e-ISSN 2829-7652
Volume 3, No. 1 March 2024
Page 20-30

https://jurnal.astinamandiri.com/index.php/juria

The Influence Of Training And Industrial Relations On Work Productivity And Its Impact On Employee Performance

Aip Zaenal Mutaqin[1]*, Zakie Shiddieqi[2], Hasan Firdaus[3]

STAI Persis, Garut, West Java, Indonesia.
aipzm@staipersisgarut.ac.id, zakieshiddieqi@gmail.com, hasanfirdaus@staipersisgarut.ac.id

Submitted: 02-20-2024 | Received: 03-10-2024 | Published: 03-30-2024

Abstract

Work productivity is a vital determinant of organizational success, encompassing both the quality and quantity of output. At PT. XYZ Garut, a steel manufacturing company, enhancing employee productivity is achieved through education and training (Diklat) programs aimed at improving skills and competencies. Additionally, the company prioritizes harmonious industrial relations to foster a conducive working environment. This study investigates the influence of training and industrial relations on work productivity and their subsequent impact on employee performance. Using associative research with saturated sampling involving 98 employees, data analysis revealed that training contributes 37.4% and industrial relations 42.0% to work productivity. Combined, these factors account for 50.6% of productivity improvements. Moreover, work productivity significantly influences employee performance, contributing 32.1%. Statistical tests confirmed these relationships, with positive regression coefficients indicating that effective training and harmonious industrial relations directly enhance productivity and performance. The findings emphasize the importance of targeted training programs and strong industrial relations policies in achieving organizational goals. Recommendations include systematic training, motivation enhancement, and recognition initiatives to sustain high employee morale and collaboration.

Keywords: Training, Industrial Relations, Work Productivity, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

Work productivity is a fundamental element in achieving organizational goals, encompassing not just the quantity of output but also the quality of work produced. Kaplan et al. (2009) emphasize that productivity entails both efficiency and effectiveness in task execution, highlighting that the value of an individual's contribution is measured not only by how much they produce but also by the caliber of their output. This dual focus on quality and quantity underscores the complexity of productivity as a metric, making it integral to aligning personal performance with organizational objectives.

Furthermore, individual productivity is a direct reflection of an employee's ability to perform assigned tasks effectively, playing a pivotal role in determining organizational success. According to Carpini (2017), high levels of individual productivity often translate to better team and organizational outcomes, as every employee's contribution adds to the collective effort. The interplay between individual efforts and overall organizational performance illustrates how productivity at the micro level has significant implications for the macro-level achievements of an organization.

In an effort to enhance work productivity, PT. XYZ Garut, a manufacturing company specializing in steel, has implemented education and training (Diklat) programs for its employees. These programs are designed to improve employee competencies and skills, enabling them to better address job challenges and meet the company's product quality standards. Education and training play a pivotal role in human resource development, contributing to the enhancement of individual and organizational

performance (Usman, H Miri; Denok, Sunarsi; Mukhsin, Mukhsin; Mutdi, Ismuni; Haryadi, 2024). Education provides a foundation for long-term career preparation by fostering knowledge and theoretical understanding, while training emphasizes practical skill development tailored to immediate job requirements. This strategic combination aligns with the company's goal to ensure its workforce remains competitive in the rapidly evolving manufacturing industry.

Education and training are essential components of human resource optimization, each serving distinct but complementary purposes. Education typically follows a more formal structure and focuses on equipping employees with knowledge and abilities for future roles and responsibilities. In contrast, training prioritizes developing the specific skills needed to perform current tasks effectively. As noted by Dessler (2020), a balanced approach to education and training enables organizations to address both present operational demands and future strategic goals. PT. XYZ's implementation of such programs reflects its commitment to fostering a skilled workforce capable of meeting stringent quality standards and adapting to dynamic industrial challenges.

As a steel manufacturing company, PT. XYZ Garut produces two main types of corrugated steel: flat steel sheets and corrugated steel sheets. The production process for flat steel sheets involves stages such as Shearing Line and Galvanizing Line. In contrast, the production of corrugated steel sheets includes Shearing Line, Galvanizing Line, and Corrugation Line. All products are tailored to meet the needs of the market while adhering to the standards set by the Indonesian National Standard (SNI). This underscores the importance of employee productivity in maintaining the quality and quantity of the products delivered.

In managing human resources, PT. XYZ Garut places a significant emphasis on job training as a vital approach to enhance employee competencies. According to Blanchard (2023), job training plays a crucial role in equipping employees with the skills and knowledge necessary to perform their duties effectively. The training programs implemented by the company aim to ensure that employees are capable of meeting established quality standards in their work, thereby contributing to the overall excellence of the organization's products. This approach aligns with the notion that investing in employee development fosters both individual and organizational growth, as highlighted by (Daud, 2023).

In addition to training, PT. XYZ Garut prioritizes the development of harmonious industrial relations, which are integral to creating a supportive and collaborative work environment. Harmonious industrial relations, as emphasized by Gibson et al. (2014), involve productive interactions between employees and management, as well as among employees themselves. By fostering mutual understanding and cooperation, the company seeks to build a positive workplace culture that strengthens collaboration and trust. This commitment not only enhances job satisfaction but also supports the achievement of organizational goals through a unified effort by all stakeholders.

PT. XYZ Garut has implemented various policies to cultivate harmonious industrial relations. One such policy is the provision of rewards and promotions for outstanding employees. The company also strives to improve employee welfare through various programs, ensuring that employees can meet their needs while performing their duties more effectively. Regarding employment status, PT. XYZ Garut has established that an employee is promoted to permanent status after completing a six-month probationary period. Permanent employees are entitled to a basic salary along with various additional allowances. These policies aim to provide job security and comfort for employees, which ultimately contributes positively to their productivity.

This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Despite the efforts made, PT. XYZ Garut continues to face challenges in improving employee productivity. One of the primary challenges is ensuring that the training programs conducted are effective in enhancing employee skills. Additionally, the company must maintain harmonious industrial relations to create a conducive working environment. Therefore, research on the impact of training and industrial relations on work productivity is highly relevant. This research not only aims to determine the extent to which these factors influence work productivity but also seeks to understand their impact on employee performance.

In an organizational context, work performance is a critical indicator for evaluating individual contributions to achieving company objectives. Performance evaluation serves not only as a tool for assessment but also as feedback for employees to understand the extent to which they meet the company's expectations. According to Kumala (2023), performance evaluation has several main objectives, including providing a basis for decisions related to promotions, demotions, terminations, and determining employee remuneration. In other words, performance evaluation is an essential tool in effective human resource management.

To achieve these goals, companies need to implement fair and transparent performance evaluation policies. These policies should prioritize the interests of the organization as a whole, without being influenced by the interests of specific individuals or groups. A well-conducted performance evaluation can motivate employees to enhance their productivity. Conversely, an unfair evaluation may lead to dissatisfaction, which could negatively impact work productivity.

This research seeks to answer several key questions regarding the influence of training and industrial relations on employee productivity at PT. XYZ Garut. Specifically, this study aims to determine whether job training and industrial relations, either individually or simultaneously, have a significant effect on work productivity. Furthermore, the research aims to explore the extent to which work productivity influences employee performance.

Thus, this research is expected to contribute to the development of more effective human resource management strategies at PT. XYZ Garut. The findings of this study are also anticipated to serve as a reference for other companies facing similar challenges in improving employee productivity.

Based on the explanation above, this study is titled, "The Influence of Training and Industrial Relations on Work Productivity and Its Impact on Employee Performance at PT. This title reflects the focus of the study, which is to analyze the effects of training and industrial relations on work productivity and their impact on employee performance. This research aims to provide a deeper understanding of the factors influencing work productivity and to offer relevant recommendations for improving company performance.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a well-structured research methodology to explore the impact of training and industrial relations on employee productivity at PT. XYZ Garut. The methodology encompasses population and sampling techniques, research design, and data analysis strategies, all underpinned by established academic frameworks and theories.

The population of this research consists of 98 employees at PT. XYZ Garut. According to Sugiyono (2020), a population represents the entire set of elements or subjects from which data can be drawn for a study. Given the manageable size of the population, a saturated sampling technique was employed. In this approach, every member of the population is included in the sample, making the sample size identical to the population size. This technique ensures comprehensive data collection and is

particularly suitable for smaller populations where the inclusion of every respondent enhances the accuracy and reliability of the findings (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

The study is categorized as associative research, which aims to identify relationships between variables. Associative research is particularly relevant for examining causal relationships or correlations, as it enables the researcher to determine whether and how one variable affects another (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). In this case, the study investigates the relationship between training and industrial relations as independent variables and employee productivity as the dependent variable.

To ensure robust and reliable results, various data analysis techniques were employed, starting with instrument testing. The validity and reliability of the research instruments were examined to guarantee the accuracy and consistency of the data. Validity testing, as explained by Ghozali (2018), assesses whether a measurement tool appropriately measures the intended variable. This study employed a two-tailed significance test, with instruments deemed valid if the significance value was below 0.05. Reliability testing, on the other hand, evaluated the consistency of the measurement tools. Instruments were considered reliable if Cronbach's Alpha exceeded 0.600, in line with the thresholds proposed by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).

Subsequent to instrument testing, classical assumption tests were conducted to ensure that the regression model used adhered to fundamental statistical assumptions. The normality test assessed whether the data followed a normal distribution, an essential assumption for many statistical analyses. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, a significance value greater than 0.05 indicated a normal distribution, while values below this threshold suggested non-normality (Ghozali, 2018). Multicollinearity tests evaluated correlations among independent variables, with tolerance values below 1 and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values below 10 indicating the absence of multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2014). Autocorrelation tests, conducted using the Durbin-Watson test, identified potential correlations between residuals from different observations, which could compromise the validity of regression results (Gujarati & Porter, 2009). Finally, heteroskedasticity tests, using the Glejser method, ensured that residual variances were consistent across observations, a critical assumption for regression models.

The data analysis continues with statistical techniques to explore the relationships between variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to examine how the independent variables—training and industrial relations—affect the dependent variable, employee productivity. Regression analysis is a powerful tool for predicting the impact of independent variables on a dependent variable (Hair et al., 2014). Additionally, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was calculated to determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. This analysis provides insights into the explanatory power of the regression model, with higher R^2 values indicating stronger relationships (Ghozali, 2018).

Hypothesis testing was conducted using t-tests to evaluate the partial effects of individual independent variables and F-tests to assess their simultaneous effects. These tests determine the statistical significance of observed relationships, with significance levels below 0.05 indicating meaningful effects. The use of t-tests and F-tests aligns with the methodology described by Sugiyono (2020), who emphasizes their importance in validating causal relationships in associative research.

Through these methodological steps, the study aims to provide a comprehensive and reliable analysis of how training and industrial relations influence employee productivity at PT. XYZ Garut. The rigorous approach ensures that the findings are both accurate and relevant, contributing valuable insights to the field of human resource management.

This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Volume 3, No. 1 March 2024
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55903/juria.v3i1.196

RESEARCH RESULT

1. Instrument Test Results

The results of the tests indicate that all questionnaire items related to the training variable yielded a 2-tailed significance value of 0.000, which is less than the threshold of 0.05, confirming the validity of the instrument. Similarly, for the industrial relations variable, all questionnaire items also obtained a 2-tailed significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, demonstrating the validity of the instrument. Furthermore, the work productivity variable questionnaire items produced a 2-tailed significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, establishing the validity of this instrument as well. In terms of reliability testing, the results provided further confirmation of the dependability of the instruments used in this study.

Table 1. Reliability Test Results

Variables	*Cronbach's Alpha*	Alpha Critical Standard	Information
Training (X1)	0.64	0.6	Reliable
Industrial relations (X2)	0.653	0.6	Reliable
Work Productivity (Y)	0.664	0.6	Reliable
Employee Work Performance (Z)	0.629	0.6	Reliable

Based on the test results above, all training variables (X1), industrial relations (X2), work productivity (Y) and employee work performance (Z) obtained a Cronbach alpha value greater than 0.600. Thus it is declared reliable.

2. Classical Assumption Test Results

a. Normality Test

The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test tool are as follows:

Table 2. Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro Wilk		
	Statistics	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
Work Productivity (Y)	0.074	98	.200*	0.975	98	0.1

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the test results in the table above, a significance value of 0.200 is obtained, where this value is greater than the value of $\alpha = 0.050$ or (0.200 > 0.050). Thus, the assumption of the distribution of the equation in this test is normal.

b. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test is conducted by looking at the Tolerance Value and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. The test results are as follows:

Table 3. Results of Multicollinearity Test with Collinearity Statistic.

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	9.91	2,957		3.35	0		

	Training (X1)	0.33	0.08	0.358	4.07	0	0.672	1,489
	Industrial Relations (X2)	0.44	0.087	0.443	5.04	0	0.672	1,489

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the tolerance value of each independent variable is 0.672 <1.0 and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value is 1.489 <10, thus this regression model does not experience multicollinearity.

c. Heteroscedasticity Test

Testing was carried out using the Glejser Test Model. The test results are as follows:

Table 5. Results of Heteroscedasticity Test with Glejser Test Model

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.473	1,692		2,053	0.04
	Training (X1)	-0.16	0.046	-0.401	-3.39	0.07
	Industrial Relations (X2)	0.114	0.05	0.272	2.303	0.08

a. Dependent Variable: RES2

The test results using the Glejser test obtained a Sig. value > 0.050. Thus, the regression model has no heteroscedasticity interference.

3. Descriptive Analysis

In this test, it is used to find out the minimum and maximum scores, the highest scores, rating scores and standard deviations of each variable. The results are as follows:

Table 6. Results of Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Training (X1)	98	30	46	37.9	3,757
Industrial Relations (X2)	98	31	46	38.1	3.484
Work Productivity (Y)	98	32	46	39	3.436
Employee Work Performance (Z)	98	31	50	39.2	3.656
Valid N (listwise)	98				

The training obtained a minimum variance of 30 and a maximum variance of 46 with a rating score of 3.790 with a standard deviation of 3.757. Industrial relations obtained a minimum variance of 31 and a maximum variance of 46 with a rating score of 3.813 with a standard deviation of 3.484. Work productivity obtained a minimum variance of 32 and a maximum variance of 46 with a rating score of 3.897 with a standard deviation of 3.436. Employee work performance obtained a minimum variance of 31 and a maximum variance of 50 with a rating score of 3.918 with a standard deviation of 3.656.

4. Quantitative Analysis.

This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

This analysis is intended to determine the influence of independent variables on dependent variables. The test results are as follows:

a. Regression Analysis

This regression test is intended to determine changes in the dependent variable if the independent variable changes. The test results are as follows:

Table 7. Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing Training (X1)

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17,772	2,812		6,320	0
	Training (X1)	0.559	0.074	0.612	7,574	0

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation Y = 17.772 + 0.559X1 is obtained. From this equation it is explained as follows:

1) The constant of 17.772 means that if there is no training, then there is a work productivity value of 17.772 points.
2) The training regression coefficient is 0.559, this figure is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in training of 0.559 points, work productivity will also increase by 0.559 points.

Table 8. Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing of Industrial Relations (X2)

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14,599	2.935		4.97	0
	Industrial Relations (X2)	0.639	0.077	0.648	8,338	0

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation Y = 14.599 + 0.639X2 is obtained. From this equation it is explained as follows:

1) The constant of 14.599 means that if industrial relations did not exist, then there would be a work productivity value of 14.599 points.
2) The industrial relations regression coefficient is 0.639, this figure is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in industrial relations of 0.639 points, work productivity will also increase by 0.639 points.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9.91	2,957		3.35	0
	Training (X1)	0.33	0.08	0.358	4.07	0
	Industrial Relations (X2)	0.44	0.087	0.443	5.04	0

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation Y = 9.908 + 0.327X1 + 0.437X2 is obtained. From the equation it is explained as follows:

1) The constant of 9.908 means that if there is no training and industrial relations, then there is a work productivity value of 9.908 points.
2) The training regression coefficient is 0.327, this figure is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in training of 0.327 points, work productivity will also increase by 0.327 points.
3) The industrial relations regression coefficient is 0.437, this figure is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in industrial relations of 0.437 points, work productivity will also increase by 0.437 points.

b. Determination Coefficient Analysis

The determination coefficient analysis is intended to determine the percentage of influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The test results are as follows:

Table 8. Results of Testing the Determination Coefficient of Training on Work Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.612a	0.374	0.368	2,732

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training (X1)

Based on the test results, a determination value of 0.374 was obtained, meaning that training has a 37.4% contribution to work productivity.

Table 9. Results of Testing the Determination Coefficient of Industrial Relations on Work Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.648a	0.42	0.414	2,630

a. Predictors: (Constant), Industrial relations (X2)

Based on the test results, a determination value of 0.420 was obtained, meaning that industrial relations have a 42.0% contribution to work productivity.

Table 10. Results of Testing the Determination Coefficient of Training and Industrial Relations Simultaneously on Work Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.711a	0.506	0.496	2,440

a. Predictors: (Constant), Industrial relations (X2), Training (X1)

Based on the test results, a determination value of 0.506 was obtained, meaning that training and industrial relations simultaneously have a contribution of 50.6% on work productivity, while the remaining 49.4% is influenced by other factors.

Table 11. Results of Testing the Determination Coefficient of Work Productivity on Employee Work Performance

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.567a	0.321	0.314	3,028

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results, a determination value of 0.321 was obtained, meaning that work productivity has a 32.1% contribution to employee work performance.

c. Hypothesis Testing

This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Partial Hypothesis Test (t-Test)

Hypothesis testing with t-test is used to find out which partial hypothesis is accepted. The test results are as follows:

Table 12. Results of Training Hypothesis Testing on Work Productivity

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17,772	2,812		6,320	0
	Training (X1)	0.559	0.074	0.612	7,574	0

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated t value is > t table or (7.574 > 1.985), thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between training and work productivity is accepted.

Table 13. Results of Industrial Relations Hypothesis Testing on Work Productivity

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14,599	2.935		4.97	0
	Industrial Relations (X2)	0.639	0.077	0.648	8,338	0

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated t value is > t table or (8.338 > 1.985), thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between industrial relations and work productivity is accepted.

Table 14. Results of Hypothesis Testing of Work Productivity on Employee Work Performance

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15,679	3,501		4.48	0
	Work Productivity (Y)	0.603	0.089	0.567	6,740	0

a. Dependent Variable: Employee work performance (Z)

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated t value is > t table or (9.017 > 1.985), thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between work productivity and employee work performance is accepted.

Simultaneous Hypothesis Test (F Test)

Hypothesis testing with the F test is used to determine which simultaneous hypotheses are accepted. Third hypothesis: There is a significant influence between training, industrial relations and motivation on work productivity. Table 15. Results of

Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing of Training and Industrial Relations on Work Productivity.

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	579,284	2	289,642	48,647	.000b
	Residual	565,624	95	5,954		
	Total	1144.908	97			

a. Dependent Variable: Work Productivity (Y)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Industrial Relations (X2), Training (X1)

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated F value was obtained > F table or (48.647 > 2.700), thus the fourth hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between training and industrial relations simultaneously on work productivity is accepted..

DISCUSSION

1. **The Impact of Training on Work Productivity**

   Training has a significant effect on work productivity with a coefficient of determination of 37.4%. Hypothesis testing obtained a calculated t value > t table or (7.574 > 1.985). Thus, the proposed hypothesis that there is a significant effect between training and work productivity is accepted.

2. **The Influence of Industrial Relations on Work Productivity**

   Industrial relations have a significant effect on work productivity with a determination coefficient value of 42.0%. Hypothesis testing obtained a calculated t value > t table or (8.338 > 1.985). Thus, the proposed hypothesis that there is a significant effect between industrial relations and work productivity is accepted.

3. **The Influence of Training and Industrial Relations on Work Productivity**

   Training and industrial relations have a significant effect on work productivity with the regression equation Y = 9.908 + 0.327X1 + 0.437X2, with a coefficient of determination of 50.6% while the remaining 49.4% is influenced by other factors. Hypothesis testing obtained a calculated F value > F table or (48.647 > 2.700). Thus, the proposed hypothesis that there is a significant effect between training and industrial relations on work productivity is accepted.

4. **The Influence of Work Productivity on Employee Work Performance**

   Work productivity has a significant effect on employee work performance with a determination coefficient value of 32.1%. Hypothesis testing obtained a calculated t value > t table or (9.017 > 1.985). Thus, the proposed hypothesis that there is a significant effect between work productivity and employee work performance is accepted..

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight several significant relationships between training, industrial relations, and productivity at PT. XYZ Garut. Training has a significant impact on work productivity, contributing 37.4% to productivity improvement. This is supported by hypothesis testing results, which show that the calculated t-value (7.574) is greater than the critical t-value (1.985), confirming the positive influence of training on productivity. Similarly, industrial relations also significantly influences work productivity, with a contribution of 42.0%. Hypothesis testing results indicate a calculated t-value of 8.338, which exceeds the critical t-value of

This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

1.985, demonstrating the importance of harmonious industrial relations in enhancing productivity.

When analyzed simultaneously, training and industrial relations jointly influence work productivity with a combined contribution of 50.6%, leaving 49.4% of productivity influenced by other factors outside the scope of this study. This result is supported by hypothesis testing using F-values, where the calculated F-value (48.647) exceeds the critical F-value (2.700). Finally, work productivity has a significant effect on employee performance, contributing 32.1% to performance outcomes. Hypothesis testing results confirm this with a calculated t-value of 9.017, which surpasses the critical t-value of 1.985, indicating that higher productivity levels positively impact employee performance.

Based on these conclusions, several recommendations are proposed. The company should implement systematic training programs targeting specific units or departments that require skill enhancements. This would help employees acquire the necessary competencies to perform their tasks effectively, aligning with the company's overall goals. Furthermore, it is essential for the company to foster motivation and provide adequate recognition to employees, ensuring they maintain high morale and a collaborative spirit in achieving organizational objectives.

Lastly, the company can enhance overall productivity by empowering employees through well-enforced regulations and strengthening industrial relations. Improved policies and practices in these areas will not only boost individual productivity but also contribute to creating a more harmonious and efficient workplace environment.

REFERENCES

Blanchard, P. N., & Thacker, J. W. (2023). *Effective training: Systems, strategies, and practices*. SAGE Publications.

Carpini, J. A., Parker, S. K., & Griffin, M. A. (2017). A look back and a leap forward: A review and synthesis of the individual work performance literature. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(2), 825–885.

Daud, I. (2023). Employee Development Strategies, Organizational Culture, And The Use Of HRM Technology In Building Organizational Trust: The Role Of Employee Engagement Interventions. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ)*, *4*(6), 9974–9983.

Dessler, G. (2020). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. Pearson.

Gibson, C., H. Hardy III, J., & Ronald Buckley, M. (2014). Understanding the role of networking in organizations. *Career Development International*, *19*(2), 146–161.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2009). Putting the balanced scorecard to work. In *The economic impact of knowledge* (pp. 315–324). Routledge.

Kumala, D., Sunarsi, D., Haryadi, R. N., & Sukardi, D. (2023). The Influence of Work Discipline on Employee Performance in Manufacturing. *Pasundan Social Science Development*, *4*(1), 72–77. https://doi.org/10.56457/pascidev.v4i1.82

Usman, H Miri; Denok, Sunarsi; Mukhsin, Mukhsin; Mutdi, Ismuni; Haryadi, R. N. (2024). *Organisasi Pembelajaran* (1st ed.). Penerbit Litrus.