JOURNAL OF VENTURE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
Volume: 1 | Issue: 2 | Year: 2026

The Effect of Communication, Motivation, and Teamwork on Employee Performance at Multi Paper Stationery

M. Faaiz Aqiila Naufal[1*] Yateno[2] Suwarto[3]
1,2,3 Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro, Indonesia
* Corresponding Author: faizaqila960@gmail.com

Received : 02 March 2026
Revised : 06 Mei 2026
Accepted : 14 Juni 2026
Published: 17 July 2026

Abstract

This study examines the effect of communication, motivation, and teamwork on employee performance at Multi Paper Stationery, an office-supplies wholesaler in Metro, Lampung. A quantitative survey approach was applied, with a saturated (census) sample of all 43 employees. Data were collected through interviews, documentation, and a questionnaire that was tested for validity and reliability, and were analysed using multiple linear regression in SPSS, preceded by classical assumption tests of normality, linearity, and homogeneity. The results show that communication, motivation, and teamwork each have a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance, and that the three variables jointly exert a significant simultaneous effect, explaining 74.3 percent of the variance in performance. Teamwork recorded the largest standardised effect, indicating that coordinated effort is the most influential determinant of performance in this wholesale setting. These findings indicate that clearer communication, stronger work motivation, and more effective teamwork are associated with higher employee performance. The study contributes to human resource management research in small wholesale enterprises and recommends that management strengthen two-way communication, recognition and goal-setting, and team-building to sustain employee performance.

Keywords: *Communication; Motivation; Teamwork; Employee performance; Human resource management*

1. Introduction

Human resources are among the most important assets in the development of an organisation, and their management is a critical factor in achieving organisational goals. Employee performance, in particular, reflects the extent of an employee's contribution to the organisation and signals the progress of a firm in its business activities. Firms therefore need to understand the factors that influence employee performance, among which communication, motivation, and teamwork are widely regarded as important (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

Multi Paper Stationery is an office-supplies store in Metro, Lampung, that operates on a wholesale basis and distributes stationery to offices, schools, and retail stores across the region. Its sales targets and achievements during 2021 to 2023 fluctuated: the firm fell short of its target in 2021 but met or exceeded its targets in 2022 and 2023, indicating that performance is sensitive to the management of human factors that shape how employees work.

Communication is a primary determinant of performance, as effective communication between supervisors and employees creates coordination that improves outcomes, whereas poor communication reduces performance (de Vries et al., 2010). Interviews at Multi Paper Stationery

revealed communication problems, including unclear information about goals, policies, and changes, and directives that did not reach all parties. Motivation is similarly important, since it builds enthusiasm and willingness to work; interviews indicated low motivation, with employees working only to meet obligations and feeling insufficiently recognised (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Locke & Latham, 2002). Teamwork, which generates positive energy through coordinated effort, was also problematic, with employees focusing on personal targets and unresolved interpersonal tensions (LePine et al., 2008).

Prior research consistently reports that communication, motivation, and teamwork significantly affect employee performance, yet much of this evidence comes from larger firms and service or manufacturing settings. Evidence specific to small wholesale enterprises remains limited, which constitutes the research gap addressed here (Anitha, 2014; Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).

Accordingly, this study examines the effect of communication, motivation, and teamwork on employee performance at Multi Paper Stationery. The study contributes to human resource management research in small wholesale enterprises and provides practical recommendations for improving performance. The objectives are to analyse the partial and simultaneous effects of the three variables on performance.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Theoretical Foundation

Communication is the process of sharing meaning through verbal and non-verbal behaviour between two or more people, enabling coordination within an organisation. Effective leader and team communication is associated with knowledge sharing and improved outcomes (de Vries et al., 2010). Motivation is the internal drive that energises effort toward goals; self-determination theory and goal-setting theory hold that motivation, supported by recognition and clear goals, raises performance (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Locke & Latham, 2002), and meta-analytic evidence confirms that intrinsic motivation and incentives jointly predict performance (Cerasoli et al., 2014).

Teamwork is the coordinated effort of individuals with diverse backgrounds and skills who complement one another to achieve shared goals. Meta-analytic and review evidence shows that teamwork processes are positively related to team effectiveness and performance (LePine et al., 2008; Mathieu et al., 2008; Salas et al., 2005). Employee performance, finally, is the level of achievement in completing assigned tasks, measured through quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, and work commitment (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).

2.2 Hypothesis Development

Drawing on human resource management theory and prior evidence, effective communication is expected to raise performance through coordination (de Vries et al., 2010), motivation is expected to raise performance through enthusiasm and effort (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Locke & Latham, 2002), and teamwork is expected to raise performance through coordinated effort (LePine et al., 2008). The hypotheses are therefore:

H1: Communication has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

H2: Motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

H3: Teamwork has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

H4: Communication, motivation, and teamwork jointly have a significant effect on employee performance.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative survey design to test the effects of communication, motivation, and teamwork on employee performance at Multi Paper Stationery in Metro, Lampung.

3.2 Data Collection

The population comprised all 43 employees of the firm, and a saturated (census) sampling technique was applied so that the entire population served as respondents. Data were collected through interviews, documentation, and a questionnaire that was tested for validity and reliability prior to hypothesis testing.

3.3 Data Analysis

Data were analysed using multiple linear regression in SPSS 25, preceded by classical assumption tests of normality, linearity, and homogeneity. Hypothesis testing was conducted through the partial t-test, the simultaneous F-test, and the coefficient of determination.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

The sales targets and achievements that motivated the study are summarised in Table 1, showing a shortfall in 2021 followed by achievement in 2022 and 2023.

Table 1. Sales targets and achievements, 2021 to 2023 (boxes)

Year	Target	Achievement	Outcome
2021	30,297	29,050	Below target
2022	45,896	46,814	Above target
2023	39,009	41,960	Above target

Source: Multi Paper Stationery, 2024

The classical assumption tests, summarised in Table 2, confirmed that the model met the required conditions: the variables were normally distributed, the relationships were linear, and the variances were homogeneous.

Table 2. Classical assumption test results

Test	Significance	Conclusion
Normality (X1, K-S)	0.051	Normal
Normality (X2, K-S)	0.076	Normal
Normality (X3, K-S)	0.081	Normal
Normality (Y, K-S)	0.065	Normal
Linearity (deviation, X1; X2; X3)	0.593; 0.160; 0.304	Linear
Homogeneity (X1; X2; X3)	0.200; 0.255; 0.145	Homogeneous

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026

The multiple linear regression results are presented in Table 3. The estimated equation is Y = 16.203 + 2.198X1 + 2.085X2 + 4.704X3. All three predictors recorded significance values below 0.05, so H1, H2, and H3 are supported, with teamwork exhibiting the largest standardised coefficient.

Table 3. Multiple linear regression coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t / Sig.

(Constant)	16.203	6.918	-	2.342 / 0.024
Communication (X1)	2.198	0.084	0.288	2.358 / 0.023
Motivation (X2)	2.085	0.124	0.104	3.683 / 0.009
Teamwork (X3)	4.704	0.115	0.752	6.120 / 0.000

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026. Dependent variable: employee performance.

The simultaneous F-test, summarised in Table 4, produced a value of 37.556 with a significance of 0.000, confirming that the three variables jointly affect performance, so H4 is supported. The coefficient of determination is 0.743, indicating that the three variables explain 74.3 percent of the variance in employee performance, while the remaining 25.7 percent is attributable to other factors.

Table 4. Simultaneous test and coefficient of determination

Statistic	Value	Conclusion
F-value (Sig.)	37.556 (0.000)	Significant
R	0.862	-
R-squared	0.743	74.3% explained
Adjusted R-squared	0.723	-

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 25, 2026

4.2 Discussion

The significant effect of communication on performance supports H1 and indicates that clearer communication improves coordination and outcomes. This finding is consistent with research linking effective communication to knowledge sharing and performance (de Vries et al., 2010). Addressing the communication problems identified, such as unclear information and undelivered directives, through regular meetings and internal communication channels can therefore raise performance.

The significant effect of motivation supports H2 and shows that stronger motivation, supported by recognition and clear goals, raises performance. This result aligns with self-determination and goal-setting theory and with meta-analytic evidence that motivation predicts performance (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Locke & Latham, 2002). The significant effect of teamwork supports H3 and, with the largest standardised coefficient, identifies coordinated effort as the most influential determinant of performance, consistent with evidence that teamwork processes drive effectiveness (LePine et al., 2008; Mathieu et al., 2008).

Jointly, the three variables significantly affect performance, explaining nearly three-quarters of its variance, which confirms that performance is the synergistic outcome of communication, motivation, and teamwork within a human resource management framework. Theoretically, the study extends this framework to small wholesale enterprises, while practically it implies that integrated improvements in two-way communication, recognition and goal-setting, and team-building are required to sustain performance.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the effect of communication, motivation, and teamwork on employee performance at Multi Paper Stationery. Communication, motivation, and teamwork each have a positive and significant partial effect on performance, and the three variables jointly have a significant effect, explaining 74.3 percent of the variance, with teamwork as the most dominant determinant. These results indicate that better communication, higher motivation, and stronger teamwork together raise employee performance.

The study recommends that management improve communication through regular meetings, two-way communication, and internal communication platforms; strengthen motivation through development opportunities, clear and measurable targets, and non-financial recognition; and enhance teamwork through periodic team-building, collaborative projects, and effective conflict mediation. Future research should incorporate additional variables such as leadership, compensation, and organisational culture, and extend the study to other enterprises or larger samples to improve generalisability.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the management and employees of Multi Paper Stationery for their participation. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63*(3), 308-323. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*(4), 980-1008. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035661

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 89-136. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The what and why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson Education.

de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership = communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 367-380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9140-2

Diamantidis, A. D., & Chatzoglou, P. (2019). Factors affecting employee performance: An empirical approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 68*(1), 171-193. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2018-0012

Gagne, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331-362. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: Tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology, 61*(2), 273-307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00114.x

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705-717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management, 34*(3), 410-476. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061

Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 617-635. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education.

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1217-1227. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217

Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a Big Five in teamwork? *Small Group Research, 36*(5), 555-599. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405277134

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.