



Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

Similarity Found: 12%

Date: Thursday, December 17, 2021

Statistics: 453 words Plagiarized / 3743 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

Multicultural Education ISSN: 10683844 Volume 6, Issue 1, 2020

1

Effect Of Personality And Work Motivation On Normative Commitment: An Empirical Study Hegar Harini, Purwani Puji Utami Article Info Abstract Article History Received: December 10, 2019 In an effort to increase normative commitment, principals should be supported by personality and work motivation.

A number of research were lack of examining specifically normative commitment in educational organizations. Therefore, the purpose of this present study is to examine the direct influence of personality and work motivation on the normative commitment of the principals. The survey method with the path analysis approach was employed in this study.

Based on the results of data analysis, it was concluded that personality and work motivation have a direct positive effect on the normative commitment of the principals, which means that better personality and higher commitment Accepted: March 10, 2020
Keywords educational organization, normative commitment, personality, principals, work motivation DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3708066 Introduction Schools, as one of the skill development institutions, have an obligation to improve the quality of Indonesian human resources in order to face challenges in global competition. Therefore, the presence of school principals whose high commitment is a mandatory.

Their presence is regarded as real attempts at education quality betterment. The real condition of school principals points out that many are suspected of committing violations in the field of management. Quoting from the governor of Jakarta for period 2012-2017, BasukiTjahajaPurnama, it was reported that nine school principals were

suspected of being involved in extortion, which ultimately dismissed them from their positions for tarnishing the image of education which has begun to develop.

The case infers that most of the principals have low organizational commitment in their profession. One of the important organizational commitments to own by a school principal is normative commitment. Normative commitment **reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization** (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

Kondalkar(2007) states, "normative commitment is a definite belief and acceptance of values **and goals of the** organization". Principals who have normative commitment will refer to the standard of behavior or social norms in the leadership process. *Ianertofo ralsnomaticomitent, rmonopsoyandwokmoivatio* should be patronized.

Principals with high work motivation will assist with the enhancement of normative commitment directing to school progress. The low normative commitment of school principals will be closely related to their personality. Elleman, et.al (2018) state that models of normative commitment are based on the big five, a widely-accepted taxonomy that organizes most individual differences into five broad traits: conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism (sometimes referred **by its polar opposite, emotional stability**), openness (sometimes called intellect), and extraversion. Up until now, research on normative commitment in the field of education, especially in high school, are not frequently found.

Such studies are usually more associated with companies or enterprises. Several journals examine the effect of 2 variables, namely **personality and work motivation on** normative commitment in general. Meyer, et.al, (2002) examined the relationship of 3 components of the commitment model, comprising of **affective, continuance, and normative commitment to** organizations in connection with job satisfaction, job involvement, and work relations. Various organizations were involved in the study.

Leephaijaroen(2016) 2 examined **the effect of personality** and organizational commitment **on organizational citizenship behavior** (OCB) involving staffs at higher institutions as the samples. Previous studies have generally analyzed the factors influencing organizational commitment, which varies one researcher to another, which at the end creates a research gap. The present study, to be more specific, concerns on the **influence of personality and work motivation on the normative commitment of the principal.**

The two things are regarded critical due to the low commitment phenomenon of high

school principals in Jakarta, coar rals' rfeiosasnt. Normative Commitment Noma mmitntisafeenooligantormaiwi y ne'copy (Andre, 2008). Normative commitment is a feeling of loyalty to organization (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2008).

Furthermore Kondalkar(2007) states that normative commitment is a definite belief and acceptance of value and goals of the organization. Normative commitment, which stems from a psychological attachment to an oganizatio vos idficatioandintertin f riovals. the rnizatio idy ecmes nteatedintoa ern'sel -view, he or she becomes more committed to promoting the organiza tios -being, leading strong cultures to grow stronger over time.

The link between strong culture firms and compliance based on commitment, or commitment based on instrumental or extrinsic rewards, is less clear (Peterson & Mannix, 2003). The above definitions point out that normative commitment is obligations and responsibilities to the organization. The indicators are (1) attachment of obligations to survive with the organization, (2) attachment of choice to stay attached to strong organizations, (3) definite attachment to beliefs and acceptance of organizational values and goals.

Personality Personality is a critical part of a person's life and underlies employee behavior at work. How someone reacts to others, it is inseparable from one's personality. Personality refers to the structures and propensities inside a person that explain his or her characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior (Colquitt, LePine, & Wesson, 2009). Kinicky and Fugate (2016) propose that ernalitisdnedas mbnatioo le pys ehavioal, and ncharters giveinivids niqids".Psoy ht be further interpreted as how people affect others and how they understand and view themselves, as well as their pattern of inner and outer measurable traits and the person situation interaction.

How people affect others depends primarily on their external appearance (height, weight, facial features, color, and other physical aspects) and traits. For example, in terms of external appearance, a very tall worker will act partly compared to a very short worker. A meta-analysis evidence also speaks that there are gender differences in certain personality characteristics.

However, of more importance to the physiological/biological approach in the study of personality than the external appearance is the role of heredity and the brain (Luthans, 2011). McShane and Glinow(2008) outline the five dimensions of personality as follows: 1) Extraversion, consisting of: easy going in relationships, staying comfortable around people, initiating conversation, talking to everyone, good at attracting people and skilled at handling social situations, 2) Agreeableness, comprising of: being tolerant, providing time for others, being able to empathize with other people's feelings, making

peace, showing gratitude, thinking of others first, being attentive, being good at entertaining (fun), and being helpful, 3) Openness or Intellect, covering: lots of ideas, admiring art, lots of vocabulary, often reflection, love of challenging reading, preferring new ways to improve, 4) Emotional Stability, including: always staying calm, rarely feeling sad, not easily feeling disturbed, not agitating others, rarely getting angry, 5) Conscientiousness or Dependability, encompassing: always getting ready to work, being keen on details, completing tasks immediately, working on a plan, and being careful on a job.

Referring to those mentioned statements, **personality can be defined** as integrated and dynamic physical and psychological system that distinguishes the person from others. The indicators supporting the system are extraversion, agreeableness, openness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. Work Motivation Work **motivation is defined as** psychological behavior in an organization, effort level, and persistence in the face of obstacles. **The three key elements of work motivation are direction of behavior, level of effort, and level of persistence** (George, 2012).

Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2002) note that "motivation is the impetus that a person has to carry out a good job, this encouragement can come from within and outside oneself." and persistence of a person's effort toward a goal. Furrmoe, Roba ud (2017: 247) acknowledge that the content of an individual's intensity, direction, and persistence of effort toward a goal. Those definitions infer that work motivation is the impetus that a person has to carry out a good job, this encouragement can come from within and outside oneself.

The indicators of work motivation include 1) work direction, 2) work effort and 3) persistence. Methods This study employed a survey method with a path analysis approach. The instrument **used to collect data** was questionnaires, assessing the interrelationship between research variables and measuring one variable with another.

The unit of analysis is the principals of Public High School in Jakarta, Indonesia. The samples were taken using simple random sampling technique based on the sample technique formula from Slovin, with the number of samples were 90 (n=90). The hypothesis testing in this study used the constellation model between variables, consisting of these variables namely exogenous variables of Personality (X1), Work Motivation (X2), and endogenous variables: Normative Commitment (Y).

The constellation of the research problem model showing the model of the relationship between the exogenous variable (X) and the endogenous variable (Y) is presented in Figure 1. Figure 1. Constellation Model of Research Problem Description: Y : Normative Commitment X1 : Personality X2 : Work Motivation Results and Discussion Path analysis

technique applies the analysis of prerequisite tests, which consist of normality, linearity, and regression significance test.

The following tables present the analysis of each requirement test. Table 1 Summary of Normality Test Results No Estimated Error of Regression n L-count L-table Description a 5 a 1 1. Y above X1 90 0,071 0,093 0,109 Normal 2. Y above X2 90 0,063 0,093 0,109 Normal 3.

X2 above X1 90 0,052 0,093 0,109 Normal The normality test calculation result indicates that L count table, so **it can be concluded that the** estimated error distribution between variables comes from populations with a normal distribution. Table 2 Summary of Significance Test Results and Linearity Regression Reg Equation Regression Test Linearity Test Conclusion Fcount Ftable Fcount Ftable Personality (X1) Work Motivation (X2) Normative Commitment (Y) 4 a =,0 a =,0 Y above X1 =99,48 + 0,424 X1 31,26 6,93** 0,767 1,64ns Regression is very significant/Linear regression Y above X2 =92,48 + 0,563 X3 29,88 6,93** 1,183 1,64ns Regression is very significant/Linear regression X2 above X1 = 78,05 + 0,385 X1 32,68 6,93** 0,721 1,64ns Regression is very significant/Linear regression The above table shows the significance of the regression test obtained, which is F -count =F -table, as for the linear regression test is F-count < F-table, then the regression is concluded very significant and linear.

The path coefficients in the hypothetical model of research are β_{y1} , β_{y2} , β_{y1} . In determining the magnitude of the path in a hypothetical model of research, it is obtained by determining the magnitude of correlation value which is then followed by finding the path coefficient value, and then proceeding with the test of path coefficient significance.

The calculation results obtained **by the correlation matrix** among variables is presented in table 3 as follows. Table 3. Inter-Variable Correlation Matrix r X 1 X 2 Y X 1 1,000 0,520 0,512 X 2 0,520 1,000 0,503 Y 0,512 0,503 1,000 The amount of direct influence and significance test for each path (path analysis) is summarized **in the following table.** Table 4 Summary of Path Significance of Test Results No.

Direct Influence Coefficient Path Dk Tcount ttable a 005 a = 0,01 1. X1 to Y 0,279 86 2,70 1,99 2,63 2. X2 to Y 0,242 86 2,27 1,99 2,63 3. X1 to X2 0,366 87 3,78 1,99 2,63 Structurally the overall diagram of the path of each structure can be seen in Figure 2 below. Figure 2. Causal Path Diagram Effects of X 1 and X2 on Y Based on the path analysis test mentioned above, hypothesis testing can be generated as follows: First Hypothesis: **there is a positive direct effect** on Personality (X1) on Normative Commitments (Y).

The statistical hypothesis tested shows positive direct effect on Personality (X1) and Normative Commitments (Y). Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{10} = 0$ $H_1: \beta_{10} > 0$ $X_1 \rightarrow Y$ $r^2_{y1} = 0,503$ $\beta_{y2} = 0,242$ $r^2_{12} = 0,520$ $\beta_{21} = 0,366$ $r_{1y} = 0,512$ $\beta_{y1} = 0,279$ 5 Based on the results of Personality (X1) path analysis on normative commitment (Y) shows 0,279 with $t_{count} = 2,70$, while the value of $t_{table} = 1,96$ ($\alpha = 0,05$; $dk = 86$). Therefore $t_{count} > t_{table}$, so H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Thus, it can be concluded that Personality has a direct positive effect on Normative Commitment. Second Hypothesis: there is a positive direct effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Normative Commitment (Y). Having tested the hypothesis, the result shows a positive direct effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Normative Commitment (Y).

Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{20} = 0$ $H_1: \beta_{20} > 0$ The calculation of variable Work Motivation (X2) on Normative Commitment (Y) $t_{count} = 2,27$, while the score of $t_{table} = 1,96$ ($\alpha = 0,05$; $dk = 86$). Since $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Thus it signifies Work Motivation has a positive direct effect on Normative Commitment. Third hypothesis: there is a positive direct effect of Personality (X1) towards Work Motivation (X2).

After being tested, the statistical hypothesis suggests a direct positive effect of Personality (X1) on Work Motivation (X2). Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{12} = 0$ $H_1: \beta_{12} > 0$ Based on the results of personality (X1) path analysis on work motivation (X2), the path coefficient obtained is 0,378, while the score of $t_{table} = 1,96$ ($\alpha = 0,05$; $dk = 86$). $t_{count} > t_{table}$, so H_0 is rejected, H_1 is accepted.

On that ground, this proves that Personality has a positive direct effect on Work Motivation. Looking at the results of analysis and hypotheses testing, it is exactly proven that each path has a positive direct effect. To be more detail, the discussion of the analysis and hypotheses testing proposed in the present study is displayed below.

Personality Direct Effect on Normative Commitment The first hypothesis testing results in path coefficient β_{y1} score: 0.279, which precisely rejects H_0 and accepts H_1 . The path analysis between personality and normative commitment variable provide an understanding that the better personality displayed, the better normative commitment of principals will be performed, and vice versa.

The above data analysis result and statistical calculation is corroborated by previous relevant research. Kumar (2012) explained values of narrative commitment include openness, fairness, commitment to the organization, and moral integrity as the most

affective and normative which become the predictors of organizational commitment and personal values.

Personal and organizational values and congruence between the two are significant in determining organizational commitment. Further, once the organization selects personnel with high values of openness, fairness, logic and moral integrity and promote these values in the organization, a more affective and normative workforce take place. Nelson and Cooper (2007) declare that commitment concerns on curiosity and engagement.

Control concerns on the ability to coach influence and take responsibility. Furthermore, Colquitt, et.al.(2009) argue that "coscieuelos n e rcotedtotheiroganizatio The findings in this study support the results of previous studies put forward by Leephaijaroen(2016) , "the findings above revealed that **the big-five personality traits and organizational commitment** have positive contios ernalit ndnoma mmitnt" ohave acist f ernalita organizational commitment, the principal must have an open personality and normative commitment.

Work Motivation Direct Effect on Normative Commitments The hypothesis testing of the second hypothesis shows the path coefficient (β_2) is 0,242 which directs to the rejection of H0 and acceptance of H1. This proves that **there is a positive direct effect of work motivation on the normative commitment of the principals.** The results of the path analysis between work motivation variable with 6 normative commitment variable betoken positive **effect of work motivation on** normative commitment, inferring that a high level of work motivation shall assist the promotion of **normative commitment of the principals.**

The results **of this present study** are in line with the research of Yundong(2015) revealing that intrinsic motivation is positively associated with normative commitment. This hypothesis is supported by the SEM anal pcoficie.3,p=.) he esults gget hat individuals with high level of intrinsic motivation **are more likely to have high** normative commitment.

The effect size of intrinsic motivation on normative commitment is 0.192, which means that 19.2 % of the normative commitment variance is explained by intrinsic motivation. As for Gibson, et.al.(2012) argue, research evidence indicating the absence of commitment can reduce organizational effectiveness.

Intrinsic rewards are important for developing organizational commitment. Ortio e le eelosnees y rvidg hallegin potuni infee bk, encouraging employee participation and

recognizing achievement. When it occurs, a significant impact on commitment shall be observed.

Furthermore, to Yundong (2015), normative commitment refers to a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Previous work on the relation between intrinsic motivation and normative commitment is very limited. As mentioned, the social value or obligation that keeps an individual working in a certain organization is not a personal need or goal; it is the personal needs of all social members that may shape social values. The normative commitment of the principal refers to the feeling of obligation to work.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and normative commitment is not closely connected. The social values or obligations that make the principal work are not regarded as personal needs or goals, but personal needs can bridge to the emergence of social values.

Personality Direct Effect on Work Motivation Hypothesis testing of personality effect on work motivation results in the value of the path coefficient ($p = 0.366$), concluding the rejection of H0 and acceptance of H1. This proves that there is a positive direct effect of personality on work motivation. The principal's own better personality, high possibility to get the result of the work motivation of the principal's personality. This is in agreement with a research conducted by Yahaya, et al.

(2012) that the Big Five Personality, competition, motivation and organization commitment can influence job satisfaction of the manufacturing workers. By defining the Big Five Personality dimensions as the difference of role's interaction to circumstance of environmental stimuli, we expect to contribute to a renaissance of motivational approaches to explain human personality. While Griffin et al.

(2017: 173) stated that they noted earlier that individual differences play a key role in motivation. To be more precise, different things motivate different people, in this case the principals, in terms of different abilities, needs, personalities, values, and self-concept. Conclusion Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, the conclusions in this study are drawn as follows: 1) There is a significant positive direct effect of personality on normative commitment. This signifies that better personality will direct the principals to have well normative commitment.

Relevant research supporting this result has been conducted earlier by Kumar and Leephaijaroen. 2) There is a significant positive direct effect of work motivation on normative commitment. To be more specific, the higher work motivation performed by the principals, the better normative commitment will take place. This result is in line with Yogrc 3)

There is a significant positive direct effect of personality on work motivation. This result further denotes that better personality determines higher work motivation.

The research of Yahaya has initially probed this matter. Recommendations Efforts of Fostering Normative Commitment through Strengthening Personality Traits that determine the effectiveness of either physical or mental with the following indicators: seriousness, friendliness, openness, and carefulness.

Holding regular training, by emphasizing on mental personality development, is deliberated on mental personality development, not to the skill. Another step is direct coaching of superiors to subordinates. A more friendly approach is counted as the strong point of this coaching. Schools also need to host forums that can open space for principals to express their opinions.

7 Efforts of Enhancing Normative Commitment through Strengthening Work Motivation Upad pialscofid s n ffoot fithda ke espsnitowokthecar out with the presence of the following indicators: persistence at work, ability to solve problems encountered, and ability to grant them more experience and abilities.

Comparative study is another brilliant idea to conduct, expecting that the principals can gain experience to compare normative commitment accomplished in advance. Acknowledgements or Notes I would like to express my thanks to public Senior High School principals in Jakarta. I also wish to express my thanks to the anonymous referees for their useful suggestion. References Andre, R. (2008).

Organizational behaviour: An introduction to your life in organizations. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. Colquitt, J., LePine, J., & Wesson, M. (2009). Organizational behavior: Essentials for improving performance and commitment. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, Inc. Elleman, L. G., Condon, D. M., Russin, S. E., & Revelle, W. (2018). The personality of U.S. states: Stability from 1999 to 2015. Journal of Research in Personality, 72, 64 – 72. George, J. M. (2012).

Understanding and managing organizational behavior. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc. Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnely, J. ., & Konopaske, J. R. (2012). Organization behavior, structure, processes. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, Inc. Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2017). Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations. Boston: Cengage Learning. Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, J. R., & Matteson, M. T. (2008).

Organizational behavior management. New York: McGraw-Hill Education Inc. Kinicky, A., & Fugate, M. (2016). Organizational behavior: A practical-problem solving approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, Inc. Kondalkar, V. G. (2007). Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd., Publishers. Kumar, N. (2012). Relationship of personal & organizational values with organizational commitment. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 306 – 314.

Leephaijaroen, S. (2016). Effects of the big-five personality traits and organizational commitments on organizational citizenship behavior of support staff at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 37, 103 – 111.

Luthans, F. (2011). Organizational behavior: an evidence-based approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, Inc.

McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. A. (2008). *Organizational behavior: emerging knowledge and practice for the real world*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, Inc. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences.

Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61, 20 – 52. Nelson, D. L., & Cooper, C. L. (2007). Positive organizational behavior. London: Sage Publications, Ltd. Peterson, R. S., & Mannix, E. A. (2003). Leading and managing people in the dynamic organization. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). Organizational behavior. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Ltd. Schermerhorn Jr, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2002). Organizational behavior.

New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Yahaya, A., Yahaya, N., Bon, A. T., Ismail, S., & Noor, N. M. (2012). The relationship between big five personality with work motivation, competitiveness and job satisfaction. *Elixir Psychology*, 44, 7454 – 7461. Yundong, H. (2015). Impact of intrinsic motivation on organizational commitment: Empirical evidences from China. *International Business and Management*, 11(3), 31 – 44.

Author Information Hegar Harini of First Author Purwani Puji Utami of Second Author 8 Lecturer of STKIP Kusumanegara Jakarta, Indonesia. Jl. Raya Bogor, RT.3/RW.4, Gedong, Kec. Ps. Rebo, Kota Jakarta Timur, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 13770 Lecturer of STKIP Kusumanegara Jakarta, Indonesia. Jl. Raya Bogor, RT.3/RW.4, Gedong, Kec. Ps.

Rebo, Kota Jakarta Timur, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 13770

INTERNET SOURCES:

1% - zenodo.org › record › 3708066
<1% - www.academia.edu › 6116507 › Affective_Continuance
<1% - www.academia.edu › 9902045 › The_relationship
<1% - r4dn.com › how-are-the-big-5-personality-traits
<1% - www.academia.edu › 33367092 › Validation_of_the
<1% - www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov › pmc › articles
<1% - www.mrp.ase.ro › no83 › f4
<1% - www.trijurnal.lemlit.trisakti.ac.id › ber › article
<1% - quizlet.com › 10982395 › chapter-9-flash-cards
<1% - www.slideshare.net › DrRhea1 › lesson-1-introduction
<1% - www.slideshare.net › Manisha_D_Vaghela13 › basic-of
<1% - openstax.org › 2-3-personality-an-introduction
<1% - www.questionpro.com › blog › employee-motivation
<1% - quizlet.com › 214208051 › man-3240-chapter-6-flash-cards
<1% - www.formpl.us › blog › data-collection-method
<1% - doaj.org › article › 64b387d116194bb69ea1d90068647e0b
<1% - www.connectmath.com › Navidi_App_A_Tables
<1% - online.stat.psu.edu › stat505 › book
<1% - www.irs.gov › irm › part2
<1% - www.atlantis-press.com › article › 125928454
<1% - pps.unj.ac.id › educational-management-thesis-title
<1% - heimaproperty.academia.edu › IMadePutrawan
<1% - www.intechopen.com › chapters › 57830
<1% - www.simplypsychology.org › big-five-personality
<1% - www.sciencedirect.com › science › article
<1% - quizlet.com › 334532540 › motivation-exam-2-review
1% - www.cscanada.net › index › ibm
<1% - www.getmyuni.com › articles › team-spirit
<1% - www.ijlpr.com › admin › php
<1% - www.floridatechonline.com › blog › business
<1% - www.atsdr.cdc.gov › hac › phamannual
<1% - juniperpublishers.com › pbsij › pdf
<1% - acknowledgementworld.com › acknowledgement-samples
<1% - ijec.ejournal.id › index › counseling
<1% - ibn.e-journal.id › index › ESENSI
<1% - openstax.org › books › organizational-behavior
<1% - www.amazon.com › Organizational-Behavior-Managing
<1% - www.academia.edu › 40595531 › organizational

<1% - library.umd.umich.edu › newbooks › 2015
<1% - jp.feb.unsoed.ac.id › index › jeba
<1% - www.academia.edu › 27845259
<1% - www.sci epub.com › reference › 245345
<1% - www.scirp.org › (S(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffcz55
<1% - www.academia.edu › 4764699 › Affective_Continuance
<1% - www.sci epub.com › reference › 113329
<1% - en.wikipedia.org › wiki › Wiley_(publisher)
<1% - www.semanticscholar.org › paper › The-relationship
<1% - link.springer.com › article › 10
<1% - id.theasianparent.com › pondok-pesantren-di-jakarta
<1% - maketcreator.com › jual-airsoft-gun-jakarta-murah