Journal of Economics, Management, Entreprenuer, and Business

| ISSN (Online) 2797-1511 | ISSN (Print) 2797-1503 |

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52909/jemeb.v5i1.224

Employee Productivity Improvement Strategy Through Innovation: an Analysis of Digital Communication Technology and R&D in Trading Companies in Jakarta

Aprison[1], Slamet Ryadi[2], Suyanto[3], Sukesi[4], Aminullah Assagaf[5]
[1] Student of Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya Indonesia
[2] Lecturer of Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya Indonesia
[3] Lecturer of Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya Indonesia
[4] Lecturer of Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya Indonesia
[5] Lecturer of Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya Indonesia

Corresponding Author: aprison729@gmail.com [1]

Abstract: *This study analyzes how CSR, innovation, and environmental policies influence organizational sustainability. It also examines how organizational culture mediates these factors to enhance overall performance. Study employ a quantitative research design, distributing structured questionnaires to employees and management in various industries. The data were analyzed with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to assess the relationships between the independent variables (innovation, CSR, and environmental practices), the mediating variable (organizational culture), and the dependent variable (organizational sustainability). The reasuts reveal Digital communication technology strongly enhances innovation ($\beta = 0.771$, $t = 22.06$, $p < 0.001$), while R&D modestly boosts innovation ($\beta = 0.087$, $t = 1.96$, $p = 0.025$). Notably, digital technology has no direct impact on productivity ($\beta = 0.014$, $t = 0.50$, $p = 0.308$). In contrast, R&D almost perfectly drives productivity ($\beta = 0.996$, $t = 136.01$, $p < 0.001$), and innovation also contributes positively but only slightly ($\beta = 0.019$, $t = 2.00$, $p = 0.036$). All interpretations align with standard significance benchmarks ($|t| \approx 2$, $p < 0.05$). By presenting data on important factors and the mediating function of organizational culture, this study advances our understanding of organizational sustainability. It provides practitioners and policymakers with helpful ideas on how to take use of these characteristics to enhance performance. A comprehensive model of organizational sustainability is created by this research by combining five independent variables, a mediating variable, and a dependent variable. It presents a fresh viewpoint on how internal variables amplify the influence of sustainability drivers by highlighting the function of organizational culture, offering a comprehensive strategy for enhancing sustainability.*

Keyword: *Innovation, CSR, Environmental Practise, Organizational Culture*

INTRODUCTION

Employee productivity in Jakarta in 2023 has shown notable dynamics, shaped by factors such as the adaptation to new post-pandemic work patterns, advancements in technology, and global economic challenges. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, many trading companies in Jakarta have implemented a hybrid working model that blends in-office and remote work. Research by Bachri et al. (2024) indicates that this hybrid model has positively influenced employee productivity, resulting in a 15% increase compared to the previous year. The flexibility provided by this approach enables employees to achieve a better balance between their personal and professional lives.

Figure 1. Employee Productivity per Province in 2023
Source: https://bps.go.id

Figure 1 highlights that Jakarta province ranks first in employee productivity among workers in Indonesia, with an index of 404.21. This can be attributed to Jakarta's role as the nation's economic and business hub, hosting a high concentration of large corporations, creative industries, and service sectors. This competitive environment drives workers to enhance their productivity to secure or advance their positions in the labor market (Pranata, 2018). A trading company in Jakarta is a company engaged in buying and selling goods or commodities in bulk and retail, which are then distributed to local and international markets (Fachrudin et al., 2021). Jakarta is the center of trade in Indonesia, so many companies are headquartered there and involved in various trading sectors, ranging from raw materials, consumer products, to export commodities.

A growing challenge in some trading companies is the issue of "digital fatigue." According to a study by Dienlin & Johannes (2020), approximately 40% of employees exhibit symptoms of digital fatigue, which adversely affects their productivity. In response, many companies have introduced "digital detox" initiatives and time management training programs to help employees address this issue. Conversely, the integration of technology and automation across various business sectors in Jakarta has significantly enhanced employee efficiency and productivity. A study by Judijanto et al. (2023) reports a 22% increase in employee productivity within the financial services and information technology sectors that have implemented digital technology solutions in their operations.

A competitive business environment can drive employee productivity, which is a primary objective for companies. High employee productivity can provide competitive advantages, operational efficiency, and sustainable business growth (Muhammad et al., 2022; Ehsan & Ali, 2019). In an era of rapid development, innovation emerges as a key factor influencing employee productivity (Van Ark, 2016; Mohnen, 2019)

The implementation of R&D strategies to enhance employee productivity also positively impacts a company's competitiveness. By producing more innovative or superior products or services compared to competitors, companies can gain a competitive edge in the market and increase their market share (Koutroumpis et al., 2020). R&D enables companies to continuously adapt to market changes, identify new consumer needs, and develop relevant business strategies (Ugur et al., 2016; Bhattacharya et al., 2021). This helps companies remain relevant, sustainable, and grow amidst intense competition.

An analytical study by experts identified a theoretical research gap, possibly due to differences in research objects, industries studied, or the samples selected by researchers. For instance, research conducted at PT. Haier Electrical Appliances Indonesia revealed that the work environment and work discipline significantly influence employee productivity. Work discipline has a significant positive effect on employee productivity, while the work environment does not directly affect employee performance but does so indirectly through employee productivity, which is influenced by work discipline ((Awaliah & Hidayat, 2023). Meanwhile, research by Ndruru et al. (2022) at PT. Trikarya Cemerlang Medan found that communication and motivation individually have a significant effect on employee productivity. Communication and motivation contribute 72.8% to employee productivity, with the remaining 27.2% influenced by other factors.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a quantitative verification method, using explanatory research to examine variable status and inter-variable influence, ultimately explaining causal relationships through hypothesis testing (Sugiyono, 2013). Hernawati (2017) notes that verification research aims to reassess previous theories, potentially strengthening or disproving them.

The research focuses on employees of trading companies in Jakarta's trading and service sectors. Data was collected through questionnaires and documentation, with purposive sampling used to select participants. A Likert scale was applied for measurement, and validity testing was conducted using SPSS 23 and Smart PLS 3.0

Population and Sample

According to Hair (2021), a population consists of objects or subjects with specific qualities and characteristics studied to draw conclusions. This study's population included 4,580 employees of trading companies in Jakarta.

The researchers used purposive sampling to select 368 samples, a method that targets individuals or groups meeting specific criteria (Singh & Masuku, 2014), ensuring relevant and detailed information aligned with the research objectives.

Data Collection

A questionnaire is a data collection method where respondents are given a series of written questions or statements to answer. It can consist of closed or multiple-choice questions, where predefined answer options are provided. The questionnaire in this study includes 107 statements related to the variables outlined in the variable operationalization. This is a closed questionnaire, meaning the responses are restricted to specific options determined by the researcher.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using SmartPLS 3, a path analysis software. The analysis aimed to examine the relationships between digital communication technology, research and development, innovation, and employee productivity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Objects of Research

This study examines 15 trading companies, comprising 7 B2B and 8 B2C enterprises, offering products such as smartphones, computers, air conditioners, refrigerators, clothing, and food and beverages. B2B companies cater to the needs of other businesses, while B2C companies target end consumers directly. The analysis aims to highlight the differences in strategies and employee work cultures between these two types of companies.

Respondent Demographic

Table 1. Respondents Demographic

Demography	Characteristic	Frequence	Percentage
Gender	Male	211	57.3
	Female	157	42.7
	Total	368	100.0
Age	17-20 years	30	8.0
	21-30 years	45	12.2
	31-40 years	155	42.1
	41-50 years	134	36.4
	>50 years	4	1.3
	Total	368	100.0
Education	High School	25	7.0
	Scholar	312	84.7
	Master's/Doctoral	31	8.3
	Total	368	100.0
Occupation	Operator	42	11.4
	Supervisor	114	31.0
	Manager	50	13.6
	Others	162	44.0
	Total	368	100.0

Source: processed by researchers

Table above presents respondent demographics, including gender, age, education, company type, and position. Among 368 respondents, males dominate with 211 individuals (57.3%), while females make up the rest. Most respondents are aged 31-40 (155 respondents or 42.1%) and 41-50 (134 respondents or 36.4%). The majority hold an undergraduate degree (312 respondents or 84.7%), with the remainder having high school or doctoral-level education. Supervisors constitute the largest group (31%), followed by managers and operators.

Convergent Validity Test (Loading Factor)

The measurement model (outer model) will be evaluated using structural equation modeling (SEM) with a partial least squares (Smart PLS) approach. The initial evaluation involves analyzing the factor loading values for indicators of several variables: Digital Communication Technology (X1), R&D (X2), Innovation (Z), and Employee Productivity (Y). The researcher will determine whether each variable's factor loading meets the Smart PLS threshold of 0.7 or higher (Hair, 2021).

Outer loading, or Loading Factor (LF), represents the correlation between each measurement item and its corresponding variable, indicating how well the item reflects the variable

(Hair, 2021; Henseler et al., 2015). While there is no universal standard, Hair (2021) suggest a threshold of LF ≥ 0.70. However, Chin (1998) considers LF values of ≥ 0.60 acceptable. This study follows Chin's recommendation, using LF ≥ 0.60 as the benchmark. Figure 4.1 presents the first estimation of loading factors based on Chin's criteria.

Table 2. The Convergent Validity Test Result

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading	Condition	Information
***Employee Productivity* (Y)**	EP1	0.648	>0.6	Valid
	EP2	0.654	>0.6	Valid
	EP3	0.745	>0.6	Valid
	EP4	0.693	>0.6	Valid
	EP5	0.805	>0.6	Valid
	EP6	0.764	>0.6	Valid
	EP7	0.699	>0.6	Valid
	EP8	0.694	>0.6	Valid
	EP9	0.656	>0.6	Valid
	EP10	0.661	>0.6	Valid
***Innovation* (Z)**	INV1	0.643	>0.6	Valid
	INV2	0.654	>0.6	Valid
	INV3	0.603	>0.6	Valid
	INV4	0.652	>0.6	Valid
	INV5	0.620	>0.6	Valid
	INV6	0.636	>0.6	Valid
	INV7	0.676	>0.6	Valid
***Digital Communication Technology* (X1)**	DCT1	0.636	>0.6	Valid
	DCT2	0.731	>0.6	Valid
	DCT3	0.672	>0.6	Valid
	DCT4	0.705	>0.6	Valid
	DCT5	0.703	>0.6	Valid
	DCT6	0.746	>0.6	Valid
	DCT7	0.646	>0.6	Valid
	DCT8	0.653	>0.6	Valid
	DCT9	0.645	>0.6	Valid
	DCT10	0.612	>0.6	Valid
***Research and Development* (X2)**	RD1	0.648	>0.6	Valid
	RD2	0.648	>0.6	Valid
	RD3	0.656	>0.6	Valid
	RD4	0.736	>0.6	Valid
	RD5	0.692	>0.6	Valid
	RD6	0.793	>0.6	Valid
	RD7	0.757	>0.6	Valid
	RD8	0.691	>0.6	Valid
	RD9	0.704	>0.6	Valid
	RD10	0.654	>0.6	Valid
	RD11	0.662	>0.6	Valid

Output Smart-PLS 3

Due to the fact that each indicator has a loading factor value greater than 0.70, the final results of the Convergent Validity test demonstrate that all indicators are valid and satisfy the Convergent Validity.

Discriminant Validity

The cross-loading values reflect how strongly each indicator correlates with its own construct compared to other constructs, offering crucial insight into discriminant validity. A commonly accepted benchmark is that an indicator's loading on its intended construct should be at least 0.6—and notably higher than its loadings on other constructs (Shin, 2017). Discriminant validity is confirmed when the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each construct exceeds its correlations with any other construct, and each AVE itself is above 0.5 to ensure convergent validity. In the current model, all constructs meet these criteria—their AVE roots surpass inter-construct correlations, and AVE values exceed 0.5—indicating strong discriminant validity and clear measurement distinctions among constructs.

Table 3. The Average Variance Extracted Test Result

Variable	Condition	AVE
Employee Productivity (Y)	> 0.5	0.595
Innovation (Z)	> 0.5	0.548
Digital Communication Technology (X1)	> 0.5	0.557
Research & Development (X2)	> 0.5	0.585

Table 3. describe every variables has a good AVE value. For Employee Productivity, Innovation, Digital Communication Technology, Research & Development already have 0.5 score.

Table 4. The Discriminant Validity Test Result (Fornell-Lacker Criterion)

Variable	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Innovation (Z)	0.913				
Employee Productivity(Y)	0.557	0.783			
Research & Development (X2)	0.491	0.781	0.921		
Digital Communication Technology (X1)	0.546	0.789	0.914	0.908	

When each construct's √AVE exceeds its correlations with all other constructs, we can conclude that the model meets discriminant validity standards. This means that each construct explains more of its own indicators' variance than it shares with others. Additionally, because all AVE values in this model exceed 0.50, convergent validity is also confirmed.

Regarding reliability, both Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability (CR) were calculated for all latent variables. With Cronbach's Alpha ≥ 0.70 and CR ≥ 0.70 for each construct, the instruments demonstrate strong internal consistency and dependability. This indicates that the questionnaire items reliably measure their intended constructs, ensuring the overall measurement model is both valid and reliable.

Table 5. Validity and Reliability Construct Test Result

Variable	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Composite Reliability**	**Information**
Employee Productivity (Y)	0.886	0.907	Reliable
Innovation (Z)	0.825	0.866	Reliable
Digital Communication Technology (X1)	0.867	0.893	Reliable
Research & Development (X2)	0.893	0.912	Reliable

Output Smart-PLS 3.0

Structural Model Test (Inner Model)

The Structural Model Test evaluates how well a model functions within a given context by assessing its robustness, reliability, and predictive capability. This process is grounded in a conceptual framework and relies heavily on inner model analysis, particularly the R-squared (R^2) value to evaluate model fit (Hair et al., 2021). R^2, ranging from 0 to 1, shows how much variance in dependent variables is explained by independent variables—the higher the R^2, the better the predictive accuracy. However, R^2 tends to increase as more predictors are added, even if those predictors contribute little, which means R^2 must be interpreted in context. Ultimately, the R-square value for each dependent variable is determined through data analysis to assess whether the model provides meaningful explanatory and predictive power.

Table 6. R-Square Test Result

Variable	R-Square
Innovation	0.703
Employee Productivity	0.992

Output Smart PLS 3.0

The R^2 coefficient measures the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the model, ranging from 0 to 1 and indicating how effectively the model captures variation in the data.

For Innovation ($R^2 = 0.703$), approximately 70.3% of its variation is accounted for by the model. This is considered a good fit, especially in fields like economics or social sciences where values between 0.5–0.7 are viewed positively. It indicates that the predictors are meaningfully linked to innovation outcomes, offering robust explanatory power.

In contrast, Employee Productivity ($R^2 = 0.992$) shows that the model explains an astonishing 99.2% of the variance—an exceptionally high result. While this suggests near-perfect predictive power, such a high R^2 may also point toward overfitting, where the model captures noise or sample-specific patterns rather than true general relationships.

Table 7. The F-Square Test Result

Variable	F-Square	Information
Innovation > Employee Productivity	0.010	Weak
R&D > Innovation	0.011	Weak
R&D > Employee Productivity	43.110	Strong
Digital Communication Tech > Innovation	0.835	Medium
Digital Communication Tech > Emp. Productivity	0.001	Weak

Output Smart PLS 3.0

The F^2 (F-square) metric is used in structural equation modeling to assess the effect size or practical impact of one construct on another. According to Cohen (1988), which is widely cited in PLS-SEM literature, F^2 values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 correspond to small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively in table 6. Innovation → Employee Productivity ($F^2 = 0.010$), This falls below 0.02, indicating a negligible effect, meaning innovation has little practical influence on productivity. R&D → Innovation ($F^2 = 0.011$), Also below small threshold, showing a very weak effect, suggesting R&D contributes minimally to innovation in this model. R&D → Employee Productivity ($F^2 = 43.110$), This extraordinarily large value—far above 0.35—indicates a very strong effect, with R&D exerting a dominant influence on productivity. Digital Communication Technology → Innovation ($F^2 = 0.835$), again well above 0.35, this highlights a large effect, demonstrating that digital communication technologies significantly drive innovation. Digital Communication Technology → Employee Productivity ($F^2 = 0.001$): Also negligible, showing virtually no effect on productivity. Overall, R&D strongly impacts employee productivity, and digital communication technology significantly enhances innovation. The other pathways have minimal practical influence and might warrant reconsideration or further exploration if they were expected to play major roles.

Table 8. Hypothesis Testing Results

No	Hypothesis	Coefficient (β)	Standard Deviation	T-Statistics	P Value	Description	Results
H1	Digital Communication Tech → Innovation	0.771	0.035	22.057	0.000	Significant Positive	Accepted
H2	R&D → Innovation	0.087	0.044	1.961	0.025	Significant Positive	Accepted
H3	Digital Communication Tech → Employee Productivity	0.014	0.029	0.502	0.308	Not-Significant Positive	Rejected
H4	R&D → Employee Productivity	0.996	0.007	136.01	0.000	Significant Positive	Accepted
H5	Innovation → Employee Productivity	0.019	0.001	1.999	0.036	Significant Positive	Accepted

Output Smart PLS 3.0

The table summarizes the hypothesis testing outcomes for key structural paths in the model. All path coefficients (β) are standardized, and their significance is assessed using t-statistics and p-values.

Overall, the guidelines for evaluating significance in PLS-SEM indicate that a t-statistic above approximately 1.96 (for a 95% confidence level) and a p-value below 0.05 denote a statistically significant positive effect.

Digital Communication Tech → Innovation has a β of 0.771, t = 22.057, and p < 0.001. This indicates a very strong, highly significant positive effect, confirming that digital communication technologies robustly foster innovation. R&D → Innovation yields β = 0.087, t = 1.961, p = 0.025—just passing the threshold (t ≈ 1.96 and p < 0.05), signifying a modest but statistically significant positive effect of R&D on innovation. Digital Communication Tech → Employee Productivity shows a β of 0.014, t = 0.502, p = 0.308. Since the t-value is very low and the p-value exceeds 0.05, this indicates an insignificant effect, and the hypothesis is rejected accordingly. R&D → Employee Productivity stands out with β = 0.996, t = 136.01, p < 0.001, signifying a near-perfect, highly significant positive relationship, meaning R&D is a dominant driver of employee productivity. Innovation → Employee Productivity has β = 0.019, t = 1.999, p = 0.036. Although the coefficient is small, it meets the significance criteria, indicating a statistically significant but modest positive effect.

In summary, four out of five hypothesized paths are supported: Digital Communication Tech and R&D both significantly influence innovation (strong and moderate, respectively), R&D strongly drives productivity, and innovation itself contributes modestly to productivity. Only the effect of Digital Communication Tech directly on productivity is unsupported. These findings adhere to conventional hypothesis-testing standards, where high t-values and p-values below 0.05 provide confidence in accepting hypothesized relationships .

Table 9. Mediation Test

Hypothesis	Coefficient (β)	Standard Deviation	T-Statistics	P Value	Description	Results
Digital Communication Tech → Innovation →Employee Productivity	0.014	0.008	1.804	0.036	Not-Significant	Rejected
R&D → Innovation → Employee Productivity	0.002	0.001	1.178	0.120	Not-Significant	Rejected

Output Smart PLS 3.0

The mediation analysis tested whether Innovation mediates the relationship between Digital Communication Technology and Employee Productivity, and separately, whether Innovation mediates the impact of R&D on Employee Productivity. Both indirect paths were found to be non-significant:

For the path Digital Communication Tech → Innovation → Employee Productivity, the standardized indirect effect ($\beta = 0.014$, $t = 1.804$, $p = 0.036$) does not meet the common significance threshold ($t < \sim 1.96$ for 95% confidence, $p > 0.05$), leading to rejection of the mediation hypothesis.

Similarly, the path R&D → Innovation → Employee Productivity has an indirect effect of $\beta = 0.002$ with $t = 1.178$ and $p = 0.120$, which is clearly non-significant, resulting in rejection of this mediation as well.

In practical terms, this means that although Digital Communication Technology and R&D may influence Innovation, these effects do not translate into measurable indirect impacts on Employee Productivity through Innovation. Instead, any productivity gains likely arise through other direct mechanisms not captured by Innovation as a mediator.

Predictive-relevance (Q2) value is used to measure the goodness of the structural fit model on the inner model. The model has a predictive relevance value if the Q-Square value is greater than 0 (zero). The following computation shows the R-Square value for each endogenous variable used in this study:

Table 10. The Construct Cross-Validation Redundancy Test Results (Q^2)

Variable	SSO	SSE	Q2 (=1-SSE/SSO)
Innovation (Z)	2464	1745	**0.292**
Employee Productivity (Y)	3080	1945	**0.368**
Digital Communication Tech (X1)	3080	2113	**0.314**
R&D	3388	2138	**0.369**

Output Smart PLS 3.0

The Q^2 statistic evaluates the predictive relevance of a structural model. A positive Q^2 value indicates the model can accurately reconstruct and predict the data of endogenous variables. Innovation ($Q^2 = 0.292$): A Q^2 above zero demonstrates that the model has predictive relevance for innovation. With a value between 0.25 and 0.5, this suggests a moderate to strong ability to predict innovation based on its predictors. Employee Productivity ($Q^2 = 0.368$): Similarly positive and between 0.25 and 0.5, indicating good predictive power for employee productivity. Digital Communication Tech ($Q^2 = 0.314$): Also falls within the moderate-to-strong predictive range, showing the model effectively predicts values for this construct. R&D ($Q^2 = 0.369$): At 0.369, this construct has strong predictive relevance, meaning the outputs for R&D are reliably estimated by the model.

All Q^2 values significantly exceed zero, confirming that the model possesses predictive relevance for each of these endogenous constructs. By conventional thresholds (0.02 small, 0.15 medium, 0.35 large), the Q^2 scores of approximately 0.3–0.37 reflect moderate-to-high predictive accuracy, reinforcing the model's robustness in forecasting unseen data points for innovation, productivity, technology use, and R&D capacity. In summary, your model is well-suited for making predictions across these key variables, striking a good balance between explanatory and predictive performance.

CONCLUSION

With a t-statistic value of more than 1.96, all variables and hypotheses demonstrate positive significant results that can be accepted. Additionally, if all variables have a significant effect, the p-value of each hypothesis variable that is less than 0.05 can be explained except hypothesis 3.

Overall, the model demonstrates strong predictive validity across key endogenous variables—Innovation, Employee Productivity, Digital Communication Technology, and R&D—all showing positive Q^2 values in the range of 0.29 to 0.37, which indicates moderate-to-strong predictive relevance.

Among direct effects, Digital Communication Technology has a robust impact on Innovation ($\beta = 0.771$, $p < 0.001$), and R&D exerts a near-perfect, statistically significant influence on Employee Productivity ($\beta = 0.996$, $p < 0.001$). The effect of Innovation on productivity is small yet significant, whereas Digital Communication Technology shows no direct influence on productivity. These findings are supported by substantial effect sizes ($F^2 > 0.35$) for the strong relationships identified between R&D → Productivity and Digital Tech → Innovation . Mediation analysis further reveals that Innovation does not mediate the effects of either Digital Technology or R&D on productivity—both indirect paths were non-significant. Taken together, the evidence indicates that to enhance productivity, organizations should prioritize R&D investments, while digital communication technology should be leveraged to stimulate innovation. Innovation itself offers only modest direct productivity gains, and expectations of mediating effects through innovation are unsupported by the data.

The practical suggestion from this study is that to maximize impact from your model's results, begin by deepening investment in R&D, as this is the strongest driver of employee productivity. Embrace Agile methodologies such as short sprint cycles, daily stand-ups, and retrospective reviews to boost R&D output efficiency by 20–30% and enhance collaboration among teams . Complement this with digital communication technologies—such as Slack, Microsoft Teams, and collaborative platforms—that have been shown to significantly foster innovation by enabling real-time knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and spontaneous idea generation. Because innovation in isolation has only modest effects on productivity, pair these tools with AI-enhanced workflows that automate administrative tasks (e.g., scheduling, document summarization, chatbots) to free employee time for creative and high-value work—a combination seen to boost both innovation and productivity substantially . Furthermore, invest in continuous training, goal alignment, and well-being support to ensure employees are prepared to leverage these systems effectively. Finally, implement ongoing performance tracking using predictive Q^2 insights and effect-size diagnostics, adapting strategies as results emerge to maintain momentum and drive sustained performance improvements.

To amplify employee productivity and innovation, organizations should prioritize R&D efforts and integrate Agile frameworks such as sprints, cross-functional teams, and frequent iterations. Research shows that Agile methods in R&D can improve efficiency by up to 20%, enable rapid risk mitigation, and foster continuous improvement through early feedback cycles. Meanwhile, deploying digital communication tools like Slack, Microsoft Teams, and collaborative platforms can significantly enhance innovation outcomes by enabling real-time knowledge sharing and cross-team collaboration. However, given that digital tools did not directly boost productivity, it's essential to supplement tech investments with people-focused HR strategies. Implement SMART objectives, continuous training, and employee wellbeing initiatives to ensure staff are ready and motivated to use these tools effectively.

To fully leverage innovation and digital communication, consider integrating AI-driven automation to take over routine tasks—such as scheduling and document summarization—which frees up time for creative and high-value work. Furthermore, introduce knowledge management systems and job enrichment programs to ensure innovations are captured, shared, and translated into productivity gains. Finally, embrace continuous monitoring using predictive metrics (e.g., Q^2 values around 0.3–0.37) and effect-size diagnostics (F^2) to measure impact, refine strategies, and validate structural relationships over time. By combining targeted R&D investment, digital collaboration, AI-enabled efficiency, and strong HR infrastructure, your organization can drive both innovation and productivity in a balanced, sustainable manner.

REFERENCES

Andriyanty, R., Komalasari, F., & Rambe, D. (2021). Corporate Culture Mediated By Performance. *Journal of Applied Management (JAM)*, *19*(3). https://jurnaljam.ub.ac.id/index.php/jam/article/view/1948

Awaliah, N. H., & Hidayat, R. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas dengan Implikasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi pada Karyawan PT.Haier Electrical Appliances Indonesia). *Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif*, *5*(3), 370. https://doi.org/10.32493/jee.v5i3.28713

Bachri, S., Sumawidjaja, R. N., Sudaryo, Y., Ali, M. M., Herlinawati, E., & Aziz, D. A. (2024). The influence of hybrid work and work-life balance on the performance of PT. Tuest tech Indonesia employees. *Jurnal Scientia*, *13*(01 SE-Articles), 456–464. https://infor.seaninstitute.org/index.php/pendidikan/article/view/2196

Bhattacharya, M., Okafor, L. E., & Pradeep, V. (2021). International firm activities, R&D, and productivity: Evidence from Indian manufacturing firms. *Economic Modelling*, *97*(January), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2021.01.012

Campbell, B. A., & Banerjee, P. M. (2012). Knowledge complementarities: human capital management and R&D investment in high-technology firms. *International Journal of Strategic Change Management*, *4*(3/4), 335. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijscm.2012.051865

Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach for structural equation modeling. *Modern Methods for Business Research*, *April*, 295–336.

Cin, B. C., Kim, Y. J., & Vonortas, N. S. (2017). The impact of public R&D subsidy on small firm productivity: evidence from Korean SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, *48*(2), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9786-x

Dienlin, T., & Johannes, N. (2020). The impact of digital technology use on adolescent well-being. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, *22*(2), 135–142. https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2020.22.2/tdienlin

Ehsan, M., & Ali, K. (2019). The Impact of Work Stress on Employee Productivity: Based in the Banking sector of Faisalabad, Pakistan. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development*, *4*(6), 32–50. https://doi.org/10.18775/ijied.1849-7551-7020.2015.46.2003

Fachrudin, D. H., Rahayu, A., Fattah, N., & Wibowo, L. A. (2021). The Mediating Role of Dynamic Capabilities and Business Model Innovation on the Relationship Between Environment Turbulence and Firm Performance. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, *191*(AICoBPA 2020), 20–25.

Friesenbichler, K. S. (2016). Innovation, Competition and Productivity: Firm Level Evidence for Eastern Europe and Central Asia. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *516*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2764249

Hair, J. F. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R A Workbook. In *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* (Vol. 30, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2022.2108813

Hashim, M. Z., Razak, R. C., Muhammad, N., Ahlami, F., Mansor, F. A., Nor, W., & Wan, H. (2022). *The Determinants of Digital Workplace Adoption : A Conceptual Framework The Determinants of Digital Workplace Adoption : A Conceptual Framework*. *1*(10), 477–492. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i10/14822

Hassine, A. B. H. (2022). The challenges of digital transformation, problems and promises : Case of Tunisian SMEs. *Quantitative Economics and Management Studies*, *3*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.35877/454ri.qems448

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). *A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling*. 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hossain, M. E., Mahmud, I., & M. Idrus, R. (2021). Modelling End Users Continuance Intention To Use Information Systems In Academic Settings: Expectation-Confirmation And Stress Perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, *16*, 371–395.

Judijanto, L., Supriyanto, W., Afin, A., & Mayndarto, E. C. (2023). The Impact of Digital Technology Implementation on the Productivity of MSMEs in Jakarta: An Analysis of E-commerce Adoption, Business Process Automation, and Business Growth. *West Science Journal Economic and Entrepreneurship*, *1*(12), 453–462. https://doi.org/10.58812/wsjee.v1i12.448

Kahn, A., Sithole, M., & Buchana, Y. (2022). An analysis of the impact of technological innovation on productivity in South African manufacturing firms using direct measures of innovation. *South African Journal of Economics*, *90*(1), 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/saje.12310

Koutroumpis, P., Leiponen, A., & Thomas, L. D. W. (2020). Small is big in ICT: The impact of R&D on productivity. *Telecommunications Policy*, *44*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2019.101833

Li, G., Zhou, X., & Bao, Z. (2022). A Win–Win Opportunity: The Industrial Pollution Reduction Effect of Digital Economy Development—A Quasi-Natural Experiment Based on the "Broadband China" Strategy. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095583

Ma, X., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Digital innovation risk management model of discrete manufacturing enterprise based on big data analysis. *Journal of Global Information Management*, *30*(7), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4018/JGIM.286761

Mohnen, P. (2019). R&D, innovation and productivity. *The Palgrave Handbook of Economic Performance Analysis*, *822781*, 97–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23727-1_4

Muhammad, A. M., Trang, I., & Saerang, R. T. (2022). Penempatan, Komunikasi Dan Disiplin Pengaruhnya Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada Seluruh Holland Bakery Cabang Kota Manado Placement, Communication and Discipline Effect on Employee Work Productivity in All Holland Bakery Manado City Branch. *Jurnal EMBA*, *10*(1), 735–744.

Ndruru, K., Waruwu, M., Tarigan, J., & Silaen, N. R. (2022). Pengaruh Komunikasi Dan Motivasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Di Pt. Trikarya Cemerlang Medan. *Jurnal Global Manajemen*, *11*(2), 170. https://doi.org/10.46930/global.v11i2.2545

Nguyen, H. N., Le, Q. H., Tran, Q. B., Tran, T. H. M., Nguyen, T. H. Y., & Nguyen, T. T. Q. (2020). The impact of organizational commitment on employee motivation: A study in Vietnamese enterprises. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *7*(6), 439–447. https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO6.439

Pranata, T. R. (2018). Pengaruh dari Pelatihan, Penerapan SOP, Peralatan Terhadap Produktivitas Pekerja di PT . Selectrix Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *12*(9).

Tetteh, C. K. (2024). R&D, innovation and labour productivity: Evidence from the manufacturing sector in Ghana. *Scientific African*, *24*(October 2023), e02136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2024.e02136

Ugur, M., Trushin, E., Solomon, E., & Guidi, F. (2016). R&D and productivity in OECD firms and industries: A hierarchical meta-regression analysis. *Research Policy*, *45*(10), 2069–2086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.08.001

Van Ark, B. (2016). The Productivity Paradox of the New Digital Economy. *International Productivity Monitor*, *31*(Fall), 3–18. https://www.conference-board.org/data/economy-

Yaw Obeng, A., & Boachie, E. (2018). The impact of IT-technological innovation on the productivity of a bank's employee. *Cogent Business and Management*, *5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1470449

Yuan, Y. H. (2022). A Study From a Psychological Perspective of High Performance to Explore the Relationship Among Resource Bricolage, Social Capital, Entrepreneurial Attitude, and Intention. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(July), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.944151