

The Influence of Situational Leadership Style, workload and Work Discipline On employee Productivity at PT. Torganda Medan

Elsa Saritua Sijabat *, Maludin Panjaitan, Jon Henri Purba

Universitas Methodist Indonesia

Jl. Hang Tuah No.8, Madras Hulu, Kec. Medan Polonia, Kota Medan, Sumatera Utara (20151), Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received May 2, 2025

Revised May 19, 2025

Accepted June 1, 2025

Keywords:

Situational Leadership
Style Workload
Work Discipline
On Employee
Work Productivity

ABSTRACT

This research intends to assess and examine the situational leadership style, workload, and work discipline's impact on employee productivity at PT. Troganda Medan. This research is a descriptive quantitative study. This study included 40 respondents as samples. From the findings of the t hypothesis test, it can be deduced that the situational leadership style does not have a partial effect on work productivity, while the workload influences work productivity, and the work discipline also impacts work productivity. From the findings of the F hypothesis test, it is determined that collectively the situational leadership style, workload, and work discipline influence work productivity. From the analysis of the determination coefficient, the R-Square value was found to be 0.809 or 80.9%, indicating that the impact of situational leadership style, workload, and work discipline on employee productivity at PT is significant. Troganda Medan accounts for 80.9%, whereas the remaining 19.1% is affected by other variables or factors not examined.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Elsa Saritua Sijabat
Universitas Methodist Indonesia
Email: elsa1302sarisijabat@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

One of the assets found in an organization or company is human assets. For organizations, human assets are considered a profoundly potential and vital resource. The reason for the significance of human assets is that no matter how progressed the innovation, how quick the data circulates, or how adequate the capital is, people stay a vital component in accomplishing the company's objectives. Work efficiency is the capacity of people, bunches, or organizations to create ideal execution by utilizing accessible assets viably and proficiently. Usually in line with Priansa's articulation (2017:191) which states that work efficiency is the individual's capacity to create quality work in an proficient time and with optimal asset utilization. Situational administration may be a hypothesis that centers on devotees.

Leaders who apply situational leadership more often adapt each existing leadership style to the developmental stage of their members, specifically the extent to which members are ready to carry out each task. Situational leadership attempts to combine the leadership process with the existing situation and conditions.

This approach centers a parcel of consideration on representative characteristics, meaning that workers have diverse levels of status. Agreeing to (Savitri, 2013), work teach features a positive and critical affect on work efficiency, meaning that on the off chance that work teach is tall, at that point work efficiency will

moreover be tall. Other than the variables of Situational Administration Fashion and Workload, work teach is one of the components that can impact Work Efficiency, specifically Workload. Workload is one of the perspectives that must be considered in each company, since workload can increment worker efficiency. To get it the real issues with respect to work efficiency, a pre-survey was conducted by conveying a preparatory survey to 40 representatives of PT. Torganda Medan. Based on the comes about of the pre-survey conducted by the analyst within the table over, the analyst found that explanations point 1 and point 2 were very great, but not ideal. There are still representatives at PT Torganda who have not been equipped with the aptitudes to total the errands doled out by the company, with reactions of "Yes" at 40% and "No" at 60%. Giving satisfactory abilities will upgrade an employee's work efficiency in a company.

Situational Leadership Style, Workload, and Work Discipline indicate the level of Work Productivity that can be given to a company. Based on the background explanation, we are interested in conducting research with the title "The Influence of Situational Leadership Style, Workload, and Work Discipline on Employee Work Productivity at PT. Torganda Medan".

METHOD

The approach utilized in this ponder is the Quantitative inquire about strategy. Sugiyono (2017:8) characterizes quantitative information as a investigate approach grounded in positivist reasoning, pointed at analyzing a specific populace or test, utilizing inquire about devices for information collection, utilizing quantitative/statistical strategies for information investigation, and planning to test the defined theory. The consider location is PT. Torganda Medan, arranged on Jl. Abdullah Lubis No. 26, Babura, Kecamatan Medan Baru, Sumatera Utara 20153. This ponder was carried out from Eminent 2024 until February 2025.

RESULTS

Based on the distribution of questionnaires to employees of PT Torganda Medan, the frequency values of respondents' answers regarding the work productivity variable are as follows:

Table 1. Scor variable work productivity

No	Alternatif answer											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	14	35.00%	17	42.50%	5	12.50%	2	5.00%	2	5.00%	40	100.00%
2	16	40.00%	19	47.50%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
3	11	27.50%	17	42.50%	6	15.00%	5	12.50%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
4	17	41.03%	15	33.33%	5	12.50%	5	12.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
5	16	40.00%	15	37.50%	3	7.50%	4	10.00%	2	5.00%	40	100.00%
6	18	45.00%	13	32.50%	8	20.00%	1	2.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
7	17	42.50%	15	37.50%	4	10.00%	3	7.50%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
8	14	35.00%	19	47.50%	4	10.00%	3	7.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
9	16	40.00%	15	37.50%	6	15.00%	3	7.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
10	16	40.00%	18	45.00%	4	10.00%	2	5.00%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
11	19	47.50%	15	37.50%	1	2.50%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
12	13	32.50%	20	50.00%	4	10.00%	2	5.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%

Source: Processed Data from SPSS, 2025

1. Respondent's answer "The quality of my work results is in accordance with the standards set by the company," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 42.50%.
2. Respondent's answer "I have high enthusiasm when working," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 47.50%.
3. Respondent's answer "I am on time in completing every job so that I can do the next task," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 42.50%.
4. Respondent's answer "I try to improve the results achieved," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 41.03%.
5. Respondent's answer "I feel something is missing when I don't go to work," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 40.00%.
6. Respondent's answer "The company provides motivational encouragement so that employees are enthusiastic about working," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 45.00%.

7. Respondent's answer "The company facilitates self-development activities," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 42.50%.
8. Respondent's answer "The company provides promotion opportunities in my job," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 35.00%.
9. Respondent's answer "I always try to improve the quality to be better than before," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 40.00%.
10. Respondent's answer "I get the information needed to do the job well," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 45.00%.
11. Respondent's answer "I am encouraged to act productively and efficiently," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 47.50%.
12. Respondent's answer "I feel my work results are very efficient," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 50.00%.

Table 2 Scor situational leadership style

No	Alternatif answer											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	15	37.50%	17	42.50%	5	12.50%	2	5.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
2	15	37.50%	16	40.00%	6	15.00%	2	5.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
3	13	32.50%	16	40.00%	8	20.00%	2	5.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
4	15	37.50%	11	27.50%	10	25.00%	3	7.50%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
5	10	25.00%	16	40.00%	5	12.50%	5	12.50%	4	10.00%	40	100.00%

Source: Processed Data from SPSS, 2025

Based on the distribution of questionnaires to employees of PT Torganda Medan, the frequency values of respondents' answers regarding the situational leadership style variable are as follows :

1. Respondent's answer "Superiors have so far given clear and detailed instructions to subordinates in carrying out tasks and work," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 42.50%.
2. Respondent's answer "Superiors clearly and in detail inform what needs to be done and completed immediately by subordinates," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 40.00%.
3. Respondent's answer "Superiors carry out strict supervision of subordinates in carrying out tasks and work," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 40.00%.
4. Respondent's answer "Superiors apply a one-way communication pattern to subordinates in communicating," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 37.50%.
5. Respondent's answer "Superiors in making decisions or solving problems are only based on the information they have without asking for advice and opinions from their subordinates," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 40.00%.

Table 3 Scor variable workload

No	Alternatif answer											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	11	27.50%	16	40.00%	8	20.00%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
2	14	35.00%	15	37.50%	3	7.50%	6	15.00%	2	5.00%	40	100.00%
3	10	25.00%	16	40.00%	8	20.00%	5	12.50%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
4	11	27.50%	15	37.50%	7	17.50%	4	10.00%	3	7.50%	40	100.00%
5	15	37.50%	13	32.50%	7	17.50%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
6	13	32.50%	16	40.00%	6	15.00%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%

Based on the distribution of questionnaires to employees of PT Torganda Medan, the frequency values of respondents' answers regarding the workload variable are as follows:

1. Respondent's answer "I feel my job is clear and has well-defined goals," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 40.00%.
2. Respondent's answer "My workload is in accordance with my ability to complete it well," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 37.50%.
3. Respondent's answer "I can manage my work time well to complete all assigned tasks," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 40.00%.
4. Respondent's answer "I rarely feel rushed or overwhelmed by the existing workload," the majority of respondents answered "agree" at 37.50%.

5. Respondent's answer "I feel motivated to achieve the targets set by the company," the majority of respondents answered "strongly agree" at 37.50%.
6. Respondent's answer: I receive sufficient support to achieve the set targets, with the majority of respondents answering agree at 40.00%

Table 4 Scor variable work discipline

No	Alternatif Answer											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	14	35.00%	10	25.00%	9	22.50%	5	12.50%	2	5.00%	40	100.00%
2	16	40.00%	13	32.50%	6	15.00%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
3	9	22.50%	19	47.50%	9	22.50%	2	5.00%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
4	17	42.50%	15	37.50%	5	12.50%	3	7.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
5	21	52.50%	11	27.50%	6	15.00%	2	5.00%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%
6	16	40.00%	17	42.50%	3	7.50%	3	7.50%	1	2.50%	40	100.00%
7	18	45.00%	11	27.50%	5	12.50%	4	10.00%	2	5.00%	40	100.00%
8	20	50.00%	15	37.50%	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	0	0.00%	40	100.00%

Source: Processed Data from SPSS, 2025

Based on the distribution of questionnaires to employees of PT Torganda Medan, the frequency values of respondents' answers regarding the work discipline variable are as follows:

1. Respondent's answer: I always comply with the rules and policies set by the company, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 35.00%.
2. Respondent's answer: I follow work procedures according to the determined standards, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 40.00%.
3. Respondent's answer: I always arrive on time according to the determined working hours, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 47.50%.
4. Respondent's answer: I complete my tasks and responsibilities on time according to the given deadlines, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 47.50%.
5. Respondent's answer: I maintain polite behavior towards colleagues, superiors, and subordinates, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 52.50%.
6. Respondent's answer: I avoid behavior that can disrupt the work atmosphere, such as gossiping or conflict, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 42.50%.
7. Respondent's answer: I comply with cleanliness rules and keep the work environment tidy, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 45.00%.
8. Respondent's answer: I comply with company guidelines regarding smoking bans in certain areas, with the majority of respondents answering strongly agree at 50.00%.

The validity test is used to determine the validity of each instrument in the situational leadership style variable (X1), workload (X2), work discipline (X3), and work productivity (Y) of the employees at PT Troganda Medan. Based on the results of data processing using SPSS 25, the validity test results for each statement regarding the situational leadership style variable (X1), which consists of 5 statements, workload (X2), which consists of 6 statements, work discipline (X3), which consists of 8 statements, and work productivity (Y), which consists of 12 statements, with a population of 40, obtained rtable 0.312 in the research questionnaire, it is concluded that:

- If the r count value > r table (0.312), it is declared valid.
- If the r count value < r table (0.312), it is declared invalid.

The results of the validity test for the situational leadership style variable (X1), workload (X2), work discipline (X3), and work productivity (Y) on SPSS 25 are presented in the following table:

Table 5 Situational Leadership Style, Workload, Work Discipline, and Work Productivity Validity Test

Variable	Indikator	r count	r table	Description
Situational leadership style variable (X1)	X1.1	0.661	0.312	Valid
	X1.2	0.741	0.312	Valid
	X1.3	0.818	0.312	Valid
	X1.4	0.808	0.312	Valid
	X1.5	0.652	0.312	Valid
Workload (X2)	X2.1	0.877	0.312	Valid
	X2.2	0.828	0.312	Valid
	X2.3	0.846	0.312	Valid
	X2.4	0.789	0.312	Valid
	X2.5	0.76	0.312	Valid
	X2.6	0.8	0.312	Valid
Work discipline (X3)	X3.1	0.889	0.312	Valid
	X3.2	0.895	0.312	Valid
	X3.3	0.787	0.312	Valid
	X3.4	0.747	0.312	Valid
	X3.5	0.716	0.312	Valid
	X3.6	0.752	0.312	Valid
	X3.7	0.854	0.312	Valid
	X3.8	0.79	0.312	Valid
Work productivity (Y)	Y1	0.852	0.312	Valid
	Y2	0.807	0.312	Valid
	Y3	0.831	0.312	Valid
	Y4	0.783	0.312	Valid
	Y5	0.693	0.312	Valid
	Y6	0.734	0.312	Valid
	Y7	0.783	0.312	Valid
	Y8	0.859	0.312	Valid
	Y9	0.735	0.312	Valid
	Y10	0.685	0.312	Valid
	Y11	0.682	0.312	Valid
	Y12	0.798	0.312	Valid

Source: Processed Data from SPSS, 2025

Concurring to the discoveries displayed within the table over, it is demonstrated that the r hitung esteem $>$ r tabel 0.312 for each variable: situational leadership (X1) with 5 articulations, workload (X2) with 6 articulations, work teach (X3) with 8 explanations, and work efficiency (Y) with 12 survey articulations, in this way all factors are considered substantial.

To survey the critical affect of authority fashion, work environment, and motivations on work efficiency, a fractional test (t-test) is utilized. Choice making happens by differentiating the computed t-value with the t-table at a noteworthiness level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The outcomes are displayed within the table:

Table 6 Test Hipotesis Persial (Uji-t)

		Unstandardized Coefficients ^a		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.397	3.224		2.295	.028
	Gaya Kepimpinan Situasional	.235	.238	.113	.985	.331
	Beban Kerja	.377	.181	.253	2.078	.045
	Disiplin Kerja	.743	.155	.599	4.782	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Kerja

Source: Processed Data from SPSS, 2025

The following is a summary of the Partial Significance Test (t-test) results based on the above table:

- a. The situational leadership style variable's t-test findings indicate that it has a significance value of 0.331, meaning that H0 is accepted because the significance value is more than 0.05 and H1 is rejected. With a t-count of $0.985 < 2.026$ (t-table), it may be concluded that there is no significant relationship between the situational leadership style variable (X1) and the work productivity variable (Y).
- b. According to the workload variable's t-test results, its significance value is 0.045, meaning that H0 is rejected because the significance value is more than 0.05 and H1 is accepted. The workload variable (X2) has a considerable impact on the work productivity variable (Y), as indicated by the t-count of $2.078 > 2.026$ (t-table).
- c. With a significance value of 0.000, the work discipline variable's t-test findings indicate that H0 is rejected because the significance value is more than 0.05, and H1 is accepted. The work productivity variable (Y) is considerably impacted by the work discipline variable (X3), as indicated by the t-count of $4.782 > 2.026$ (t-table).

There is no correlation between situational leadership style and employee productivity, according to the results of hypothesis testing (H1). The research findings indicate that situational leadership style (X1) has a t-count value of $0.985 < t\text{-table } 2.026$ with a significance level of $0.331 > 0.05$. The findings from PT Troganda Medan employee respondents show that a poor leadership style can have a negative impact on employee productivity, whereas an effective leadership style can increase work productivity. Given that work discipline (X3) has a t-count value of $2.078 > t\text{-table } 2.026$ with a significance threshold of $0.045 < 0.05$, the findings of hypothesis testing (H2) demonstrate that workload and employee productivity are influenced. According to the findings of the employee survey conducted by PT Troganda Medan, the company's working hours are satisfactory and in line with the workers' skills. By demonstrating that work discipline (X3) has a t-count value of $4.782 > t\text{-table } 2.026$ with a significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$, the results of hypothesis testing (H3) demonstrate that work discipline and employee productivity are influenced. According to a review of respondent responses about work discipline indicators at PT Troganda Medan, employee work productivity is impacted by work discipline, which includes being on time, using time effectively, taking responsibility, and following corporate policies.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information investigation comes about and the discourse that has been expounded, the taking after conclusions are gotten:

1. The t-test comes about appear that administration fashion (X1) in part has no impact on work efficiency (Y). Typically based on a t-count esteem of 0.985, which is littler than the t-table of 2.026.
2. The t-test comes about appear that workload (X2) somewhat influences work efficiency (Y). Usually based on a t-count esteem of 2.078, which is more noteworthy than the t-table of 2.026.
3. The t-test comes about appear that work teach (X3) mostly influences work efficiency (Y). Typically based on a t-count esteem of 4.782, which is more prominent than the t-table of 2.026.
4. The factors of situational administration fashion (X1), workload (X2), and work teach (X3) are able to clarify 80.9% of the work efficiency variable (Y), and the remaining 19.1% is affected by other factors not included within the inquire about relapse show.

REFERENCES

- [1] Affandi, S. (2020). Pelaksanaan Fungsi Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Meningkatkan Fungsi Sosial Keagamaan Pondok Pesantren Darul Quran Medan Tahun 2019 (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara).
- [2] Baiti, et al. (2020). Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Ditinjau dari Motivasi, Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan pada PT. Iskandar Indah Printing Textile Surakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika*, 4(01), 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.29040/jie.v4i01.812>
- [3] Dadi Lado, M., Fanggidae, R. P. C., & Timuneno, T. (2020). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Situasional Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pdam Kota Kupang, *Journal of Management Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)*, 10(3), 283–297. <https://doi.org/10.35508/jom.v10i3.1996>
- [4] Darmasari, E. (2022). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan CV. Sinar Utama Yamaha Kota samarinda. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis FISIPOL UNMUL*, 10(4), 296
- [5] Kurniawan, I. S., & Herawati, J. (2021). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan situasional, disiplin dan motivasi kerja terhadap produktivitas karyawan PT. Pratama Sentosa Pematang. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen dan Sains)*, 6(2), 437-443
- [6] Lado, M. D., Fanggidae, R. P., & Timuneno, T. (2019). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan situasional terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan PDAM Kota Kupang. *Journal of Management: Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)*, 10(3), 283-297.
- [7] Manoppo, P. K., Tewal, B., & Trang, I. (2021). Pengaruh beban kerja, lingkungan kerja dan integritas terhadap produktivitas karyawan di PT. Empat Saudara Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 9(4), 773-

- 781.
- [8] Savitri, M. T. (2013). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja pada karyawan PT. Kabelindo Murni, Tbk. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Dan Bisnis (JPED)*, 1(2), 40-53.
- [9] Sugiyono, 2017, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*, PT. Alfabeta: Yogyakarta.
- [10] Waskito, M., & Kartini, M. I. (2021). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Pada Pt. Trimuri Karya Cipta. *Kinerja*, 3(02), 167-182.