



## Strategic Human Resource Interventions: Assessing the Efficacy of Training and Discipline in the Manufacturing Industry

Muhamad Arief Noor<sup>1\*</sup>, Halim Tjiwidjaja<sup>2</sup>, Budi Prajogo<sup>3</sup>

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Ganesha, Indonesia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61987/bamj.v3i2.1645>

### Article History:

Received: 17 July 2025

Revised: 02 October 2025

Accepted: 22 November 2025

### Keywords:

Employee Productivity,  
Training, Work Discipline, Job  
Promotion, Manufacturing

### \*Correspondence Address:

ariefnoor319@gmail.com

### Abstract :

Employee productivity is a critical factor in organizational performance, particularly in the manufacturing sector, where intense competition and operational efficiency demands are driving performance. This study aims to examine the effects of training, work discipline, and job promotion on employee productivity. A quantitative explanatory approach with a survey method was employed. Data were collected from 100 employees selected through simple random sampling using a structured questionnaire measured on a five-point Likert scale. Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the impact of each independent variable on productivity. The results indicate that training positively and significantly affects productivity ( $t = 3.436$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), as does work discipline ( $t = 2.498$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), while job promotion shows no significant effect ( $t = -1.005$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ). Collectively, all three variables have a significant influence on employee productivity. These findings suggest that enhancing productivity in manufacturing organizations is more effectively achieved through strengthening training programs and enforcing work discipline rather than relying solely on promotion policies.

## INTRODUCTION

Employee productivity has become a critical issue in modern organizations, particularly within the manufacturing sector, where efficiency and competitiveness determine long-term sustainability (Hefniy & Alwahedi, 2025; Holidi, 2025; Khofsah, 2025; Manshur, 2026). From a societal perspective, productivity is not only an organizational concern but also contributes significantly to economic growth, employment stability, and national competitiveness. In the context of Indonesia's post-pandemic recovery, organizations are increasingly required to optimize their human resources to remain competitive in both domestic and global markets (Hikmah & Mudarris, 2026; Kusumawati, 2025; Syafiih, 2025). Empirical evidence suggests that organizations with higher employee productivity tend to achieve better operational outcomes and financial performance. Therefore, improving productivity is not merely a managerial objective but a broader socio-economic necessity. This condition highlights the importance of identifying key determinants that can enhance employee productivity. Consequently, research focusing on human resource management practices becomes essential to provide evidence-based strategies that can support organizational performance and contribute to sustainable economic development.

Despite its importance, achieving optimal employee productivity remains a persistent challenge for many organizations, particularly in labor-intensive industries such as manufacturing. Companies often face issues related to inefficient work processes, lack of employee motivation, and inadequate competency development, all of which contribute to suboptimal performance outcomes. In many cases, organizations struggle to align human resource management practices with productivity goals, resulting in a gap between expected and actual performance levels. This issue becomes more critical in developing economies, where labor productivity is often influenced by structural and managerial limitations (Rahman, 2026; Shoha, 2026). Furthermore, ineffective implementation of training programs, weak enforcement of work discipline, and unclear promotion systems may hinder employees' ability to perform optimally. These challenges indicate that improving productivity is not solely dependent on increasing output but also requires strategic interventions in managing human resources. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the underlying factors that influence employee productivity in order to develop more effective and sustainable management practices.

At PT Cipta Kreasindo Gracia, a manufacturing company in Indonesia, indications of suboptimal employee productivity have been observed. This condition is reflected in work outcomes that have not fully met the company's established performance standards, suggesting inefficiencies in operational processes and employee performance. Such a phenomenon highlights the need for a systematic evaluation of managerial practices that may influence productivity levels. In particular, factors such as training, work discipline, and job promotion are considered crucial elements in shaping employee performance and organizational effectiveness (Lestari & Wahyudin, 2025). In practice, employees may not receive sufficient training to enhance their competencies, or disciplinary systems may not be consistently enforced, leading to variations in work performance. Additionally, promotion policies that are perceived as unclear or unfair may reduce employee motivation. These conditions indicate that the organization requires a more comprehensive understanding of how human resource management practices affect productivity, thereby providing a strong empirical basis for conducting this research.

Previous studies have extensively examined the role of human resource management practices in influencing employee productivity. Training, for instance, is widely recognized as a systematic process aimed at enhancing employees' knowledge, skills, and competencies required for effective job performance (Purwanto & Wafa, 2023; Sanjani, 2024). Empirical studies suggest that well-designed training programs can significantly improve employee productivity by increasing efficiency and reducing operational errors. Similarly, work discipline has been identified as a critical factor that reflects employees' adherence to organizational rules and standards, which directly contributes to work effectiveness (Ataman, 2024; Safitri, 2024). Employees who demonstrate high levels of discipline are more likely to achieve better performance outcomes due to their consistency and responsibility in completing tasks. Furthermore, job promotion is often considered a motivational tool that recognizes employee achievements and provides opportunities for career advancement, potentially enhancing job satisfaction and commitment (Hasanah et al., 2025; Salsabila & Ayuba, 2024). These findings collectively indicate the importance of integrating multiple human resource practices in improving productivity.

Although prior research has highlighted the importance of training, work discipline, and job promotion, empirical findings remain inconsistent regarding their relative influence on employee productivity. Some studies emphasize the dominant role of training in enhancing competencies, while others highlight the significance of discipline or motivational factors associated with promotion. Moreover, many studies tend to examine these variables in isolation rather than integrating them into a comprehensive empirical model. This fragmented approach limits the ability to understand the combined effects of these factors on productivity. Additionally, contextual differences across organizations and industries contribute to variations in research findings, creating a gap between theoretical assumptions and empirical evidence. Therefore, there is a need for further research that simultaneously examines these variables within a specific organizational context. Addressing this gap is important to provide a more holistic understanding of the determinants of employee productivity and to develop more effective human resource management strategies.

Based on the identified research gap, this study offers a novel contribution by simultaneously examining the effects of training, work discipline, and job promotion on employee productivity within a manufacturing context. Unlike previous studies that focus on individual variables, this research adopts an integrated approach to analyze the combined and partial effects of these factors. The research problem addressed in this study is whether and to what extent training, work discipline, and job promotion influence employee productivity at PT Cipta Kreasindo Gracia. The study proposes the argument that employee productivity is more strongly influenced by competency development and behavioral discipline than by structural career advancement mechanisms alone. Accordingly, the hypotheses suggest that training, work discipline, and job promotion have positive and significant effects on productivity, both partially and simultaneously. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically by strengthening the integration of human capital and organizational behavior perspectives, and practically by providing evidence-based recommendations for improving human resource management practices in manufacturing organizations.

Based on this conceptual framework, the relationships between the independent variables (training, work discipline, and job promotion) and the dependent variable (employee productivity) are assumed to be positive and significant. The hypotheses proposed in this study are as follows:

- H1: Training has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.
- H2: Work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.
- H3: Job promotion has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.
- H4: Training, work discipline, and job promotion simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research design using an explanatory approach to examine the causal relationships between independent variables training, work discipline, and job promotion and the dependent variable, namely employee productivity (Ghanad, 2023; Sardana et al., 2023). The quantitative approach was selected because it allows for objective measurement and statistical testing of

relationships among variables, thereby providing empirical evidence to support or reject the proposed hypotheses. The explanatory design is particularly appropriate for this study as it aims not only to describe phenomena but also to explain the extent to which each independent variable influences employee productivity within an organizational context. Through this approach, the study seeks to generate generalizable findings and contribute to the development of human resource management theories related to productivity improvement.

The research was conducted at PT Cipta Kreasindo Gracia, a manufacturing company in Indonesia, which was selected as the research site due to observed indications of suboptimal employee productivity. This organizational context provides a relevant setting for examining the influence of human resource management practices on productivity, particularly in a labor-intensive industry. The population consisted of all employees within the organization, from which 100 respondents were selected using probability sampling with a simple random sampling technique. This method ensures that each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the sample (Ghanad, 2023; Gul, 2023). The inclusion criteria included employees with at least one year of work experience, active employment status, and direct involvement in operational activities, ensuring that respondents possess sufficient experience to provide reliable data.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The instrument was designed to capture key indicators of each variable, including training (relevance of materials, methods, instructor competence, and evaluation), work discipline (punctuality, compliance with rules, responsible use of resources, and behavioral consistency), job promotion (clarity, transparency, fairness, and competency alignment), and employee productivity (quality, quantity, timeliness, and efficiency). Data collection was conducted both directly and through digital platforms to increase response accessibility. Prior to the main data collection, a pilot test involving 20 respondents was conducted to assess the validity and reliability of the instrument. Validity was tested using the product-moment correlation technique, while reliability was measured using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient with a minimum threshold of 0.70, indicating acceptable internal consistency.

The collected data were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis to determine the influence of independent variables on employee productivity. Before conducting regression analysis, classical assumption tests including normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity were performed to ensure the suitability of the model. Descriptive statistics were also used to summarize respondent characteristics and data distribution. The regression results were evaluated using the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) to assess explanatory power, the t-test to examine partial effects, and the F-test to analyze simultaneous effects. The significance of the results was determined by comparing the p-value with the significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). If the p-value was less than 0.05, the hypothesis was accepted, indicating a statistically significant relationship. Through these analytical procedures, the study ensures the validity, reliability, and robustness of findings, thereby providing credible empirical insights and practical recommendations for improving human resource management practices.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Respondent Characteristics

To provide a comprehensive overview of the research participants, the demographic characteristics of the 100 respondents were analyzed based on gender, age, educational background, and work experience. Table 1 presents the distribution of respondent characteristics.

**Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N = 100)**

| Characteristic  | Category               | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Gender          | Male                   | 64            | 64.0           |
|                 | Female                 | 36            | 36.0           |
| Age             | 20–30 years            | 28            | 28.0           |
|                 | 31–40 years            | 42            | 42.0           |
|                 | 41–50 years            | 22            | 22.0           |
| Education       | Senior High School     | 45            | 45.0           |
|                 | Diploma (D3)           | 25            | 25.0           |
|                 | Bachelor's Degree (S1) | 27            | 27.0           |
|                 | Postgraduate (S2)      | 3             | 3.0            |
| Work Experience | 1–5 years              | 35            | 35.0           |
|                 | 6–10 years             | 38            | 38.0           |
|                 | 11–15 years            | 18            | 18.0           |
|                 | >15 years              | 9             | 9.0            |

*Source: Primary data processed (2025)*

As shown in Table 1, the majority of respondents were male (64.0%), aged between 31 and 40 years (42.0%), and held senior high school as the highest educational attainment (45.0%). Regarding work experience, most respondents had between 6 and 10 years of experience (38.0%), indicating that the sample consisted predominantly of experienced employees who possess sufficient understanding of organizational practices, thereby enhancing the reliability of the data collected.

#### Validity and Reliability Testing

Prior to conducting the main analysis, the research instrument was tested for validity and reliability to ensure that the questionnaire items accurately measured the intended constructs. Table 2 summarizes the results of the validity and reliability tests for each variable.

**Table 2. Validity and Reliability Test Results**

| Variable                          | Indicator | r-count | r-table | Validity | Cronbach's Alpha | Reliability |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|------------------|-------------|
| Training (X <sub>1</sub> )        | X1.1      | 0.723   | 0.444   | Valid    | 0.821            | Reliable    |
|                                   | X1.2      | 0.756   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
|                                   | X1.3      | 0.701   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
|                                   | X1.4      | 0.689   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
| Work Discipline (X <sub>2</sub> ) | X2.1      | 0.745   | 0.444   | Valid    | 0.798            | Reliable    |
|                                   | X2.3      | 0.768   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
|                                   | X2.4      | 0.734   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
| Job Promotion (X <sub>3</sub> )   | X3.1      | 0.691   | 0.444   | Valid    | 0.784            | Reliable    |
|                                   | X3.2      | 0.708   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
|                                   | X3.3      | 0.722   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
|                                   | X3.4      | 0.715   | 0.444   | Valid    |                  |             |
| Employee Productivity (Y)         | Y1.1      | 0.734   | 0.444   | Valid    | 0.812            | Reliable    |

|      |       |       |       |
|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Y1.2 | 0.751 | 0.444 | Valid |
| Y1.3 | 0.769 | 0.444 | Valid |
| Y1.4 | 0.708 | 0.444 | Valid |

Source: Primary data processed (2025)

\*Note: r-table = 0.444 (df = 20,  $\alpha = 0.05$ )\*

The results in Table 2 indicate that all item correlation coefficients (r-count) for each variable exceeded the critical r-table value of 0.444, confirming that all questionnaire items were valid. Furthermore, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for all variables ranged from 0.784 to 0.821, all exceeding the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.70. These findings demonstrate that the instrument possessed adequate internal consistency and reliability, thereby providing a solid foundation for further statistical analysis.

### Classical Assumption Testing

To ensure that the multiple linear regression model met the required assumptions for accurate estimation, classical assumption tests were performed, including normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and linearity tests. Table 3 presents the summary of these test results.

Table 3. Classical Assumption Test Results

| Assumption Test    | Method                   | Result   | Conclusion                          |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Normality          | Kolmogorov-Smirnov       | Asymp. Sig. = 0.201  | Data normally distributed           |
| Multicollinearity  | VIF                      | $X_1 = 1.452$ , $X_2 = 1.387$ , $X_3 = 1.561$                  | No multicollinearity (VIF < 10)     |
| Heteroscedasticity | Glejser                  | Sig. $X_1 = 0.234$ , $X_2 = 0.178$ , $X_3 = 0.312$             | No heteroscedasticity (Sig. > 0.05) |
| Linearity          | Deviation from Linearity | Sig. = 0.087 ( $X_1$ -Y), 0.124 ( $X_2$ -Y), 0.056 ( $X_3$ -Y) | Linear relationship                 |

Source: Primary data processed (2025)

As shown in Table 3, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test yielded a p-value of 0.201, which exceeds the 0.05 threshold, indicating that the residuals were normally distributed. The multicollinearity test showed that all Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were below 10, confirming the absence of multicollinearity among the independent variables. The Glejser test for heteroscedasticity indicated p-values greater than 0.05 for all variables, indicating that the residual variance was constant (homoscedastic). Finally, the linearity test indicated that the relationships between each independent variable and the dependent variable were linear, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. These results confirm that the regression model met all classical assumptions, making it suitable for hypothesis testing.

### Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

To examine the effects of training, work discipline, and job promotion on employee productivity, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. Table 4 presents the results of the regression analysis.

**Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results**

|       |                                  | Coefficients <sup>2</sup>   |            |                           |        |       |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|
| Model |                                  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig.  |
|       |                                  | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |       |
| 1`    | (Constant)                       | 7,667                       | 1,889      |                           | 4,059  | 0.000 |
|       | Training (X <sub>1</sub> )       | 0.266                       | 0.077      | 0.305                     | 3.436  | 0.001 |
|       | WorkDiscipline (X <sub>2</sub> ) | 0.613                       | 0.245      | 0.677                     | 2.498  | 0.014 |
|       | Job Promotion (X <sub>3</sub> )  | -0.182                      | 0.181      | -0.265                    | -1.005 | 0.317 |

*Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity (Y)*

*Source: Primary data processed (2025)*

Based on the regression results presented in Table 4, the following regression equation was derived:

$$Y = 7.667 + 0.266X_1 + 0.613X_2 - 0.182X_3 + e$$

The constant value of 7.667 indicates that when training, work discipline, and job promotion are held at zero, the baseline level of employee productivity is 7.667. This positive constant suggests that other factors not included in the model also contribute to employee productivity.

The coefficient for training (X<sub>1</sub>) is 0.266 with a significance value of 0.001 (p < 0.05), indicating that training has a positive and statistically significant effect on employee productivity. This finding implies that each one-unit increase in training is associated with a 0.266-unit increase in employee productivity, holding other variables constant.

The coefficient for work discipline (X<sub>2</sub>) is 0.613 with a significance value of 0.014 (p < 0.05), demonstrating that work discipline has a positive and statistically significant effect on employee productivity. Notably, this variable exhibits the largest coefficient among the independent variables, suggesting that work discipline exerts the strongest influence on productivity within the model.

Conversely, the coefficient for job promotion (X<sub>3</sub>) is -0.182 with a significance value of 0.317 (p > 0.05), indicating that job promotion has a negative but statistically insignificant effect on employee productivity. This result suggests that, within the context of this study, job promotion does not significantly contribute to productivity improvements.

**Coefficient of Determination (R<sup>2</sup>)**

The coefficient of determination was calculated to assess the proportion of variance in employee productivity explained by the independent variables. **Table 5** presents the model summary.

**Table 5 Coefficient of Determination (R<sup>2</sup>)**

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | 0.631 | 0.399    | 0.380             | 1,276                      |

*Source: Primary data processed (2025)*

As shown in Table 5, the R Square value is 0.399, indicating that 39.9% of the variance in employee productivity can be explained by the three independent variables—training, work discipline, and job promotion—while the remaining 60.1% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study, such as leadership style, organizational culture, compensation systems, and work environment. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.380

accounts for the number of predictors in the model, providing a more conservative estimate of explanatory power.

## Hypothesis Testing

### Partial Test (t-test)

The t-test was conducted to examine the partial effect of each independent variable on employee productivity. The decision rule was based on comparing the calculated t-value (t-count) with the critical t-value (t-table = 1.661) at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Table 4 (presented earlier) provides the t-test results.

Referring to Table 4, the t-value for training ( $X_1$ ) is 3.436, which exceeds the critical t-value of 1.661, with a significance level of 0.001 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is accepted. This result confirms that training has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

For work discipline ( $X_2$ ), the t-value is 2.498, also greater than the critical t-value of 1.661, with a significance value of 0.014 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Consequently, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_2$ ) is accepted. This finding indicates that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

In contrast, the t-value for job promotion ( $X_3$ ) is -1.005, which is lower than the critical t-value of 1.661, with a significance value of 0.317 ( $p > 0.05$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_3$ ) is rejected. This result demonstrates that job promotion does not have a significant effect on employee productivity within the context of this study.

### Simultaneous Test (F-test)

The F-test was conducted to determine whether the independent variables—training, work discipline, and job promotion—simultaneously influence employee productivity. Table 6 presents the results of the F-test.

**Table 6. Simultaneous Test (F-test) Results**

|   | Model      | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.  |
|---|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Regression | 103.631        | 3  | 34.544      | 21.213 | 0.000 |
|   | Residual   | 156.329        | 96 | 1.628       |        |       |
|   | Total      | 259.960        | 99 |             |        |       |

Source: Primary data processed (2025)

As presented in Table 6, the calculated F-value (F-count) is 21.213, which is substantially greater than the critical F-value (F-table) of 2.71, with a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected. This finding indicates that training, work discipline, and job promotion simultaneously have a significant effect on employee productivity. The combined implementation of these human resource management practices plays an important role in improving employee performance and overall organizational effectiveness.

## Discussion

These results emphasize the importance of adopting an integrated human resource management strategy in which training and disciplinary mechanisms are strengthened while promotion systems are continuously evaluated to ensure fairness, transparency, and alignment with employee competencies and performance outcomes.

The findings indicate that organizational productivity is not determined by a single factor but rather by the interaction of multiple managerial practices that collectively shape employee performance. In this context, organizations must adopt a holistic approach that integrates competency development, behavioral control, and career management systems to achieve optimal productivity outcomes. Such an approach is particularly relevant in manufacturing organizations where operational efficiency and workforce performance are critical to maintaining competitiveness in dynamic business environments.

The findings of this study reveal that training has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity, confirming its role as a strategic instrument in human resource development. This result is consistent with previous studies that highlight the importance of training in enhancing employees' knowledge, skills, and competencies required for effective job performance (Nyoman, 2024; Obeng-Tuaah, 2025). From a theoretical perspective, training represents an investment in human capital that contributes to improved organizational performance. Employees who receive structured and continuous training are better equipped to adapt to changing job demands, reduce operational errors, and improve work efficiency. This finding reinforces the argument that training programs should not only be routine activities but must be designed systematically to align with organizational goals and employee competency needs.

Furthermore, the study demonstrates that work discipline has a positive and significant influence on employee productivity, indicating that disciplined employees tend to perform more effectively. This finding supports prior research emphasizing the critical role of discipline in maintaining organizational efficiency and productivity (Malik et al., 2025; Simanjuntak & Rahayu, 2025). Work discipline reflects employees' adherence to organizational rules, punctuality, and responsibility in completing tasks, all of which contribute to consistent performance outcomes. From an organizational behavior perspective, discipline can be seen as a form of behavioral control that ensures employees act in accordance with established standards. Therefore, organizations that successfully enforce clear rules and cultivate a culture of discipline are more likely to achieve higher levels of productivity and operational stability.

In contrast, the findings indicate that job promotion does not have a significant effect on employee productivity, which diverges from several previous studies suggesting that promotion can enhance motivation and performance. This inconsistency highlights the complexity of the relationship between promotion and productivity (Adanma & Ogunbiyi, 2024; Gyau et al., 2024). One possible explanation is that promotion systems within the organization may not be fully aligned with employee competencies or performance achievements. Additionally, employees who receive promotions may require an adjustment period to adapt to new roles and responsibilities, which may temporarily limit their productivity. This finding suggests that promotion policies alone are insufficient to drive productivity unless they are supported by adequate preparation, competency alignment, and transparent evaluation mechanisms.

Theoretically, these findings contribute to the human resource management literature by emphasizing the relative importance of training and work discipline as primary determinants of employee productivity (Sari et al., 2024; Tasya et al., 2024). While traditional motivation theories often position job promotion as a key driver of performance, this study suggests that productivity improvements are more strongly influenced by competency development and behavioral discipline. This insight highlights

the need to integrate human capital theory with organizational behavior perspectives, where employee performance is shaped not only by incentives but also by skills, knowledge, and adherence to organizational norms. Consequently, organizations should reconsider the dominant reliance on promotion as a motivational tool and instead focus on strengthening internal capabilities and work discipline systems.

From a managerial perspective, the findings provide important implications for improving organizational performance. Organizations should prioritize the implementation of structured and continuous training programs to enhance employee competencies and adaptability (Rustam et al., 2024; Yertas, 2024). In addition, strengthening disciplinary systems through clear regulations and consistent enforcement is essential to maintaining operational efficiency. Although job promotion was not found to significantly influence productivity, it remains an important aspect of career development and should be managed carefully to ensure fairness, transparency, and alignment with employee capabilities. Ultimately, by integrating training, discipline, and promotion systems into a coherent human resource management strategy, organizations can create a supportive work environment that fosters employee performance and enhances long-term competitiveness.

## CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that employee productivity is more substantially influenced by training and work discipline than by job promotion, highlighting an important insight for both theory and practice. The most significant finding is that work discipline emerges as the strongest determinant of productivity, followed by training, indicating that behavioral consistency and competency development are critical drivers of performance in manufacturing organizations. These findings provide an important lesson that productivity improvement is not solely dependent on structural incentives such as promotion, but rather on strengthening employees' capabilities and reinforcing disciplined work behavior. From an academic perspective, this study contributes to the development of human resource management literature by integrating human capital theory and organizational behavior perspectives, emphasizing that productivity is shaped by both competency-based and behavioral factors. This integrative approach offers a more comprehensive understanding of how multiple human resource practices interact to influence employee performance.

However, this study is not without limitations. The research was conducted within a single organization with a relatively limited sample size, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other organizational contexts or industries. Additionally, the use of self-reported questionnaire data may introduce potential response bias, as the data rely on employees' subjective perceptions. Therefore, future research is recommended to expand the scope by including multiple organizations and larger, more diverse samples to enhance external validity. Further studies should also consider incorporating additional variables such as leadership style, organizational culture, and employee motivation to provide a more comprehensive analysis of productivity determinants. By addressing these limitations, future research can build upon the findings of this study and contribute to a more robust and nuanced understanding of employee productivity.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors sincerely thank the management of PT Cipta Kreasindo Gracia for allowing this research and supporting data collection, and all employees who participated as respondents. Appreciation is also given to the reviewers and editors for their valuable feedback. This study was conducted independently without external funding, and all conclusions are the authors' responsibility.

## REFERENCES

- Adanma, U. M., & Ogunbiyi, E. O. (2024). A comparative review of global environmental policies for promoting sustainable development and economic growth. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 6(5), 954–977. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.v6i5.1147>
- Ataman, A. (2024). Exploring complementary leadership styles in madrasahs by aiming at their impact on integrity and character development. *Business and Applied Management Journal*, 1(2), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.61987/bamj.v1i2.487>
- Ghanad, A. (2023). An overview of quantitative research methods. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 6(08), 3794–3803. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i8-52>
- Gul, Y. E. (2023). A theoretical perspective on survey method from quantitative research methods. *Universum: Psikология и Образование*, 4 (106), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.32743/UniPsy.2023.106.4.15254>
- Gyau, E. B., Appiah, M., Gyamfi, B. A., Achie, T., & Naeem, M. A. (2024). Transforming banking: Examining the role of AI technology innovation in boosting banks financial performance. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 96, 103700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2024.103700>
- Hasanah, M., Rofiqi, & Ayuba, J. O. (2025). The effect of customer experience and e-WOM on increasing the number of students. *Al-Fikru: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sains*, 6(1), 12–20.
- Hefniy, H., & Alwahedi, M. A. A. (2025). Virtual School Tours: Boosting Community Interest and Attracting Prospective Students. *EVALUASI: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 9(2), 340–353. <https://doi.org/10.32478/3gtzvf72>
- Hikmah, U., & Mudarris, B. (2026). A Strategic Plan For High Quality And Effective Madrasah Management In Realized Quality Superior Education. *Journal of Education Management and Policy*, 2(1), 39–49.
- Holidi, M. (2025). CBT Exam Implementation Guidance for Students in Facing Digital-Based Assessments. *Communautaire: Journal of Community Service*, 4(3), 297–312. <https://doi.org/10.61987/communautaire.v4i3.820>
- Khofsah, S. (2025). Management of the Habit of Reading the Qur'an as an Effective Memorization Strategy for Tahfidz Class Students at Madrasahs. *Journal of Education Management and Policy*, 1(3), 198–207.
- Kusumawati, I. (2025). Ai-Based Human Capital As A Catalyst For Increasing The Strategic Agility Of Educational Organizations. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Reseach*, 1(5), 239–245.

- Malik, S., Solong, A., Djaya, S., & Sucipto, K. (2025). The Influence of Discipline and Work Motivation on Employee Productivity Improvement. *Journal of Indonesian Scholars for Social Research*, 5(1), 121–128.
- Manshur, U. (2026). Madrasah Vision Management Strategy in Realizing Superior Educational Quality. *EDUCARE: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.71392/ejip.v5i1.122>
- Nyoman, S. A. P. (2024). Analysis of the importance of training and career development on employee performance. *Jurnal Bisnisan: Riset Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 6(2), 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.52005/bisnisan.v6i02.254>
- Obeng-Tuaah, M. (2025). Employees Training and Development to Enhance Organisational Performance: A Systematic Review: Employees Training and Development to Enhance Organisational Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies and Innovative Research*, 13(1), 1–15.
- Purwanto, A., & Wafa, A. (2023). Interpersonal Communication Strategies in Building an Image of Contingency Perspective of Accommodation. *Managere: Indonesian Journal of Educational Management*, 5(3), 267–279. <https://doi.org/10.52627/managere.v5i3.281>
- Rahman, M. (2026). Improving The Quality Of Education In Madrasah Tsanawiyah Through Digital Technology-Based Strategic Management. *JETech: Journal of Education and Technology*, 2(1), 11–19.
- Rustam, A., Astuti, I. Y., & Safitri, U. R. (2024). Strategies for improving employee competencies in the digitalization era through training and human resource development. *The Journal of Academic Science*, 1(7), 849–857. <https://doi.org/10.59613/bewkpf69>
- Safitri, S. D. (2024). Character Management in Crisis: Implementation of Five Day in Ma'had as a Social Care Solution in Elementary Madrasah. *JUMPA: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 5(1), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.33650/jumpa.v5i1.9321>
- Salsabila, N. F., & Ayuba, J. O. (2024). The Role of Foster Carers in Shaping Santri Discipline in Pesantren Through a Humanistic Approach. *Lentera Pendidikan : Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah Dan Keguruan*, 27(2), 278–299. <https://doi.org/10.61987/jemr.v3i1.347>
- Sanjani, M. A. F. (2024). The impact of school principals on graduate quality through character education initiatives. *Journal of Educational Management Research*, 3(1), 30–46. <https://doi.org/10.61987/jemr.v3i1.347>
- Sardana, N., Shekoochi, S., Cornett, E. M., & Kaye, A. D. (2023). Qualitative and quantitative research methods. In *Substance use and addiction research* (pp. 65–69). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-98814-8.00008-1>
- Sari, A. N., Febriansyah, Y., Oktaviannur, M., Defrizal, D., & Farida, I. (2024). The Influence of Education and Training, Discipline, Experience on Employee Performance at the Staffing and Human Resource Development Agency of Pesawaran District. *Journal Of Administration, Policy, And Service Integration*, 1(2), 1–15.
- Shoha, S. I. (2026). Curriculum Renewal Management in Elementary Schools: A Case Study of the Implementation of the Independent Curriculum in Schools. *Journal of Education Management and Policy*, 2(1), 6171.
- Simanjuntak, H. F., & Rahayu, S. (2025). Employees' Perceptions of the Role of Work Discipline and Work Environment in Enhancing Productivity at CV Requel HFS Medan. *Proceedings of International Conference on Islamic Community Studies*, 3073–3082.

- Syafiih, M. (2025). The Future Of Education In The Digital Era: Between Technological Innovation And Equitable Access. *Proceeding of International Conference on Education, Society and Humanity*, 3(1), 737–741.
- Tasya, C. Y., Akbar, M. A., & Lina, R. (2024). Work discipline on employee performance through work productivity. *Advances in Human Resource Management Research*, 2(3), 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.60079/ahrmr.v2i3.326>
- Yertas, M. (2024). The role of training and continuous development in improving employee productivity and its impact on company financial performance. *Atestasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 7(2), 1362–1379. <https://doi.org/10.57178/atestasi.v7i2.1047>