

Article

The Effect of Leadership Style, Work Stress and Commitment on Employee Work Productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama in Medan, Indonesia

Sahat Simbolon ^{1,*}, Linda Sutiono ¹ and Dwi Maria Simbolon ¹

¹ Institut Bisnis Informasi Teknologi dan Bisnis, Kota Medan, Sumatera Utara 20235, Indonesia; lindasutiono.09@gmail.com (L.S); simbolontuan30@gmail.com (D.M.S)

* Correspondence: sahats_simbolon@yahoo.com (S.S)

Citations: Simbolon, S., Sutiono, L. & Simbolon, D.M. (2023). The Effect of Leadership Style, Work Stress and Commitment on Employee Work Productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama in Medan, Indonesia. *International Journal of Finance, Economics and Business*, 2(1), 1-12.

Academic Editor: Khatijah Omar.

Received: 22 November 2022

Accepted: 15 February 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Abstract: This study analyzes the effect of leadership style, work stress and work commitment on employee work productivity and the impact of work stress on employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. A total of 85 staff participated in this study and collected using the census method due to the population being less than 100 persons. The data was analyzed using SPSS version 20. The results of the descriptive analysis in leadership style, work commitment and work productivity are in the good category at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, while the descriptive analysis results in the work stress variable are in the bad category at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. The partial test (t-test) showed that leadership style positively and significantly impacts employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, work stress negatively and significantly impacts employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan and work commitment positively and significantly impact employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. F-test showed that simultaneously variable leadership style positively and significantly impacts employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, variable work stress negatively impacts employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan and variable work commitment positively and significantly impact employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

Keywords: leadership style; work stress; work commitment; employee work productivity.



Copyright: © 2022-2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The business world's globalization era is marked by the opening of intense competition in all fields, including companies engaged in cosmetic distributors (Arnold & Quelch, 1998; Peng, 2021; Schuh, 2007). It is a challenge to implement the development of the Indonesian nation. Organizations face challenges to improve the quality of human resources so that they have special skills and can compete with the business world. The problem of labor productivity is an urgent issue to be discussed. Although it is not an absolute

certainty, it is a sign that we are also aware of the possibility or there seem to be signs of insufficient workforce productivity. Many factors cause it; for example, the orientation of life does not care about productivity. PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is a private company that operates as a cosmetic distributor in Indonesia with its head office in Jakarta, Indonesia, and a branch office in Medan, Indonesia—the beginning of the establishment of PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan started as a shop selling some cosmetic supplies in retail. After the development in the business and capital fields, the business that was carried out was getting bigger and finally given the trust by the manufacturer to become a distributor of cosmetics in Indonesia. More new companies are formed that are engaged in the same field. This results in a higher level of business competition. PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan must strive to achieve the company's initial goals and make developments and adjustments to survive in increasingly fierce competition. To face the increasingly fierce competition, of course, PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan requires human resources who are qualified, have good performance, and are also productive.

It is very necessary to support the organization's activities to run well and be able to survive during increasingly fierce business competition and be able to run following technological changes. As the company goes on, several problems must be considered, including labor productivity. Labor productivity is an urgent issue to be discussed. Although it is not an absolute certainty, it is a sign that we are also aware of the possibility or have appeared signs of inadequate labor productivity. Many factors, such as life orientation, are also reflected in work life. Usually, life orientation pays less attention to productivity or production effectiveness. Various expressions, such as performance, efficiency, and effectiveness, are often associated with productivity. On the basis of a previous research journal conducted by Angela Mamahit (2016) studied the influence of leadership style, work commitment, and work stress on employee work productivity at the general election commission of North Sulawesi Province. She found that leadership style is positive and significant to work productivity, work commitment has a negative and significant effect on work productivity, and work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee productivity at the general election commission of North Sulawesi province.

In connection with this, it can be said that the type of leadership that is carried out in the North Sulawesi Provincial KPU Secretariat office environment can be maintained because it increases the work productivity of employees, and leaders should be able to increase their intelligence, social maturity and continue to improve good relationships with their employees, and can motivate themselves and achievement so that they can be used as role models for employees. In a company, the factor that affects the workforce's productivity is the leadership style. Subordinates who work always depend on the work system of the leader. It can be said that how employees work can follow how the leader works. If the leader cannot lead, then the tasks given by the leader may not be completed properly by subordinates. Meanwhile, if the leader has good leadership skills, all tasks assigned to subordinates can be completed properly and on target.

A company needs an effective leader who can lead a team. So, a leader or head of an organization will be recognized as a leader if he can influence and direct his subordinates toward organizational goals. Zebua (2017) found a positive influence between leadership style and employee productivity simultaneously or partially. So, the more precise and good the leadership style of a leader in a company, the better the work productivity shown by the company's employees. On the other hand, if increased productivity means good performance, it will be feedback for business or work motivation, and the individual will not experience work stress at the workplace. The individual must also increase productivity by utilizing how employees build relationships with superiors and subordinates.

The pressures faced by employees will cause stress to the individual. Likewise, employees' mental and physical abilities will provide good productivity for the company if the employee does not experience stress that causes stress in the workplace. In addition to work stress, another factor that contributes to work productivity is employee work commitment. Everyone who works in a company or organization must have a commitment to work because if a company's employees do not have a commitment to work, then the company or organization's goals will not be achieved. However, sometimes a company or organization pays less attention to the existing commitment to its employees, it impacts the decline in employees' work productivity or employee loyalty is reduced. Previous research conducted by Amirullah (2016) indicated that work stress has a negative effect on productivity at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Makassar.

According to Kartikasari & Cherny (2017), they stated that work stress has a negative effect on employee productivity at PT. Epsom Batam. Commitment to each employee is very important because an employee can become more responsible for his work compared to employees who do not commit. Usually, employees who commit will work optimally to devote their attention, thoughts, energy, and time to their work, so what they have done is as expected by the company.

Nursanti (2018) studied the influence of Employee Performance, Organizational Commitment on Employee Work Productivity at the Center for the Development and Empowerment of Educators and Kindergarten Educational Personnel and Special Education" It can be concluded that in order to improve employee initiatives while working, it is recommended to improve organizational communication between leaders and employees and improve employee competence. In order to improve the competence and ability of employees, it is recommended to provide various education and training tailored to the organization's needs and regulations and policies. Given the importance of the problem and to address the conditions mentioned above, this study analyses the effect of leadership style, work stress, and work commitment on employee work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Leadership Style

Rivai (2016) defines leadership style as a set of characteristics used by leaders to influence subordinates so that organizational goals can be achieved. Leadership style is a pattern of behavior and strategies that are preferred and often applied by a person leader. In addition, leadership style is the overall pattern of the actions of a leader, both visible and invisible to his subordinates (Rivai, 2014). Leadership style describes a consistent combination of philosophies, skills, traits, and attitudes that underlie one's behavior. Meanwhile, according to Afandi (2018), a leadership style is an important dynamic force that motivates and coordinates the organization to achieve goals. As mentioned by Afandi (2018), the indicators of leadership style are: 1. Dimensions of leadership characteristics a. Spiritual, social and physical maturity b. Show exemplary c. Can solve problems creatively d. Have honesty e. Have communication skills 2. Effective leadership a. Have a strong motivation to lead b. Responsibility c. Discipline d. Have many relationships e. Quick to make decisions?

2.2. Work Stress

According to Robbins & Judge (2016), job stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual faces an opportunity, demand, or resource related to the environment, organizational conditions, and a person. Siagian (2008) stated that stress is a condition of tension that affects a person's emotions, thoughts, and physical condition. Mangkunegara & Octorend (2015) defined stress as a state of stress, both physical and mental as well as psychological. This depressed state is generally a condition with the characteristic that the demands of the environment exceed the individual's capabilities to respond to them. The environment doesn't mean just the physical and social environments. This kind of environment is also present in work organization as a place where every member or employee spends most of their time in daily life. Hasibuan (2017) reveals that work stress is a condition of tension that affects somebody's emotions, thought processes, and mental conditions. Robbins & Judge (2016) state that there are three indicators of work stress, namely as follows: 1. Environmental Stress Environmental uncertainty affects organizational design, so uncertainty becomes a burden for employees, especially when organizational change takes place. The environmental dimension is economic, technological, and political uncertainty causing job stress because employees feel their energy is no longer needed. 2. Organizational Stress. The organizational dimension relates to situations where employees experience task demands, role demands, personal demands. Task demands related to the amount of work that must be completed make employees feel tired to complete their work. Role demands are related to the pressures experienced by employees when completing their work. Personal claims regarding workgroups do not provide technical assistance if needed. 3. Individual Stress This dimension regarding the personal life of each employee is a family problem, personal economic problem and employee personality.

2.3. Work Commitment

Organizational commitment is a promise (agreement/contract) to do something. Our actions reflect our promises to ourselves or others (Samsuddin, 2018). Commitment is a complete acknowledgment, as an attitude that comes from the character that comes out from within a person. Organizational commitment is the identification of employees towards approval to achieve the unit's or organization's mission (Priansa & Garnida, 2016). According to Busro (2018), work commitment embodies a person's willingness, awareness, and sincerity to be bound and always in the organization, which is illustrated by the amount of effort, determination, and belief that they can achieve a common vision, mission, and goals. Indicators of work commitment, as stated by Busro (2018), are: (1) Indicators of Affective Commitment include: a. Strong

belief and acceptance of the organization's values and goals b. Loyalty to the organization c. Willingness to use efforts for the benefit of the organization. (2) Indicators of Continuous Commitment include a. Considering the benefits of staying in the organization b. Calculating the loss if leaving the organization. (3) Indicators of Normative Commitment include a. Willingness to work b. Responsibility for advancing the organization.

2.4. Work productivity

According to Tohardi in Sutrisno (2011), work productivity is a mental attitude that is always looking for improvements to what already exists. A belief that one can do a better job today than yesterday and tomorrow better than today. Meanwhile, according to Hasibuan in Busro (2018), productivity is a comparison between results (output) and input (input). If productivity increases, it will increase efficiency (time-material-labor) and work systems, production techniques and an increase in workforce skills. Kussrianto in Sutrisno (2011) suggests that productivity compares the results achieved with labor participation per unit of time. The participation of the workforce here is the use of resources as well as effective and efficient.

According to Sinungan in Busro (2018), work productivity is the ability of a person or group of people to produce goods and services within a certain time that has been determined or according to the plan. According to the researcher, the ability here can be interpreted as physical or skill ability. The Big Indonesian Dictionary defines skills as the ability to complete tasks. According to Mahendra & Woyanti (2014), technically, productivity is a comparison between the results achieved (output) with the overall required resources (input). Productivity implies comparing the results achieved with the role of labor per unit of time. In order to measure work productivity, an indicator is needed, namely as follows (Sutrisno, 2011):

1. Ability- can carry out tasks. The ability of employees is very dependent on the skills they have and their professionalism at work. It gives them the power to complete the tasks assigned to them and see the quality of the work produced.
2. Improve the results achieved. Strive to improve the results achieved. The result can be felt by both those who do and those who enjoy the results of the work. So, efforts to take advantage of the work productivity of each involved in a job through initiative and accuracy in completing tasks.
3. Work spirit. It is an effort to be better than yesterday through an effort to think more creatively in completing tasks and how to carry out work completion. The work ethic of the results achieved is one day later compared to the previous day.
4. Self-development. Always develop themselves to improve work skills and communication between employees. Self-development can be done by looking at the challenges, disciplines, and expectations that will be faced. Because the stronger the challenge, self-development is necessary. So is the hope to get better in turn
5. Quality. Always trying to improve the quality of work that is better than the past so that there is prudence in completing the tasks. Quality is the result of work that can show the quality of an employee's work. So, improving quality to provide the best results will be very useful for the company and itself.
6. Efficiency. Comparison with what was achieved with the overall resources used. Inputs and outputs are aspects of productivity that significantly influence employees, such as the efficient use of the number of employees and technology to achieve the efficiency of the resources used in the company.

3. Materials and Methods

This research was conducted at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is a distributor of cosmetics in Indonesia. The scope of this research is leadership style, work stress, work commitment and work productivity. The population in this study were all employees at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, totaling 85 (eighty-five) employees using the census method, means that all population members become the research sample. Data collection techniques used are questionnaires and documentation. The operational definition of a variable is an explanation of the variable to be studied. The variables analyzed in this study are: 1. The independent variables consist of leadership style, work stress and work commitment. 2. The independent variable (dependent variable) consists of work productivity. Data collection techniques used are questionnaires and documentation where to collect data from PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan which is needed in this research.

3.1. Data Analysis

3.1.1. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis aims to describe or describe the information obtained. In order to answer the first problem, this study used percentage analysis. This description describes the leadership style, work stress, commitment, and employee productivity. Kasmadi (2014) defines descriptive analysis as data that has been collected and processed using descriptive statistical techniques presented in the form of a frequency distribution which includes the mean or average score, standard deviation, median, mode or mode, maximum score, minimum score, and is equipped with a histogram.

3.1.2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Sugiyono (2014) revealed that the multiple-linear regression analysis equation is formulated as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

Where: Y = employee work productivity, a = constant, b_1 = regression coefficient of leadership style variable (X_1), b_2 = regression coefficient of work stress variable (X_2), b_3 = regression coefficient of work commitment variable (X_3), X_1 = leadership style, X_2 work stress, X_3 = work commitment and ε = epsilon; namely variables other than the independent variables studied.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Descriptive statistics analysis was conducted to determine the frequency and percentage values obtained from each alternative answer given by each respondent in the research questionnaire. The description of the answer assessment scores for each variable in this study is as follows:

Table 1. Number and percentage of descriptive answers for leadership style variables

No	Items	Response Category									
		SS		S		RR		TS		STS	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Spiritual maturity	33	38.8	32	37.6	11	12.9	9	10.6	0	0
2	Social maturity	18	21.2	47	55.3	15	17.6	5	5.9	0	0
3	Physical Maturity	16	18.8	44	51.8	20	23.5	5	5.9	0	0
4	Show exemplary	24	28.2	36	42.4	17	20	8	9.4	0	0
5	Solve problems creatively	24	28.2	36	42.4	21	24.7	4	4.7	0	0
6	Have honesty	15	17.6	45	52.9	19	22.4	6	7.1	0	0
7	Have communication skills	20	23.5	40	47.1	12	14.1	12	14.1	1	1.2
8	Have a strong motivation to lead	19	22.4	42	49.4	19	22.4	5	5.9	0	0
9	Responsibility	17	20	43	50.6	14	16.5	11	12.9	0	0
10	Discipline	19	22.4	41	48.2	22	25.9	3	3.5	0	0
11	Have many relationships	19	22.4	46	54.1	11	12.9	9	10.6	0	0
12	Quick in decision making	23	27.1	42	49.4	11	12.9	9	10.6	0	0
Total		247	290.6	494	581.2	192	225.9	86	101.2	1	1.2
Average			24.2		48.4		18.8		8.4		0.1

Table 1 shows that the respondents who answered strongly agreed were 24.2%; respondents who answered agreed were 48.4%; respondents who answered undecided were 18.8%; respondents who answered disagree were 8.4%; and respondents who answered strongly disagree were 0.1%. Of the total respondents' answers, 72.6% of respondents answered strongly agree and agree, where the percentage of answers is in an assessment score of 70-79. It shows that the condition of the leadership style in this company is categorized as good, which means that the leader can become a transformational leader, that is, have a level of social and physical maturity that is good enough to lead a company. In addition, the level of

creativity and discipline the leadership possesses can be said to have met the expected leadership requirements. However, the data above also shows that 8.5% of respondents answered disagree and strongly disagree. It shows that there are still weaknesses in the leadership style, namely, the leadership has not been able to improve communication skills with employees, leaders are less responsible for employees, and leaders are less able to increase employee spiritual maturity.

Table 2. Number and percentage of descriptive answers for work stress variables

No	Items	Response Category									
		SS		S		RR		TS		STS	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Economic uncertainty	6	7.1	40	47.1	4	4.7	28	32.9	7	8.2
2	Technological uncertainty	4	4.7	41	48.2	10	11.8	25	29.4	5	5.9
3	Political uncertainty	6	7.1	37	43.5	8	9.4	28	32.9	6	7.1
4	Task demands	4	4.7	41	48.2	10	11.8	22	25.9	8	9.4
5	Role demands	2	2.4	41	48.2	6	7.1	30	35.3	6	7.1
6	Personal claim	4	4.7	41	48.2	12	14.1	25	29.4	3	3.5
7	Family problem	6	7.1	37	43.5	13	15.3	23	27.1	6	7.1
8	Personal economic problems	5	5.9	38	44.7	10	11.8	23	27.1	9	10.6
9	Have personality	6	7.1	37	43.5	10	11.8	21	24.7	11	12.9
Total		43	50.6	353	415.3	83	97.6	225	264.7	61	71.8
Average			5.6		46.1		10.8		29.4		8

Table 2 displays that the respondents who answered strongly agreed were 5.6%; respondents who answered agreed were 46.1%; respondents who answered undecided were 10.8%; respondents who answered disagree was 29.4% and respondents who answered strongly disagree were 8.0%. Of the total respondents' answers, there are 51.8% of respondents who answered strongly agree and agree where the percentage of answers is in the assessment score of 50 - 59. This shows that the work stress conditions in this company are categorized as not good, which means that there are still employees who can experience stress. work while working in the company. So, this is something that must be handled immediately by the company so that employees do not experience prolonged work stress and result in a decrease in employee productivity. However, the data above also shows that there are 37.4% of respondents who answered disagree and strongly disagree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in work stress, namely the demands of roles given by the company to employees, employees have economic uncertainty when working at the company and employees feel political uncertainty within the company.

Table 3. Description of the answer assessment score of the work commitment variable

No	Items	Response Category									
		SS		S		RR		TS		STS	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Desire in organization	31.6	20.0	44	51.8	17	20.0	5	5.9	2	2.4
2	Emotional attachment	31.6	20.0	43	50.6	18	21.2	5	5.9	2	2.4
3	Involvement in the organization	37.1	23.5	41	48.2	17	20.0	6	7.1	1	1.2
4	Values in the organization	35.4	22.4	41	48.2	18	21.2	5	5.9	2	2.4
5	Awareness of costs within the organization	40.9	25.9	39	45.9	16	18.8	7	8.2	1	1.2
6	Losses in the organization	33.5	21.2	43	50.6	17	20.0	5	5.9	2	2.4
7	Feeling	42.8	27.1	38	44.7	18	21.2	6	7.1	0	0.0

8	Obligations of employees in the organization	29.7	18.8	44	51.8	13	15.3	11	12.9	1	1.2
Total		152	178,8	333	391.8	134	157.6	50	58.8	11	12.9
Average			22.4		49.0		19.7		7.4		1.6

Table 3 above captures the respondents who answered strongly agreed were 22.4%; respondents who answered agreed were 49.0%; respondents who answered undecided were 19.7%; respondents who answered disagree was 7.4% and respondents who answered strongly disagree were 1.6%. Of the total respondents' answers, there are 71.4% of respondents who answered strongly agree and agree where the percentage of answers is in an assessment score of 70 - 79. This shows that the condition of work commitment in this company is categorized as good. In addition, there are 9% of respondents who answered disagree and strongly disagree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in the condition of work commitment, namely the lack of employee obligations in the organization, lack of awareness of costs in the organization and lack of desire to organize.

Table 4. Number and percentage of descriptive answers for work productivity variables

No	Items	Response Category									
		SS		S		RR		TS		STS	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Main job	24	28.2	39	45.9	20	23.5	2	2.4	0	0.0
2	Work professionalism	27	31.8	37	43.5	19	22.4	2	2.4	0	0.0
3	Quality of work	21	24.7	39	45.9	18	21.2	7	8.2	0	0.0
4	Completing assignments on time	25	29.4	37	43.5	20	23.5	3	3.5	0	0.0
5	Initiative on work	21	24.7	42	49.4	18	21.2	4	4.7	0	0.0
6	High level of creativity	28	32.9	33	38.8	19	22.4	5	5.9	0	0.0
7	Compliance with work procedures	22	25.9	41	48.2	21	24.7	1	1.2	0	0.0
8	Good communication	26	30.6	36	42.4	22	25.9	1	1.2	0	0.0
9	High level of discipline	27	31.8	33	38.8	21	24.7	4	4.7	0	0.0
10	Good job	24	28.2	38	44.7	21	24.7	2	2.4	0	0.0
11	Be careful in completing work	25	29.4	36	42.4	22	25.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
12	Save the number of employees	23	27.1	39	45.9	21	24.7	2	2.4	0	0.0
13	Using technology for efficiency purposes	30	35.3	32	37.6	17	20.0	6	7.1	0	0.0
Total		323	380.0	482	567.1	259	304.7	41	48.2	0	0.0
Average			29.2		43.6		23.4		3.7		0.0

Table 4 shows the respondents who answered strongly agreed were 29.2%; respondents who answered agreed were 43.6%; respondents who answered in doubt were 23.4%; respondents who answered disagree was 3.7% and there were no respondents who answered strongly disagree. Of the total respondents' answers, there are 72.8% of respondents who answered strongly agree and agree where the percentage of the answers is in an assessment score of 70 - 79. This shows that the condition of work productivity in this company is categorized as good. Meanwhile, of the total respondents' answers, there were 3.7% of respondents who answered that they did not agree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in this company related to work productivity, including the quality of employee work is unsatisfactory, employees always use technology for efficiency purposes and the lack of creativity level possessed by employees.

4.2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The results of multiple linear regression analysis using IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 for the influence between the variables of leadership style, work stress, work commitment and work productivity are as follows:

Table 5. Result of Multiple linear regression – Hypothesis testing

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	31.268	5.036	6.209	0.000
Leadership Style	0.473	0.083	5.695	0.000
Work Stress	-0.305	0.074	-4.119	0.000
Work Commitment	0.231	0.098	2.341	0.022

a. Dependent variable: Work productivity

Table 5 shows that the constant value is 31.268, the leadership style score (B1) is 0.473, the work stress score (B2) is -0.305, and the work commitment score (B3) is 0.231. The coefficient a is a constant or the value of the employee productivity variable if the value of the leadership style, work stress and work commitment variables = 0. In contrast, the coefficient b is the regression coefficient value of each variable X. So, this study's multiple linear regression equation is $Y = 31.268 + 0.473X_1 - 0.305X_2 + 0.231X_3$. The partial hypothesis testing can be seen that the leadership style variable has a t-stat of 5.695 and a t-table of 1.98. It means $t\text{-stat} > t\text{-table}$. The significance value of the leadership style variable is 0.000 where this significance value is smaller than the alpha value (0.05). By comparing t-stat and t-table values and the significance value, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that leadership style positively and significantly affects employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

The work stress variable has a t-stat of -4.119 and a t-table of 1.98. It means $t\text{-stat} > t\text{-table}$. The significance value of the work stress variable is 0.000, which is smaller than the alpha value (0.05). By comparing t-stat and t-table values and the significance value, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employees' work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. The work commitment variable has a t-stat of 2.341 and a t-table of 1.98. It means $t\text{-stat} > t\text{-table}$. The significance value of the work commitment variable is 0.022, which is smaller than the alpha value (0.05). By comparing t-stat and t-table values and the significance value, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that work commitment has a positive and significant effect on employees' work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

Coefficient determination is a statistical measure that determines the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that the independent variables can explain in a regression model. It assesses how well the regression model fits the observed data. R-squared values range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating that the independent variables have no explanatory power in predicting the dependent variable and 1 indicating a perfect fit where the independent variables explain all the variability in the dependent variable. The interpretation of the R-squared value depends on the context and the field of study. Generally, a higher R-squared value indicates a better fit of the model to the data. However, it is important to note that R-squared alone does not determine the validity or usefulness of a regression model. Other factors, such as the significance of the independent variables, the model's assumptions, and the context of the study, should also be considered when evaluating the regression model.

Table 6. Results of Coefficient Determination

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.812 ^a	0.660	0.647	4.268

Table 6 displays the R square value as 0.660, which means that independent variables (leadership style, work stress and work commitment) can explain their relationship to employee performance by as much as 66 percent. Other variables explain 34 percent, which does not include in this research. In addition, the results of the multiple linear correlation coefficient test for the influence between the variables of leadership style, work stress, work commitment, and work productivity are as follows:

Table 7. Correlation Coefficient

Variable relationship	F-stat	Correlation Coefficient interval	Level of relationship
$ry_{X_1 X_2 X_3}$	0.812	0.800 – 1.000	Very strong

Table 7 shows the results of the multiple linear correlation coefficient test for the influence between the variables of leadership style, work stress and work commitment on the employee productivity variable is 0.812 which is in the coefficient interval between 0.800-1,000 with a very strong relationship level. This means that leadership style, work stress and work commitment have a very strong influence on the work productivity of employees at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. The results of the simultaneous hypothesis test or f test from IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 for the influence of leadership style, work stress and work commitment variables on employee productivity variables are as follows:

Table 8. ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.864.558	3	954.853	52.414	0.000 ^b
Residual	1.475.630	81	18.218		
Total	4.340.188	84			

a. Dependent variable: Work productivity; b. Predictors: (Constant), Work commitment, Job stress, Leadership style

Table 8 captures the F-stat value is 52.414, with a significance of 0.000, while the F-table at the 95% confidence interval or $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.72. By comparing the value of F-stat with F-table, then F-stat 52.414 is greater than F-table 2.72. The decision is that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, meaning that simultaneously the leadership style variable has a positive and significant effect on employees' work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, work stress negatively and significantly affects employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan and work commitment positively and significantly affect employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. The conclusion is that increasing leadership style and work commitment can help increase employee productivity significantly at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. Meanwhile, if work stress decreases, it can also help increase employee productivity significantly at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. In addition, decreasing leadership style and good work commitment will cause a decrease in employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. In addition, increased work stress will also result in a decrease in employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

5. Discussion

On the basis of descriptive analysis of the leadership style variable states that there are 72.6% of respondents choose the answers agree and strongly agree, where the percentage of answers is between an assessment score of 70 - 79 with a good category. It shows that the leadership style at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is categorized as good, while from the total respondents, 8.5% of respondents answered disagree and strongly disagree. It shows that there are still weaknesses in PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is related to the problem of leaders who have been unable to improve communication skills with subordinates or employees, leaders are less responsible for employees, and leaders are less able to increase employee spiritual maturity. Some of these things affect the work productivity of employees at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. For the work stress variable, 51.8% of respondents chose the answer to agree and strongly agree, where the percentage of the answers was between an assessment score of 50 - 59 with a bad category. This shows that the level of work stress of employees at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is categorized as not good, which means that there are still employees who can experience work stress when working at the company. So, this is something that must be handled immediately by the company so that employees do not experience prolonged work stress and result in a decrease in employee productivity. Meanwhile, of the total respondents there are 37.4% of respondents who answered disagree and strongly disagree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in work stress, namely the demands of roles given by the company to employees, employees have economic uncertainty when working at the company and employees feel political uncertainty within the company.

For the work commitment variable, there are 71.4% of respondents who choose the answer agree and strongly agree where the percentage of the answer is between an assessment score of 70 - 79 with a good category. This shows that the condition of work commitment in this company is categorized as good. In addition, there are 9% of respondents who answered disagree and strongly disagree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in the condition of work commitment, namely the lack of employee obligations in the organization, lack of awareness of costs in the organization and lack of desire to organize. For the work productivity variable, there are 72.8% of respondents who choose the answers agree and strongly agree where the percentage of the answers is between an assessment score of 70 - 79 with a good category. This shows that the work productivity of employees at PT. This Medan Indonesia Main Lunadorii categorized as good, while of the total respondents there were 3.7% who chose the answer to disagree. This shows that there are still weaknesses in PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is related to work productivity problems, including the quality of employee work is unsatisfactory, employees always use technology for efficiency purposes and the lack of creativity level possessed by employees. Based on the results of the calculation of the coefficient of determination, it shows that the contribution between the variables of leadership style, work stress and work commitment to the employee productivity variable is 0.647 or 64.7%. This shows that the contribution of leadership style, work stress and work commitment can increase employee work productivity by 64.7%, while the remaining 35.3% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study, such as work environment, organizational culture., promotions and so on.

6. Conclusions and Suggestions

6.1. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study identified that leadership style, work commitment, and work productivity variables are in a good category at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan but for the work stress variable is in the bad category at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. Based on the results of partial hypothesis testing indicated that leadership style has a positive and significant influence on employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. The variable of work stress has a negative and significant effect on work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan. Work commitment has a positive and significant influence on work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

Besides that, the results of simultaneous hypothesis testing or F test for the influence between leadership style, work stress, and work commitment on employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is $F\text{-stat} > F\text{-table value}$, meaning that leadership style and work commitment positively and significantly impact employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan, while work stress negatively and significantly affects employees' work productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan.

Also, the coefficient of determination shows the contribution of the variables of leadership style, work stress and work commitment to employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan was 0.647 or 64.7%. It shows the contribution of leadership style, work stress, and work commitment variables to increase employee productivity at PT. Lunadorii Utama Indonesia Medan is 0.647 or 64.7%, while the remaining 0.353 or 35.3% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study, such as work environment, organizational culture, promotions, etc.

6.2. Suggestions

For the leadership style variable, leaders are expected to seek to improve employee communication skills by providing training, for example, English language training, so that employees can communicate orally and verbally. Leaders are expected to be more responsible for employees by providing job guarantees to employees, for example, by increasing incentives, promotions, and so on, so that employees feel the responsibility given by the company can guarantee employee career paths. For work stress variables, Leaders are expected to be able to provide work demands according to agreed deadlines and not provide excessive workload, which can affect employee productivity. Leaders must be able to provide solutions if employees have a sense of economic uncertainty and job security for employees, for example during this pandemic the company did not terminate employment and the company continued to provide full salaries and overtime pay if employees worked beyond working hours. employee. For work commitment variable; leaders must formulate clear company goals, for example by providing an equal distribution of work to employees to reduce overlapping work tasks and the need for delegation of power or authority so that these employees can carry out the task as well as possible to increase work productivity. Leaders are expected to appreciate and accept suggestions from employees to increase the level of employee trust so that employees feel they are an important part of the company. For work productivity variables, the way to overcome the

quality of employee work is to give appreciation to employees who have good and satisfying work quality, for example companies can provide bonuses so that morale is created and can increase employee work productivity. Leaders must be able to establish Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for every job that requires the use of technology.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.S. and L.S.; methodology, S.S.; software, L.S.; validation, S.S., L.S. and D.M.S.; formal analysis, S.S.; investigation, S.S.; resources, S.S.; data curation, L.S. and D.M.S.; writing—original draft preparation, S.S.; writing—review and editing, S.S., L.S. and D.M.S.; visualization, L.S.; supervision, L.S. and D.M.S.; project administration, L.S. and D.M.S.; funding acquisition, S.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Institut Bisnis Informasi Teknologi dan Bisnis, Medan, Indonesia, for supporting this research and publication. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori, Konsep dan Indikator)*. Riau: Zanafala Publishing.
- Afandi, R. R. V. (2018). *Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Leader-Member Exchange Dan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Mediasi Pada Karyawan PT. Radio Fiskaria Jaya Suara Surabaya*. Universitas Airlangga.
- Amirullah, F. (2016). *Pengaruh Stres Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan pada PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Makassar*. Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar.
- Angela Mamahit, N. (2016). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Konflik Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Komitmen Organisasi Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Riset Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 4(3), 335–350.
- Arnold, D. J., & Quelch, J. A. (1998). New strategies in emerging markets. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 40(1), 7–14.
- Busro, M. (2018). *Teori-teori manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Prenada Media.
- Hasibuan, M. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Haji Masagung.
- Kartikasari, D., & Cherny, K. B. (2017). Pengaruh stres dan motivasi terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada pt epson batam. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Ekonomi Dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 5(1), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.30871/jaemb.v5i1.306>
- Kasmadi, N. S. S. (2014). *Panduan modern penelitian kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Mahendra, A. D., & Woyanti, N. (2014). *Analisis pengaruh pendidikan, upah, jenis kelamin, usia dan pengalaman kerja terhadap produktivitas tenaga kerja (Studi di Industri Kecil Tempe di Kota Semarang)*. Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis.
- Mangkunegara, A. P., & Octorend, T. R. (2015). Effect of work discipline, work motivation and job satisfaction on employee organizational commitment in the company (Case study in PT. Dada Indonesia). *Marketing*, 293, 31–36.
- Nursanti, I. (2018). Kinerja Pegawai, Komitmen Organisasi Dalam Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 25(2), 347–361.
- Peng, M. W. (2021). *Global strategy*. Cengage learning.
- Priansa, D. J., & Garnida, A. (2016). *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan SDM* (2nd ed.). CV Alfabeta.
- Rivai, V. (2014). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan* (6th ed.). PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2016). *Organizational Behavior* (15th Ed). Pearson.

-
- Samsuddin, H. (2018). Kinerja Karyawan Tinjauan dari Dimensi Gaya Kepemimpinan, Budaya Organisasi dan Komitmen Organisasi. *Sidoarjo: Indomedia Pustaka*.
- Schuh, A. (2007). Brand strategies of Western MNCs as drivers of globalization in Central and Eastern Europe. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(3/4), 274–291.
- Siagian, S. (2008). Filsafat Administrasi edisi revisi. *Bumi Aksara, Jakarta*.
- Sugiyono, M. (2014). Educational Research Methods Quantitative, Qualitative Approach and R&D. *Bandung: Alfabeta*.
- Sutrisno, E. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Zebua, M. (2017). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada pt. Coca-cola cabang malang. *Akubis: Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, 1(1), 29–39.