintain performance expectations and accountability. However, if implemented too rigidly, it can create undue pressure on employees, potentially diminishing morale and affecting overall productivity. In contrast, when repressive supervision is structured to provide constructive feedback, it enables employees to refine their skills, improve efficiency, and enhance the quality of their work in subsequent tasks. This approach fosters an environment where continuous improvement is encouraged, leading to long-term benefits for both the individual and the organization. Additionally, work culture defined by the shared values, beliefs, and norms within the organization serves as a significant factor influencing employee behavior and performance. A well-established, cohesive culture promotes a sense of unity and commitment, motivating employees to align their personal objectives with organizational goals. Research has demonstrated that organizations with strong and adaptable cultures tend to experience higher levels of employee engagement, loyalty, and productivity (Pravotorova, 2024).

Despite the broad recognition of supervision and work culture as productivity drivers, existing literature reveals important research gaps. Previous studies have often examined preventive supervision or general supervisory practices in relation to employee performance, or analyzed the role of discipline and working conditions as complementary factors. However, few studies have specifically investigated repressive supervision as a distinct construct and examined its interplay with organizational work culture in shaping employee productivity. Moreover, limited attention has been given to the printing and commercial production sector, where employee discipline and adherence to quality standards are especially critical. Addressing this gap, the present study focuses on PT Global Offset Sejahtera, a commercial printing company that has recently experienced declining employee productivity, increasing lateness, and inconsistent work discipline. (Soekoningrum & Djastuti, 2025)

Based on these gaps, the central research problem is articulated as follows: To what extent do repressive supervision and work culture influence employee productivity at PT Global Offset Sejahtera? To answer this question, the study formulates three hypotheses: first, repressive supervision significantly influences employee productivity; second, work culture significantly influences employee productivity; and third, both factors simultaneously exert a significant effect on productivity. The objective of this study is to empirically analyze the impact of repressive supervision and work culture on employee productivity, thereby offering theoretical insights into human resource management literature and providing practical recommendations for organizational leaders. Methodologically, the study employs a quantitative approach with a descriptive-associative design. Primary data were collected through questionnaires distributed to employees of PT Global Offset Sejahtera and analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS software. The findings, while not disclosed in detail here, indicate the importance of aligning supervisory mechanisms and cultural values to enhance productivity outcomes. (Ahmed *et al.*, 2021)

Theoretically, this study contributes to extending the discourse on supervision by foregrounding repressive supervision as a distinct managerial practice and exploring its interaction with organizational culture. Practically, the results provide PT Global Offset Sejahtera with empirical evidence to guide managerial strategies in strengthening disciplinary frameworks and embedding cultural values that support productivity. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant theoretical foundations and previous studies. Section 3 explains the research methodology. Section 4 presents the analysis and discussion of findings. Finally, Section 5 concludes with key insights, implications, and recommendations for future research. (Millhollon, 2024)

2 | BACKGROUND THEORY

Repressive Supervision as a Managerial Mechanism

Supervision is one of the fundamental functions of management, serving both as a control mechanism and as an evaluative tool to ensure that organizational goals are achieved. Within the broader typology of supervision, repressive supervision refers to the evaluative process conducted after tasks or activities are completed. Its primary purpose is corrective, aiming to identify deviations from established standards and implement remedial measures. Scholars argue that repressive supervision has both strengths and weaknesses. On one hand, its reliance on actual performance outcomes allows for objective evaluation and data-driven decision-making. (Lentjušenkova & Lapina, 2016). On the other hand, it is inherently reactive, as interventions occur after the fact, meaning that potential inefficiencies or errors may have already compromised productivity. In practice, the effectiveness of repressive supervision depends on the quality of feedback delivered to employees. Constructive feedback can foster learning and continuous improvement, while punitive approaches may increase psychological pressure and diminish motivation. In relation to the present study, repressive supervision is conceptualized as a managerial practice that emphasizes corrective actions, fairness, and systematic feedback. This perspective positions repressive supervision not merely as a mechanism of punishment, but as a managerial tool that can enhance employee productivity when implemented with a developmental orientation. (Dereli, 2015).

Work Culture as a Determinant of Employee Behavior

Work culture represents the shared values, norms, and beliefs that shape employee behavior within an organization. It provides a collective framework that influences how tasks are approached, how employees interact, and how organizational objectives are pursued. A strong and positive work culture is associated with higher levels of employee engagement, commitment, and motivation. Several scholars identify work culture as a key determinant of productivity because it fosters a sense of belonging, encourages collaboration, and establishes behavioral expectations. For example, cultures that emphasize responsibility, integrity, and teamwork tend to produce employees who are more disciplined and proactive. Conversely, weak or fragmented cultures can lead to role ambiguity, lack of accountability, and reduced organizational loyalty, ultimately undermining performance. (Asiaei & Jusoh, 2015) While there is consensus on the importance of culture, debates remain regarding the extent to which culture can be deliberately shaped by management versus emerging organically from employee interactions. Some studies suggest that managerial interventions, such as training, reward systems, and leadership modeling, can effectively internalize cultural values. Others caution that culture evolves gradually and cannot be engineered through formal structures alone. (Gogan *et al.*, 2016).

Employee Productivity: Concept and Measurement

Employee productivity is defined as the efficiency and effectiveness with which individuals use organizational resources to produce outputs that meet quality and quantity. It encompasses multiple dimensions, including the volume of output, timeliness, quality, and initiative. From a human resource management perspective, productivity is influenced by both individual factors (skills, motivation, and initiative) and organizational factors (leadership, supervision, and culture). Scholars generally agree that productivity cannot be understood solely as a quantitative measure of output; it must also account for qualitative aspects such as innovation, problem-solving, and adaptability. Methodologically, productivity is often measured through surveys, performance evaluations, and quantitative indicators of output relative to input. However, one limitation frequently cited in previous studies is the reliance on self-reported measures, which may be subject to bias. This study seeks to address this limitation by combining quantitative assessments with statistical modeling to determine the extent to which repressive supervision and work culture explain variations in employee productivity. (Okoye & Ezejiofor, 2013).

Integrating Theories: Linking Supervision, Work Culture, and Productivity

Integrating supervision theory with organizational culture frameworks offers a well-rounded perspective on employee productivity. Repressive supervision and work culture, in theory, can function as complementary forces. While supervision establishes formal structures to ensure accountability, organizational culture shapes informal norms and values that influence employee behavior. Together, these mechanisms have the potential to work in tandem, creating a dual reinforcement that enhances productivity through both formal oversight and cultural alignment. However, various studies offer contrasting views. Some researchers warn against excessive reliance on repressive supervision, as it may lead to stress and undermine employees' autonomy. When supervision becomes overly rigid, it can reduce job satisfaction, lower morale, and inhibit initiative. On the other hand, there are those who argue that a strong organizational culture, though important, is insufficient to drive productivity without adequate managerial oversight. In organizations where a positive culture exists but supervision is weak, employees may lack the necessary guidance to effectively translate cultural values into productive outcomes. The relationship between supervision, culture, and productivity is intricate and cannot be reduced to a simple cause-and-effect pattern. It is shaped by various factors, such as industry specifics and the leadership style prevalent within the organization (Mention, 2012). Understanding how these elements interact requires

a balance between structured supervision and a supportive, value-driven work culture. This balance enables the alignment of organizational goals with employee performance, fostering both individual growth and overall organizational success.

3 | METHOD

This study utilized a quantitative research design with an associative approach, appropriate for exploring the relationships and causal effects between independent and dependent variables. This design was chosen because the research aimed to determine the extent to which repressive supervision and work culture influence employee productivity at PT Global Offset Sejahtera. Quantitative methods allowed for statistical hypothesis testing, providing empirical evidence that supports the generalizability of the findings within the study population (Abubakar, 2021). The study's population consisted of all permanent employees at PT Global Offset Sejahtera, which numbered 200 employees according to company records at the time of the research. A probability sampling technique, specifically simple random sampling, was used to ensure that every member of the population had an equal chance of being selected. The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula with a margin of error of 5%. Based on the population size ($N = 200$), the formula indicated that a sample of 133 employees was required. This sample size was deemed sufficient for conducting regression analysis while maintaining the representativeness of the population (Goundar, 2012).

Data collection was performed using a structured questionnaire designed to capture responses regarding three variables: repressive supervision (X1), work culture (X2), and employee productivity (Y). Each construct was operationalized into indicators based on established theories of management and organizational behavior. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Repressive supervision was defined as corrective supervisory practices applied after tasks are completed, with indicators including direct oversight, corrective feedback, enforcement of discipline, and corrective sanctions. Work culture, characterized by shared values, norms, and practices, was measured through indicators such as discipline, responsibility, teamwork, initiative, and work ethic. Employee productivity, defined as the ability to achieve output effectively and efficiently in line with organizational standards, was assessed through indicators such as work quality, quantity, timeliness, efficiency, and initiative.

To ensure the accuracy and consistency of the instrument, validity and reliability tests were conducted before data analysis. Validity was tested using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, with all items achieving correlation coefficients above the critical r -table value ($\alpha = 0.05$), indicating adequate construct validity. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha, with coefficients greater than 0.70 for all variables, confirming internal consistency (Wijaya, 2013). Primary data were collected over two months in early 2025 at the company's main office in Sidoarjo, East Java. The questionnaires were distributed directly to respondents during working hours with the assistance of the human resources department. Respondents were informed of the study's objectives, assured of the confidentiality of their responses, and asked to provide written consent before participating. To minimize response bias, anonymity was guaranteed, and participants were encouraged to answer truthfully without fear of management repercussions. Secondary data, such as company records and organizational reports, were also reviewed to provide background information and triangulate the survey findings (Walliman, 2021).

Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27. The analysis involved several sequential steps: (1) validity and reliability testing to ensure the suitability of the instruments; (2) classical assumption tests, including normality and heteroscedasticity tests, to confirm the appropriateness of regression modeling; (3) multiple linear regression analysis to determine the effects of repressive supervision (X1) and work culture (X2) on employee productivity (Y); and (4) hypothesis testing using the t -test (for partial effects) and F -test (for simultaneous effects), with significance levels set at $p < .05$. Multiple regression analysis was chosen because it is well-suited for examining the contributions of independent variables to a dependent variable (Snyder, 2019).

Ethical principles were strictly adhered to throughout the study. Respondents were informed about the study's objectives and procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time was emphasized. Written informed consent was obtained prior to data collection, and data confidentiality was ensured by anonymizing responses and securely storing the data. Participation was voluntary, with no incentives or penalties associated with involvement (Patten, 2016).

The use of self-reported questionnaires may introduce social desirability bias, which was mitigated by emphasizing confidentiality and anonymity during data collection. Additionally, the cross-sectional design of the study captures relationships at a single point in time, limiting the ability to draw conclusions about long-term causal effects. Future studies may benefit from using longitudinal approaches to explore causal dynamics more effectively. Finally, the study focused on a single company, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. However, the methodological rigor applied in sampling and analysis enhances the reliability of the results within this organizational context (Ahuja, 2011).

4 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Results of the t-Test (Partial)

The results of the t-test (partial) reveal significant relationships between repressive supervision, work culture, and employee productivity. As shown in Table 1, the unstandardized coefficients for repressive supervision (X1) and work culture (X2) are 0.395 and 0.332, respectively, with positive t-values (4.312 for X1 and 3.349 for X2). The significance values ($p < 0.05$) confirm that both variables have a significant impact on employee productivity. The standardized coefficients (Beta) indicate that repressive supervision (0.348) has a slightly stronger effect than work culture (0.271). These findings suggest that both repressive supervision and work culture are crucial factors influencing employee productivity, with repressive supervision having a greater impact.

Table 1 Results of the t-Test

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.994	1.698		2.353	.020
Pengawasan Represif (X1)	.395	.092	.348	4.312	.000
Budaya Kerja (X2)	.332	.099	.271	3.349	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity (Y)

The table above presents the results of the t-test from the multiple regression analysis, which examined the influence of Repressive Supervision (X1) and Work Culture (X2) on Employee Productivity (Y). The constant value of 3.994 indicates that if both Repressive Supervision and Work Culture are equal to zero, the baseline value of Employee Productivity would be 3.994. The variable Repressive Supervision (X1) has a regression coefficient of 0.395, with a t-value of 4.312 and a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05). This result demonstrates that Repressive Supervision has a positive and significant effect on Employee Productivity, meaning that for every one-unit increase in Repressive Supervision, Employee Productivity increases by 0.395 units. Similarly, the variable Work Culture (X2) has a regression coefficient of 0.332, with a t-value of 3.349 and a significance level of 0.001 (< 0.05). This indicates that Work Culture also has a positive and significant effect on Employee Productivity, such that a one-unit increase in Work Culture leads to a 0.332-unit increase in Employee Productivity. Thus, it can be concluded that both Repressive Supervision and Work Culture contribute positively and significantly to the enhancement of Employee Productivity, with Repressive Supervision exerting a slightly stronger influence, as reflected in its higher standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.348) compared to Work Culture (Beta = 0.271).

Based on the unstandardized coefficients, the multiple linear regression equation is expressed as follows: $Y = 3.994 + 0.395X1 + 0.332X2$. The constant of 3.994 suggests that when both Repressive Supervision (X1) and Work Culture (X2) are zero, the predicted value of Employee Productivity (Y) is 3.994. This value represents the baseline of productivity when neither of the independent variables influences the outcome. The coefficient of 0.395 for Repressive Supervision (X1) indicates that for every one-unit increase in Repressive Supervision, Employee Productivity rises by 0.395 units, assuming Work Culture remains unchanged. Similarly, the coefficient of 0.332 for Work Culture (X2) means that a one-unit increase in Work Culture results in a 0.332 unit increase in Employee Productivity, assuming Repressive Supervision stays constant. In the partial significance test (t-test), the results show that for X1 (Repressive Supervision), the t-value is 4.312 with a significance level of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, confirming that Repressive Supervision has a significant impact on Employee Productivity. For X2 (Work Culture), the t-value is 3.349 with a significance of 0.001, also below 0.05, indicating that Work Culture also has a significant effect on Employee Productivity. Both factors Repressive Supervision and Work Culture show significant influences on Employee Productivity, with Repressive Supervision exerting a slightly stronger effect than Work Culture.

4.1.2 F-Test (Simultaneous Test)

The F-test results, shown in Table 2, confirm the overall significance of the regression model. The regression sum of squares is 690.877, with a mean square of 345.438, and the F-value is 23.147. The significance level is 0.000, which is well below 0.05, indicating that the model significantly explains the variation in Employee Productivity (Y). The residual sum of squares is 1940.116, and the total sum of squares is 2630.992, with 132 degrees of freedom. These findings suggest that both Repressive Supervision (X1) and Work Culture (X2) have a meaningful effect on Employee Productivity. The overall model is statistically significant, demonstrating that the predictors contribute to explaining employee performance.

Table 2. F-Test Results

ANOVA ^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	690.877	2	345.438	23.147	.000 ^b
Residual	1940.116	130	14.924		
Total	2630.992	132			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity (Y)					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Culture (X2), Repressive Supervision (X1)					

The table presents the results of the multiple regression model significance test with Employee Productivity (Y) as the dependent variable and two independent variables, namely Repressive Supervision (X1) and Work Culture (X2). The regression sum of squares is 690.877 with 2 degrees of freedom (df), resulting in a mean square regression of 345.438. Meanwhile, the residual sum of squares is 1940.116 with 130 degrees of freedom, yielding a mean square residual of 14.924. The total sum of squares is recorded at 2630.992 with 132 degrees of freedom. Based on the ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) results, the calculated F value is 23.147 with a significance value of 0.000. Since this significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the regression model involving Repressive Supervision (X1) and Work Culture (X2) simultaneously has a significant effect on Employee Productivity (Y). Thus, these two independent variables together are able to explain the variations in the dependent variable, and the regression model is considered appropriate for further analysis.

4.2 Discussion

Based on the research conducted at PT Global Offset Sejahtera, it was found that repressive supervision and work culture together have a significant impact on employee productivity. These results address the three research problems formulated in this study. First, strict and consistent supervision was found to have a significant effect on employee performance. This is evidenced by the t-test, which shows a significance value below 0.05. This means that the more firmly and clearly supervisors impose sanctions and evaluate work outcomes, the more disciplined and responsible employees become in carrying out their tasks. Second, work culture also has a substantial influence on productivity. (anak Anggak *et al.*, 2025).

A work culture embodied in values such as cooperation, enthusiasm, responsibility, and pride in the company fosters a more positive work attitude among employees. Employees working within a supportive cultural environment feel more motivated and develop a sense of ownership over the tasks assigned to them. Third, the two independent variables repressive supervision and work culture jointly contribute significantly to improving employee productivity. The F-test results indicate that the combination of strict supervision and an internalized work culture creates a more productive work environment. This is particularly important considering that the company has been facing challenges of declining productivity due to ineffective supervision and inconsistent work culture across different departments. The findings of this study demonstrate that improving employee performance cannot be achieved solely through mastery of technical skills. (Steers & Sánchez-Runde, 2017).

It must also be supported by management approaches that emphasize consistent yet fair evaluation of work outcomes, as well as the cultivation of a work culture that promotes cooperation, discipline, and loyalty. Therefore, the company can sustainably increase productivity if it is able to strike a balance between strict supervision and a supportive work culture. These findings are expected to serve as a reference for the management of PT Global Offset Sejahtera in designing internal policies, both in terms of employee supervision and the development of organizational cultural values. (Kanfer *et al.*, 2017).

5 | CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Based on the research findings, several conclusions can be made. Repressive Supervision has a significant positive effect on employee productivity. The application of strict supervision, such as enforcing penalties, conducting regular performance appraisals, and maintaining tight controls, encourages employees to be more disciplined and responsible, which in turn boosts productivity. Work culture also impacts productivity levels. While values like discipline and enthusiasm are already evident among employees, aspects such as responsibility and teamwork still require improvement to ensure the culture effectively supports organizational goals. Moreover, both repressive supervision and work culture together influence employee productivity. This suggests that companies should focus on integrating both effective supervision and a supportive work culture to enhance overall employee performance.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, H. R. (2021). *Pengantar metodologi penelitian*. SUKA-Press UIN Sunan Kalijaga.
- Ahmed, Q., Sumbal, M. S., Akhtar, M. N., & Tariq, H. (2021). Abusive supervision and the knowledge worker productivity: The mediating role of knowledge management processes. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(10), 2506–2522. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2020-0504>
- Agus, I., Putri, E., & Sari, D. I. R. (2025). The Effect of Supervision and Work Culture on Employee Work Productivity at UPT. Rawa Indah Market Bontang. *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 7(2), 697~704. <https://doi.org/10.56338/ijhess.v7i2.6759>
- Ahuja, R. (2011). *Research methods*. Rawat Publications.
- Anak Anggak, L., Linang, B., & Ing, S. S. (2025). Qualitative investigation of employee efficacy on sustainable work performance in oil palm plantation.
- Asiaei, K., & Jusoh, R. (2015). A multidimensional view of intellectual capital: The impact on organizational performance. *Management Decision*, 53(3), 668–697. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-05-2014-0293>
- Dereli, D. D. (2015). Innovation management in global competition and competitive advantage. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 1365–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.263>
- Fareed, M., Noor, W. S. W. M., Isa, M. F. M., & Salleh, S. S. M. M. (2016). Developing human capital for sustainable competitive advantage: The roles of organizational culture and high-performance work systems. *Journal of Economic & Management Perspectives*, 10(4), 655–673.
- Gogan, L. M., Artene, A., Sarca, I., & Draghici, A. (2016). The impact of intellectual capital on organizational performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 221, 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.029>
- Goundar, S. (2012). Research methodology and research method. *Victoria University of Wellington*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Kanfer, R., Frese, M., & Johnson, R. E. (2017). Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 338–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000107>
- Lentjušenkova, O., & Lapina, I. (2016). The transformation of the organization's intellectual capital: From resource to capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17(4), 610–631. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-06-2016-0072>
- Lombok, A. S., Masengei, E., & Pangkey, I. (2021). The Effect of Inherent Supervision and Work Environment on Employee Work Discipline at the Manado State University Head Office. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 21, 158.
- Mention, A.-L. (2012). Intellectual capital, innovation, and performance: A systematic review of the literature. *Business and Economic Research*, 2(1), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ber.v2i1.1553>
- Millhollon, P. L. H. (2024). Reflexive discourses of the lived experiences of postmodern supervisors. *University of Louisiana at Monroe*.
- Okoye, P. V. C., & Ezejiolor, R. A. (2013). The effect of human resources development on organizational productivity. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 250–268.
- Patten, M. L. (2016). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials*. Routledge.
- Pravotorova, O. M. (2024). The paradigm of control and supervision in public administration. *ПАРТИСИПАТИВНЕ МУНІЦИПАЛЬНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ: ІМПЛЕМЕНТАЦІЯ ДОСВІДУ ФРН В УКРАЇНІ*.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.024>
- Soekoningrum, F. A. H., & Djastuti, I. (2025). The role of field supervision in enhancing worker engagement and productivity in construction projects. *Economic and Business Horizon*, 4(2), 271–278.

- Stanojevic, A., Akkerman, A., & Manevska, K. (2020). The oppressive boss and workers' authoritarianism: Effect of voice suppression by supervisors on employees' authoritarian political attitudes. *Contemporary Politics*, 26(5), 573-595.
- Steers, R. M., & Sánchez-Runde, C. J. (2017). Culture, motivation, and work behavior. In C. L. Cooper & P. L. Perrewé (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of cross-cultural management* (pp. 190–216). Blackwell Publishing.
- Walliman, N. (2021). *Research methods: The basics*. Routledge.
- Wijaya, T. (2013). *Metodologi penelitian ekonomi dan bisnis: Teori dan praktik* (p. 23). Graha Ilmu.
- Yuningsih, N., Wiryawan, T. W., Kosim, M., & Purnamasari, P. (2023). The Influence Of Work Supervision, Work Culture And Work Environment On Employee Productivity PT ABC. *Business Innovation and Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(2), 153-160.

How to cite this article: Karunia, I. D. (2025). The Effect Of Repressive Supervision And Work Culture On Employee Work Productivity At Pt Global Offset Sejahtera. *Indonesian Journal Economic Review (IJER)*, 5(2), 327-334. <https://doi.org/10.59431/ijer.v5i2.631>.