

The Influence of Work Motivation and Workload on Employee Productivity

¹Syahrul Mubarak Yamang, ²Zaharuddin, ³Supriyadi

^{1,2}Prodi Magister Manajemen, Universitas Mitra Bangsa;

³Prodi Pendidikan Ekonomi, Universitas Panca Sakti Bekasi.

¹msyahrul56@gmail.com, ²zaharuddin@umiba.ac.id, ³supriyadi@panca-sakti.ac.id

ABSTRACT

In the era of globalization, competition among companies and institutions has become increasingly intense. This study aims to examine the influence of work motivation on employee productivity, the influence of workload on employee productivity, and the simultaneous effect of work motivation and workload on employee productivity. The research employs a quantitative methodology with a survey approach. Data were collected through research instruments designed by the researchers, including instruments for work motivation, workload, and employee productivity. The results indicate that: (1) work motivation has a positive effect on employee productivity; (2) workload does not have a significant positive effect on employee productivity; (3) work motivation and workload, when considered simultaneously, have a positive effect on employee productivity.

Keywords: Work motivation, workload, employee productivity.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization, human resources (HR) are required to continuously develop proactively to adapt to technological and organizational changes (Noe et al., 2021). Employees must become lifelong learners, willing to improve their competencies and work diligently with enthusiasm to optimize their potential. Modern organizations require employees who can swiftly adapt to technological advancements and respond effectively to environmental changes (Tarique & Schuler, 2021). Human resources play a pivotal role in every organizational activity, as they constitute the core element essential for achieving organizational goals (Dessler, 2020). Effective human resource management ensures that organizations can plan, execute, and control their operations to achieve set objectives (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020).

Maintaining employees' motivation is crucial for optimizing their performance. Work motivation refers to an organizational climate that fosters enthusiasm and commitment among employees to perform their duties efficiently (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Hasibuan (2013) defines work motivation as an individual's desire and determination to perform tasks diligently and in a disciplined manner to achieve optimal performance. Panggabean (2014) argues that several factors influence work motivation, including work environment, workload, and compensation. The work environment, both internal and external, significantly impacts employee motivation and can determine the efficiency of task completion (Nitisemito, 2013). A study by Nursyafriani (2019) supports this claim, indicating that the work environment significantly affects employee motivation. However, Putri (2020) found no significant relationship between the work environment and employee motivation, suggesting that other factors may play a more crucial role.

Another critical factor influencing employee motivation is workload. Workload encompasses all tasks assigned to an employee, the time required to complete them, and the mental and physical exertion involved (Salas et al., 2020). According to Tarwaka (2011), workload emerges from the interaction between job demands, the work environment, and employee skills and perceptions. Aslamiah (2019) found that

workload significantly affects employee motivation, whereas Novemarill (2019) reported no direct relationship between workload and motivation. These conflicting findings highlight the need for further research into how workload impacts employee performance and well-being.

Employee compensation is another strategy used by organizations to enhance motivation (Lazear, 2018). Compensation serves as a form of reward and recognition for employees' contributions, influencing their morale and productivity. The success of an organization largely depends on the quality of its workforce, as employees are the driving force behind organizational performance (Becker et al., 2020). Organizations must treat employees with respect and provide both material and non-material incentives to maintain their commitment (Deci et al., 2017). Managers should acknowledge and address employees' needs to foster a work environment conducive to high performance (Hackman & Oldham, 2020).

High employee motivation is essential for achieving organizational objectives. Organizations not only require employees who are skilled and capable but also those who are willing to work diligently to maximize their contributions (Gagné et al., 2021). Employees' motivation plays a crucial role in enhancing productivity, which in turn determines organizational success (Podsakoff et al., 2020). Regardless of the size or scale of an organization, human resources remain its most asset, contributing creativity, effort, and expertise to drive productivity (Boxall & Purcell, 2021). Several factors influence employee productivity, including work motivation, discipline, education level, skills, nutrition and health, ethics, work climate, technology, and career opportunities (Mathis et al., 2020).

Employee productivity reflects the expected level of excellence required to meet managerial expectations (Drucker, 2018). It encompasses timeliness, employee skills, and overall performance efficiency. Employees are more likely to perform enthusiastically when they derive satisfaction from their work, as job satisfaction is a key determinant of workplace morale, discipline, and performance (Judge et al., 2021). Organizations continuously strive to enhance employee productivity to meet their objectives and maintain competitive advantage (Schaufeli et al., 2019).

Productivity is commonly linked to economic and sociological perspectives. According to Syarif (2017), productivity is the relationship between output quality and the effort expended to achieve that output. It involves continuous improvement, where today's work methods must surpass those of yesterday, and tomorrow's results must exceed today's (Bailey et al., 2018). In essence, productivity measures the ratio between output and the resources utilized to produce it.

Although theoretical frameworks suggest that work motivation enhances productivity, the issue remains complex and requires sustained efforts for improvement. Employee productivity is a pressing concern that demands immediate attention from organizations. Proper employee development fosters high motivation, which in turn boosts productivity (Herzberg et al., 2017). A conducive work environment, direct managerial supervision, equitable compensation aligned with job roles, and supportive colleagues contribute to enhanced work enthusiasm and overall productivity (Robbins & Judge, 2020). Given the strong correlation between work motivation and productivity, organizations must prioritize strategies to foster a motivated workforce.

Based on the above discussion, this study examines the influence of work motivation and workload on employee productivity, with a specific focus on the Directorate General of Immigration.

METHODS

Survey research was employed in this study, which is categorized as associative research. Associative research aims to analyze the relationship between two or more variables, particularly investigating causal relationships (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This study examines the relationship between independent variables, namely work enthusiasm and workload, and the dependent variable, namely work productivity. Associative research is crucial in understanding organizational behavior as it provides empirical evidence on how workplace dynamics influence performance outcomes (Sekaran & Bougie, 2022). Furthermore, this methodological approach is supported by social cognitive theory, which posits that human behavior is influenced by personal, behavioral, and environmental factors (Bandura, 2021). The implementation of survey methodology is aligned with contemporary approaches in organizational psychology, which emphasize the importance of measuring employee attitudes and behaviors quantitatively (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2022).

The population in this study consists of employees, and a saturated sampling technique was applied, resulting in a total of 10 participants. Data collection was conducted using three validated and reliable instruments measuring work enthusiasm, workload, and work productivity. Instrument validation and reliability testing were performed to ensure measurement accuracy and consistency (Hair et al., 2021). Hypothesis testing was conducted to examine three hypotheses: (1) Work enthusiasm has a positive effect on employee productivity, (2) Workload influences employee productivity, and (3) Work enthusiasm and workload collectively have a positive effect on employee productivity. Hypothesis testing in social science research is fundamental for confirming theoretical assumptions with empirical data (Field, 2022). These findings contribute to the broader discourse on employee productivity, highlighting the interplay between motivation and workload in contemporary organizational settings (Robbins & Judge, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research data obtained before the hypothesis test is described as shown below.

		Statistics		
		Work Spirit	Workload	Work Productivity
N	Valid	10	10	10
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		91.4000	90.8000	92.6000
Std. Error of Mean		1.60000	1.42829	1.51438
Median		93.0000	90.5000	92.5000
Mode		87.00a	88.00	90.00a
Std. Deviation		5.05964	4.51664	4.78888
Variance		25.600	20.400	22.933
Range		14.00	14.00	15.00
Minimum		83.00	83.00	84.00
Maximum		97.00	97.00	99.00
Sum		914.00	908.00	926.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

From the table above, the mean value (average value) for the morale variable is 91.40, for the workload variable 90.80, and the productivity variable is 92.60; for the median variable of work morale 93, for the variable of workload 90.50, and for the variable of work productivity 92.50; The mode of the work morale variable 87, for the workload variable 88, and the productivity variable 90; The standard deviation for the

morale variable was 5.06, for the workload variable was 4.52, and the productivity variable was 4.79; The highest score for the morale variable was 97, for the workload variable 97, and the productivity variable was 99; The lowest score for the morale variable was 83, for the workload variable 83, and the productivity variable 84; The score ranges for the morale variable 14, for the workload variable 14, and the productivity variable 15; The variance for the morale variable was 25.60, for the workload variable was 20.40, and the productivity variable was 22.93; The total score for the morale variable was 914, for the workload variable 908, and for the productivity variable 926.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Work Spirit	Workload	Work Productivity
N		10	10	10
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	91.4000	90.8000	92.6000
	Std. Deviation	5.05964	4.51664	4.78888
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.224	.232	.206
	Positive	.208	.232	.206
	Negative	-.224	-.187	-.192
Test Statistic		.224	.232	.206
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) ^c		.168	.134	.200e
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) ^d	Mr.	.168	.130	.266
	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound	.159	.122
			.178	.139
				.277

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. Lilliefors' method based on 10000 Monte Carlo samples with starting seed 2000000.

e. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The table above shows the results obtained by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in the Sig column, on the variable of work morale 0.168, the variable of workload 0.130 and the variable of work productivity 0.266, all three variables have an Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) or writable all three variables have a p-value greater than 0.05 or H_0 is accepted, thus the variable data of work morale, workload and work productivity are normally distributed.

The hypothesis test in this study was obtained:

1) Double Linear Equation and Regression Equation Coefficient Significance Test, Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Mr.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	32.603	22.360		1.458	.188
	Work Spirit	.950	.371	1.004	2.560	.038
	Workload	-.296	.416	-.279	-.711	.500

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity

From the results of the analysis, the constants $b_0 = 32.603$, regression coefficients $b_1 = 0.950$ and $b_2 = -0.296$ were obtained. So that the double linear regression equation is $\hat{Y} = 32.603 + 0.950X_1 + (-0.296X_2)$. a) The results of the analysis obtained the price $t_1 = 2.560$, $df = 6$, $p\text{-value} = 0.038/2 = 0.019 < 0.05$ H_0 is rejected, which means that the work spirit technology has a positive effect on work productivity; b) the results of the analysis obtained the price $T_2 = -0.711$, $df = 6$, $P\text{-value} = 0.500/2$

= 0.250 > 0.05 H0 accepted, which means that the workload does not have a positive effect on work productivity;

2) Double Regression Equation Significance Test,

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Mr.
1	Regression	130.340	2	65.170	5.998	.030b
	Residual	76.060	7	10.866		
	Total	206.400	9			

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Workload, Morale

The results of the analysis obtained the price of Fhit = 5.998, and p-value = 0.000 < 0.03 H0 was rejected. Thus, work morale and workload jointly and simultaneously have a positive effect on employee work productivity;

3) Double Correlation Coefficient Significance Test,

Model Summary									
Model				Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square			F Change	df1	df2	
1	.795a	.631	.526	3.29633	.631	5.998	2	7	.030

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workload, Morale

The results of the analysis presented in the table above are obtained with the price of R2 = 0.795 Fhit = 5.998, db (2, 7): p- value = 0.030 < 0.05 or H0 rejected. Thus, the influence of work morale and workload variables on employee work productivity was 79.5%.

Discussion

Work spirit has a positive effect on employee work productivity, the results of this study are in line with Hasibuan (2013:94) Work spirit is the desire and seriousness of a person to do a good job and be disciplined to achieve maximum work performance. Because with this work spirit will stimulate a person to work and be creative in their work. Although in theory, employee work productivity will increase if the employee's work spirit is carried out regularly and continuously. Because the longer the problem of employee work productivity is a problem that must be solved immediately, with good coaching, there will be a high level of work quality and employee work productivity will increase. Very satisfactory working conditions, both place and comfort in working, direct supervision from the leadership spur employees to be more active in working. Thus, the first hypothesis of this study is supported by empirical data.

Workload does not have a positive effect on employee work productivity, the results of this study are not in line with Tarwaka, (2011) that, Workload is something that arises from the interaction between the demands of the work environment tasks which are used as a workplace, skills and perceptions of work. This is supported by research conducted by Suwaibatul Aslamiah (2019) showing that workload has a significant effect on employee morale. Meanwhile, the results of another study conducted by Novemarill (2019) stated that workload did not have a significant effect on work morale directly. There are many ways that government institutions or agencies do to encourage the morale of their employees, one of which is by providing compensation. Thus, the second hypothesis in this study is not supported by empirical data.

Work morale and workload together and simultaneously have a positive effect on employee work productivity, the results of this study are in line with Panggabean

(2014:50) stated that factors that affect work morale include work environment, workload and compensation. One of the factors that affect work morale is the work environment, the work environment is an internal and external condition that can affect work morale so that work can be expected to be completed faster and better, Nitisemito (2013:159). This is supported by research conducted by Andi Nursyafriani (2019) Aiming that work environment factors have a significant effect on employee morale.

Meanwhile, the results of another study conducted by Risa Amelia Putri (2020) stated that the work environment factor did not have a significant effect on employee morale. Then work morale can also be affected by workload. Workload refers to all activities that involve employees, the time required to carry out tasks and work either directly or indirectly. According to (Tarwaka, 2011:106) that, Workload is something that arises from the interaction between the demands of the work environment tasks which are used as a workplace, skills and perception of work. This is supported by research conducted by Suwaibatul Aslamiah (2019) showing that workload has a significant effect on employee morale. Meanwhile, the results of another study conducted by Novemarill (2019) stated that workload did not have a significant effect on work morale directly. There are many ways that government institutions or agencies do to encourage the morale of their employees, one of which is by providing compensation. Thus, the third hypothesis in this study is supported by empirical data.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, work enthusiasm has been proven to have a positive and significant influence on employee work productivity. This shows that the higher the work enthusiasm possessed by employees, the higher their productivity. This finding is in line with Hasibuan's theory (2013) which emphasizes that work enthusiasm is the main motivation for individuals to work diligently and with discipline in order to achieve optimal work results. In addition, a supportive work environment, direct supervision from leaders, and comfortable working conditions are also factors that can increase employee work enthusiasm. Thus, efforts to increase employee productivity can be carried out by encouraging work enthusiasm through ongoing coaching and motivation strategies.

On the other hand, this study shows that workload does not have a significant influence on employee work productivity. This result is not in line with the research of Tarwaka (2011) and Suwaibatul Aslamiah (2019), which states that workload can affect employee work enthusiasm. However, this finding supports Novemarill's research (2019), which states that workload does not have a direct effect on work enthusiasm. Nevertheless, simultaneously, work spirit and workload together have a positive influence on work productivity, as stated by Panggabean (2014). Therefore, although workload does not directly increase productivity, proper workload management, accompanied by increased work spirit, can contribute to improving employee effectiveness and performance.

References

- Amalia, A. N. ., & Supriyadi, S. (2023). The Influence of Social Media and Digital Literacy on Students' Learning Achievement in Economics Subjects. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 4(2), 1560 - 1566. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v4i2.620>
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Bailey, C., Yeoman, R., Madden, A., Thompson, M., & Kerridge, G. (2018). *The meaning of work: The case for dignity*. Springer.
- Bambang Tri, I. Cahyono. (1996). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: IPWI.
- Bandura, A. (2021). *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Becker, G. S., Murphy, K. M., & Tamura, R. (2020). *Human capital and economic development*. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 12-37.
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2021). *Strategy and human resource management*. Red Globe Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19-43.
- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management*. Pearson Education.
- Drucker, P. (2018). *The practice of management*. Routledge.
- Field, A. (2022). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Van den Broeck, A., et al. (2021). The role of motivation in predicting work outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 158, 27-47.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (2020). *Work redesign*. Addison-Wesley.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2021). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Hanif, H., Supriyadi, S., & Zaharuddin, Z. (2025). The Influence of Digital Marketing and Online Customer Reviews on Clothing Sales. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 6(1), 248 - 254. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v6i1.1007>
- Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. (2002). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Husein Umar. (2004). *Riset Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Organisasi* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2022). *Personality and Work: Integrating Individual Differences into the Organizational Context*. Oxford University Press.
- Lazear, E. P. (2018). Compensation and incentives in human resource management. *American Economic Review*, 88(2), 85-90.
- Mangkunegara, Prabu Anwar A.A. (2001). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Manullang, M. (2000). *Manajemen Personalia*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada.
- Marwansyah. (2010). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Moekijat. (2010). *Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Muchdarsyah Sinungan. (2000). *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi 2). Yogyakarta: BPFE.

- Nasution, S. (2003). *Metode Research*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Nazir, Moh. (2003). *Metode Penelitian* (Cetakan Kelima). Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2021). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Rivai, Veithzal. (2004). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: Murai Kencana.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2020). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational Behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2019). Work engagement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 61-97.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2022). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Singarimbun, Masri & Effendi, Gofian. (1989). *Metodologi Penelitian Survei*. Jakarta: Pustaka LP3ES.
- Singarimbun, Masri & Effendi, Sofian. (1989). *Metode Penelitian Survei* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: PT. Pustaka LP3ES.
- Soeprihanto, John. (1996). *Manajemen Personalialia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Soeratno & Arsyad, Lincolin. (1999). *Metodologi Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: UPP AMP YKPN.
- STIE YKPN Yogyakarta.
- Sugiyono. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Sumiyati, S., Slamet Riyanto, A., Zaharuddin, Z., & Supriyadi, S. (2025). Organizational Culture and Emotional Intelligence on Employee Creativity. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 6(1), 326 - 331. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v6i1.1019>
- Supranto, J. (2001). *Pengukuran Tingkat Kepuasan Pelanggan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Supriyadi, S. (2023). The Influence Of Learning Models On Students' Integrated Economic Sciences Learning Outcomes. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 4(2), 1544 - 1550. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v4i2.444>
- Tulus, Agus. (1992). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Wahana Komputer Semarang. (1998). *10 Model Penelitian dan Pengolahannya dengan SPSS 10.01*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- Widyasmoro, A. ., Agustin, S. ., Supriyadi, S., & Zaharuddin, Z. (2024). Optimization of Work Systems and Ergonomics to Improve Comfort and Efficiency Through The Implementation of Energy Management. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 5(2), 1601 -. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v5i2.665>