

The Impact of Leadership, Workload, and Motivation Towards The Work Productivity of the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Textile Manufacturing Bandung

Gugun Adril Wargiman^{1,*}

¹Widyatama University, Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: adril.wargiman@widyatama.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research investigates The impact of leadership, Workload and motivation towards employee productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division of PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung. Leadership, workload, and motivation serve as independent variables, while work productivity is the dependent variable. A quantitative research approach was adopted, incorporating surveys, interviews, and observations for data collection. The study sampled 73 employees and employed statistical analyses such as Validity and reliability assessments, descriptive analysis, classical assumption evaluations, multiple linear regression, hypothesis testing, and determination analysis. The findings reveal that leadership, workload, and motivation significantly impact work productivity, both individually and collectively. The results provide insights for organizations to enhance employee performance through improved leadership strategies, balanced workloads, and motivation- driven initiatives.

Keywords: *Leadership, Workload, Motivation, Work Productivity*

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective The management of human resources is crucial For businesses operating in overseeing, structuring, and optimizing employees to enhance productivity and achieve corporate objectives. As key assets, employees contribute significantly to improving overall work efficiency within the organization. Human resources play a fundamental role in driving all operational activities within a company or institution (Sutrisno, 2020). High productivity is crucial for a company as it is closely related to achieving goals and ensuring optimal performance. Strategies to enhance employee productivity can be pursued Through the provision of incentives that promote work efficiency. These incentives may include economic, sociological, and psychological satisfaction. When employees experience job satisfaction, it positively impacts productivity and overall workplace efficiency (Hasibuan, 2019).

Leadership is one of the most critical management functions. Regardless of how skilled an employee is, their performance highly depends on the guidance, direction, and support of a leader. Effective leadership plays a significant role in ensuring that company operations align with predetermined goals. Leaders must have a deep understanding of internal organizational activities to make informed decisions, implement necessary improvements, and adapt to changes. Strong leadership helps establish clear goals, create a positive work environment, and maintain accountability, ultimately enhancing productivity and organizational success (Siagian, 2021).

To acquire the desired human resources that positively contribute to all corporate activities, employees must have high work motivation, which ultimately enhances productivity. Motivation is a key factor that management must prioritize if they expect employees to make meaningful contributions to the company's success. With strong motivation, employees will demonstrate enthusiasm in carrying out their responsibilities. Without motivation, employees may find it difficult to achieve performance standards or surpass expectations, as they lack the drive and sense of purpose needed to excel in their work.

PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung is a company operating in the textile industry, specializing in dyeing services. Additionally, it provides maklun services, where raw or white yarn from other companies is processed for dyeing. This study focuses on the dyeing department, particularly the packing section.

Despite advancements in systems and technology at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung, along with the availability of skilled employees, a noticeable decline in work productivity has been observed. One contributing factor

is the lack of specific skill requirements for newly recruited employees, which does not align with the company's operational needs.

The decline in productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division has been evident from 2018 to 2020. In 2018, productivity was recorded at 5,314.102 tons, decreasing to 4,613.785 tons by 2019. The company initially set production targets of 76,320 tons for 2016 and 2017, 69,480 tons for 2018, 59,040 tons for 2019, and 51,840 tons for 2020. However, due to workforce reductions and internal transfers from the Logistics and Packaging Division to other sections, the company's productivity consistently declined and fell short of its annual targets.

Given these challenges, this study aims to explore the factors influencing work productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division. Therefore, the author is interested in conducting research titled: "The Impact of Leadership, Workload and Motivation Towards Employee Productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung."

1.1. Problem Formulation

Based on the background described, this study seeks to explore the following research questions:

- a. What are the current conditions of leadership, workload, motivation, and work productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung?
- b. How do leadership, workload, and motivation individually (partially) influence the work productivity of the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung?
- c. How do leadership, workload, and motivation collectively (simultaneously) impact the work productivity of the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung?

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a quantitative methodology to examine The Impact of leadership, workload, and motivation on employee productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung, located in Bandung Regency. A descriptive research design is utilized to systematically analyze the relationships between these variables.

The study focuses on the Logistics and Packaging Division's employees, with a total population of 73 individuals. Data collection involved both primary and secondary sources, utilizing a survey method conducted through purposive sampling. The questionnaire included sections on demographics, leadership, workload, motivation, and productivity, with responses measured using a Likert scale to facilitate quantitative analysis.

Statistical tools, including descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis using SPSS software, were employed for data analysis. Measurement consistency was verified through validity and reliability tests, followed by hypothesis testing using t-tests and F-tests. To uphold research ethics, informed consent and confidentiality were strictly maintained throughout the study.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Validity Test

The validity test is conducted to determine whether a questionnaire is legitimate and capable of accurately measuring the intended variables. A questionnaire is considered valid if its items effectively capture the dimensions being evaluated. The test involves comparing the computed correlation coefficient (r_{hitung}) with the critical value from the correlation table (r_{tabel}), based on the degrees of freedom (DF), which is calculated using the formula $DF = n - 2$, where n is the sample size. In this study, the sample consists of 73 respondents, resulting in $DF = 73 - 2 = 71$. At $DF = 71$ and a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$), the critical r_{tabel} value is 0.195. If the calculated r_{hitung} exceeds r_{tabel} and is positive, the corresponding item, statement, or indicator in the questionnaire is considered valid.

3.2. Reability Test

The reliability of a research variable or construct is assessed using the Cronbach's Alpha (α) statistical test. A variable or A construct is deemed reliable if its Cronbach's Alpha value is greater than 0.6, indicating internal consistency among the measured items. The closer the alpha value is to 1, the higher the reliability of the data,

suggesting that the questionnaire or measurement instrument consistently captures the intended variables with minimal error.

3.3. Normality Test

Table 1 Findings of the Normality Test

Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		73
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Average	.0000000
	Standard Deviation	1.52487426
Largest Differences	Absolute Value	.073
	Positive Value	.073
	Negative Value	-.045
Test Value		.073
Asymp. Sig. (Two-tailed)		.210 ^{c,d}

Referring to Table 1, the Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) value is 0.210, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the data follows a normal distribution. Therefore, the assumption The model for regression normality has been met.

3.4. Multicollinearity Test

Table 2 Multicollinearity Test Results

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		
	Leadership	.953	1.051
	Workload	.987	1.013
	Motivation	.934	1.050
a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity			

Based on Table 2, each variable has a tolerance value close to 1 and a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of less than 10.0. This indicates that there is no multicollinearity, meaning the independent variables are not highly correlated with each other and are suitable for further analysis.

3.5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 3 Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Model		Sig.
1	(Constant)	.006
	Leadership	.265
	Workload	.528
	Motivation	.323
a. Outcome Variable: Abs_RES		

Referring to Table 3, the results indicate Indicating that no independent variables have a Quantitatively significant impact on The outcome variable. Absolute Ut (AbsUt). This is evident Derived from the significance Likelihood values, which are all above the 0.05 (5%) confidence level. Therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model does not exhibit heteroscedasticity.

3.6. Autocorrelation Test

Table 4 Autocorrelation Test Results

Model Summary ^b			
Model	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.343	1.550	1.831

Referring to Table 4, the Durbin-Watson value obtained is 1.831. This value is then compared with the Durbin-Watson table values at a significance level using the formula (K:N), where the number of independent variables is 3 (K=3), and the sample size is 73 (N=73). From the table, the lower bound (DL) is 1.532, and the upper bound (DU) is 1.705. Since the obtained Durbin-Watson value (1.831) Surpasses both DU and DL, it confirms that no autocorrelation is present in the data, allowing further analysis to be conducted reliably.

3.7. Hypothesis Testing Results

Tabel 5 t-test Result (partial)

Coefficients ^a		
Model		Sig.
1	(Constant)	.657
	Leadership	.000
	Workload	.005
	Motivation	.005

Referring to Table 5, the outcomes of the partial test (t-test) conducted in this study show the following findings: The significance value for the leadership variable is 0.000 ($0.000 < 0.05$), indicating that leadership has a significant effect on work productivity. The significance value for the workload variable is 0.005 ($0.005 < 0.05$), meaning that workload also has a significant impact on work productivity. Similarly, the significance value for the motivation variable is 0.005 ($0.005 < 0.05$), confirming that motivation significantly influences work productivity.

3.8. F-Test Analysis

Table 6. f-test Result (Simultant)

ANOVA ^a			
Model		F	Sig.
1	Regression	12.884	.000b
	Residual		
	Total		

Based on Table 6, the calculated F-value is 12.884 with a significance value of 0.000, which is lower than the confidence level (α) of 5%. Therefore, The study hypothesis stating Which Leadership, Job demands and motivation collectively influence Employee productivity and Needs to be acknowledged Numerically.

3.9. Discussion

The findings Of this research highlight the significant impact of leadership, Workload and motivation towards employee productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division at PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung. Effective leadership fosters a positive work environment, enhances communication, and provides clear direction, all of which contribute to improved performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Additionally, workload management plays a crucial role in maintaining efficiency, as excessive workloads can lead to stress and decreased productivity. Proper task distribution and supportive leadership are essential in preventing burnout and ensuring optimal performance levels (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Motivation also serves as a key driver of employee productivity. Employees who feel valued and motivated demonstrate higher engagement and efficiency in their tasks. Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory suggests that both intrinsic Elements like acknowledgment and career growth, and extrinsic factors, such as incentives, play a crucial role in maintaining employee motivation (Herzberg, 1966). Organizations that implement motivation- enhancing strategies, such as career development programs and reward systems, can significantly improve employee commitment and work performance (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Overall, the combination of effective leadership, balanced workload, and strong motivation underscores the importance of strategic workforce management. Leaders who provide guidance, ensure fair task allocation, and foster a motivating work culture create an environment conducive to high productivity. Organizations that prioritize leadership development, workload optimization, and motivation-driven policies are more likely to enhance employee performance and achieve long-term success. By adopting these strategies, PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung can strengthen its workforce productivity and sustain business growth.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Conclusion

Based on the research conducted in the Logistics and Packaging Division of PT. Santoso Tekstil Manufaktur Bandung, examining The Impact of leadership, workload, and motivation on work productivity, the following conclusions are explained that Leadership Exhibits a positive and substantial impact Towards work productivity when analyzed individually (partially). Workload also Positively and significantly influences work productivity. when considered independently. Motivation similarly contributes positively and significantly to work productivity on a partial basis. Leadership, workload, and motivation collectively (simultaneously) influence work productivity in a positive and significant manner.

4.2. Recommendations

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance work productivity in the Logistics and Packaging Division that the company should continuously improve its leadership and monitoring strategies to ensure effective supervision and guidance, which will contribute to increased employee productivity. A review and evaluation of work targets should be conducted to ensure they align with employees' capabilities. Additionally, managing workload distribution effectively can prevent employees from experiencing excessive pressure, enabling them to meet company targets more efficiently. The company should strengthen employee motivation through incentives, rewards, and recognition to encourage higher engagement and improved performance. A systematic assessment of task distribution is necessary to ensure that workloads remain manageable. Excessive workloads may hinder productivity, so fair allocation of tasks is crucial to maintaining efficiency and employee well-being.

REFERENCE

- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006) *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior, *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227 – 268.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Bumi Aksara. Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293 – 315.
- Siagian, S. P. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara. Sutrisno, E. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Kencana.