

THE EFFECT OF WORK DISCIPLINE AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE WORK PRODUCTIVITY AT UD SUKRI DANA ABADI PONOROGO

Mazda Restu Ristiawan

Management Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas PGRI Madiun

email: mazda_2203102244@mhs.unipma.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo. The study used a quantitative approach with a correlational design, involving all 67 employees as respondents through a saturated sampling (census) technique. Data were collected using a four-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed with SPSS 25 through validity and reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression analysis, and hypothesis testing. This study was motivated by the phenomenon of employees arriving late, being absent, and smoking during working hours, together with a hot, dusty, and poorly arranged work environment within the coir-broom and coconut-fiber broom production unit. The results show that Work Discipline and Work Environment, both partially and simultaneously, have a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity. The results of the study are expected to contribute to the development of Human Resource Management science and provide input for UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo in strengthening work discipline and improving the work environment to enhance employee work productivity.

Keywords: *Work Discipline, Work Environment, Employee Work Productivity.*

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background and Phenomenon

Human resources are one of the most important elements in a company because people act as the primary driver of operational activities and the achievement of organizational goals. A company may possess capital, raw materials, technology, and adequate facilities, yet without disciplined, comfortable, and productive human resources, its activities cannot run optimally (Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). In production companies, employee performance is directly linked to the attainment of production

targets, so work productivity becomes an essential measure of a company's ability to generate output relative to the resources used (Prawoto & Hasyim, 2022).

UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo is a manufacturing business producing coir brooms and coconut-fiber brooms, located in Dukuh Tempel, Purwosari Village, Babadan District, Ponorogo Regency, and operating as a branch of its head office in Surabaya. Of the company's 250 employees spread across its head office and branches, 67 work at the Ponorogo branch, consisting of 1 manager, 1 administrative staff member, 2 production supervisors, 8 daily production workers, and 55 piece-rate production workers, with piece-rate workers alone accounting for 82.09% of the branch's workforce. This composition shows that the branch's production activities depend heavily on direct labor, making employee discipline and a supportive work environment critical to maintaining smooth production.

Although the company has established work rules covering working hours, uniform requirements, product quality, rest periods, a no-smoking policy, workplace tidiness, task assignment, and mandatory attendance, preliminary observations revealed several discipline-related problems, including employees arriving late, absenteeism (particularly among daily workers), smoking during working hours, and morale that fluctuated with order volume. In addition, the work environment was found to be less conducive: the production area becomes hot due to its zinc roofing, is dusty from raw materials used in production, and has poorly arranged storage that limits employees' movement and makes tools difficult to locate (Susamai & Cay, 2025).

Production data from March 2025 to March 2026 further illustrate the company's dynamics: total output reached 387,700 units (233,040 coir brooms and 154,660 coconut-fiber brooms), peaking at 35,400 units in December 2025 and falling to a low of 25,200 units in February 2026. These fluctuations are used only as supporting context, not as a direct indicator of employee productivity, since productivity in this study is measured

through ability, achievement improvement, morale, self-development, quality, and efficiency rather than output volume alone.

Previous studies have produced inconsistent findings on this relationship. Prawoto and Hasyim (2022), Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022), and Dwi Astuti et al. (2024) found that work discipline and work environment positively and significantly affect employee productivity. However, Qulub and Ilhami (2024) found that work environment had a negative, non-significant effect on the productivity of production employees, while Mahdiyyah et al. (2025) found that work discipline had a significant negative effect on productivity. Most prior research was conducted at large manufacturers, government agencies, or cooperatives, whereas UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo is a small, local production enterprise dominated by piece-rate labor. This gap, together with the discipline- and environment-related phenomena observed in the field, motivates the present study to examine the effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study uses Organizational Behavior Theory as the grand theory. Robbins and Judge (2014) explain that organizational behavior is a field of study examining the influence of individuals, groups, and structure on behavior within organizations, with the aim of improving organizational effectiveness. In this study, work discipline reflects individual behavior in complying with rules and work standards, while work environment reflects an organizational condition that influences employee comfort and behavior, together shaping employee productivity (Robbins & Judge, 2022).

Employee Work Productivity is understood as employees' ability to complete work effectively and efficiently by making use of time, effort, raw materials, and available facilities to achieve company targets (Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). The indicators

of employee work productivity in this study refer to Edy Sutrisno as cited in Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022), namely ability, improvement of achieved results, morale, self-development, quality, and efficiency.

Work Discipline is understood as employees' attitudes and behavior in complying with company rules, carrying out work according to standards, and being responsible for assigned tasks (Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). The indicators of work discipline refer to Sastrohadiwiryo as cited in Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022), namely attendance frequency, level of alertness, compliance with work standards, compliance with work regulations, and work ethics.

Work Environment is understood as all physical and non-physical conditions surrounding employees that affect their comfort, safety, morale, and smoothness in carrying out their work (Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). The indicators of work environment refer to Sedarmayanti as cited in Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022), namely lighting, air temperature, workplace noise, use of color, required movement space, work safety, and employee relations.

Several previous studies support the relationship among these variables. Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022) found that work discipline and work environment significantly affect employee productivity, both partially and simultaneously, at a regional public works office. Apriliani and Romus (2023) and Qulub and Ilhami (2024) similarly found that work discipline positively and significantly affects the productivity of production employees. Fitriah and Akbar (2023) found that physical work environment positively and significantly affects work productivity, and Dwi Astuti et al. (2024) found that discipline and environment jointly explained 58.6% of the variance in employee productivity at an engineering company. However, not all findings are consistent: Qulub and Ilhami (2024) also reported a negative, non-significant effect of work environment on productivity in a different sample, and Mahdiyyah et al. (2025) found that discipline had a

significant negative effect, indicating that this relationship remains dynamic and warrants further investigation, particularly at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.

3. Research Objective

This study aims to: (1) provide empirical evidence of the effect of Work Discipline on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo; (2) provide empirical evidence of the effect of Work Environment on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo; and (3) provide empirical evidence of the simultaneous effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.

4. Research Hypotheses

- a. H₁: Work Discipline affects Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.
- b. H₂: Work Environment affects Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.
- c. H₃: Work Discipline and Work Environment simultaneously affect Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo.

B. METHOD

This study used a quantitative method with a correlational design to examine the effect of Work Discipline (X_1) and Work Environment (X_2) on Employee Work Productivity (Y) (Sugiyono, 2013). The population consisted of all 67 employees of UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo, with saturated sampling (census) used as the sampling technique (Sugiyono, 2023), resulting in a total sample of 67 respondents.

Data were collected using a four-point Likert-scale questionnaire. Work Discipline was measured with 10 items across 5 indicators — attendance frequency, level of alertness, compliance with work standards, compliance with work regulations, and work ethics

(Sastrohadiwiryo as cited in Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). Work Environment was measured with 14 items across 7 indicators — lighting, air temperature, noise, use of color, movement space, work safety, and employee relations (Sedarmayanti as cited in Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022). Employee Work Productivity was measured with 12 items across 6 indicators — ability, improvement of achieved results, morale, self-development, quality, and efficiency (Edy Sutrisno as cited in Asriningtyas & Kusumayadi, 2022).

Instrument feasibility was tested using Pearson Correlation for validity (r table = 0.240, $df = 65$, $\alpha = 5\%$) and Cronbach's Alpha for reliability (threshold > 0.60) (Ghozali, 2018). Classical assumption tests were conducted prior to regression analysis, comprising normality (One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov, sig. > 0.05), heteroscedasticity (Glejser test, sig. > 0.05), and multicollinearity (Tolerance > 0.10 , VIF < 10).

Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with the equation $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$. Hypothesis testing used the F-test (simultaneous effect), t-test (partial effect), and coefficient of determination (R^2) (Ghozali, 2018), with a significance criterion of 0.05, processed using SPSS 25.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Instrument Evaluation and Classical Assumption Test Results

Respondents consisted of 67 employees of UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo, comprising 59 female employees (88.06%) and 8 male employees (11.94%), with the majority aged over 35 years (65.70%), holding a senior/vocational high school education (SMA/SMK, 59.70%), and having worked for 1–3 years (34.30%). Validity testing across 67 respondents showed that all items on the Work Discipline, Work Environment, and Employee Work Productivity variables had r-calculated values greater than the r-table value (0.240) with $p = 0.000$,

proving all items valid. Reliability tests confirmed all variables exceeded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.60, as presented in Table 1.

Tabel 1. Instrument Testing Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Description
Work Discipline	0.928	10	Reliable
Work Environment	0.964	14	Reliable
Employee Work Productivity	0.957	12	Reliable

Source: SPSS 25 Output,

Classical assumption testing was carried out prior to regression analysis. The normality test using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test produced a significance value of 0.200 (> 0.05), indicating that the residual data are normally distributed. The multicollinearity test showed a Tolerance value of 1.000 and a VIF value of 1.000 for both independent variables, well within the required thresholds (Tolerance > 0.10 ; VIF < 10), confirming the absence of multicollinearity. The heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test showed significance values of 0.744 for Work Discipline and 0.250 for Work Environment, both greater than 0.05, indicating that the regression model does not exhibit heteroscedasticity. The regression model therefore satisfies all classical assumption requirements and is suitable for multiple linear regression analysis.

2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Work Productivity, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Model	B	Std. Error	Coeff. Beta	t-statistic	Sig.
(Constant)	-6.485	2.635	-	-2.461	0.017
Work Discipline	0.679	0.085	0.499	8.009	0.000
Work Environment	0.626	0.055	0.709	11.382	0.000

Source: SPSS 25 Output

Based on Table 2, the multiple linear regression equation is $Y = -6.485 + 0.679X_1 + 0.626X_2 + e$, where Y is Employee Work Productivity, X_1 is Work Discipline, and X_2 is Work Environment. Both regression coefficients are positive, indicating that an increase in Work Discipline and Work Environment is followed by an increase in Employee Work Productivity. The standardized coefficient (Beta) of Work Environment (0.709) is higher than that of Work Discipline (0.499), indicating that Work Environment contributes more strongly to Employee Work Productivity.

3. Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypotheses were tested using the t-test for partial effects and the F-test for the simultaneous effect, with decisions based on a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. Table 3 summarizes the partial hypothesis testing results.

Table 3. Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Path	Coefficient (Beta)	t-statistic	p-values
H ₁	Work Discipline > Employee Work Productivity	0.499	8.009	0.000

Hypothesis	Path	Coefficient (Beta)	t-statistic	p-values
H ₂	Work Environment > Employee Work Productivity	0.709	11.382	0.000

Source: SPSS 25 Output

Table 3 shows that Work Discipline has a t-statistic of 8.009 with $p = 0.000 (< 0.05)$, so H₁ is accepted: Work Discipline has a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity. Work Environment has a t-statistic of 11.382 with $p = 0.000 (< 0.05)$, so H₂ is accepted: Work Environment has a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity. The higher t-statistic of Work Environment compared to Work Discipline indicates that Work Environment has a more dominant effect on Employee Work Productivity.

Table 4. Simultaneous Effect Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Path	F-statistic	F-table	p-values
H ₃	Work Discipline, Work Environment > Employee Work Productivity	97.045	3.14	0.000

Source: SPSS 25 Output

Table 4 shows a calculated F-statistic of 97.045, greater than the F-table value of 3.14, with $p = 0.000 (< 0.05)$, so H₃ is accepted: Work Discipline and Work Environment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity.

Table 5. Coefficient of Determination Results

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
0.867	0.752	0.744

Source: SPSS 25 Output

The R value of 0.867 indicates that the relationship between Work Discipline and Work Environment with Employee Work Productivity falls into the very strong category. The R Square value of 0.752 shows that Work Discipline and Work Environment jointly explain 75.2% of the variance in Employee Work Productivity, while the remaining 24.8% is explained by other factors outside this research model, such as leadership, compensation, work culture, work motivation, job satisfaction, and training.

4. Discussion

The results confirm that Work Discipline has a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity, consistent with Organizational Behavior Theory (Robbins & Judge, 2014). Work discipline reflected through regular attendance, compliance with work standards and regulations, and sound work ethics enables employees at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo to make more effective use of working time and complete tasks according to target. This finding is consistent with Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022) and Prawoto and Hasyim (2022), who found that work discipline significantly affects employee productivity, and with Apriliani and Romus (2023) and Qulub and Ilhami (2024), who found a positive significant effect specifically among production employees. Given that production activities at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo rely heavily on timeliness and adherence to procedure, weak discipline — such as tardiness, absenteeism, or smoking during working hours — directly threatens production flow, whereas strong discipline supports a more orderly and efficient process.

Work Environment likewise has a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity, with a higher t-value and standardized coefficient than Work Discipline, indicating that it is the more dominant factor at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo. This result is consistent with Dwi Astuti et al. (2024), who found that room conditions, facilities,

temperature, noise, and movement space affect employee comfort and productivity, and with Fitriah and Akbar (2023) and Setiawan and Nuridin (2021), who found that physical work environment positively and significantly affects productivity. The dominance of this variable is consistent with preliminary observations showing that the production area's heat, dust, and cramped, poorly arranged storage limit employees' comfort and movement; improving lighting, temperature control, air circulation, and workplace organization is therefore likely to yield a comparatively large productivity gain.

Simultaneously, Work Discipline and Work Environment positively and significantly affect Employee Work Productivity, with an R Square of 0.752 reflecting a very strong joint explanatory power, reinforcing Organizational Behavior Theory's view that individual behavior and organizational conditions together shape performance (Robbins & Judge, 2022). This result supports Setiawan and Nuridin (2021), Asriningtyas and Kusumayadi (2022), and Dwi Astuti et al. (2024), who similarly found significant simultaneous effects of these two variables on employee productivity. The finding empirically confirms the field observations described in the background: the discipline problems (tardiness, absenteeism, smoking) and environmental problems (heat, dust, poor arrangement) observed at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo are not separate issues but jointly shape the day-to-day work behavior that ultimately determines employee productivity.

D. CONCLUSIONS

This study proves that Work Discipline and Work Environment each have a positive and significant effect on Employee Work Productivity at UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo, and both simultaneously affect Employee Work Productivity as well, with Work Environment proving to be the more dominant factor. These findings indicate that productivity among the largely piece-rate workforce of this local production enterprise is shaped both by employees' compliance with work rules and by the physical conditions of the production area. This study

is limited to UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo and to two explanatory variables, so the results are not intended to be generalized to all manufacturing or production businesses.

E. SUGGESTIONS

UD Sukri Dana Abadi Ponorogo is advised to strengthen work discipline by tightening attendance supervision, consistently enforcing work rules, and instilling responsibility and honesty among employees, and to improve the work environment by reorganizing the production area, upgrading lighting and air circulation, reducing dust and noise exposure, and strengthening workplace safety. Employees themselves are advised to uphold attendance, comply with work procedures and standards, and maintain professionalism, while also helping to maintain a clean and orderly workspace and fostering harmonious working relationships. Future researchers are advised to include other variables relevant to employee productivity, such as leadership, compensation, work culture, motivation, or job satisfaction, and to expand the study to other production enterprises with a larger number of respondents for more comprehensive results.

REFERENCES

- Alyanti, T., Sutrisna, A., & Asyiah, A. K. (2023). The influence of work environment and work discipline on employee productivity at Hasgradini Cibeureum Tasikmalaya Convection. *Journal of Management, Economic, and Accounting*, 2(2), 361–372.
- Annur, D. R., & Abidin, A. Z. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT Makmur Cipta Pangan di Rangkasbitung. *JURIHUM: Jurnal Inovasi dan Humaniora*, 2(2), 185–199.
- Apriliani, A., & Romus, M. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan bagian produksi. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(1), 133–141.
- Asriningtyas, D., & Kusumayadi, F. (2022). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja pegawai pada Dinas Pekerjaan Umum (PU) Kabupaten Bima. *Jurnal Manajemen Sumber*

DayaManusia, 16(2), 37–49.

<https://ejurnal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/Manajemen/article/view/7582>

Dwi Astuti, Rony, Z. T., & Sari, R. K. (2024). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT. Engineering di Kota Bekasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 2(7), 405–418.

<https://ejurnal.kampusakademik.co.id/index.php/jiem/article/download/1977/1788/7720>

Fitriah, S., & Akbar, I. R. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja pada PT. Adis Dimension Footwear Balaraja-Tangerang. *Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, 1(4), 1089–1099.

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25* (Edisi 9). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gintara, N., Sumarni, S., & Aira, D. M. F. (2025). The influence of work environment on work productivity through work discipline as an intervening variable on production employees of PT BSU Batang Hari. *Asian Journal of Management Analytics*, 4(1), 351–370.

<https://doi.org/10.55927/ajma.v4i1.13665>

Hisanuddin, I. I., Ainun, W. O. N., & Rais, L. O. M. A. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas pegawai pada Kantor Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah Kota Baubau. *GALANGI (Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis)*, 1(1), 1–7.

Indriati, I. H., Ningrum, N. R., & Lestari, R. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, lingkungan kerja, dan keterampilan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan. *Kinerja: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 20(4), 493–503.

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396–403.

<https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>

Kusufa, F., Fianto, L., & Moni, Y. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, penilaian kinerja, disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja di Kantor Kelurahan Merjosari Kota Malang. *Journal of Research on Business and Tourism*, 3(1), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.37535/104003120233>

Mahdiyyah, Pratamasyari, D. A., & Mansur, N. (2025). Pengaruh fasilitas, disiplin, lingkungan kerja, dan kepemimpinan terhadap produktivitas kerja (Studi pada Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu). *Jurnal Semesta Ilmu Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, 1(4), 1197–1213.

<https://doi.org/10.71417/j-sime.v1i4.618>

- Manulang, F. R., Sulaeman, M., & Rahmiati. (2025). Meningkatkan produktivitas karyawan melalui lingkungan, disiplin, dan motivasi kerja. *Jurnal Penelitian Manajemen Terapan (PENATARAN)*, 10(1), 99–113.
- Markus, M., Hasanah, T., & Pahlani, M. (2023). Disiplin kerja, motivasi kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja pegawai. *Journal of Management and Bussines (JOMB)*, 5(1), 741–749. <https://doi.org/10.31539/jomb.v5i1.6060>
- Mertha, I. M. A. G., & Suwandana, I. G. M. (2025). The influence of work discipline, work environment, and organizational culture on employee work productivity at the Sesetan Regional Cooperative. *American Journal of Economic and Management Business*, 4(10), 1806–1822. <https://doi.org/10.58631/ajemb.v4i10.326>
- Prawoto, A., & Hasyim, W. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktifitas kerja pada PT Manufaktur Cikarang. *Ikraith-Ekonomika*, 5(3), 276–286. <https://doi.org/10.37817/ikraith-ekonomika.v5i3.2485>
- Qulub, A. T., & Ilhami, S. D. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, lingkungan kerja, disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan bagian produksi PT Karya Mina Putra Divisi Kayu Kota Rembang. *Revitalisasi*, 13(2), 358. <https://doi.org/10.32503/revitalisasi.v13i2.6335>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2014). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (12th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson.
- Sari, N., Yancik, Y., & Ridho, A. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja di PT. Korma Jaya Utama. *Journal of Innovative and Creativity (Joecy)*, 5(2), 11895–11916. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joecy.v5i2.3003>
- Setiawan, B., & Nuridin. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan bagian operator SPBU Bekasi PT Pertamina Retail. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Krisnadwipayana*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.35137/jmbk.v9i1.520>
- Setyanti, S. W. L. H., Sudarsih, S., & Audiva, D. (2022). Pengaruh keterampilan, disiplin kerja, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan. *EKOMBIS Review: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 10(S1), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v10iS1.1938>
- Simanjuntak, D. C. Y., Panggabean, E. P. A., & Ahmadi, E. A. (2023). The influence of work discipline and work environment on employee work productivity. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v4i3.330>

- Sitepu, M. A., Samrin, S., & Setiawan, A. (2026). Analysis of discipline and work environment on the work productivity of employees at the Auto2000 Workshop in Medan-Binjai. *Journal of Management, Economic, and Accounting*, 5(2).
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Susamai, A. A., & Cay, S. (2025). The effect of work discipline and work motivation on employee performance. *Journal of Investment Development, Economics and Accounting*, 1(3), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.70001/jidea.v1i3.274>