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Abstract – This research aims to explore and find out the effect of leadership and ethics on the motivation of the soldiers of the Indonesian military. The research is conducted on the soldiers in the rank of non-commissioned and enlisted (Sergeant, Corporal and Private) at one of the Indonesian military units in Jakarta. The data is obtained with the survey method on the sample that comprises of 83 respondents. A simple random sampling technique is used to take the sample among the soldiers in the unit. The data is analyzed with the Path Analysis technique utilizing SPSS 22 software. The questionnaires as the instrument of research are validated with Product Moment correlation while the reliability of instruments is measured with Alpha Cronbach. The test of validity and reliability is applied to 30 respondents. The findings of the research are (1) leadership has a positively direct effect on motivation; (2) military ethics has a positively direct effect on motivation; (3) leadership and military ethics have a simultaneously positive effect on motivation. Based on the findings, the motivation of soldiers can be enhanced by strengthening leadership and military ethics. The motivation is more enhanced by ethics than leadership. The enhancement of motivation is prioritized on the weakest aspect of motivation namely the desire to affiliate. Accordingly, strengthening ethics is prioritized on the consistency of applying the code of ethics as the weakest aspect of ethics and strengthening leadership is prioritized on influencing ability which are the weakest aspects of leadership.
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INTRODUCTION
Globalization, in fact, is not a new phenomenon. Globalization occurred hundreds, or even thousands, years ago as people from different territory and culture met each other. However, during those times the process of globalization was very slow as well as its effects. A limited number of people were affected by other cultures because new cultures were physically brought by the presence of newcomers.

That condition is quite different from globalization that has been happening nowadays especially since the world entered the 20th century. As science and technology got advanced and advanced, new cultures, lifestyles, the way of thinking, etc. spread to every corner of the world in real time brought by electromagnetic waves in the form of a television network, internet, social media, and the like. Finally, the world seems to be unified as a single global village.

Many tremendous changes happened in societies all over the world ever since. One of the changes, as stated by Arjun Appadurai, is ideoscapes, i.e. concatenations changes on the ideology and counter-ideology of the states including freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation, and democracy (Appadurai, 1996). The change of ideoscapes, in turn, affects the national identity of a nation. National identity as a differing factor from other nations cannot be isolated from the influences of global insight (Bechhofer & McCrone, 2009; McCrone & Bechhofer, 2015). In the era of globalization, national identity is not merely a local value, because no nation can avoid global influences. In some cases, the interaction between local values and global values may create a serious problem.

According to Waluyo Jati, globalization, to some extent, tends to reduce the spirit of nationalism, but at the same time increases local identity sentiment based on a narrow primordialism (Jati, 2017). In the meantime, Sjafri Sairin wrote, in Indonesia, globalization especially in the dimension of ideoscape has raised cultural ambiguity as a result of the adoption of global modern values in the midst of traditional societies. These transitional societies seem to be nowhere, they are like being not in here nor there; not in its traditional culture nor in the modern one (Sairin, 2004). But the
The weakening sense of nationalism does not only occur in the developing countries. This is indicated by the results of research by Mau et al. in Germany, Tiley and Heath in England, and Tamar Ashuri's in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Israel (Ariely, 2012).

The weakening of nationalism is a serious problem of human resource management in public service organizations such as in military organizations. To overcome the problem, one of the answers is to strengthen motivation, because commitment is rooted in motivation (Colquitt, LePine, & Wesson, 2015). In other words, there will be no commitment to serve the nation without motivation to do so. Motivation is a determining factor to strengthen the commitment.

Moreover, motivation to serve the nation is extremely important in the military. The military organization is created to pursue the purpose of the nation (Davenport, 1987). Being a soldier, for most military professionals, is not merely a matter of place to work or occupation. It is a way of life and frequently a lifetime commitment (Gal, 1985). Motivation is even more important for the military since they frequently face the dangers that may threaten their lives on the battlefield. The risk cannot be faced by soldiers unless they have strong motivation. From a military point of view, motivation is non-physical combat power.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation

Motivation is a psychological process that drives behavior to a certain purpose and direction. In general, motivation is about the why and how of purposeful behavior (Kreitner, 2009). In the field of organizational behavior, Latham and Pinder defined motivation more comprehensively as “a set of energetic forces that originates both within and outside an employee, initiates work-related effort, and determines its direction, intensity, and persistence” (Colquitt et al., 2015). The direction of effort refers to what kind of action someone intends to do, the intensity of effort refers to how hard to take the action, and persistence of effort refers to how zealous or how long someone can last to take the action (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). In line with that, according to Fred Luthans’ definition, “motivation is a process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates a behavior or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive” (Luthans, 2011). This definition shows three core elements of motivation, those are the needs, drives, and incentives. The needs emerge due to physiological or psychological deficiency. The drives, or motives, are forces that drive the action to eliminate or lessen the deficiency. The incentives are somethings that is assumed or hoped to be able to eliminate or lessen the deficiency. Those two definitions can be concluded that the direction, intensity, and persistence of effort come up as the result of interaction between the needs, drives, and incentives. Well-motivated people engage in positive behavior or action, i.e. the actions go to the right direction, in high intensity, and strong persistence.

Motivation can be differentiated from the source of motivator, that is internal or intrinsic motivation and external or extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation can be described as motivation by the work itself. It comes from a strong desire to be a competent and self-determining person. A person will be highly motivated as he or she has a perception that his or her work is important, interesting, can be autonomously done and improve his or her knowledge and skills. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is the motivation that comes from outside, such as payment, salary, rewards, and the like. The action of an extrinsically motivated person is taken not for the work, but for the reward (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). In short, it may be philosophically stated that intrinsic motivation is more oriented to give than to take. On the contrary, extrinsic motivation is more oriented to take than to give.

Based on the description of motivation above, the motivation of soldiers preferably is more intrinsic than extrinsic one. Eliminating extrinsic motivation, of course, is impossible. Having extrinsic motivation, however, is part of an embedded human character. Nevertheless, for the sake of the works and national purposes a soldier should be intrinsically motivated, that is reflected in what they can give to the nation. Basically, soldiers work for the nation, even though in practice they work within an organization. The organizational commitment of soldiers are the representation of their commitment to nation. It is the nature of the military profession, that the military is the field of devotion to the nation.
However, motivation is not static, but a dynamic condition. Many factors influence the motivation that may make the motivation stronger or weaker. In accordance with the scope of the study, factors that will be discussed further are leadership and military ethics.

**Leadership**

In every organization to include military units, there are people with naturally different desires, interests, or motivations. However, an organization is created to achieve shared objectives through coordinated efforts based on mutually agreed norms. For that reason, every organization needs leadership to coordinate and direct the commitment of the members of the organization to the achievement of the organizational objectives.

According to Gary Yukl, “leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (Schermerhorn, Jr. et al., 2010). So, leadership functions to manage or to transform the differences among the members of an organization in order not to contravene with the efforts of achieving shared organization’s objectives. There are two kinds of leadership powers to do that. Those are organizational power and personal power. Organizational power is an authority possessed by the leader due to his or her position in the organization. This power is sometimes called formal authority. Personal power is a power owned by someone because he or she has the certain personal ability needed by an organization that others do not have (Colquitt et al., 2015).

Based on the definition of leadership stated by Griffin and Moorhead that “leadership is the use of noncoercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of group members to meet a goal” (Griffin & Moorhead, 2014), the use of power to influence employees or subordinates should be in noncoercive ways. Therefore, the effectiveness of leadership is determined by the characteristic or condition of the leader him/herself, subordinates, and environment. The characteristic of leader a comprises of traits and behaviors, while the condition of subordinates comprises of their abilities and willingness (Schermerhorn, Jr. et al., 2010; Torrington et al., 2017). After all, it is determined by how fit it is to the environment. Different kinds of situations need different kinds of leadership characteristics and styles. However, there is no single best leadership to be the most effective one. The most effective leadership is the one that fittest to the situation. This perspective of leadership is called Situational Leadership.

The role of leadership on subordinates’ motivation is very important in the organization since one of the main functions of leadership is to motivate them (Doh & Luthans, 2018). It is emphasized by Armstrong and Taylor that leadership enhances subordinates’ motivation by setting direction, encouraging and stimulating achievement to reach goals and improve performance (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). In a military organization, Chan, Soh, and Ramaya even stated that leadership is a determinant of soldiers’ combat motivation (Chan, Soh, & Ramaya, 2011). The commander influences and motivates the subordinates that their work is for the sake of the nation, not for the reward for themselves. Thus, the motivational function of leadership in the military is to encourage and strengthen the intrinsic motivation of soldiers, at the same time is to lessen their extrinsic motivation as much as possible.

The effect of leadership on motivation is also empirically proven by a number of researches. Several types of research found that leadership has a significant positive impact on motivation. One research was conducted by Naile and Selesho on teaching staff from 13 high schools (Naile & Selesho, 2014). Another research was conducted by Apak and Gumus on public administrators in Istanbul, Turkey (Apak & Gümüş, 2015). There is also research conducted by Alghazo and Al-Anazi on employees of two department stores in Saudi Arabia (Alghazo & Al-Anazi, 2016).

**Ethics**

In organizational behavior perspective, Trevino, Weaver, and Reynolds said that “ethics reflects the degree to which the behaviors of authority are in accordance with generally accepted moral norms” (Colquitt et al., 2015). The meaning of authority mentioned does not only refer to the authority of the leader upon his/her subordinates but also the authority of a person upon oneself. The latter is very important to be understood because a person often has to decide autonomously what must or must not be done. The moral is the norm that guides to what decision should be made. Implementing moral norms in decision making is not a simple matter. In accordance with the definition of ethics stated by McShane and Glinow, ethics is not only about right or wrong but also good or bad. McShane and Glinow wrote...
that “ethics refers to the study of moral principles or values that determine whether actions are right or wrong and outcomes are good or bad” (McShane & Von Glinow, 2018). It can be concluded that ethics is about values that should underlie actions or behaviors.

Measuring the ethics of someone is to measure how far someone cares about ethical issues and how hard he/she intends to apply ethical or moral norms on behavior. Based on research in social psychology, ethical behavior is a result of multistage sequences that consist of moral awareness, moral judgment, and moral intent (Colquitt et al., 2015). Moral awareness is the degree of how serious a person cares or concerns to existing ethical issues in the workplace and environment as well. Moral judgment is the ability of someone to recognize and judge moral norms in a given situation and how to relate to the decision of action. This ability brings a person to implement ethics consistently in any different situations. The decision made is not based on the norms of right or wrong only, but also on the norm of good or bad. Moral intent is the degree of how hard a person to strive to apply moral norms on his/her actions or behaviors.

In organizations, especially large organizations, ethics should be comprehended by all members of the organization. Of course, ethics must correspond to the core business of the organization. Commonly the organizations establish written ethics called code of ethics. Code of ethics as institutionalized ethics is very important as a mean to communicate the norms in order to be used as guidance of behavior by members of the organization (George & Jones, 2012).

There are also ethics that prevail within a certain profession, that is the professional code of ethics such as military ethics. The professional code of ethics makes possible for followers of the profession to be bound not by authoritative or legal norms only, but also by shared idealism and moral values. That is why the profession is also often called as a moral community (Bertens, 2013). In the Indonesian military, there is two military code of ethics. Those are Sumpah Prajurit (Soldier Oath), and Sapta Marga (Seven Ways). Basically, Soldier Oath is a personal oath of an Indonesian soldier before God. In Soldier Oath, each of Indonesian soldier swears to God to fulfill the moral norms stated in the oath. Seven Ways is a self-statement of moral norms of Indonesian soldier as citizen, patriot, warrior, and military of Indonesia to serve the country and the nation.

Ethics underlies the values of what is good and what is bad. A certain objective is valuable to be reached because it is good. The drive to obtain the objective is nothing else but motivation (Gibson et al., 2012). In other words, the objective to be reached is very much determined by values, and one of the values is moral value. Thus, there is a direct effect of ethics on motivation. In accordance with that, Griffin and Moorhead also stated that ethical values help a person to decide what course of action or behavior should be taken (Griffin & Moorhead, 2014). An environmental expert, Carol Booth, even said that morality has proven to be a power to motivate conservation (Booth, 2009).

A research conducted by Hayati and Caniago on employees of Islamic Bank in Bandar Lampung, Indonesia also proved empirically that ethics has a direct effect on motivation (Hayati & Caniago, 2012). Another research with a similar result is conducted by Young and Durwin in Boston, USA (Young & Durwin, 2013), and also research by Gheitani et al. on bank employees in Khuzestan, Iran (Gheitani, Imani, Seyyedamiri, & Foroudi, 2018).

METHODS
This research applies a quantitative approach based on the survey method. The survey was conducted in one of the Indonesian military units located in Jakarta, Indonesia. The questionnaires are developed from the constructs of the variable studied. Those are leadership and military ethics respectively as the independent variables, and motivation as the dependent variable. Motivation is measured on three indicators, those are the achievement, affiliation, and social power. Leadership is measured on three indicators, those are the ability to influence, to motivate, and to direct. Ethics is measured on three indicators, those are the concern to ethical issues, consistency to implement ethics, and the will power to implement ethics.

Due to the homogeneous population, the random sampling technique was used to collect the data. The number of respondents is 83 to comprises of soldiers in the rank of non-commissioned and enlisted (Sergeant, Corporal, and Private). The data were analyzed with Path Analysis technique.
The test of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were applied to 30 respondents. The Product Moment Pearson method was used to test the validity, while the reliability was measured by the Alpha Cronbach formula. Test of validity for soldier’s motivation questionnaire found no invalid items out of 27 items provided. The Alpha Cronbach value of these valid questionnaires was 0.949. This value indicates the reliability of the motivation questionnaires is good. Test of validity for leadership questionnaire found 24 valid items out of 27. The Alpha Cronbach value of these valid questionnaires was 0.956 that indicates the reliability of the leadership questionnaires is good. Test of validity for military ethics questionnaire found 22 valid items out of 26. The Alpha Cronbach value of these valid questionnaires was 0.916 that indicates the reliability of the military ethics questionnaires is good.

Data were analyzed after analysis requirements to be met, otherwise, the results of the analysis would not be valid to predict the population. In each regression of independent on the dependent variable, the residual should be distributed normally, and both variables should be linearly related. Kolmogorov-Smirnov method was used to test the normality, while the test of linearity was based on the output of SPSS calculation. The test of normality found asymp. sig. value of the regression of motivation variable on leadership variable was 0.200 and asymp. sig. value of the regression of motivation variable on the ethics variable was 0.065 and asymp. sig. value of the regression of motivation variable on the ethics variable was 0.200. Each of those two values was greater than 0.05. Thus, the residual distribution on the regression of soldiers’ motivation on leadership variable as well as the regression of soldiers’ motivation variable on the military ethics variable was normal. Test of linearity of the relationship between soldiers’ motivation and leadership found sig. value of 0.000 and test of normality of the relationship between soldiers’ motivation and military ethics found sig. value of 0.000. Both values were respectively smaller than 0.05. Thus, the relationship between leadership and soldiers’ motivation as well as the relationship between military ethics and soldiers’ motivation is linear. The summary of the result of the analysis requirement test is depicted in Table-1.

Table 1. The Result of Analysis Requirement Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Linearity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Leadership</td>
<td>0.200 &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Ethics</td>
<td>0.065 &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS and DISCUSSION
Descriptive Statistics
The quantitative data of soldiers’ motivation shows the minimum score is 98, the maximum score is 133, the standard deviation is 8.005, the mean is 118.65, and the mode is 119. The mean is in the class interval of 118-122 which occupies the proportion of 22.9%. Cumulatively, the proportion of scores smaller than mean is 39.8% and the proportion of scores larger than mean is 37.3%. Based on ungrouped data, the coefficient of skewness is -0.044. While measurement based on indicators results in the mean score of achievement is 374.78, the mean score of affiliation is 358.67, and the mean score of social power is 360.78.

The quantitative data of leadership shows the minimum score is 79, the maximum score is 119, the standard deviation is 10.27, the mean is 105, and the mode is 112. The mean is in the class interval of 103-108 which occupies the largest proportion, i.e. 24.1%. Cumulatively, the proportion of scores smaller than mean is 32.5% and the proportion of scores larger than mean is 43.4%. Based on ungrouped data, the coefficient of skewness is -0.654. While measurement based on indicators results in the mean score of ability to influence is 358.50, the mean score of ability to motivate is 367.50 and the mean score of ability to direct is 360.78.

The quantitative data of military ethics shows the minimum score is 86, the maximum score is 110, the standard deviation is 5.548, the mean is 99.4, and the mode is 100. The mean is in the class interval of 98-101 which occupies the largest proportion, i.e. 26.5%. Cumulatively, the proportion of scores smaller than mean is 38.6% and the proportion of scores larger than mean is 34.9%. Based on ungrouped data, the coefficient of skewness is -0.108. While measurement based on indicators results in the mean score of the concern to ethical issues is 381.11, the mean score of consistency to implement ethics is 368.67, and the mean score of the will power to implement ethics is 372.57.
Path Analysis

SPSS 22 software is utilized to analyze the regression of motivation variable (Y) to leadership variable (X1) and the regression of motivation to ethics variable (X2). The outputs of the SPSS are exhibited in Table-2, Table-3, and Table-4.

Table 2. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Adjusted R^2</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.545^a</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>6.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ethics, Leadership

Table 3. ANOVA^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1559.884</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>779.942</td>
<td>16.887</td>
<td>0.000^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3694.984</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5254.867</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Ethics, Leadership

Table 4. Coefficients^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>40.235</td>
<td>14.037</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>3.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>3.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

Table-2 shows the value of R^2 is 0.297. Thus, the error of Y is ε_y = Y - Ŷ = 0.838. This value indicates the influence of variables outside the model on motivation. Column-5 Table-4 shows the path coefficient of motivation on leadership is 0.303, and the path coefficient of motivation on ethics is 0.374. These values demonstrate that the effect of leadership on motivation has a value of 0.303, and the effect of ethics on motivation has a value of 0.374. The simultaneous effect of leadership and military ethics on motivation is 0.303 + 0.374 = 0.677. The total effects of leadership, ethics, and other variables from outside the model can be represented by the regression equation: Y = 0.303X_1 + 0.374X_2 + 0.838.

Table-3 column-5 shows the determination coefficient (F_{count}) is 16.887 and column-6 shows the sig. value of 0.000. There are two independent variables in this model with the number of respondents is 83. Thus, the value of F_{table} is 3.11. These values mean that leadership and ethics simultaneously influence motivation because the value of sig. is smaller than 0.05 and the value of F_{count} is larger than F_{table}. In Table-2 column-3 it is written that the value of R^2 is 0.276. It means that the capability of the model to explain the variation of motivation is 27.6%.

1. Test of Hypothesis
   a. The Partial Effect of Leadership on Motivation
   H₀: Leadership has no positive effect on motivation.
   H₁: Leadership has a positive effect on motivation.

   In Table-4, the sig. value of leadership is 0.003, and t_{count} is 3.090. Since the number of independent variables is two, and the number of respondents is 83, then the value of t_{table} is 1.990. The value of sig. is smaller than 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05), and t_{count} is larger than t_{table} (3.090 > 1.990). Thus, H₀ is rejected. The conclusion is that leadership has a positive effect on motivation.

   b. The Partial Effect of Ethics on Motivation
   H₀: Ethics has no positive effect on motivation.
   H₁: Ethics has a positive effect on motivation.

   In Table-4, the sig. value of military ethics is 0.000, and t_{count} is 3.813. Since the number of independent variables is two, and the number of respondents is 83, then the value of t_{table} is 1.990. The value of sig.
is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), and \( t_{\text{count}} \) is larger than \( t_{\text{table}} \) (3.813 > 1.990). Thus, \( H_0 \) is rejected. The conclusion is that military ethics has a positive effect on soldiers’ motivation.

c. The Simultaneous Effect of Leadership and Ethics on Motivation

\( H_0 \): Leadership and ethics have no positive effect on motivation simultaneously. 
\( H_1 \): Leadership and ethics have a positive effect on motivation simultaneously.

Table 3 shows that sig. value is 0.000, and \( F_{\text{count}} \) is 16.887. Since the number of independent variables is two, and the number of respondents is 83, then the value of \( F_{\text{table}} \) is 3.110. The value of sig. is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), and \( F_{\text{count}} \) is larger than \( F_{\text{table}} \) (16.887 > 3.110). Thus, \( H_0 \) is rejected. The conclusion is that leadership and ethics have an effect on motivation simultaneously.

The measurement of the motivation variable results in the proportion of scores below the mean is larger than the upper one. The result means that the number of highly motivated soldiers is fewer than the low motivated one. However, based on ungrouped data the coefficient of skewness is negative. The negative sign indicates the tendency of the score to clustered to the right of the mean or the condition of soldiers’ motivation is quite good. Nonetheless, the motivation of soldiers should be improved especially for soldiers whose scores are still below average, besides due to the great importance of motivation in the military. The result of measurement based on indicators indicates that achievement is the most influencing factor with respect to soldiers’ motivation, while the need to the affiliate is the weakest one.

The measurement of leadership variable results in the proportion of scores above the mean is larger than the lower one. Based on ungrouped data the coefficient of skewness is negative. The negative sign indicates the tendency of the score to clustered to the right of the mean or the condition of leadership in the unit is quite good. This result indicates that leadership works well in the organization. However, the leadership should be reinforced in order to increase motivation. The result of measurement based on indicators indicates that the ability to motivate is the strongest factor of leadership in the organization, while the ability to influence is the weakest one. Relating to soldiers’ motivation in the organization that should be improved, the ability to motivate should be utilized more to improve the motivation of the soldiers.

The measurement of ethics variable results in the proportion of scores below the mean is larger than the upper one. However, based on ungrouped data the coefficient of skewness is negative. The negative sign indicates the tendency of the score to clustered to the right of the mean or the condition of military ethics in the unit is quite good. Nonetheless, the ethics should be increased in order to increase motivation especially for soldiers whose scores are still below average, besides in order to increase motivation. The result of measurement based on indicators indicates that the concern to ethical issues is the strongest factor of ethics of the soldiers, while the consistency to implement is the weakest one.

As shown at regression equation, the path coefficient of the effect of leadership (\( X_1 \)) on soldiers’ motivation (\( Y \)) is 0.303, while the effect of military ethics (\( X_2 \)) on it is 0.374. These values denote that increasing \( X_1 \) by one unit will increase the 0.303 unit of \( Y \). So will \( X_2 \), increasing \( X_2 \) by one unit will increase the 0.374 unit of \( Y \). The partial effect of leadership, as well as, ethics on soldiers’ motivation somewhat approach to zero respectively. Thus, it can be stated that each effect is not significant. However, the simultaneous effect of both variables on soldiers’ motivation is quite significant, since the magnitude is slightly close to one, i.e. 0.303 + 0.374 = 0.677. This calculation is also supported by the rejection of the null hypotheses, which statistically prove that leadership and military ethics have partially or simultaneously positive effect on soldiers’ motivation.

The coefficient of error is 0.838. This value means that 83.8% of the influence on soldiers’ motivation comes from any other variables outside of the model or to be caused by inaccuracy of measurement. The effect is significant since the magnitude is quite close to one. This significant effect also justifies that soldiers’ motivation is influenced by plenty of variables. Leadership and military ethics are just two of them to be studied. However, leadership and military ethics remain useful to be studied for improving soldiers’ motivation.

In accordance with the findings, this research suggests the Indonesian military in general and especially the military unit researched to improve the motivation of the soldiers. It is suggested that the
target of improvement should be mainly prioritized in increasing the drive to affiliate because this is the weakest aspect of the motivation in the unit. For motivation is positively influenced by leadership, thus the leadership should be strengthened. This research shows that the ability to influence is the weakest aspect of leadership, so this aspect should be the main target of strengthening leadership.

It is important to note that the motivation of soldiers is desirably intrinsic motivation. For that reason, leadership in the unit should apply transformational leadership, because transactional leadership may result in extrinsic motivation which is not expected to be the motivation of soldiers. Leadership by example is one of the effective leadership styles to strengthen intrinsic motivation. However, the best leadership is nothing else except the one that best-matched to a situation. That is the situation where it is well-matched characteristics between leadership, subordinate, and environment.

Besides leadership, military ethics should be taken into consideration in improving soldiers’ motivation, because motivation is also positively influenced by ethics. Soldier Oath and Seven Ways as the code of ethics of the Indonesian military are moral norms or ethical guidance for soldiers to serve the country and nation. Living up to the code of ethics will lead the soldiers intrinsically motivated. Ethics is about values. Soldiers must comprehend well the values and have a strong desire to implement consistently in any situation. Values are in the realm cognition, affection, and conation. Cognition and affection are of no use if they do not merge to become conation. Conation must be based on the right values in the heart and mind unless it goes to the wrong direction. The values, in turn, define that something is valuable to be reached. Needs or deficiencies come from this process that motivates a person. This is a drive that motivates someone to fulfill the need or eliminate the deficiency. A stronger drive motivates stronger.

Therefore, the soldiers should encourage themselves to live up to the code of ethics. They should comprehend the code of ethics deeper, so the moral norms come into their hearts. As moral norms come into their hearts, the needs become highly valuable objectives to be reached. By doing so, the ethics of soldiers in the unit become stronger that makes the motivation strengthened. Strengthening ethic prioritizes on strengthening the aspect of consistent implementation because this is the weakest aspect of ethics in the unit.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that (1) leadership has a positive effect on soldiers’ motivation; (2) military ethics has a positive effect on soldiers’ motivation; (3) leadership and military ethics have a positive effect on soldiers’ motivation simultaneously.

Another conclusion is that the findings of the research have corroborated theories and previous relevant researches. Leadership and military ethics are two variables that must be combined in order to be able to strengthen soldiers’ motivation significantly. The simultaneous effect of leadership and military ethics on soldiers’ motivation is much more significant than its partial effect separately.
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