Leadership and Employee Productivity at The Galatta Lestarindo Fertilizer Company

Khuzrotun Nusfiyah[1], Rahmah Salsabila Al Maghfuri[2]

[1]SMK Sunan Drajat Lamongan Indonesia, [2]Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya Indonesia

Email: [1]nusfiyah@gmail.com, [2]elsarahmah04@gmail.com ,

Corresponding Author :
elsarahma04@gmail.com

Abstract: *The purpose of this study was to determine the positive and significant influence of leadership on employee work productivity at the fertilizer company Galatta Lestarindo. The collection method is through interviews and submission of questions by means of a questionnaire involving 25 respondents. Analysis tools in the form of correlation and regression as well as data processing with SPSS software. The results showed a correlation coefficient of 0.714, an R Square value of 0.510 meaning that 51% of changes that occur in productivity can be explained by leadership. Correlation value of 0.714 has a positive and significant relationship between leadership and employee work productivity at the fertilizer company Galatta Lestarindo.*

Keywords : *Leadership, productivity, quality of work, performance*

Introduction

In this era of globalization, the business world is colored by very tight competition, therefore companies must be able to manage their resources, including human resources. This can be achieved by increasing employee work productivity. To increase employee work productivity, encouragement or motivation is needed as well as a leader figure who can spur employees to be more productive and responsible for the work they face. The encouragement itself includes encouragement from within oneself (internal) and encouragement from outside (external).

Each Individual has its own characteristics which are influenced by several factors such as: differences in the level of needs, differences in educational levels, differences in the environment, and others (Reksohadiprojo and T. Hani Handoko 1999:205). According to Handoko (1997:296) the style of leadership in roughly termed is the same as that used by the leader in influencing his followers. According to Dharma (1998:242) productivity measurements include; 1) Quantity, namely the amount that must be produced. 2). Quality is the quality that must be produced. 3). Timeliness is in accordance with the time planned. Winardi (1993:32) in the economics dictionary says that productivity is the amount produced by each job in a certain period of time. Markum Singodimedjo (2000: 127) says that

productivity contains a mental attitude that always has the view that the quality of life must be better than yesterday and tomorrow is better than today.

Klinger and Nambaldian quoted by Markum Singodimedjo (2000: 130) said that productivity is a function of employee effort which is supported by high motivation with employee abilities obtained through training. The results of research conducted by Hadi (1998) entitled The Influence of Leadership Style and Motivation on Employee Work Productivity at the Rice Milling Factory of PT. Dwi Udayana concluded that there is a significant influence of leadership style on the work productivity of production employees. While the influence of each predictor is 0.3026 or 30.26% for motivation and 0.5112 or 51.12% for leadership style.

In research conducted by Laili (2005) with the title Leadership Style and Work Motivation on Employee Work Productivity at Fertilizer Company PT. Sunan Drajat Group concluded that there is a strong correlation between leadership style and work productivity, this is shown by the result of 0.813.

Productivity is only a tool, so it is important to set goals before doing measurement work. The objective of measuring Productivity is to optimize the factors that support Productivity, and minimize the factors that hinder it. Therefore productivity measurements at the company level must be linked to actual companies in the industry and the economy as a whole.

Leadership (Kreitner, 2008) is the process of influencing one individual to another to achieve a common goal. Leadership (Robbins, 2006) is the ability to influence groups towards achieving goals. Leadership (Jacob and Jacques, 2008) is a process of influencing group activities that are organized to achieve common goals. Leadership is a process of giving meaning to cooperation and is generated by the willingness to lead in achieving goals. Leadership (Ivancevich Robert Konopaske and Michael T. Matteson., 2008) is the use of influence in organizational devices or situations, which produces something meaningful and has a direct impact on challenging goals.

Measurement in research can be seen from leadership indicators which include; 1). Treatment of superiors to subordinates. 2). The attention of superiors so that subordinates feel happy about their work. 3). The superior's policy always considers the suggestions of subordinates in making decisions. 4). The superior's policy that places subordinates' suggestions in the implementation of their work and 5). Scheduling of tasks to be carried out and maintenance of standard tasks of subordinates.

Productivity measurement indicators include: 1). Company policy regarding the use of employee power in completing work. 2). Overall organizational activities. 3). Use of time with standard working hours and provisions on working hours imposed by the company. 4). Output obtained in carrying out daily tasks and 5). The dependence of employees on other people at work. From the background explanation above, the researcher aims to find out the positive and significant influence of leadership on employee work productivity at the Galatta Lestarindo Company

Method

This type of research is explanatory research, namely research that explains the causal relationship between variables through testing the hypotheses that have previously been formulated. The number of samples and population is 25 respondents. Collection of research data through interviews and delivery of questions. The null hypothesis (H0) of leadership has no positive and significant effect on employee work productivity at the Galatta Lestarindo fertilizer company, and the first hypothesis (H-1) that leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee work productivity at the Galatta Lestarindo fertilizer company. The analytical tools used are validity tests (Ulum, 2020), reliability tests (Ulum, Miftachul, 2023), correlation and regression analysis (Ulum, 2013). Data processing using the SPSS software application version 23

Results and Discussion

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from indicators of fair treatment from superiors to subordinates as shown in table 1.

Table 1 Fair Treatment From Superiors To Subordinates

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	2	8
3.	Fairly Good	3	12	48
4.	Good	4	10	40
5.	Very Good	5	1	4
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of statements about superiors treating all subordinates well, it can be concluded that 4% or as much as 1 respondent said it was very good, 40% or as many as 10 respondents said it was good and 48% said it was quite good as many as 11 respondents. And 8% said it was not good as many as 2 respondents.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from superior indicators making subordinates feel happy at their jobs as in table 2.

Table 2 Superiors Make Subordinates Feel Good at Their Work

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	1	4
3.	Fairly Good	3	17	68
4.	Good	4	7	28
5.	Very Good	5	0	0
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about superiors making subordinates feel happy at their jobs, it can be concluded that 68% or as many as 17 respondents said quite often, 28% or as many as 7 respondents said often, and as many as 4% or 1 respondent said not often,

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained the results from indicators that superiors consider subordinates before making decisions as shown in table 3.

Table 3 Superiors Consider with Subordinates Before Making Decisions

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	18	72
4.	Good	4	7	28
5.	Very Good	5	0	0
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about superiors considering subordinates before making decisions, it can be concluded that 72% or as many as 18 respondents stated quite often, 28% or 7 respondents stated often.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from superior indicators considering subordinates' suggestions and placing them in subsequent implementation as in table 4.

Table 4 Superiors Consider Subordinates' Proposals And Place Them In Further Implementation

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	12	48
4.	Good	4	13	52
5.	Very Good	5	0	0
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about superiors considering and placing subordinates' suggestions in subsequent implementation, it can be concluded that 52% or as many as 13 respondents stated often, 48% or as many as 12 respondents stated quite often.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from indicators of supervisors scheduling tasks to be carried out and maintaining task standards to be determined later as in table 5.

Table 5 Superiors Schedule the Tasks to be Done and Maintain the Standards of the Tasks to be
Defined

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	1	4
3.	Fairly Good	3	11	44
4.	Good	4	13	52
5.	Very Good	5	0	0
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about superiors scheduling tasks to be carried out and maintaining task standards to be set, it can be concluded that 52% or as many as 13 respondents stated often, 44% or as many as 11 respondents said quite often, 4% or as many as 1 respondent stated not often .

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained the results from indicators of the use of labor in completing work as shown in table 6

Table 6 Use of Energy in Completing Work

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	0	0
4.	Good	4	14	56
5.	Very Good	5	11	44
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the question about the use of labor in completing work, it can be concluded that 56% or 14 respondents said they were capable, 44% or 11 respondents said they were very capable.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from indicators of activity in the organization as a whole as in table 7

Table 7 activities in the organization as a whole

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	2	8
4.	Good	4	13	52
5.	Very Good	5	10	40
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about employee activities in the organization as a whole, it can be concluded that 52% or 13 respondents said it was good, 40% or 10 respondents said it was very good, 8% or 2 respondents said it was enough.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from indicators of time use with standard working hours and accuracy during working hours as shown in table 8

Table 8 Use of Time with Standard Working Hours and Accuracy in Working Hours

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	2	8
4.	Good	4	16	64
5.	Very Good	5	7	28
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions regarding the use of standard working hours and accuracy during working hours, it can be concluded that 64% or 16 respondents said they were able, 28% or 7 respondents said they were very capable, 8% or 2 respondents said they were quite capable.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from the outcome indicators obtained in carrying out daily tasks as shown in table 9

Table 9 Results Obtained in Doing Daily Tasks

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	8	32
4.	Good	4	8	32
5.	Very Good	5	9	36
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions regarding the results obtained in carrying out daily tasks, it can be concluded that 36% or as many as 9 respondents said it was very good, 32% or as many as 8 respondents said it was good, and 32% or as many as 8 respondents said it was quite good.

The results of a survey conducted on 25 respondents obtained results from indicators of dependence on other people at work as shown in table 10

Table 10 Dependence on Other People at Work

No	Criteria	Score	Total	%
1.	Very Bad	1	0	0
2.	Not Good	2	0	0
3.	Fairly Good	3	1	4
4.	Good	4	15	60
5.	Very Good	5	9	36
	Total		25	100

Source: Main data processed

From the table of questions about dependence on other people at work, it can be concluded that 60% or as many as 15 respondents said they were dependent, 36% or as many as 9 respondents said they were somewhat dependent, and 4% or 1 respondent said they were quite dependent.

Validity test was carried out to test the validity of the instrument. An instrument is said to be valid if r count > r table. At the real level of 0.05. from the results of the validity test calculations, the results for the leadership variable and productivity variables are obtained as shown in table 11 and table 12

Table 11 R values of Question Items on Leadership Variables

NO	Question Items (Leadership)	R count	R table	information
1	Question 1	0,535	0,396.	Valid
2	Question 2	0,496	0,396.	Valid
3	Question 3	0,456	0,396.	Valid
4	Question 4	0,604	0,396.	Valid
5	Question 5	0,657	0,396.	Valid

Table 12 R values of Question Items on Productivity Variables

NO	Question Items (Leadership)	R count	R table	information
1	Question 1	0,550	0,396.	Valid
2	Question 2	0,550	0,396.	Valid
3	Question 3	0,557	0,396.	Valid
4	Question 4	0,762	0,396.	Valid
5	Question 5	0,499	0,396.	Valid

The reliability test for the leadership variable is 0.700 and the employee productivity variable is 0.727 which means that this research instrument is reliable because it has a Cronbach Alpha accuracy > 0.60.

Based on the results of calculations between leadership and productivity variables using SPSS version 23, a correlation coefficient of 0.714 was obtained, an R^2 (R Square) value of 0.510 means that 51% of changes that occur in productivity can be explained by leadership. The correlation between all

the independent variables and the dependent variable is 0.714. From the results of the linear regression analysis above, it can be concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between leadership style and employee work productivity at the fertilizer company Galatta Lestarindo.

Significant testing of the independent variable on the dependent variable, at 95% degrees of freedom or 5% significance level, this test can be obtained from a significance level of 0.000. thus the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the first hypothesis or (H¬1) is accepted. Means that leadership has a positive and significant influence on employee productivity at Pupuk Galatta Lestarindo Company.

Conclusion

The results of research conducted at Galatta Lestarindo concluded that employee productivity in work activities is strongly influenced by leadership carried out by leaders. Leadership carried out by a director of the Galatta Lestarindo company has been able to increase productivity in fertilizer production at Galatta Lestarindo

References

Arikunto, Suharsimi, 1998. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek Edisi Revisi IV. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

As'ad, Moh. S.U. 1995. "Seri Ilmu Sumber Daya Manusia Psikologi Industri Edisi Ke-empat". Yogyakarta: Liberty.

Daryanto S.S. 1997. Kamus Bahasa Indonesia Lengkap, Surabaya: Apollo

Dharma, Agus, 1990. Manajemen Prestasi Kerja Bagi Para Penyelia Untuk Meningkatkan Prestasi Kerja. Jakarta: CV. Radjawali.

Hartono, Sri Rejeki, 2000. Kapita Selekta Hukum Ekonomi. Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Hasibuan, Malayu, 1994. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Dasar dan Kunci Keberhasilan. Jakarta: Yayasan Masagung

Ivancevich Robert Konopaske and Michael T. Matteson. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour and Management, Eight Edition. International Edition.* McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Jacob and Jacques. (2008). *The Relationship Among Principal Leadership, School Culture, and Student Achievment In Missouri Midle Schools*. University of Missouri.

Kreitner, R. and A. K. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour* (Eight Edit). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Reksohadiprodjo, Sukanto dan Handoko, T Hani, 1990. "Organisasi Perusahaan, Teori Struktural dan Perilaku". BPFE Yogyakarta.

Robbins, S. P. (2006). *Teori Organisasi : Struktur Desain dan Aplikasi (Alih Bahasa : Yusuf Udaya)*. Arcan.

Terry,George R, 1992. Dasar-Dasar Manajemen. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Singodimedjo, *Markum dkk*, 2000. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Surabaya: SMMAS

T. Hani Handoko, 2000. Dasar-Dasar Manajemen Produksi Dan Operasi Edisi I, Yogyakarta: BPFE

Ulum, Miftachul, A. M. (2023). Leadership and Performance of Teachers and Employees of SMK Sunan Drajat Lamongan. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Education , Economic and Culture*, *1*(1), 1–12.

Ulum, M. (2013). Mahir Analisa Data SPSS Statistical Product, Service Solution. *Ghaneswara Yogyakarta*.

Ulum, M. (2020). Basic Statistic With Statistical Package for Social Sciences. In *CV Pustaka Ilalang Lamongan*.