INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 2, July 2027, pp. 440-455
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

Work Discipline, Work Motivation, and Work Environment as Determinants of Employee Performance: A Study at Roso Joyo 2 Restaurant in Sragen

Yudha Aji Pramana [1*], Asih Handayani [2]
[1, 2] Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Indonesia
ajiyudha9898@gmail.com[1], asihhandayani@unisri.ac.id[2]

Article Info

Corresponding Author:
Yudha Aji Pramana, Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Indonesia

Keywords:
Discipline, Employee Performance, Motivation, Work Environment

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of discipline, motivation, and the work environment on employee performance. A quantitative research method was employed, utilizing both primary and secondary data sources. The study population consisted of employees at the Roso Joyo 2 Restaurant in Sragen, with a sample size of approximately 30 employees selected using the saturated sampling technique. Data collection involved observation and questionnaires. Data analysis techniques included descriptive analysis, multiple linear regression, t-tests, F-tests, and the coefficient of determination test. The multiple linear regression equation derived from the study is Y = -4.628 + 0.828X1 + 0.099X2 + 0.659X3 + e. The t-test results indicate that discipline has a significance value of 0.029 (< 0.05), meaning it significantly influences the performance of Roso Joyo 2 Restaurant employees. Motivation yielded a significance value of 0.742 (> 0.05), indicating no significant influence on employee performance. Conversely, the work environment showed a significance value of 0.018 (< 0.05), indicating a significant influence on the performance of Roso Joyo 2 Restaurant employees. The calculated F-test result of 19.268, with a significance value of 0.000 (< 0.05), indicates that discipline, motivation, and the work environment have a significant effect on employee performance. The coefficient of determination (R^2) result is 0.654, meaning that the independent variables—X1 (Discipline), X2 (Motivation), and X3 (Work Environment)—contribute 65.4% to the variance in Y (Employee Performance), while the remaining 34.6% (100% - 65.4%) is explained by variables outside the model used.

How to Cite:
Pramana, Y. A., & Handayani, A. (2027). Work discipline, work motivation, and work environment as determinants of employee performance: A study at Roso Joyo 2 Restaurant in Sragen. Income Journal of Economics Development, 7(2), 440-455. https://doi.org/10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

1. Introduction

Human resource management (HRM) plays a central role in ensuring that organizational resources are managed effectively to achieve operational and strategic objectives. Employee performance represents one of the most important outcomes of HRM because it reflects the extent to which employees transform their knowledge, skills, abilities, effort, and responsibilities into measurable work outcomes. Employee performance generally refers to the quality and quantity of work achieved by an individual or group in accordance with assigned responsibilities and organizational objectives (Emela et al., 2024). Performance therefore represents not only an individual-level outcome but also an important indicator of organizational effectiveness because the achievement of organizational objectives depends substantially on employees' ability to complete their responsibilities consistently, efficiently, and effectively. Previous studies have also demonstrated that employee performance is closely related to the effectiveness and efficiency of task implementation within organizations (Emela et al., 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026; Osiani et al., 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024). The importance of employee performance becomes particularly evident in micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs), where business operations are frequently supported by a relatively limited number of employees.

MSMEs constitute productive business units operated by individuals or business

entities across various economic sectors and contribute substantially to local economic activity (Malau & Ekananda, 2025). Limited human and organizational resources can increase the dependence of MSMEs on employee capabilities because employees may perform several operational functions simultaneously, including production, customer service, order processing, administrative activities, cleanliness, and coordination. Employee performance can consequently influence operational efficiency, service consistency, customer satisfaction, and the sustainability of business activities. HRM practices and employee-related conditions therefore remain relevant for understanding performance differences within MSME environments, particularly where organizational structures are relatively simple and individual employee behavior can have an immediate influence on daily operations.

The present study focuses on Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen, a culinary MSME located on Jl. Irian, Nglorog, Sragen District, Sragen Regency, Central Java, Indonesia. Restaurant businesses depend heavily on employees because service quality is produced through direct interaction between employees, customers, and operational processes. Employees are required to arrive according to established schedules, perform assigned tasks, process customer orders, maintain cleanliness, coordinate with coworkers, and provide services according to expected standards. Employee performance problems may therefore affect service speed, work coordination, customer experience, and the overall effectiveness of restaurant operations. Preliminary observations and customer reviews at the research location indicated several conditions related to employee performance, providing an empirical basis for examining factors associated with employee performance in this specific culinary MSME context.

Work discipline represents one factor that may be associated with employee performance. Discipline refers to employees' awareness and willingness to comply with organizational regulations and applicable social norms while carrying out their responsibilities (Emela et al., 2024). Discipline is reflected through behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, compliance with organizational rules, responsibility for assigned tasks, and adherence to established work procedures. Such behaviors are particularly relevant in restaurant operations because service activities require employees to work according to schedules and coordinate their responsibilities continuously. Adequate discipline can support orderly work processes, reduce operational disruptions, and facilitate consistent task completion. Inadequate discipline may create delays, increase coordination problems, and interfere with service delivery. The relationship between discipline and employee performance is therefore theoretically plausible in operational businesses in which employee behavior is directly connected to organizational outputs.

Empirical evidence generally indicates a positive relationship between work discipline and employee performance. Significant relationships between discipline and performance have been reported in several recent studies conducted in different organizational contexts (Emela et al., 2024; Osiani et al., 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024). Evidence from academic institutions has similarly demonstrated that discipline is positively and significantly associated with staff performance when examined alongside motivation and the work environment (Sumarni et al., 2024). Positive findings have also been identified in business and service-oriented settings, suggesting that disciplined employee behavior can facilitate more reliable task execution and contribute to organizational performance.

The empirical evidence concerning discipline is not entirely consistent, however. Several studies have reported that work discipline does not have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance under particular organizational conditions (Raskin et al., 2026; Sendri et al., 2024). Research conducted among employees at BPJS Ketenagakerjaan also reported an insignificant direct relationship between discipline and performance, despite a significant relationship involving motivation (Sendri et al., 2024). Other evidence has similarly indicated that the strength of the discipline–performance relationship can vary according to organizational characteristics, employee responsibilities, managerial practices, measurement approaches, and the inclusion of other explanatory variables. These inconsistencies indicate that the relationship between discipline and performance cannot be assumed to operate uniformly across

organizational settings. Examination within a culinary MSME is therefore relevant because restaurant employees operate under service conditions that require punctuality, coordination, task responsibility, and continuous interaction with customers.

Work motivation constitutes a second factor that may be related to employee performance. Motivation refers to forces that encourage individuals to direct and sustain effort toward particular objectives. Employees who perceive meaningful rewards, recognition, supportive treatment, and achievable work goals may be more inclined to maintain effort and persistence in completing their responsibilities (Suheri & Raharjo, 2023). Motivation is particularly relevant to employee performance because organizational outcomes depend not only on employees' ability to perform tasks but also on their willingness to exert effort and maintain that effort during routine or demanding activities. Within a restaurant environment, employee motivation may be reflected in enthusiasm for serving customers, willingness to complete assigned responsibilities, persistence during periods of high workload, and readiness to maintain service standards.

Previous research has provided substantial support for a positive relationship between motivation and employee performance. Significant effects of motivation on performance have been reported across various organizational and business settings (Emela et al., 2024; Hati et al., 2026; Khairunisah & Suhendra, 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024). Motivation has also been found to have a significant positive relationship with academic staff performance when examined together with discipline and the work environment (Sumarni et al., 2024). Findings from MSME-related research similarly indicate that employee motivation can be an important factor associated with performance, particularly where employees contribute directly to operational activities and business outcomes.

The relationship between motivation and performance nevertheless remains subject to empirical variation. Motivation has been found to have an insignificant relationship with employee performance in some organizational contexts (Ka'ti et al., 2026). Differences in compensation systems, employee characteristics, managerial practices, job design, organizational culture, and other workplace conditions may influence how motivation is translated into actual performance. The existence of inconsistent findings creates an empirical basis for reassessing the motivation–performance relationship in different organizational settings. The present study addresses this issue by examining whether motivation has a significant relationship with employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen.

The work environment represents a third factor that may influence employee performance. The work environment encompasses physical, social, and psychological conditions surrounding employees while they perform their duties, including temperature, air circulation, lighting, noise, cleanliness, safety, work facilities, and interpersonal relationships (Emela et al., 2024). Appropriate environmental conditions can facilitate employee comfort, concentration, communication, and task completion. In restaurant operations, environmental conditions are particularly important because employees may work for extended periods in environments characterized by heat, customer activity, equipment use, noise, and continuous interaction. A supportive work environment can facilitate coordination and maintain employee comfort, whereas an unfavorable environment may interfere with concentration, communication, and the completion of work responsibilities.

Empirical findings generally support the positive role of the work environment in employee performance. Significant relationships between work environment and performance have been identified in several recent studies (Hati et al., 2026; Nabila & Erica, 2026; Osiani et al., 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024). A positive and significant relationship has also been identified among academic staff, demonstrating that work environment conditions can remain relevant even in organizational settings with different types of work activities (Sumarni et al., 2024). Research in service and business organizations has similarly shown that work environment can contribute to employee performance when employees require adequate physical conditions and supportive interpersonal relationships to complete their responsibilities effectively. Studies conducted in operational and service-oriented organizations provide additional support for examining these variables simultaneously. Research at PT Opal Coffee Indonesia reported significant

relationships involving work environment, work discipline, work motivation, and employee performance, while similar findings were reported among employees at CV ATH Group Balikpapan (Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Sihombing et al., 2024).

Other research has found significant relationships among the three variables in MSMEs and public-service organizations, although the magnitude and significance of individual predictors have varied across contexts (Emela et al., 2024; Fauziah & Baskara, 2024; Fathur Rozi et al., 2024). Such findings suggest that employee performance is unlikely to be adequately understood through a single explanatory factor. Discipline concerns employees' compliance and responsibility, motivation concerns willingness and persistence to exert effort, and the work environment concerns the conditions within which work activities are performed.

The simultaneous examination of discipline, motivation, and work environment is therefore important because these variables represent different dimensions of the employee work experience. Discipline may facilitate consistent adherence to work requirements, motivation may encourage employees to direct and sustain effort, and the work environment may provide physical and social conditions that support task completion. Previous evidence has demonstrated that these variables can jointly explain substantial variation in employee performance, although their individual effects are not necessarily consistent across organizational settings (Emela et al., 2024; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024). The variation in findings indicates that the relevance of each factor may depend on organizational characteristics and the specific nature of employees' work.

A research gap consequently emerges from two considerations. First, previous empirical findings concerning discipline and motivation remain inconsistent, with some studies reporting significant relationships and others reporting insignificant effects (Ka'ti et al., 2026; Raskin et al., 2026; Sendri et al., 2024). Second, much of the existing evidence has been generated in public institutions, health services, educational organizations, financial institutions, or larger business settings. Although research has increasingly examined MSMEs, the specific combination of discipline, motivation, and work environment in small culinary businesses remains comparatively underexplored. Culinary MSMEs possess distinctive operational characteristics because employees are directly involved in customer service, service speed, cleanliness, coordination, and the immediate delivery of products. These characteristics may produce different relationships between employee-related factors and performance compared with organizations characterized by more formalized structures and less direct customer interaction.

The present study addresses this gap by examining the relationship between work discipline, motivation, and work environment and employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. The study uses a quantitative approach to assess the individual and simultaneous relationships among the three independent variables and employee performance. The research is expected to provide empirical evidence concerning whether discipline, motivation, and work environment are statistically significant predictors of employee performance within a culinary MSME context. The findings may also provide practical information for management in identifying employee-related and workplace-related aspects that require attention to support more effective and efficient operations.

Based on the theoretical considerations and empirical evidence discussed above, three hypotheses are formulated. H1: Work discipline has a significant effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. H2: Work motivation has a significant effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. H3: Work environment has a significant effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. The study consequently aims to examine the significance of work discipline, work motivation, and work environment in explaining employee performance and to extend empirical understanding of HRM factors within the operational context of culinary MSMEs.

2. Literature Review

Human Resource Management (HRM) is the science and art of managing employment relationships and the role of the workforce efficiently and effectively to achieve the objectives of the company, employees, and society (Emela et al., 2024). Employee performance refers to the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties in accordance with the

responsibilities assigned, based on competence, experience, dedication, and time (Suheri & Raharjo, 2023).

Discipline is behavior that demonstrates compliance with applicable provisions, reflecting an individual's willingness to follow existing rules and limitations (Purnomo, 2018). Motivation is a factor that encourages a person to engage in a particular activity and is often understood as a driving factor behind an individual's behavior. Essentially, motivation is an internal force that drives individuals to act or work enthusiastically in order to achieve goals (Sumarni et al., 2024).

The work environment refers to everything surrounding workers that can influence them while working, including physical factors such as temperature, humidity, ventilation, lighting, noise, cleanliness, and the availability of adequate work tools and equipment (Emela et al., 2024). Based on the theoretical perspectives and findings of previous studies, this study proposes that employee performance is associated with three main factors, namely discipline, motivation, and the work environment. Discipline reflects employees' compliance with organizational rules and responsibilities, motivation represents the internal and external factors that encourage employees to perform their duties, while the work environment encompasses the physical and supporting conditions surrounding employees during work. These factors are conceptually positioned as independent variables, whereas employee performance serves as the dependent variable. The proposed relationships among the variables are examined through three hypotheses, as described below.

H1: Discipline Has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

Discipline is behavior or action that demonstrates compliance with applicable provisions or laws (Purnomo, 2018). Discipline is one of the determining factors that can influence employee performance within an organization. Without disciplined behavior among individuals within an organization, the organization may experience disorder because it lacks established rules that regulate individuals and encourage them to comply with the rules that have been established. Previous studies examining the effect of discipline on employee performance have stated that discipline has a significant effect on employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Osiani et al., 2026; Sihombing et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

H2: Motivation Has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

Motivation is a manager's effort or activity to generate and increase employees' enthusiasm and passion for work so that they are willing to perform their duties to achieve organizational objectives by mobilizing both internal and external drives (Pongtuluran & Marewa, 2025). Previous studies examining the effect of motivation on employee performance have stated that motivation has a significant effect on employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Erawati et al., 2019; Hati et al., 2026; Khairunisah & Suhendra, 2026; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

H3: The Work Environment Has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

The work environment is everything surrounding workers that can influence their performance in carrying out their duties, including physical aspects such as temperature, humidity, ventilation, lighting, noise, cleanliness, and the adequacy of work equipment (Emela et al., 2024). It includes adequate work facilities and infrastructure, whereby a good work environment will support optimal employee performance, and vice versa. The work environment is an important factor that can influence employee performance within an organization. It not only affects performance but can also influence employees' perceptions of the organization. Previous studies examining the effect of the work environment on employee performance have stated that the work environment has a significant effect on employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Hati et al., 2026; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026; Osiani et al., 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024).

3. Method

3.1 Research Scope and Setting

This study was conducted among employees of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen, a micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise (MSME) operating in the culinary sector. The research setting was selected because the culinary MSME sector is characterized by intense competition, with numerous businesses offering similar products and services. The study therefore examines the business management practices implemented by the owner of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen, particularly in responding to the current

competitive culinary business environment. The study focuses specifically on employee-related factors that may contribute to organizational performance, namely discipline, motivation, and the work environment, and their relationship with employee performance.

3.2 Data Type and Source

This study employed a quantitative research approach. Research data can be categorized into qualitative and quantitative data. Quantitative data in this study were obtained from employee responses measured using a Likert scale. The study primarily relied on primary data, which were collected directly by the researcher from employees of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. Primary data were obtained through direct interviews and questionnaires administered to the research respondents. Quantitative survey approaches involving employee questionnaires have also been employed in previous research examining work-related factors and employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026).

3.3 Population and Sample

The study population comprised all employees of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. At the time of the study, the organization had 30 employees. The number of employees had initially been 25, but five additional employees joined within several days, resulting in a total population of 30 employees. The study employed census (saturated) sampling, whereby all members of the population were included as research respondents. This sampling approach was selected because the population was relatively small, consisting of only 30 employees. Consequently, the final sample consisted of 30 respondents. The use of saturated sampling in studies involving relatively small employee populations is consistent with previous quantitative research examining employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026).

3.4 Operationalization of Variables

The study examined four variables, comprising three independent variables, namely discipline (X_1), motivation (X_2), and work environment (X_3), and one dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y). These constructs have been examined in previous studies investigating the relationships between employee-related factors and organizational performance (Emela et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

Discipline refers to employees' behavior in complying with organizational rules established by Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. In this study, discipline was measured using three indicators, namely attendance, responsibility, and compliance with regulations. Attendance reflects employees' consistency in reporting to work according to established schedules, responsibility refers to their commitment to completing assigned duties, and compliance with regulations represents their willingness to follow organizational rules and procedures. The relevance of discipline to employee performance has been examined in previous quantitative studies (Emela et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

Motivation refers to the efforts made by employees of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen to improve their own performance and encourage the performance of their colleagues while carrying out their work. Motivation was measured using four indicators, namely compensation, working conditions, work facilities, and work achievement. Compensation reflects the rewards received by employees for their contributions, working conditions represent the circumstances supporting employees in performing their responsibilities, work facilities refer to the resources provided to facilitate task completion, and work achievement reflects employees' accomplishment of assigned duties. Work motivation has been examined as an important construct associated with employee performance in previous empirical research (Emela et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

The work environment refers to the conditions surrounding employees that contribute to their comfort while performing their duties, including the provision of facilities that meet generally applicable standards. The work environment was measured using four indicators, namely lighting, color, air, and security. Lighting refers to the adequacy of illumination in supporting employees' activities, color reflects the visual conditions of the workplace, air represents the quality and circulation of air within the working environment, and security refers to the protection and safety conditions experienced by employees while performing their responsibilities. Previous studies have also examined the work environment as a relevant factor in employee performance (Nabila & Erica,

2026; Sumarni et al., 2024).

Employee performance refers to the results of individual or collective efforts made by employees of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen in carrying out their respective duties. Employee performance was measured using five indicators, namely quantity of work results, quality of work, efficiency in performing tasks, independence, and timeliness. Quantity of work results reflects the volume of tasks completed, quality of work represents the extent to which work outcomes meet established standards, efficiency refers to employees' ability to complete tasks using available resources appropriately, independence describes their ability to perform responsibilities without excessive supervision, and timeliness reflects the completion of assigned duties within the required period. Employee performance has been employed as a dependent variable in quantitative research involving motivation, discipline, and work environment (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Emela et al., 2024).

Data were collected using several techniques. Interviews were conducted through direct question-and-answer interactions with employees to obtain information relevant to the research context. Observation involved direct examination of the research setting and the phenomena occurring within it. Documentation was used to collect supporting information from relevant documents, archives, and written records. Questionnaires were administered to the respondents to obtain quantitative measurements of the research variables. Triangulation was used by combining different data collection techniques and sources, particularly interviews, observations, and documentation, to support data credibility.

The questionnaire employed a Likert scale to measure respondents' attitudes and perceptions. The Likert scale enables respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements, allowing qualitative responses to be quantified for statistical analysis. The application of Likert-scale questionnaires in quantitative employee performance research is consistent with previous empirical studies (Pancasila et al., 2023).

3.5 Research Instrument Testing

The research instrument was evaluated through validity and reliability testing before being used for subsequent statistical analysis. Validity testing was conducted to determine whether the questionnaire items adequately measured the intended constructs. An instrument was considered valid when its significance value was below 0.05, whereas a p-value of 0.05 or greater indicated that an item did not meet the validity criterion applied in this study. The use of questionnaire validity and reliability assessments is consistent with previous quantitative research examining employee performance (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Nabila & Erica, 2026).

Reliability testing was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. Reliability reflects the consistency and stability of respondents' answers across items measuring the same construct. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. A Cronbach's alpha value of at least 0.60 was adopted as the minimum reliability criterion, with a value of 0.70 or higher indicating stronger internal consistency. The use of Cronbach's alpha for evaluating questionnaire reliability has also been applied in previous employee performance research (Emela et al., 2024; Pancasila et al., 2023).

3.6 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the characteristics of the research variables through measures such as the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, variance, kurtosis, and skewness. These statistics provide an overview of the observed data without extending the findings to the broader population. Descriptive and inferential statistical approaches have also been employed in quantitative studies examining employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

Inferential analysis was subsequently employed to test the proposed hypotheses and examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The analysis included classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression analysis, partial significance testing (t-test), simultaneous significance testing (F-test), and the coefficient of determination (R^2). These analytical procedures are consistent with previous quantitative studies investigating employee performance (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Nabila & Erica, 2026).

3.7 Classical Assumption Tests

Classical assumption tests were conducted before multiple linear regression analysis to assess whether the regression model met the relevant statistical assumptions. The tests comprised multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, normality, and autocorrelation assessments. Similar statistical procedures have been employed in previous regression-based employee performance studies (Nabila & Erica, 2026). The multicollinearity test was used to identify correlations among the independent variables. Multicollinearity was assessed using the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. A VIF value below 10 and a Tolerance value above 0.10 were adopted as the criteria for determining the absence of problematic multicollinearity in the regression model.

The heteroscedasticity test was conducted to determine whether the residual variance remained constant across observations. A regression model is considered to satisfy the homoscedasticity assumption when the residual variance is constant. Heteroscedasticity may be assessed using a scatterplot and statistical procedures such as the Rank Spearman test. A significance value above 0.05 indicates no statistical evidence of heteroscedasticity, whereas a value of 0.05 or below indicates evidence of heteroscedasticity under the selected test. The normality test was conducted to determine whether the data or regression residuals followed a normal distribution. The study used the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S) test through SPSS. An Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value above 0.05 indicates that the normality assumption is not rejected, whereas a value below 0.05 indicates a statistically significant deviation from normality. The Jarque–Bera (JB) test using EViews was also described, with a JB probability above 0.05 indicating that the normality assumption is not rejected. The autocorrelation test was used to assess whether residuals from consecutive observations were correlated. The Run Test was employed as a non-parametric procedure to assess the randomness of the residual sequence. An Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.05 or greater indicates that the null hypothesis of randomness is not rejected, whereas a value below 0.05 indicates evidence of a non-random residual sequence.

3.8 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between the three independent variables—discipline (X_1), motivation (X_2), and work environment (X_3)—and employee performance (Y). Multiple linear regression has been applied in previous empirical studies examining the relationships between work-related factors and employee performance (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Emela et al., 2024).

The regression model used in this study was formulated as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e$$

In this equation, Y represents employee performance, a denotes the constant or intercept, b_1, b_2, and b_3 represent the regression coefficients, X_1 refers to discipline, X_2 refers to motivation, X_3 represents the work environment, and e denotes the error term.

3.9 Partial Significance Test

The partial t-test was used to examine the effect of each independent variable on employee performance individually. A significance value below 0.05 indicates a statistically significant relationship, whereas a value above 0.05 indicates that the relationship is not statistically significant at the specified level. The use of partial significance testing in multiple regression analysis is consistent with previous employee performance research (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Nabila & Erica, 2026). The hypotheses tested were formulated as follows. The null hypothesis (H_0: $\beta_i = 0$) indicates that the corresponding independent variable does not have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance, whereas the alternative hypothesis (H_a: $\beta_i \neq 0$) indicates that the corresponding independent variable has a statistically significant relationship with employee performance. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%).

3.10 Simultaneous Significance Test

The simultaneous F-test was conducted to determine whether discipline, motivation, and the work environment jointly contribute significantly to employee performance and whether the regression model is statistically significant. The application of the simultaneous F-test to evaluate the collective relationship between independent variables and employee performance is consistent with previous quantitative research (Ardianto & Nurjanah, 2023; Nabila & Erica, 2026). The hypotheses were formulated as follows. The null hypothesis (H_0: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$) indicates that discipline,

INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 2, July 2027, pp. 440-455
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

motivation, and the work environment do not jointly have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance, whereas the alternative hypothesis (H_a: at least one $\beta_i \neq 0$) indicates that at least one independent variable has a statistically significant relationship with employee performance. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. A significance value below 0.05 indicates that the independent variables jointly have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance.

3.11 Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to assess the proportion of variance in employee performance that can be explained by the independent variables included in the regression model. The R^2 value ranges from 0 to 1. A value approaching 1 indicates greater explanatory power of the model, whereas a lower value indicates that a smaller proportion of the variation in employee performance is explained by the model. The coefficient of determination has also been employed in previous quantitative employee performance research to evaluate the explanatory contribution of regression models (Nabila & Erica, 2026).

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Validity Test of Discipline (X_1)

Item	*p*-value	α	Decision
X1.2	< .001	.05	Valid
X1.3	< .001	.05	Valid
X1.4	< .001	.05	Valid
X1.5	< .001	.05	Valid
X1.6	< .001	.05	Valid

Table 1 shows the results of the validity test for the discipline variable (X_1). The analysis was conducted by comparing the *p*-value obtained for each questionnaire item with the significance level (α) of 0.05. The results show that items X1.2, X1.3, X1.4, X1.5, and X1.6 each produced a *p*-value of < .001, which is lower than the predetermined significance level of 0.05. Based on this criterion, all questionnaire items used to measure the discipline variable met the validity requirement and were therefore classified as valid. These results indicate that each of the retained items was statistically associated with the measurement criterion used in the validity assessment and could consequently be retained for subsequent analysis of the discipline variable.

Table 2. Validity Test of Motivation (X_2)

Item	p-value	α	Decision
X2.1	.008	.05	Valid
X2.2	.010	.05	Valid
X2.3	< .001	.05	Valid
X2.4	.001	.05	Valid
X2.5	< .001	.05	Valid
X2.6	.001	.05	Valid
X2.7	< .001	.05	Valid
X2.8	< .001	.05	Valid

Table 2 presents the validity test results for the motivation variable (X_2). The *p*-value obtained for item X2.1 was .008, while item X2.2 produced a *p*-value of .010. Items X2.4 and X2.6 each produced a *p*-value of .001, whereas items X2.3, X2.5, X2.7, and X2.8 produced *p*-values of < .001. All of these values are below the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, all questionnaire items used to measure motivation satisfied the specified validity criterion and were classified as valid. The results indicate that items X2.1 through X2.8 were suitable for inclusion in the subsequent analysis of the motivation variable.

Table 3. Validity Test of Work Environment (X_3)

Item	p-value	α	Decision
X3.1	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.2	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.3	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.4	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.5	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.6	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.9	< .001	.05	Valid
X3.10	< .001	.05	Valid

Table 3 presents the validity test results for the work environment variable (X_3). The questionnaire items X3.1 through X3.6 and X3.9 through X3.10 each generated a *p*-value of < .001. These values are lower than the significance level (α) of 0.05, which constitutes the validity criterion applied in this study. The results therefore indicate that all questionnaire items included in the measurement of the work environment variable met the validity requirement and were classified as valid. Accordingly, the items were considered suitable for use in the subsequent statistical analysis of the work environment variable.

Table 4. Validity Test of Employee Performance (Y)

Item	p-value	α	Decision
Y1.1	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.2	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.3	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.4	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.5	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.6	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.7	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.8	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.9	< .001	.05	Valid
Y1.10	< .001	.05	Valid

INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 2, July 2027, pp. 440-455
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

Table 4 shows the validity test results for the employee performance variable (Y). All questionnaire items from Y1.1 to Y1.10 produced *p*-values of < .001. Because each *p*-value is lower than the significance level of 0.05, all ten questionnaire items met the validity criterion established for this study. Therefore, all items used to measure employee performance were classified as valid and could be retained for further statistical analysis. The results demonstrate that the employee performance measurement items satisfied the statistical requirement applied in the validity assessment. Furthermore, the consistently low p-values indicate that all ten questionnaire items demonstrated statistically significant associations with the criterion used in the validity assessment. These findings provide additional statistical support for retaining the employee performance items in the subsequent reliability testing and multiple linear regression analysis.

Table 5. Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's α	Number of Items
Work Discipline	.835	6
Motivation	.797	8
Work Environment	.913	8
Employee Performance	.930	10

Table 5 presents the reliability test results for the four research variables. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for work discipline was .835 based on six items, while motivation obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of .797 based on eight items. The work environment variable produced a Cronbach's alpha value of .913 from eight items, and employee performance produced the highest reliability coefficient, with a Cronbach's alpha value of .930 based on ten items. All Cronbach's alpha coefficients were greater than the minimum criterion of 0.60. Therefore, the questionnaire items measuring work discipline, motivation, work environment, and employee performance demonstrated acceptable internal consistency and were considered reliable for subsequent statistical analysis.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Predictor	Tolerance	VIF
Discipline (X_1)	.382	2.617
Motivation (X_2)	.416	2.406
Work Environment (X_3)	.401	2.492

Dependent variable: Employee Performance.

Table 6 presents the multicollinearity test results for the regression model. The criterion applied in this study is that the model is considered free from multicollinearity when the Tolerance value is greater than 0.10 and the VIF value is less than 10. The results show that the Tolerance value for discipline (X_1) was .382, for motivation (X_2) was .416, and for the work environment (X_3) was .401. All three Tolerance values exceeded 0.10. The corresponding VIF values were 2.617 for discipline, 2.406 for motivation, and 2.492 for the work environment, all of which were below 10. These findings indicate that the independent variables did not exhibit problematic multicollinearity. Therefore, the regression model satisfied the multicollinearity assumption and passed the multicollinearity test. Furthermore, the relatively low VIF values suggest that the correlations among the independent variables are unlikely to cause substantial inflation of the estimated regression coefficient variances. Consequently, discipline, motivation, and work environment can be retained simultaneously in the regression model for subsequent hypothesis testing without evidence of problematic multicollinearity.

Table 7. Heteroscedasticity Test

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p-value
Constant	-0.782	4.353	—	-0.180	.859
Discipline	0.147	0.246	.186	0.595	.557
Motivation	0.082	0.204	.120	0.402	.691
Work Environment	-0.103	0.179	-.176	-0.578	.569

Dependent variable: ABS_RES.

Table 7 presents the results of the heteroscedasticity test. The criterion applied in this study is that heteroscedasticity is considered absent when the significance or *p*-value is greater than 0.05. The results show that the *p*-value for discipline (X_1) was .557, the *p*-value for motivation (X_2) was .691, and the *p*-value for the work environment (X_3) was .569. All three significance values were greater than 0.05. These results indicate that the residual variance did not demonstrate statistically significant differences associated with the independent variables. Therefore, the regression model did not exhibit evidence of heteroscedasticity and was considered to have passed the heteroscedasticity test.

Table 8. Normality Test

Statistic	Value
N	30
Mean	0.0000000
Std. Deviation	2.98731381
Absolute Difference	.192
Positive Difference	.192
Negative Difference	-.089
Test Statistic	.192
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.006
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	.199

INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 2, July 2027, pp. 440-455
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

99% CI—Lower Bound	.189
99% CI—Upper Bound	.209

Table 8 presents the normality test results based on the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. The analysis was conducted using the unstandardized residuals from 30 observations. The mean residual was 0.0000000, with a standard deviation of 2.98731381, while the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test statistic was .192. The reported Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value was .006, whereas the Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) value was .199, with a 99% confidence interval ranging from .189 to .209. Based on the Monte Carlo significance value, which is greater than the 0.05 criterion, the residuals were considered to follow a normal distribution. Therefore, based on the Monte Carlo significance result reported in the analysis, the regression model was considered to have satisfied the normality assumption.

Table 9. Autocorrelation Test

Statistic	Value
Test Value (Median)	-0.04265
Cases < Test Value	15
Cases ≥ Test Value	15
Total Cases	30
Number of Runs	13
Z	-0.929
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.353

Table 9 presents the results of the autocorrelation test using the Runs Test. The criterion applied in this study is that an *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* value greater than 0.05 indicates that the residuals are randomly distributed and that no autocorrelation problem is identified. The results show a test value based on the median of -0.04265, with 15 cases below the test value and 15 cases at or above the test value, resulting in 30 total cases. The analysis produced 13 runs and a Z value of -0.929, with an *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* value of .353. Because .353 is greater than 0.05, the residual sequence is considered random. Therefore, the regression model did not exhibit evidence of autocorrelation and was considered to have passed the autocorrelation test.

Table 10. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p-value
Constant	-4.628	6.329	—	-0.731	.471
Discipline (X_1)	0.828	0.358	.408	2.310	.029
Motivation (X_2)	0.099	0.297	.056	0.332	.742
Work Environment (X_3)	0.659	0.260	.437	2.536	.018

Dependent variable: Employee Performance.

Table 10 presents the results of the multiple linear regression analysis examining the relationship between discipline (X_1), motivation (X_2), and work environment (X_3) and employee performance (Y). The resulting regression equation is $Y = -4.628 + 0.828X_1 + 0.099X_2 + 0.659X_3 + e$. The constant of -4.628 indicates the predicted value of employee performance when discipline, motivation, and work environment are held at zero. The regression coefficient for discipline is 0.828, indicating that a one-unit increase in discipline is associated with an increase of 0.828 units in employee performance, assuming motivation and work environment remain constant. The regression coefficient for motivation is 0.099, indicating a positive association between motivation and employee performance, with the other independent variables held constant.

The regression coefficient for the work environment is 0.659, indicating that a one-unit increase in the work environment score is associated with an increase of 0.659 units in employee performance when discipline and motivation are held constant. These coefficients indicate that all three predictors have positive estimated coefficients, although their statistical significance differs, as demonstrated by the subsequent partial significance test. In particular, the positive relationship between the work environment and employee performance suggests that favorable workplace conditions are associated with better employee performance within the observed sample. Furthermore, the estimated regression coefficients should be interpreted alongside their statistical significance to distinguish meaningful associations from relationships that are not statistically supported by the data.

Table 11. Partial t-Test

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p-value	Decision
Discipline (X_1)	0.828	0.358	.408	2.310	.029	Supported
Motivation (X_2)	0.099	0.297	.056	0.332	.742	Not supported
Work Environment (X_3)	0.659	0.260	.437	2.536	.018	Supported

Table 11 presents the partial *t*-test results examining the effect of each independent variable on employee performance. The results show that discipline had a significance value of .029, which is below the 0.05 significance level, with a positive regression coefficient of 0.828 and a *t* value of 2.310. This indicates that discipline has a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance, supporting H1. Motivation produced a significance value of

INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 2, July 2027, pp. 440-455
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.2.2027.912

.742, which is greater than 0.05, with a regression coefficient of 0.099 and a *t* value of 0.332. Therefore, motivation does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance, and H2 is not supported. The work environment produced a significance value of .018, which is below 0.05, with a positive regression coefficient of 0.659 and a *t* value of 2.536. This indicates that the work environment has a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance, supporting H3. Thus, the partial hypothesis testing results show that discipline and work environment are significant predictors of employee performance, whereas motivation is not statistically significant in the estimated model.

Table 12. Simultaneous F-Test

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	575.369	3	191.790	19.268	< .001
Residual	258.797	26	9.954	—	—
Total	834.167	29	—	—	—

Dependent variable: Employee Performance. Predictors: Discipline, Motivation, and Work Environment.

Table 12 presents the results of the simultaneous *F*-test examining whether discipline, motivation, and work environment jointly contribute to employee performance. The analysis produced an *F* statistic of 19.268 with a significance value of $p < .001$. Because the significance value is below the 0.05 threshold, the null hypothesis that the regression coefficients are jointly equal to zero is rejected. The alternative hypothesis is therefore supported, indicating that discipline, motivation, and work environment jointly have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance. These results demonstrate that the three independent variables, when considered simultaneously, provide statistically significant explanatory information regarding variation in employee performance.

Table 13. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.831	.690	.654	3.155

Table 13 presents the coefficient of determination for the regression model. The results show an R value of .831, an R^2 value of .690, and an adjusted R^2 value of .654, with a standard error of the estimate of 3.155. The adjusted R^2 value of .654 indicates that discipline, motivation, and work environment collectively account for approximately 65.4% of the variance in employee performance included in the estimated model. The remaining 34.6% represents variation in employee performance that is not explained by the three independent variables examined in this study. This unexplained proportion may be associated with other factors outside the model, such as leadership, compensation, internship or training, teamwork, and other organizational factors. These factors were not included in the present research model. The R^2 results therefore indicate that the three predictors collectively provide substantial explanatory information regarding employee performance within the sample, while a proportion of the variation remains attributable to factors beyond the scope of the study.

4.1 The Effect of Discipline on Employee Performance

The partial regression analysis shows that discipline has a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. The unstandardized regression coefficient was 0.828, the standardized coefficient was $\beta = .408$, and the t statistic was 2.310 with a p-value of .029. Because the p-value is below the 0.05 significance level, H1 is supported. The positive coefficient indicates that higher levels of employee discipline are associated with higher levels of employee performance when motivation and work environment are held constant.

This finding is consistent with the theoretical perspective presented in previous research, which defines discipline in terms of an individual's awareness and willingness to comply with company regulations and prevailing social norms (Emela et al., 2024; Osiani et al., 2026). Such discipline reflects employees' willingness to follow established organizational standards and fulfill their responsibilities. Employees who demonstrate consistent attendance, responsibility, and compliance with applicable regulations are more likely to maintain orderly work behavior and complete assigned duties appropriately. Higher levels of discipline can therefore be associated with stronger responsibility in performing organizational tasks. The finding is further supported by previous studies, which reported that discipline significantly affects employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Osiani et al., 2026; Sihombing et al., 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024).

The consistency between the present findings and these previous studies strengthens the empirical evidence regarding the relevance of discipline to employee performance. Employees with stronger self-discipline are expected to demonstrate greater responsibility in fulfilling their duties, whereas lower levels of discipline may increase the likelihood of work-related problems, such as unauthorized absence, failure to follow established instructions, or noncompliance with organizational expectations.

The practical implication of this finding is that the management of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen should continue to strengthen employee discipline as part of its efforts to improve performance. Employees should be encouraged to demonstrate responsibility in completing assigned tasks and to attend work according to the working hours agreed upon with the organization. Consistent implementation of organizational rules may help employees develop more reliable work behavior and strengthen their accountability to supervisors. Employees are therefore expected to comply with established regulations and working schedules so that they can become dependable members of the organization.

4.2 The Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

The partial regression results indicate that motivation does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. The regression coefficient was 0.099, the standardized coefficient was β = .056, and the t statistic was 0.332 with a p-value of .742. Because the p-value is substantially greater than the 0.05 significance level, H2 is not supported. Although the regression coefficient is positive, the magnitude of the coefficient is relatively small and the relationship does not reach statistical significance in the present model.

This finding is consistent with previous research, which reported that motivation did not have a significant effect on employee performance (Halim & Hendratmoko, 2025). The present result indicates that variations in employee motivation were not sufficiently associated with variations in employee performance within the observed sample after discipline and work environment were considered simultaneously. The finding should not be interpreted as evidence that motivation is completely irrelevant to employee performance. Rather, the statistical evidence indicates that motivation, as operationalized and measured in this study, did not independently provide a significant explanation of employee performance.

The result differs from previous studies, which reported significant effects of motivation on employee performance (Emela et al., 2024; Hati et al., 2026; Khairunisah & Suhendra, 2026; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Sumarni et al., 2024). The difference between these findings may be related to differences in organizational context, employee characteristics, motivational practices, measurement instruments, or other conditions surrounding the research setting. The present study therefore suggests that the relationship between motivation and employee performance may not necessarily be uniform across different organizational environments.

The practical implication is that management may consider strengthening motivational mechanisms that are directly relevant to employees' work experiences. Compensation in the form of salary and non-financial forms of recognition, such as competitions, recreational activities, or organizational outings, may be considered as possible approaches to encourage employees to maintain and develop their capabilities in performing assigned tasks. Such motivational practices should be aligned with employees' needs and the organization's capacity. Since the present analysis did not directly test the effectiveness of specific motivational interventions, these suggestions should be regarded as managerial considerations rather than established causal effects.

4.3 The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance

The partial regression analysis indicates that the work environment has a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. The regression coefficient was 0.659, the standardized coefficient was β = .437, and the t statistic was 2.536 with a p-value of .018. Because the p-value is below the 0.05 significance level, H3 is supported. The positive coefficient indicates that better work-environment conditions are associated with higher employee performance when discipline and motivation are held constant.

This finding is consistent with the theoretical perspective presented in previous

research, which defines the work environment as the physical, social, and psychological conditions surrounding employees that may influence their ability to perform daily tasks (Emela et al., 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026). Employees perform their responsibilities within a particular physical and organizational environment, meaning that the availability and quality of working conditions can influence how comfortably and effectively they carry out their duties. A supportive work environment can provide conditions that facilitate employees' concentration, comfort, safety, and ability to complete their responsibilities.

The finding is also supported by previous research, which found that the work environment significantly affects employee performance (Hati et al., 2026; Maulidiyah & Sidi, 2024; Nabila & Erica, 2026; Osiani et al., 2026; Sumarni et al., 2024). The consistency of the present findings with these studies indicates that the work environment is an important factor to consider when examining employee performance. In the context of a culinary business, employees must interact with physical facilities, equipment, coworkers, supervisors, and customers as part of their daily activities. The quality of these conditions may therefore be associated with employees' ability to perform their responsibilities effectively.

The practical implication of this finding is that the management of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen should maintain and improve the quality of the work environment. Appropriate lighting, adequate workplace conditions, comfortable air conditions, and sufficient attention to employee safety may support employees in performing their duties effectively. Maintaining a supportive work environment should be accompanied by periodic evaluation so that management can identify conditions that may interfere with employees' comfort and performance. Improvements in workplace conditions may consequently serve as one managerial approach to supporting employee performance.

5. Conclusion

The findings demonstrate that discipline has a statistically significant effect on employee performance at Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. Higher levels of employee discipline are associated with greater responsibility in carrying out assigned tasks and fewer work-related problems, which is reflected in better employee performance. Motivation, in contrast, does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance. This finding indicates that, within the context of this study, variations in employee motivation are not sufficiently associated with differences in performance when considered alongside the other predictors in the model. The work environment has a statistically significant effect on employee performance. A better and more supportive work environment is associated with greater employee comfort and better performance, indicating the importance of maintaining favorable working conditions for employees.

Based on these findings, several recommendations can be proposed for the management of Rumah Makan Roso Joyo 2 Sragen. In terms of discipline, the management should strengthen employees' ability to perform assigned tasks independently rather than relying predominantly on group-based task execution. Although employee attendance is generally good, the effectiveness and efficiency of task completion still require improvement. Clearer individual responsibilities and greater emphasis on effective and efficient task execution may therefore be considered. Regarding motivation, although the variable was not found to have a statistically significant effect on employee performance, management may still consider appropriate initiatives to maintain employee enthusiasm and reduce boredom in the workplace. Such initiatives may include recreational activities, salary or performance-based bonuses, vacations, and forms of employee appreciation. Regarding the work environment, management should maintain and strengthen communication with employees through both verbal and non-verbal forms of communication. Positive and supportive communication can help foster harmonious workplace relationships and contribute to a more comfortable working environment.

References

Ardianto, R. E., & Nurjanah, R. (2023). The influence of motivation, work discipline and work environment on employee performance. *Jurnal Ekonomi, 12*(1), 1825–1830.

Emela, S., Gemina, D., & Kartini, T. (2024). Employee performance based on work motivation, work environment, and work discipline. *Jurnal Ekonomi, 13*(1), 1057–1068.

Erawati, K. N., Sitiari, N. W., & Indiani, N. L. P.

(2019). The effect of stress and working environment on employee performance through motivation mediation: A case study on international restaurant in Badung Bali. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Jagaditha, 6*(1), 22–30. https://doi.org/10.22225/jj.6.1.586.22-30

Fathur Rozi, A., Sundari, A., & Syaikuddin, A. Y. (2024). Work environment, employee motivation, and discipline as drivers of employee performance in local government-owned bank. *Klabat Journal of Management, 5*(2), 167–183. https://doi.org/10.60090/kjm.v5i2.1170.167-183

Fauziah, S. I., & Baskara, I. (2024). The effect of work environment and work discipline on employee performance through motivation. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 12*(3), 649–660.

Halim, M. A., & Hendratmoko, H. (2025). The effect of motivation and work environment on employee performance with work discipline as an intervening variable at BCA Kelapa Gading. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains, 6*(10), 3325–3344. https://doi.org/10.59141/jiss.v6i10.1916

Hati, A., Jusriadi, E., & Hidayat, M. (2026). The influence of the work environment and motivation on employee performance at PT Sinergi Gula Nusantara Takalar Sugar Factory. *Journal Social Society, 6*(3), 2427–2442. https://doi.org/10.54065/jss.6.3.2026.1418

Ka'ti, A., Junaidi, J., & Jasman, J. (2026). The influence of reward, punishment, and work motivation on employee performance at MSMEs Palopo. *Golden Ratio of Mapping Idea and Literature Format, 6*(2), 1654–1667. https://doi.org/10.52970/grmilf.v6i2.2093

Khairunisah, S., & Suhendra, A. D. (2026). The effect of incentives and extrinsic motivation on employee performance at PT Isuto Sukses Jaya, West Jakarta. *Income Journal of Economics Development, 6*(2), 242–260. https://doi.org/10.54065/ijed.6.2.2026.807

Maulidiyah, L., & Sidi, A. P. (2024). The effect of work motivation, work discipline, and work environment on employee performance: Case study at CV. ATH Group Balikpapan. *Jurnal Apresiasi Ekonomi, 12*(3), 523–537. https://doi.org/10.31846/jae.v12i3.984

Malau, A. G., & Ekananda, M. (2025). The impact of MSME's on employment, investment, and income. *Economics Development Analysis Journal, 14*(2), 238–254. https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v14i2.24026

Nabila, G., & Erica, D. (2026). The influence of job satisfaction and work environment on employee performance at PT Gabag Indonesia Tangerang. *Income Journal of Economics Development, 6*(2), 277–296. https://doi.org/10.54065/ijed.6.2.2026.859

Osiani, O., Nur, M., & Wahyuni, S. (2026). Analysis of factors affecting employee performance at the Regional Planning, Research, and Development Agency (BAPPEDA) of Wakatobi Regency, Southeast Sulawesi Province. *Journal Social Society, 6*(3), 2154–2170. https://doi.org/10.54065/jss.6.2.2026.1372

Pancasila, I., Marisya, F., Marsinah, M., Hatidah, H., & Malini, S. (2023). The influence of the work environment on employee performance at PT. Ar Rayyan Tour and Travel. *Jurnal Ekonomi, 12*(1), 1005–1008.

Pongtuluran, A. K., & Marewa, J. B. (2025). The effect of work motivation and discipline on employee performance effectiveness. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13*(5), 3497–3506. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i5.3589

Raskin, R., Yusuf, M., & Adiningrat, A. A. W. (2026). The influence of motivation and work discipline on employee performance at the Gowa Regency DPRD Secretariat. *Journal Social Society, 6*(3), 2171–2185. https://doi.org/10.54065/jss.6.3.2026.1374

Sendri, S., Helmi, S., Trisninawati, T., & Roni, M. (2024). The impact of discipline, motivation and work environment on employee performance at BPJS Ketenagakerjaan Regional Office of South Sumatra and Bangka Belitung Islands: A review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA), 8*(3), 1066–1085.

https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.v8i3.3744

Sihombing, P., Fitriano, A., & Harahap, J. B. (2024). The influence of work environment, work discipline, and work motivation on employee performance at PT Opal Coffee Indonesia. *Mount Hope Economic Global Journal, 2*(2), 53–62. https://doi.org/10.61696/mega.v2i2.358

Suheri, K. F., & Raharjo, S. T. (2023). The influence of leadership style, work motivation, and compensation on the performance of MSME center employees in Semarang City. *Jurnal Bisnis Strategi, 32*(2), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.14710/jbs.32.2.55-65

Sumarni, T., Yuliana, L., & Mamengko, R. P. (2024). Academic staff performance in the post COVID-19: Study of motivation, work environment, and discipline. *Jurnal Economia, 20*(1), 125–145. https://doi.org/10.21831/economia.v20i1.63021