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ABSTRACT

Quantitative research with an explanatory research method was used in this study. The research aimed to study the influence of the dependent variable on the independent variable. For this purpose, the study enlisted the participation of one hundred individuals and employed structural analysis methods employing Partial Least Square or PLS software. This research investigates the factors that most influence employee productivity, including work environment, career development opportunities, and job satisfaction, with job satisfaction as the moderating variable. It is possible to conclude, based on the study of the research data and the conversations that took place in the part before this one, that the Work Environment has a positive and significant effect on Employee Productivity in CV Multi Lestari Utama. It has been determined that CV Multi Lestari Utama's Career Development Program has a negligible impact on Employee Productivity. When job satisfaction positively and meaningfully impacts employee productivity, this is exactly what we are talking about. In CV Multi Lestari Utama. Job satisfaction does not have a positive impact, either directly or indirectly, on the workplace environment, which in turn does not help employee productivity. Although employee satisfaction might affect productivity in CV Multi Lestari Utama directly.
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INTRODUCTION

The year 2020 will present a number of difficulties for companies all across the world. The pandemic caused by the COVID-19 virus has had a considerable and negative impact on the overall growth of the national economy. During the first year of the COVID-19 epidemic in the year 2020, the Indonesian economy was in the red. According to the findings of Indonesia's Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the country's GDP is expected to expand at a rate that is 2.07% lower in 2020 compared to 2019 on a cumulative to cumulative basis. When it comes to output, the Transportation and Warehousing Business Field experienced a growth contraction that was the most severe, clocking in at 15.04%.

During this time, virtually every component experienced a decrease in its level of expense. The contraction that was the most severe was the Export of Goods and Services component, which was 7.70%. During this time, imports of goods and services, which are considered to be a lowering factor, saw a decrease of 14.71 percent. When compared to the previous year's fourth quarter, the economy of Indonesia saw a decline in the fourth quarter of 2020. In terms of output, the Transportation and Warehousing Business Field went through the most significant rate of growth reduction, which was 13.42%.

In terms of costs, the Export Component of Goods and Services was the one that saw the most percentage decline in growth, which was 7.21 percent. During this same time period, imports of goods and services, which are considered to be a lowering factor, decreased by 13.52 percent. In terms of production, the Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries Business Fields experienced a growth contraction that was the most severe, clocking in at 20.15 percent. The Government Consumption Expenditure Component (PK-P), which expanded by 27.15%, experienced the biggest rise in terms of expenditures and was responsible for the highest growth overall.

The COVID-19 pandemic season not only impacts the contraction of economic growth but also affects business actors who are required to
adjust business strategies to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. All activities that are usually carried out must now be managed to adjust to implementing new strategies to continue to increase productivity in terms of effective and efficient management of human resources.

Good Human Resources (HR) management is needed in running the company's business, considering that HR is central to achieving organizational goals. Human Resources (HR) becomes the central and vital center in running the wheels of the organization. Given this vital role, the organization's view of human resources continues to evolve into the central resource. Human resources in organizations are one of the variables that are very important for an organization's progress (Indahyati & Yanita, 2020). Human Resources in every organization, public and business, are the primary and various other resources. Humans are the main actors moving the various resources in question.

The quality of human resources is a vital factor in supporting a company's success in achieving its goals. One of the excellent qualities of human resources can be seen in its employees' work environment and work productivity. Employee productivity is determined by their work environment (Dixit et al., 2019). Sunyoto in Wahyuningsih (2018) stated that the work environment is a crucial component in employees carrying out work activities. In doing work, a comfortable work environment is crucial for employees. Because with a comfortable environment, employees become more productive. A comfortable work environment will also impact satisfaction with working employees. An unpleasant work environment will reduce performance. Task achievement is not on target so the work system model that is built becomes ineffective and efficient to achieve goals.

In contrast, a conducive work environment will positively impact workers so that employees get satisfaction with their productivity achievements and the organization achieves the vision it determines (Sihaloho & Siregar, 2019). This is also corroborated by researcher Sunyoto in Wahyuningsih (2018), stating that the work environment is crucial to employee activities. In doing work, a comfortable work environment is crucial for employees. Because with a comfortable environment, employees become more productive at work. So it can be said that the work environment is where employees do their daily work". The results of research conducted by Aspiyah & Martono (2016), Sinaga & Ibrahim (2016), and Widowati (2017) suggest that the work environment has a positive effect on employee productivity. If the work environment is comfortable and clean, it will make employees more productive. However, research conducted by Ignatius Sony Kurniawan, 2021 shows that the work environment does not affect employee work productivity.

Based on this explanation, it is clear that more research is needed, particularly on the erratic impact of the workplace on employee productivity, as claimed by Hanif Indahyati & Yanita Hendarti in 2020, which was later supported by other studies (Eva Fathussyadah, Aar Ardiaysyah, 2020). This indicates that there is a discrepancy between the research findings of different researchers, as seen in the following table 1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Variables reviewed</th>
<th>Research Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva Fathussyaadah, (2020)</td>
<td>The Effect Of Work Environment on Work Productivity of UHT Milk Production Department Employees of PT. INDOLAKTO</td>
<td>Work environment towards work productivity</td>
<td>Do not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the research findings, there is a discrepancy between the findings of one researcher and those of another researcher, as seen in the table above. This discrepancy can be seen in the research by Mohammad Ramadona and Inadah Pangesti (2021), who found a significant association between the organizational environment and work productivity. On the other hand, these findings contradict the findings of the research (Hanif Nur Indahyati & Yanita Hendarti, 2020), which say that the organizational environment does not affect the amount of work completed. The author aims to incorporate the concept of job satisfaction as a form of mediation. Research carried out by (Sofian 2018) shows that the level of job pleasure one experiences significantly impacts work productivity. This is the case. Therefore, it is plausible to hypothesize that one's level of job pleasure can mediate (intervene) in one's level of work productivity.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Work Environment**

According to Prasetyono and Ramdayana (2020), the term work environment refers to the core tool and material that is encountered, the environment in which a person works, his work practices, and the work arrangements that are made both as individuals and as a group. According to Dixit et al.’s 2019 research, the productivity of employees is largely dependent on the work environment. This indicates that the working environment has the potential to influence employee productivity, the levels of which are artificially determined. According to Sunyoto's article in Wahyuningsih (2018), the working environment is an essential factor in determining how well workers carry out their duties. It is essential for workers to have a pleasant environment in which to perform their jobs. Because when they are provided with adequate comfort, workers tend to become more productive.
on the job. Therefore, one could say that the working environment is the setting in which employees carry out their tasks on a daily basis.

**Career Development**

According to Segoro (2018), career development is a condition that shows an increase in a person's status in an organization on a career path that has been set in the organization concerned. Career development carried out in the company is an effort to improve and develop the status of employees in the company or organization, with good career development in a company can motivate employees to work optimally. It can also affect the increased work productivity of employees. According to Sinambela and Sinambela (2019), career development is an effort made by organizations to plan their employees' careers, consisting of career management, including planning, implementing, and supervising careers.

In essence, career development is an obligation of the organization and the device itself. A progressive organization, of course, has a clear organizational structure and is socialized to all members. This socialization is necessary so that all organization members can understand the program they enter and plan the career they will take to the top of the structure. Usually, people entering an organization have different motivations. However, the main reason someone enters an organization is generally to get feedback through rewards or compensation. In addition, the following argument is for the person to have a promising career. Career by the job is two interconnected variables. That is, the job will support the career, and a promising career will support the job better because there will be new challenges for the person.

**Job Satisfaction**

One way to conceptualize job satisfaction is as an emotional or rational reaction to the many aspects of one's working environment. According to research by Verawati Wote and Patalatu (2019), "job satisfaction" refers to how a person perceives or feels about their work environment. Nabawi (2019), who also expressed an opinion that expresses the understanding of job satisfaction, noted that job satisfaction is an individual's general attitude toward his work. This is an additional viewpoint that expresses the meaning of job satisfaction. Work that involves interacting with coworkers and superiors, adhering to organizational norms and procedures, fulfilling performance requirements, and surviving in working conditions that are frequently less than ideal, among other things, is an example of this type of work.

If we understand anything well, we can conclude that job satisfaction is a natural reaction of humans, who react in response to how their surroundings are treated. For We to also be able to recognize that job happiness is crucial, and it demands special attention from management in order for us to fulfill the goals of the organization, one of which is to improve employee performance. According to Nabawi (2019), a person's level of job satisfaction is not contingent on how long they put in at their job or how well they take care of themselves.

**Employee Productivity**

Productivity at work is measured in terms of output (output), which can be viewed in terms of the quality and quantity of goods or services produced in accordance with the time constraints and quality standards established by the firm. All company demands in maintaining and managing quality human resources are increasingly urgent by the changing environmental dynamics. (Haryo &; Djoko, 2018). It is said to be productive if these resources have high work productivity, can achieve predetermined goals or targets, and can be responsible for completing tasks on time. Cindyana et al., (2018).

According to Anoraga in Busro (2018) factors that affect work productivity include Employee work motivation, Education, Work discipline, Skills, Work ethic attitude, Cooperation ability, Nutrition and health, Income level, Work environment and work climate, Sophistication of technology used, Production factors adequate, Social security, Management and leadership, Achievement opportunities.

Productivity is an essential factor in determining the success of the company. If the employee works, productivity always increases significantly from time to time, and then the company will quickly achieve the goals that have been set. The more effective or efficient a person is in utilizing
The Effect Of The Work Environment On Employee Productivity

The findings of a study carried out by Eva Fathussyaaadah (2020) and Hanif Nur Indahyati (2019) indicate that the working environment is unable to boost the productivity of employees. This is also reinforced by studies carried out by Yanita Hendarti (2020).

The Career Development On Employee Productivity

A move that promotes an individual to a higher position within an organization brings with it an increase in their responsibilities, rights, and prestige. This is what is meant by the term "career development." According to research conducted by Bahri and Nisa (2017), there is a favorable correlation between employee productivity and opportunities for career advancement. This also aligns with the findings of research carried out by Sinambela (2016) and Akhwanul Akhmal and Fitriani Laia (2018), which found that employee productivity can be affected by career development opportunities.

The Effect Of The Work Environment On Work Productivity Mediated By Job Satisfaction

Everything that surrounds workers and has the potential to impact how they carry out the activities for which they are responsible is referred to as the work environment. To achieve higher levels of productivity, the working environment must be conducive to the execution of activities in an uncomplicated manner. Therefore, based on the findings of study carried out by Wahyu Lestari (2019) and Yanita Hendarti (2020), it is said that the working environment might improve employee productivity through job happiness. This is the case since the researchers found that job satisfaction is directly correlated with increased productivity.

The Effect Of The Career Development On Work Productivity Mediated By Job Satisfaction

Suria Alamsyah (2019) expressed her opinion that job satisfaction can affect career development on employee productivity, this is in line with research conducted by (Andika Pramukti 2019) the role of job satisfaction can indirectly affect career development to employee productivity.

The Effect Job Satifaction on Employee Productivity

Based on the findings and conclusions in previous studies conducted by (Nabawi 2019) and (Qorfianalda 2021) it was concluded that job satisfaction has a positive relationship in affecting employee productivity. Research conducted by (Sulistyawati & Sufradi, 2020)supports previous research that Job satisfaction can mediate well

RESEARCH METHODS

The method of research that was utilized in this investigation was quantitative research using an explanatory research strategy. The purpose of this research was to investigate the extent to which the independent variable was influenced by the dependent variable. Quantitative research begins with the formulation of study hypotheses that present concepts in the form of unambiguous
variables. Next, computations and data are processed in a methodical manner before data are collected utilizing preexisting standards. The data is gathered in the form of figures from thorough calculations by analysis utilizing statistics or tables, and then the initial hypothesis that was constructed is debated.

The analysis used in this study was a structural analysis using a partial least square approach where the processing used Partial Least Square or PLS software by testing 100 respondents. The analysis begins with outer testing, namely the test of variable instruments and variable description, continues with testing the feasibility of the model, and ends with hypothesis testing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is known, based on the description of the validity test results shown in figure 2, that 10 instruments from the Work Environment, 10 instrument items from the Career Development variable, 12 instrument items from the Job Satisfaction variable, and 8 instrument items from the Employee Productivity variable have all been declared valid. This is due to the fact that the data processing results from each instrument produce a value that is either greater than > 0.7 or more significant than > 0.7, which allows the statement to be used in reiterating the research.

Table 2 Construct Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average e Vairanc e Extract ed (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data from table 2, it is known that all instrument statements from the Work Environment, Career Development variable, Job Satisfaction variable and Employee Productivity variable produce Cronbach’s alpha value, composite reliability, rho_A above 0.7 or > 0.7 and AVE value above 0.5 or > 0.5 so that all instruments are declared reliable and can be used for data collection in measuring the Work Environment, Career Development variable, Job Satisfaction variable and Employee Productivity variable in this study.
Table 3 R Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data from Table 6, the R Square value of the job satisfaction variable shows a value of 0.88 or above the importance of 0.2 (> 0.2), so the modeling is considered feasible and meets the criteria with substantial categories. Meanwhile, the Employee Productivity variable shows a value of 0.86 or above 0.2 (> 0.2), so modeling is also still considered feasible and meets the criteria with the moderate category.

Table 4 Path Coefficient

| Path                                      | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Work Environment -> Employee Productivity | 0.29                | 0.29            | 0.12                       | 2.44            | 0.01     |
| Career Development -> Employee Productivity | 0.15                | 0.17            | 0.12                       | 1.29            | 0.20     |
| Job Satisfaction -> Employee Productivity | 0.53                | 0.52            | 0.11                       | 4.90            | 0.00     |
| Career Development -> Job Satisfaction    | 0.37                | 0.36            | 0.10                       | 3.85            | 0.00     |
| Work Environment -> Job Satisfaction      | 0.13                | 0.12            | 0.07                       | 1.73            | 0.08     |

As can be seen from the path coefficients presented earlier, whether or not to accept a hypothesis depends on the initial sample value, the p-value, or the t-statistic. The hypothesis is accepted if the p-value or the statistical value t is higher than the table t threshold. The first assumption is that the working environment style affects the employees' productivity. A t-statistic value of 2.44, more significant than 1.98, and a p-value of 0.001 is associated with the Work Environment. There is a positive direction in the relationship between situational leadership style and employee performance, as indicated by the fact that the value of the original sample is positive and stands at 0.29. As a consequence of this, the second premise is allowed. The second contention is that there is no correlation between employee productivity and career development. It is possible that Career Development does not significantly influence Employee Productivity because the t-statistic value was 1.29 and the p-value was 0.20, more significant than 0.05. The initial sample result was positive, somewhere around 0.15, which indicates an inverse link between Employee Productivity and Career Development, which negatively impacts employee productivity. Therefore, the second premise cannot be supported. This demonstrates that Investing in Employees' Career Development Has Little Bearing on Their Productivity. The increase or decrease in the Career Development variable's value will not
sustantially impact the Employee Productivity variable score.

The third theory is that an employee’s level of happiness in their employment affects their level of productivity. The t-statistic values for this connection suggest that job satisfaction considerably influences employee productivity. These values range from 1.90 to 1.98, and the p-values for this association range from 0.00 to 0.05. The first sample value of 0.53 was positive, indicating that the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity is positive. This was proved by the fact that the value was positive. As a direct consequence of this, the third hypothesis is accurate.

According to Table 4, which covers the fourth hypothesis, the value of the indirect impact that the workplace has on the productivity of employees can be considered considerable. The statistics show no evidence of a positive link because t_1.73 > 1.98 and p values of 0.08 > 0.05. It is possible to investigate the effect of the Work Environment on Employee Productivity while also using Job Satisfaction as a mediator to identify whether Job Satisfaction has a full mediating effect or a partial mediating effect. This would allow for determining which scenario is most likely to occur. According to previously collected data, the Work Environment has a sizable impact on the entire mediation process of Employee Productivity when Job Satisfaction is considered as a mediator in the model.

The fifth hypothesis test, which refers to the indirect impact of Career Development on Employee Productivity, expresses significant value. The fifth hypothesis test examines the relationship between the two concepts. These conclusions can be drawn from the statistical values of t_3.85 > 1.98 and p value 0.00 0.05. Employee Productivity is Directly Correlated to Job Satisfaction in Every Way. The results of these experiments indicate a strong relationship between employee productivity and career development when job satisfaction is included in the model as a mediator. This differs from the first stage in that job happiness is not incorporated into the model as a mediation between the working environment and employee productivity.

**CONCLUSION**

This study sought to assess the impact of Work Environment and Career Development on Employee Productivity, with Job Satisfaction as a moderate variable. PLS-SEM (Partial Least Square – Structural Equation Modeling) with SmartPLS software version 3.3.3 tests relationships between variables. Based on the analysis of research results and discussions in the previous section, it can be concluded that the Work Environment has a good and significant effect on Employee Productivity in CV Multi Lestari Utama. In CV Multi Lestari Utama, the influence of Career Development on Employee Productivity is insignificant. It is just that when Job Satisfactionpositively and meaningfully impact positively and meaningfully impacts Employee Productivity. In CV Multi Lestari Utama. Indirectly, Job Satisfaction does not have a positive impact in affecting the Work Environment on Employee Productivity. While directly Job Satisfaction can affect Employee Productivity in CV Multi Lestari Utama.
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