International Journal of Educational Technology Research (IJETR)
Vol.4, No.1 March, 2025: 57-68

The Influence of Discipline and Work Experience on Employee Performance With Work Environment as a Moderating Variable in the Government of Ponorogo Regency

Nia Adityas Marchelia
Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta
Corresponding Author: Nia Adityas : niamarchelia01@gamil.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Discipline, Work Experience, Work Environment, Employee Performance

Received : 20, January
Revised : 25, February
Accepted: 26, March

A B S T R A C T

With the work environment serving as a moderating variable, this study attempts to investigate the impact of work discipline and work experience on employee performance. In this study, a quantitative method was used. All Ponorogo Regency Government workers made up the population, and purposive sampling was used to choose the sample. Seventy workers in all took part in the survey. Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) was used to assess the data that was gathered via surveys. A significance value of 0.001 < 0.05 indicates that work discipline has a positive and significant impact on employee performance; a significance value of 0.037 < 0.05 indicates that work experience also has a positive and significant impact on employee performance; a significance value of 0.026 < 0.05 indicates that the work environment can moderate and strengthen the influence of discipline on performance; and a significant value of 0.647 > 0.05 indicates that the work environment does not moderate the relationship between work experience and performance. The implications of this study highlight the important role of the work environment in strengthening employees' work-related behavioral factors. Therefore, organizations are encouraged to create a comfortable, supportive, and productive work environment in order to enhance employee performance.

INTRODUCTION

Employee performance can be used as an indicator to measure an individual's level of productivity. The quality of employee performance is reflected in how well an organization manages its available resources. Local government, as a public service organization, is obligated and responsible for delivering public services effectively. However, a current issue observed in the Ponorogo Regency Government is that employee performance has not yet reached its optimal level, as evidenced by several government programs that have not been implemented effectively.

Several factors have been identified as contributing to the suboptimal performance of the Ponorogo Regency Government. First, organizational performance remains inadequate, as the institutional structure has not yet aligned with the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD). Second, the score for the supervision strengthening component in the Bureaucratic Reform Index (IRB) is relatively low, at 5.58 out of a total weight of 12 (46.5%), indicating that the quality of oversight is still insufficient. Third, the percentage of planning aligned with the achievement of development targets in 2020 reached 92%, meaning that approximately 8% of development targets were not achieved as planned. Fourth, the Regional Government Implementation Report (LPPD) scores for Ponorogo from 2015 to 2018 show that the performance of local governance tends to fluctuate. Fifth, human resource management remains weak. The Civil Servant Professionalism Index (ASN) of Ponorogo Regency in 2020 was relatively low at 75%, which may be attributed to factors such as improper placement of civil servants not based on their competencies and ongoing disciplinary violations within the local government (RPJMD Ponorogo Regency, 2021).

The realization of a responsible government begins with the enforcement of discipline within the organization. According to Sinambela (2016), work discipline is a tool used by leaders to communicate with employees to encourage them to adjust their behavior in accordance with established rules (Simbolon, 2023: 166). Within the Ponorogo Regency Government, a phenomenon was observed across six divisions of the Regional Secretariat, where the average attendance rate over the past five months reached 96% out of 100%. However, one division recorded an attendance rate as low as 88%, indicating the need for greater attention to improving employee discipline. Another factor influencing performance is work experience. Differences in the length and level of experience can lead to variations in performance. Handoko (2001) stated that "experience is the best teacher," meaning that past experiences serve as valuable lessons for the future (Rumtotmey et al., 2022: 501). Additionally, the work environment is another important factor. Sedarmayanti (2017) defines the work environment as a setting where a group operates, supported by various facilities to achieve organizational goals in line with its vision and mission (Munardi et al., 2021: 337).

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Employee Performance

The concept of performance as it relates to work outcomes was proposed by Wilson and Rosenfeld (1990), who define performance as the result achieved by an employee. Hale (2004) further explains that performance represents a set of measurements and outcome values, along with behavioral integrity, used in carrying out job responsibilities (Pranogyo et al., 2021: 4).

- Hermawati (2022) identifies several indicators of employee performance (Sanjaya & Febrian, 2024: 33), including:
- Work quality, which measures how well an employee completes tasks according to established standards.
- Workload, referring to the number of tasks that must be completed within a certain period.
- Task implementation, which relates to the employee's ability to perform duties accurately and reliably.
- Responsibility awareness, defined as an individual's understanding of their obligations and duties.

2. Work Discipline

According to Sinambela (2016), work discipline is a tool used by leaders to communicate with employees in order to encourage behavioral changes that align with established rules. It serves as a mechanism for guiding and controlling employee behavior to ensure compliance with organizational standards. Several indicators of work discipline include (Agustini, 2020: 104):

- Attendance level, referring to the frequency of employee presence in carrying out work activities.
- Work procedures, which are the rules and regulations that must be followed by all members of the organization.
- Obedience to superiors, meaning adherence to instructions given by supervisors to achieve optimal results.
- Work awareness, defined as the willingness to perform tasks voluntarily and properly without coercion.
- Responsibility, referring to the employee's readiness to be accountable for work results, the use of facilities, and their work behavior.

3. Work Experience

Based on experiential learning theory proposed by David Kolb (1980), work experience can be understood as a continuous learning process in which individuals apply acquired knowledge to new work situations. The phrase "experience is the best teacher" implies that individuals gain valuable lessons from past experiences. Edy (2016) defines work experience as the length of time an employee has worked in a particular position, starting from the initial employment until the present (Basyit et al., 2020: 13).

Indicators used to assess work experience include (Rona Gah, 2021):

- Length of service, which reflects the duration of time an individual has worked and their ability to understand and perform job tasks effectively.

- Level of knowledge and skills, where knowledge refers to concepts, principles, procedures, policies, or job-related information, and skills refer to the physical abilities required to perform tasks.
- Mastery of work and equipment, indicating the employee's level of competence and proficiency in handling technical aspects of the job and related tools.

4. Work Environment

Sedarmayanti (2017) defines the work environment as a setting where a group operates, supported by various facilities to achieve organizational goals in line with its vision and mission (Munardi et al., 2021: 337). The work environment encompasses all factors surrounding employees that may influence how they perform their duties, including both physical and non-physical aspects, which contribute to productivity and well-being.

According to Siagian (2014), the work environment can generally be divided into two types (Rahmawati et al., 2020: 7–8):

a. Physical Work Environment, which includes several favorable conditions such as:

- A workplace building that is not only visually appealing but also designed with occupational safety in mind.
- Availability of adequate work equipment to support task completion.
- Provision of rest areas for employees to relieve fatigue, either within or around the workplace.
- Availability of religious facilities, such as a mosque.

b. **Non-Physical Work Environment**

This refers to a conducive work atmosphere characterized by harmonious relationships between employees and their superiors. Siagian (2014) outlines several indicators of the non-physical work environment (Rahmawati et al., 2020: 8–9):

- Harmonious relationships among colleagues without conflict or unhealthy competition.
- Good relationships between supervisors and employees, maintained through mutual respect.
- Effective cooperation among employees, enabling tasks to be completed efficiently and effectively.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative research technique, which presents data in numerical form that can be evaluated and statistically assessed. The Ponorogo Regency Government was the site of the study. Every employee of the Ponorogo Regency Government makes up the population. Purposive sampling is the method employed, which entails choosing respondents according to predetermined standards set by the researcher. Seventy respondents make up the study's entire sample size.

Direct observation and questionnaires were used to gather data. The data were then analyzed using a variety of data analysis methods, such as hypothesis testing, classical assumption tests, reliability and validity tests, and Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity and Reliability Tests

If the p-value is less than 0.05, the item is considered acceptable; if it is more than 0.05, it is considered invalid. Additionally, if an instrument's Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is greater than 0.70, it is considered dependent; if it is less than 0.70, it is considered unreliable. (Ghozali, 2018).

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	Sig. Value	Description
Discipline (X1)	X1.1	0.001	Valid
	X1.2	0.001	Valid
	X1.3	0.001	Valid
	X1.4	0.001	Valid
	X1.5	0.001	Valid
Work Experience (X2)	X2.1	0.001	Valid
	X2.2	0.001	Valid
	X2.3	0.001	Valid
	X2.4	0.001	Valid
	X2.5	0.001	Valid
Performance (Y)	Y1	0.001	Valid
	Y2	0.001	Valid
	Y3	0.001	Valid
	Y4	0.001	Valid
Work Environment (Z)	Z1	0.001	Valid
	Z2	0.001	Valid
	Z3	0.003	Valid
	Z4	0.001	Valid
	Z5	0.028	Valid
	Z6	0.001	Valid
	Z7	0.001	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on Table 1, the results of the validity test show that each indicator item for each variable has a significance value of less than 0.05, which means that each item is considered valid.

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Threshold	Description
Discipline (X1)	0.744	0.70	Reliable
Work Experience (X2)	0.733	0.70	Reliable
Performance (Y)	0.754	0.70	Reliable
Work Environment (Z)	0.790	0.70	Reliable

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the Cronbach's Alpha values for all variables exceed 0.70. Therefore, all variables used in this study are considered reliable**.**

1. **Classical Assumption Tests**

a. Multicollinearity Test

This test aims to determine whether there is a strong correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

Table 3. Multicollinearity Test Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	3.513	2.280	–	1.541	0.128	–	–
Discipline	0.329	0.076	0.440	4.315	<0.001	0.892	1.121
Work Experience	0.136	0.064	0.210	2.131	0.037	0.957	1.045
Work Environment	0.135	0.055	0.242	2.430	0.018	0.930	1.075

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Tolerance values > 0.10 and VIF values < 10 show the lack of multicollinearity. Discipline, job experience, and work environment all have tolerance values greater than 0.10 and VIF values less than 10, according to the table. Thus, it may be said that the model does not have a multicollinearity problem.

b. Autocorrelation Test

This test is conducted to detect any correlation between residuals (errors) in one period and those in the previous period within a linear regression model.

Table 4. Autocorrelation Test Results (Runs Test)

Description	Value
Test Value (Median)	-0.19574
Cases < Test Value	35
Cases ≥ Test Value	35
Total Cases	70
Number of Runs	30
Z	-1.445
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.149

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

According to the decision rule, autocorrelation is present when the p-value is less than 0.05 and absent when it is more than 0.05. These results indicate that the significance value is more than 0.05, at 0.149. Thus, it may be concluded that there is no autocorrelation in the data.

Heteroskedasticity Test

The Glejser test is used to examine whether heteroskedasticity is present by observing the significance values.

Table 5. Heteroskedasticity Test Results

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.430	1.271	–	1.125	0.265
Discipline	0.029	0.043	0.087	0.677	0.501
Work Experience	-0.001	0.036	-0.005	-0.040	0.968
Work Environment	-0.037	0.031	-0.151	-1.199	0.235

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

The decision criterion indicates that if the p-value > 0.05, heteroskedasticity is not present; otherwise, it is present. Based on the table, the significance values for discipline, work experience, and work environment are all greater than 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no heteroskedasticity in the data.

d. Normality Test

The normality test in this study uses the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method. If the significance value exceeds the alpha level (0.05), the data are considered normally distributed.

Table 6. Normality Test Results (One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

Description	Value
N	70
Mean	0.0000000
Std. Deviation	1.17628643
Test Statistic	0.087
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.200
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	0.205
Confidence Interval (99%)	0.195 – 0.216

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

The results show that the Monte Carlo significance value (2-tailed) is 0.205. Since this value is greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data on discipline, work experience, and work environment in relation to employee performance are normally distributed.

Moderated Regression Analysis

a. Regression Equation for X1, X2, and Z on Y

Table 7. Regression Equation of X1, X2, and Z on Y

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	3.513	2.280	–	1.541	0.128
Discipline (X1)	0.329	0.076	0.440	4.315	<0.001
Work Experience (X2)	0.136	0.064	0.210	2.131	0.037

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Work Environment (Z)	0.135	0.055	0.242	2.430	0.018

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on the analysis, the regression equation is formulated as follows:

Y = 6.507 + 0.329X1 + 0.136X2 + 0.135Z + e

This equation can be interpreted as follows:

Employee performance increases by 0.329 for every one-unit increase in discipline, according to the discipline regression coefficient (X1) of 0.329. A significance value of 0.001 < 0.05 indicates a positive and substantial relationship between employee performance and punishment.

The regression coefficient for work experience (X2) is 0.136, meaning that for every one-unit increase in work experience, performance increases by 0.136. A significance value of 0.037 < 0.05 indicates a positive and significant relationship between work experience and employee performance.

b. Regression Equation of X1 on Y with Moderation

Table 8. Regression Equation of X1 on Y after Moderation

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	47.025	18.195	–	2.585	0.012
Discipline (X1)	-1.472	0.809	-1.965	1.819	0.073
X1Z	0.062	0.027	3.940	2.278	0.026
Work Environment (Z)	-1.265	0.614	-2.275	-2.059	0.043

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

The regression equation is:

Y = 47.025 – 1.472X1 – 1.265Z + 0.062X1·Z + e

The interpretation is as follows:

1. The coefficient for discipline (X1) is -1.472, indicating a negative relationship, where a decrease in discipline leads to a decline in performance.
2. The coefficient for work environment (Z) is -1.265, showing that a decrease in the work environment variable reduces performance.
3. The interaction coefficient between discipline and work environment (X1·Z) is 0.062 with a significance value of 0.026 < 0.05. This indicates that the work environment significantly moderates and strengthens the relationship between discipline and performance.

c. Regression Equation of X2 on Y with Moderation

Table 9. Regression Equation of X2 on Y after Moderation

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	19.294	15.987	–	1.207	0.232
Work Environment (Z)	-0.185	0.532	-0.334	-0.349	0.728
Work Experience (X2)	-0.341	0.741	-0.524	-0.460	0.647
X2Z	0.018	0.025	1.079	0.726	0.471

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

The regression equation is:

Y = 19.294 – 0.341X2 – 0.185Z + 0.018X2·Z + e

The interpretation is as follows:

1. The coefficient for work experience (X2) is -0.341, indicating a negative relationship, where a decrease in work experience leads to a decrease in performance.
2. The coefficient for work environment (Z) is -0.185, showing that a decline in the work environment variable also reduces performance.
3. The interaction term (X2·Z) has a coefficient of 0.018 with a significance value of 0.471 > 0.05. Although the coefficient is positive, it is not statistically significant, meaning that the work environment does not moderate the relationship between work experience and performance.

4. Hypothesis Testing (Partial and Simultaneous Tests)

t-Test (Partial Test)

The t-test is conducted to determine whether each independent variable—Discipline (X1), Work Experience (X2), the interaction between Discipline and Work Environment (X1Z), and the interaction between Work Experience and Work Environment (X2Z)—has a significant partial effect on employee performance (Y). The results are as follows:

a. The first hypothesis that discipline has a substantial partial impact on performance is accepted since the discipline significance value is 0.001 < 0.05.
b. The second hypothesis that job experience has a substantial partial impact on performance is accepted since the significance value for work experience is 0.012 < 0.05.
c. The third hypothesis that the work environment moderates the impact of discipline on performance is accepted since the significance value for the interaction between discipline and work environment is 0.001 < 0.05.

d. Although the calculated t-value (0.308) is less than the t-table value (1.99), the interaction between work experience and work environment displays a significant value below 0.05. As a result, the fourth hypothesis is disproved: the association between work experience and performance is not moderated by the workplace.

F-Test (Simultaneous Test)

The significance value for the F-test involving discipline, work experience, and work environment is 0.001 < 0.05. This indicates that the hypothesis is accepted, meaning that discipline (X1), work experience (X2), and work environment (Z) simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance (Y).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research conducted and the data analysis performed, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Employee performance in the Ponorogo Regency Government is positively and significantly impacted by work discipline.
2. Employee performance in the Ponorogo Regency Government is positively and significantly impacted by work experience.
3. The Ponorogo Regency Government's workplace may both enhance and mitigate the impact of discipline on worker performance.
4. The Ponorogo Regency Government's workplace is unable to mitigate the impact of work experience on employee performance..

REFRENCES

Agustini, Fauzia. 2020. *Strategi Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Medan: UISU Press.

Bappedalitbang. 2021. Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah daerah (RPJMD). Ponorogo: Bappedalitbang.

Basyit, Abdul. 2020. "Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan dan Pengalaman Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan." *Jurnal EMA - Ekonomi Manajemen Akuntansi*. Vol. 5 No. 1. h. 13.

Gah, Dicky Zulkarnain Rona dan Andi Hendra Syam. 2021. "Pengaruh Pengalaman Kerja dan Kemampuan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Balai Latihan Masyarakat Makassar." *Jurnal Mirai Manajemen.* Vol. 6 No. 2. h. 127.

Ghozali, Imam. 2018. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25 Edisi 9*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro Semarang.

Munardi, Herwin Tri, dkk. 2021. "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. National Finance." *Jurnal Arastirma.* Vol. 1 No. 2. h. 337.

Pranogyo, Antaiwan Bowo, dkk. 2021. *Kinerja Karyawan Teori Pengukuran Dan Implikasi*. Bandung: CV. Veniks Muda Sejahtera

Rahmawati, Ita, dkk. 2020. *Karakteristik Individu dan Lingkungan Kerja serta Pengaruhnhya terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan*. Jombang: LPPM Universitas K.H. A. Wahab Hasbullah.

Rumtotmey, Jeremia G. C, dkk. 2022. "Pengaruh Pengalaman Kerja, Disiplin Kerja, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai pada Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah Kota Manado." *Jurnal EMBA*. Vol. 10 No. 1. h. 501.

Sanjaya, Vicky dan Wenny Desty Febrian. 2024. "Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Otoriter terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus pada Koperasi Karyawan Cardig International Group)." *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Madani.* Vol. 6 No. 1. h. 33.

Simbolon, Sahat dan Dwi Maria Simbolon. 2023. "Analisis Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Kompensasi, dan Budaya Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Panca Putra Gilang Mandiri Medan." *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis.* Vol. 23 No. 1. h. 166.