

The Role of Work Empowerment, Work Motivation, and Work Environment in Improving Employee Performance in the Textile Industry in Ungaran

Priska Desriana Sihura¹, Krisnawati Setyaningrum Nugraheni^{*2}

^{1,2} Management, Indonesian College of Tourism Economics, Semarang, Indonesia

Email: Priska.22510310@student.stiepari.ac.id¹, krisnawati.setyaningrum@stiepari.ac.id^{*2}

**Corresponding Author*

Article Info

Article history:

Received: May 2026

Revised: June 2026

Accepted: July 2026

Keywords:

Employee Performance

Work Empowerment

Work Environment

Work Motivation

ABSTRACT

The structural contraction in the Indonesian textile industry raises critical questions about the sustainability of the sector and the drivers of employee performance in the current manufacturing sector. This study examines how work empowerment, work motivation, and the work environment influence employee performance among textile workers in Ungaran, Central Java. The study used cross-sectional survey data and analyzed them using multiple linear regression. All research instrument items were found to be valid and demonstrated a very high level of reliability. Furthermore, classical assumption tests confirmed that the data were normally distributed and free from multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity. The results showed that all three predictor variables had a positive and significant influence on employee performance. Work motivation emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by work environment and work empowerment. Simultaneously, these three variables were also able to explain a significant portion of the variance in employee performance. Furthermore, the study identified a structural-psychological gap in work empowerment: the meaning and competence dimensions were strong, while the self-determination and impact dimensions were consistently weaker. This suggests that a centralized authority structure limits employee performance potential. These findings extend the psychological empowerment model and Self-Determination Theory to the crisis-affected manufacturing sector, and provide evidence-based guidance for integrated performance management in the Indonesian textile industry.



1. INTRODUCTION

The textile manufacturing industry employs millions of workers worldwide, where employee performance is a key determinant of organizational competitiveness and the sector's sustainability [1], [2]. Work empowerment describes organizational practices of delegating decision-making authority, allocating adequate resources, and systematically developing employees' capabilities to perform assigned roles. Work motivation encompasses intrinsic and extrinsic drives that direct employee behavior toward measurable organizational goals [3]. Meanwhile, the work environment encompasses the physical dimensions of the workplace—such as the adequacy of equipment and facility design—as well as psychosocial dimensions, such as supervisory support and interpersonal relationships, which collectively shape employees' capacity to perform their tasks. A World Economic Forum report states

that more than 50% of global manufacturing industry leaders identify skills gaps and low employee engagement as key barriers to organizational transformation. These findings suggest that manufacturing organizations need to address all three variables simultaneously to maintain competitive performance outcomes [4].

Currently, the Indonesian textile industry faces structural pressures that threaten the performance of the remaining workforce at a systemic level. The Central Statistics Agency (BPS) noted that the textile and garment subsector workforce decreased from 3.98 million in 2023 to 3.87 million in 2024. This decline reflects the ongoing structural contraction in the sector [5]. The Confederation of Indonesian Trade Unions identified Central Java as the province with the highest concentration of mass layoffs (PHK) in the textile industry.

Data from the Indonesian Textile Association (API) confirmed that approximately 15,000 workers in Central Java—including in the Ungaran, Karanganyar, and Boyolali areas—received layoff notices due to factory closures in mid-2024 [6]. Industry reports indicate that textile facilities in the Ungaran area experienced a significant decline in machine and labor utilization, reaching 45% [7]. In the second quarter of 2024, a quarterly contraction of 2.63 % was recorded in the textile and garment industry, while export volumes were at their lowest point in nine years [8]. This situation confirms that companies still operating in Ungaran face significant challenges in maintaining employee productivity, maintaining motivation levels, and implementing effective empowerment practices amidst an uncertain industrial environment.

Researchers have extensively examined the relationship between work empowerment, work motivation, work environment, and employee performance across various organizational settings. However, these findings still show striking inconsistencies. Some studies have found positive results; for example, work environment has been shown to have a significant positive influence on employee performance in a manufacturing company in Semarang [9] and in other manufacturing contexts [10]. Furthermore, transformational leadership and work empowerment serve as significant predictors of employee performance in a star-rated hotel in Central Java [11].

High Performance Work Systems (HPWS) have also been shown to improve performance through employee empowerment as a mediating variable [12], and flexibility-based empowerment programs significantly support employee career development [13]. Conversely, several other studies have shown insignificant results. Work motivation has not been shown to have a significant effect on performance in contexts where employees already have high compensation satisfaction [14]. Similarly, work environment has also been reported to have no significant effect on employee performance in certain organizational settings [15].

These differences in findings reveal at least three research gaps that this study aims to address: (1) Contextual Gap: Most previous studies have examined empowerment, motivation, and work environment in the service sector or government agencies. Consequently, the textile manufacturing sector, particularly in the Ungaran region, remains underrepresented in the empirical literature. (2) Integrative Gap: Very few studies have examined these three variables simultaneously in a manufacturing context, thus limiting the ability to compare the relative contributions of each variable to performance outcomes. (3) Temporal Gap: No study has specifically examined these relationships in the post-crisis phase of the Indonesian textile industry (2023 onwards), a period in which factory closures and mass layoffs have drastically altered the organizational and psychological conditions of surviving employees [8], [9]. Furthermore, research by Iis et al. found that career development and work environment influence employee performance through work motivation as a mediating variable [16]. This indicates that the interaction between these three constructs can produce indirect effects that are missed by single-variable studies.

Therefore, this study aims to examine the simultaneous and partial influence of work empowerment, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance in the textile industry in Ungaran. There are four specific problem formulations proposed in this study, namely (1) Does work empowerment have a significant influence on employee performance? (2) Does work motivation have a significant influence on employee performance? (3) Does the work environment have a significant influence on employee performance? (4) Do these three variables simultaneously have a significant influence on employee performance?

This study contributes to the management literature by examining these relationships in a manufacturing context, while extending the reach of previous findings beyond the dominant service sector. Practically, these findings offer evidence-based guidance for human resource managers in the

Ungaran textile industry to determine the most effective factors that can support sustainable employee performance amidst adverse industry conditions. From a business management perspective, these findings provide an empirical basis for designing a data-driven workforce performance management system—a crucial contribution to integrated managerial decision-making and organizational productivity improvement in a labor-intensive industrial context.

2. METHOD

This study adopted a quantitative research design with a cross-sectional survey approach to examine the simultaneous and partial effects of work empowerment, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance in a textile manufacturing company in Ungaran [17]. The quantitative approach was chosen because it allows for systematic measurement, testing, and interpretation of relationships between variables through statistical procedures, which supports the production of replicable findings. The cross-sectional design was applied because it allows the researcher to collect data from all respondents at a single point in time.

This is in line with the research objective of mapping the current conditions of the four variables within the target environment [18]. The population of this study included all active employees working in textile manufacturing facilities that remained operational in Ungaran, Semarang Regency, during the data collection period. Data collection was conducted at textile manufacturing facilities in Ungaran that include several production units and three shift arrangements, namely morning shift, rotating shift, and afternoon shift, as reflected in the respondents' profiles.

Due to the lack of a comprehensive and unified employee list across the scattered multi-facility clusters, as well as logistical constraints resulting from rotating shift schedules, this study employed an accidental sampling technique. Respondents were selected based on their availability and physical accessibility on the production floor during field data collection visits [17]. The minimum sample size was determined using Cohen's χ analysis for multiple linear regression with a predictor set of $k = 3$, a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$), a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, and a statistical power of 0.80, requiring a minimum sample size of 77 respondents [27].

The successfully collected sample of 99 respondents exceeded this threshold, providing sufficient statistical power for the regression analysis. This approach was used as an alternative sampling method because the total population across the Ungaran textile cluster could not be accurately determined during the field data collection phase. The use of the Slovin formula in this situation is less appropriate because it requires a definite population value (N). Data collection was conducted using a structured questionnaire that was completed independently and distributed directly to respondents at the research location. The questionnaire consisted of 40 items covering the four variables, all measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Item validity was assessed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, where an item is declared valid if its calculated r -value exceeds the critical r -table value ($r\text{-table} = 0.197$ at $\alpha = 0.05$, $n = 99$).

The instrument's reliability was evaluated using a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.80, which meets the high reliability criteria set by Nunnally and Bernstein [23]. Table 1 presents the operationalization of the four research variables, detailing the theoretical sources, dimensions, indicators, item codes, and measurement scales for each construct. More specifically, work empowerment (X_1) was operationalized based on Spreitzer's four-dimensional psychological empowerment model [20], while work motivation (X_2) refers to Ryan and Deci's Self-Determination Theory framework [21]. Meanwhile, the work environment (X_3) is measured following the physical and non-physical dimensions proposed by Sedarmayanti [22], and employee performance (Y) is based on Mangkunegara's six-dimensional performance framework [2]. What do you think of this version? The flow should now feel much stronger and more in line with academic Indonesian language standards for journal publication.

This study applies multiple linear regression analysis as the primary inferential statistical method. The regression model takes the following form: $\hat{Y} = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + e$. Prior to regression estimation, the data underwent three classical assumption tests. First, a normality test using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test confirmed that the regression residuals approximated a

normal distribution (required: sig. > 0.05). Second, a multicollinearity test using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each predictor confirmed the absence of problematic multicollinearity (required: VIF < 10.00). Third, a heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test confirmed homoscedasticity in the residual distribution (required: sig. > 0.05 for each predictor). The partial hypothesis ($H_1 - H_3$) was evaluated using the t-test ($\alpha = 0.05$), and the simultaneous hypothesis (H_4) was evaluated using the F-test. The coefficient of determination (R^2) measures the proportion of performance variance explained by the three predictors. All statistical procedures were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics software.

Table 1. Operationalization of Research Variables

Variables	Dimensions	Indicator	Goods	Scale	Source
Work Empowerment (X_1)	Meaning	Personal meaning and importance of work tasks	PK1, PK5	Likert Scale 1–5	Spreitzer [20]
	Competence	Self-confidence in one's own ability to carry out assigned tasks effectively.	PK2, PK7		
	Self-determination	Perceived freedom to determine work methods, sequence, and priorities.	PK3, PK6, PK8, PK11, PK12		
	Impact	The perceived impact of personal actions on departmental or organizational outcomes.	PK4, PK9, PK10		
Work Motivation (X_2)	True	Self-development, challenging tasks, enjoyment, and alignment with personal values	MK1, MK2, MK3, MK7, MK10, MK11, MK12	Likert Scale 1–5	Ryan & Deci [21]
	Extrinsic	Financial rewards, promotion prospects, feedback from superiors, job security, and maintenance of family well-being.	MK4, MK5, MK6, MK8, MK9		
Work Environment (X_3)	Physique	Temperature, ventilation, noise, lighting, equipment, K3 provisions, and rest facilities	LK1–LK6	Likert Scale 1–5	Nurhandayani [22]
	Non-physical	Shift scheduling arrangements and clarity of work-related communication.	LK7, LK8		
Employee Performance (Y)	Quality	Task accuracy, error reduction, and quality maintenance.	KK1, KK7, KK8	Likert Scale 1–5	Mangkunegara [2]
	Quantity	Volume of task output generated	KK2		
	Punctuality	Completion of tasks within the required timeframe.	KK3		
	Initiative	Proactive response to work-related issues and challenges.	KK4		
	Cooperation	Support provided to coworkers during the work process	KK5		
	Contribution	Active contribution in efforts to improve work processes.	KK6		

3. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Respondent Profile

A total of 99 respondents were collected from active textile industry employees in Ungaran, Semarang Regency. Female respondents constituted 81.8 % of the sample, reflecting the composition of the Indonesian textile production workforce which has historically been dominated by women. The majority of respondents (51.5 %) were in the 21–25 years age group, with a mean age of approximately 22.8 years (range: 18–30 years), indicating a young workforce profile. The education level was dominated by high school/senior high school graduates (87.9 %), consistent with the technical recruitment base in textile manufacturing. Tenure indicated that 51.5% of respondents had less than one year of service, while 24.2% could not be classified into structured tenure groups, indicating the highly transient workforce characteristic of an industry undergoing restructuring. Shift composition consisted of morning shifts (75.8 %), rotating shifts (15.2%), and afternoon shifts (9.1%).

3.2 Validity and Reliability Test

Validity testing used Pearson product moment correlation with $r\text{-table} = 0.197$ ($n = 99$, $\alpha = 0.05$, two-tailed) as the decision criterion [23]. All 40 statement items in the four variables were declared valid, with $r\text{-count}$ values ranging from 0.6310 (PK8) to 0.9513 (LK8). Reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha produced very high values for all variables, all exceeding the high reliability threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.80$ [23]. Table 2 presents a summary of the validity and reliability results based on the variables.

Table 2. Summary of Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variables	n Goods	Range r	Cronbach's α
Work Empowerment (X_1)	12	0.6310 – 0.9205	0.9325
Work Motivation (X_2)	12	0.6478 – 0.9052	0.9293
Work Environment (X_3)	8	0.8256 – 0.9513	0.9668
Employee Performance (Y)	8	0.7345 – 0.8942	0.9300

Source: SPSS Output (2026)

3.3 Classical Assumption Test

Before conducting the regression analysis, three classical assumption tests were performed. Table 3 presents the complete results.

Table 3. Results of the Classical Assumption Test

	Variables / Methods	Test Statistics	Results
Normality	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	KS statistics = 0.063	Asymptomatic Sig. = 0.200
Multicollinearity	X_1 Work Empowerment	Tolerance = 0.270	VIF = 3.704
	X_2 Work Motivation	Tolerance = 0.218	VIF = 4.587
	X_3 Work Environment	Tolerance = 0.317	VIF = 3.155
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser)	X_1 Work Empowerment	$t = -0.509$	Significance = 0.612
	X_2 Work Motivation	$t = 0.778$	Significance = 0.438
	X_3 Work Environment	$t = 1.071$	Significance = 0.287

Source: SPSS output (2026).

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test confirmed that the regression residuals were normally distributed (Asymp. Sig. = 0.200 > 0.05). Multicollinearity assessment showed that all three predictors met the formal threshold criteria (Tolerance > 0.10; VIF < 10.00). However, the VIF values for work empowerment (VIF = 3.704) and work motivation (VIF = 4.587) were slightly higher than those for work environment (VIF = 3.155), reflecting substantial theoretical interrelationships and inter-predictor correlations among these constructs. This does not invalidate the regression model but implies that individual coefficients should be interpreted as partial effects within a co-correlated system. The Glejser test results confirmed the absence of heteroscedasticity for all predictors: X_1 Sig. = 0.612, X_2 Sig. = 0.438, X_3 Sig. = 0.287, all well above the threshold of 0.05. Therefore, all three classical assumption conditions are met, supporting the use of multiple linear regression for hypothesis testing.

3.4 Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Table 4 summarizes descriptive statistics for the four study variables based on item-level mean scores. All variables fall into the High or Very High category on a five- point Likert scale, indicating generally positive perceptions across all constructs.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variables	Minimum Average	Maximum Average	Average Total
Work Empowerment (X_1)	3.61	4.52	4.07
Work Motivation (X_2)	3.94	4.48	4.21
Work Environment (X_3)	4.00	4.42	4.30
Employee Performance (Y)	3.94	4.45	4.22

Source: SPSS output (2026).

Work empowerment (X1) obtained an overall average score of 4.07, which is included in the High category. The highest scores were found in the indicators of job meaning (PK1; average = 4.52), task competence (PK2; average = 4.45), and the importance of work for company goals (PK5; average = 4.39), all of which are in the meaning and competence dimension. Conversely, the lowest scores were recorded in the indicators of freedom to set work priorities (PK8; average = 3.61), influence on departmental decisions (PK4; average = 3.67), and operational decision-making authority (PK6; average = 3.70). This consistently reflects weaker scores obtained in the self-determination and impact dimensions. In addition, the PK10 indicator recorded the highest standard deviation (SD = 1.34). The work motivation variable (X2) recorded an overall average of 4.21 (Very High category). Working for self-development (MK2; mean = 4.48) was the most dominant indicator, followed by financial gain motivation (MK4; mean = 4.42).

The presence of these two top indicators indicates the magnitude of the drive for intrinsic and extrinsic motivation simultaneously. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest score was the hope of promotion and recognition (MK5; mean = 3.94). It should also be noted that the indicator of fear of losing one's job (MK8; mean = 4.00, SD = 1.13) showed quite a large variation in responses among respondents. Furthermore, the work environment (X3) recorded the highest overall average value among all variables, reaching 4.30 (Very High category). The indicators that obtained the highest scores were the company's attention to occupational health and safety (LK5; mean = 4.42) and rest facilities (LK6; mean = 4.42).

Meanwhile, the lowest score was on the temperature and ventilation comfort indicator (LK1; mean = 4.00, SD = 1.21), which was also the item with the greatest response variability of all the statements in this study. Finally, employee performance (Y) obtained an overall average value of 4.22 (Very High category). The highest indicator on this variable was the behavior of helping coworkers (KK5; mean = 4.45). In contrast, the lowest indicator was the ability to rarely make repeated mistakes (KK7; mean = 3.94), which was then followed by the indicator of taking initiative when problems arise (KK4; mean = 4.03).

3.5 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis yields the following equation: $Y = 0.3742 + 0.4059X_1 + 0.4784X_2 + 0.4202X_3$. The constant (0.3742, $t = 1.814$, $p = 0.073$) is not statistically significant, indicating that the model is only meaningful if all three predictors have significant values. Table 5 presents the complete regression coefficients, t-test results, and model fit statistics.

Table 5. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variables	B	Standard Error	number t	p-value
Constant	0.3742	0.2063	1,814	0.073
Work Empowerment (X ₁)	0.4059	0.0763	5,078	0,000
Work Motivation (X ₂)	0.4784	0.0905	5,288	0,000
Work Environment (X ₃)	0.4202	0.0691	6,079	0,000
R = 0.8939 R ² = 0.7991 Adjusted R ² = 0.7927 F = 125.92 (p = 0.000)				

Source: SPSS output (2026).

The F test yielded $F = 125.92$ ($p = 0.000$), which confirmed that the three variables simultaneously produced a significant influence on employee performance (H_4 was supported). The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.7991$ indicated that 79.91 % of the variance in employee performance was explained by the three predictors, while Adjusted $R^2 = 0.7927$ confirmed that the model showed no signs of overfitting [19]. The partial t-test confirmed that the three variables individually produced significant positive effects: work empowerment ($b = 0.4059$, $t = 5.078$, $p = 0.000$), work motivation ($b = 0.4784$, $t = 5.288$, $p = 0.000$), and work environment ($b = 0.4202$, $t = 6.079$, $p = 0.000$), which supported H_1 , H_2 , and H_3 , respectively.

4. Discussion

The simultaneous significance of all three variables ($F = 125.92$, $p = 0.000$) and the R^2 value of 79.91% indicate substantial combined explanatory capacity. These findings directly address the integrative gap outlined in the Introduction. Previous studies focusing on non-manufacturing contexts

or single variables have not been able to establish the relative contribution of each predictor within the same model and setting. The current findings confirm that in the crisis-affected textile manufacturing context, work empowerment, work motivation, and work environment operate as an interdependent system of performance, rather than as independent predictors. This study contributes to the management literature by extending these integrative findings to the manufacturing sector experiencing acute structural stress—a context that remains underrepresented in the existing empowerment and motivation literature [11], [24]. One important finding that requires further interpretation is the difference between the variable means and their regression coefficients. Work environment recorded the highest mean (4.30) among all variables, but work motivation actually had the largest regression coefficient ($b = 0.4784$).

This distinction reflects the different conceptual roles of these variables. A conducive work environment serves as a facilitating prerequisite that enables performance capacity, while work motivation operates as a driving force that transforms that capacity into concrete work behavior. This functional distinction aligns with the division of roles between contextual conditions and internal drives in the performance motivation literature [2], [21]. The managerial implications are clear: investments in improving both the physical and non-physical work environment will only produce a ceiling effect on performance. This ceiling cannot be exceeded without a parallel program to strengthen employee motivation.

The significant effect of work empowerment on performance ($b = 0.4059$, $t = 5.078$, $p = 0.000$) confirms H₁ and extends Spreitzer's psychological empowerment model [20] to a crisis-affected manufacturing environment. Critically, the descriptive data revealed a structural-psychological gap: the meaning and competence dimensions achieved high mean scores (4.39–4.52), while the self-determination and impact dimensions were consistently weaker (3.61–3.70). This pattern confirms that Ungaran textile employees have internalized strong work values and personal competence beliefs. However, the organizational structure has not provided commensurate authority to translate these internal resources into broader contributions. Juyumaya (2022) found that psychological empowerment positively influences task performance through work engagement as a mediator, where employee age moderates the strength of this pathway [24]. These findings underscore the behavioral pathway through which empowerment perceptions are translated into performance outcomes. Guritno et al. also confirmed that empowerment serves as a mediator of performance in a manufacturing context, reinforcing the importance of delegation-based interventions [12].

For practitioners, this means that the most efficient investment in continued performance is not simply training, but rather the delegation of measurable operational decision-making authority to production line employees. Furthermore, work motivation was confirmed as the strongest predictor of performance ($b = 0.4784$, $t = 5.288$, $p = 0.000$), which supports H₂. Descriptive data indicate a dual motivational structure, where intrinsic self-development drives ($MK2 = 4.48$) and extrinsic financial drives ($MK4 = 4.42$) coexist at relatively high levels. Amidst the industrial conditions experiencing mass layoffs in Central Java, this pattern reflects a rational adaptation mechanism rather than a mere transactional orientation.

These findings are consistent with the regulatory concept identified in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Ryan and Deci [21]. In this theory, employees internalize financial and security needs as valuable personal goals, resulting in autonomous motivation despite external pressures. McAnally and Hagger's (2024) systematic review of SDT in the workplace confirmed that even when basic psychological needs are partially met, extrinsically driven motives can generate engagement that leads to increased performance [26]. On the other hand, very low promotion expectations ($MK5 = 3.94$) are a warning sign of medium-term retention risks. If employees perceive vertical career mobility as unattainable, their long-term commitment may erode even if their current performance remains high. Therefore, management needs to design transparent career paths, even in a constrained industry environment.

Work environment factors also have a significant positive effect on performance ($b = 0.4202$, $p = 0.000$), thus supporting H₃. Interestingly, the t -value of this variable (6.079) is the highest among the three predictors, indicating the strongest statistical consistency. The highest ratings on Occupational Safety and Health (K3) and rest facilities (LK5, LK6 = 4.42), along with the large variation in thermal

comfort (LK1, SD = 1.21), provide interesting indications. Companies that remain in Ungaran appear to maintain institutional and procedural aspects of the work environment as a retention mechanism. Meanwhile, thermal comfort conditions on the production floor remain variable due to heat emissions and fiber dust, which are natural characteristics of the textile production process. This interpretation is consistent with Sedarmayanti's framework on the physical and non-physical dimensions of the work environment [22], and is supported by Arbyan and Riyanto's (2023) findings in the Indonesian manufacturing context that both environmental dimensions significantly predict performance [25].

4. CONCLUSION

This study confirms that work empowerment, work motivation, and work environment each have a positive and significant influence on the performance of textile industry employees in Ungaran, both individually and simultaneously. Work motivation proved to be the most powerful predictor. This suggests that employees' internal drives—both intrinsic and externally internalized—play a greater role as a determinant of performance than the physical conditions of the workplace or formal authority. Furthermore, the work environment was the most consistent predictor. This factor serves as a functional prerequisite that enables employees to translate their motivation and empowerment into measurable work outcomes.

Meanwhile, the work empowerment variable revealed a strategically important structural finding. The gap between strong psychological empowerment dimensions (such as meaning and competence) and weak structural dimensions (such as self-determination and impact) suggests that an overly centralized decision-making structure remains a major obstacle to developing performance potential in this industrial sector.

For practitioners and management, these findings indicate that improving performance in the Ungaran textile industry requires an integrated three-pronged strategy, namely: (1) Delegating operational authority: Giving a greater portion of decision-making authority to production line employees to close the gap between structural and psychological empowerment. (2) Designing transparent career paths: Creating clear and rational career opportunities to achieve. This is important to maintain employee motivation resilience to be able to overcome the current period of industrial contraction. (3) Maintaining work environment standards: Maintaining consistent work environment operational standards—especially aspects of Occupational Safety and Health (K3) and clear communication—as a basic prerequisite for employee retention.

As a next step, future research is recommended to expand this model by including additional mediating variables, such as organizational commitment and transformational leadership. Methodologically, further research should utilize probability-based sampling techniques from a complete workforce population and utilize objective company productivity data to complement performance indicators currently measured through self-reports.

REFERENCES

- [1] SP Robbins and TA Judge, *Organizational Behavior*, 17th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson Education, 2017.
- [2] AP Mangkunegara, *Corporate Human Resource Management*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2017.
- [3] MSP Hasibuan, *Human Resource Management*, Revised Edition. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara, 2017.
- [4] World Economic Forum, "The Future of Jobs Report 2025," WEF, Geneva, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025>
- [5] Directorate General of Economic and Fiscal Strategy, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, "Supporting the National Textile Industry, the Government Extends the Implementation of Additional Import Duties," August 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://fiskal.kemenkeu.go.id/publikasi/siaran-pers-detil/581>
- [6] Investor Daily, "The Storm of Layoffs Haunts, Collaborative Synergy Needed Between Government and Industry," Sep. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://investor.id/macroeconomy/373301/badai-phk-menghantui-perlu-sinergi-kolaborasi-pemerintah-hingga-industri>
- [7] VOA Indonesia, "Domestic Textile Industry Struggles to Find Its Fate," June 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.voaindonesia.com/a/industri-tekstil-domestik-terseok-seok-memintal-nasib/7675344.html>

- [8] Tirto.id, "Textile Industry Performance Plummet 2.63 Percent in the Second Quarter of 2024," August 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://tirto.id/kinerja-industri-tekstil-anjlok-263-persen-ditriwulan-ii-2024-g2lL>
- [9] D. Dach and KS Nugraheni, "The Impact of Internal Communication and Work Environment on Employee Performance in Manufacturing Companies in Semarang," LITERACY: International Journal of Science, Society, Education, and Humanities, vol. 4, no. 2, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://jurnal-stiepari.ac.id/index.php/LITERACY/article/view/2437>
- [10] Y. Zebua and KS Nugraheni, "The Relationship between Workload and Work Environment on Employee Performance: A Study at PT MOD," LITERACY, vol. 4, no. 2, 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.56910/literacy.v4i1.2438>.
- [11] KS Nugraheni, D. Palupiningtyas, and RP Ardi, "Transformational Leadership and Empowerment as Factors Driving Employee Performance in Star-Rated Hotels in Central Java," Ann. Hum. Resort. Manag. Res., vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 231–242, 2025, doi: 10.35912/ahrmr.v5i2.2828.
- [12] B. Guritno, CS Widagdo, and KS Nugraheni, "The Impact of High Performance Work Systems (HPWS) on Employee Performance through Employee Empowerment as Mediation," J. Ilm. EDUNOMICS, vol. 8, no. 3, August 2024, doi: 10.29040/jie.v8i3.14615.
- [13] D. Palupiningtyas, KS Nugraheni, and DARN Farida, "Shifting Boundaries: Women's Career Empowerment Through Flexibility in Hotels," J. Manag. Econ. Financ. Accounts., vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 01–14, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.69714/jp7vz210.
- [14] M. Ridlo, MA Rozaq, Y. Saputra, and Mochlasin, "Moderation of Islamic Work Ethics Variables on the Influence of Work Environment, Work Motivation, Work Culture and Compensation on Employee Performance," Manag. Anal. J., vol. 11, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.15294/maj.v11i1.54793.
- [15] Y. Badrianto and M. Ekhsan, "The Influence of Work Environment and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance at PT. Nesinak Industries," J. Bus. Manag. Accounts., vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 85–91, 2019.
- [16] El Yusuf, Wahyuddin, A. Thoyib, RN Ilham, and I. Sinta, "The Effect of Career Development and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as an Intervention Variable," Int. J. Econ. Bus. Accounts. Agric. Manag. Sharia Adm., vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 227–236, 2022, doi: 10.54443/ijebas.v2i2.191.
- [17] Sugiyono, Quantitative, Qualitative, and Research Methods, 3rd edition. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2021.
- [18] JW Creswell and JD Creswell, Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [19] I. Ghazali, Multivariate Analysis Application with IBM SPSS 26 Program, 10th edition. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publisher, 2021.
- [20] GM Spreitzer, "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation," Acad. Manage. J., vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1442–1465, 1995, doi: 10.2307/256865.
- [21] R.M. Ryan and E.L. Deci, "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: Classic Definitions and New Directions," Contemp. Educ. Psychol., vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 54–67, 2000, doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020.
- [22] A. Nurhandayani, "The Effect of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, and Workload on Performance," J. Econ. Bus. Digit. EKOBIL, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 108–110, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.58765/ekobil.v1i2.65.
- [23] J.C. Nunnally and I.H. Bernstein, Psychometric Theory, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- [24] J. Juyumaya, "How Psychological Empowerment Affects Task Performance: The Mediating Role of Job Engagement and the Moderating Role of Age," Front. Psychol., vol. 13, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.889936.
- [25] A. Arbyan and S. Riyanto, "The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance," J. Studi Manaj. Organ., vol. 19, no. 2, 2023, doi: 10.14710/jsmo.v19i2.30560.
- [26] K. McAnally and M.S. Hagger, "Self-Determination Theory and Workplace Outcomes: A Conceptual Review and Future Research Directions," Behav. Sci., vol. 14, p. 428, 2024, doi: 10.3390/bs14050428.
- [27] J. Cohen, "A Power Primer," Psychol. Bull., vol. 112, no. 1, p. 155–159, 1992, doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155.