Vol. 4 No. 1 Edisi November - Januari 2027 E. ISSN. 3032-2472
Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

EXPLAINING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH DISCIPLINE AND COORDINATION: A PLS-SEM STUDY OF BEKASI REVENUE AGENCY

MENJELASKAN KINERJA KARYAWAN MELALUI DISIPLIN DAN KOORDINASI: STUDI PLS-SEM TENTANG BEKASI REVENUE AGENCY

Pahriah[1*], Adriza[2], Dudun Junaedi[3]

[1*]Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Email: pahria76@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Email: adriza@umiba.ac.id
[3]Kencana Academy of Secretarial and Management Bandung (ASMKB),
Email: dudunjunaedi@asmkencana.ac.id

*email koresponden: pahria76@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v4i1.3431

Abstract

This study examines how work discipline and coordination relate to employees' self-reported performance at the Bekasi City Regional Revenue Agency. Drawing on coordination theory and the distinction between compliant work behaviour and task accomplishment, it re-examines a cross-sectional questionnaire survey of 30 employees drawn from an agency population of 100. The supplied manuscript reports descriptive summaries and a partial least squares structural equation model estimated with SPSS and SmartPLS. Mean scores were 4.82 for discipline, 4.81 for coordination, and 4.75 for performance on the reported five-point response scale. The reported positive paths to performance were 0.225 for discipline ($t = 2.775$) and 0.741 for coordination ($t = 2.435$), with an in-sample R^2 of 0.847. The larger coordination coefficient suggests that aligning tasks and information may matter especially in interdependent revenue administration, although the design cannot establish causal effects. An arithmetic audit also finds that the published discriminant-validity matrix does not reconcile with the path coefficients and R^2, while one reported p value is inconsistent with its t statistic. The contribution is therefore a bounded account of the two relationships and a transparent assessment of the evidence supporting them. Managers can use the pattern to review task handovers and procedural clarity, while any performance claim requires independent administrative indicators and re-estimation of the measurement model.

Keywords : Work Discipline, Organisational Coordination, Employee Performance, Local Government, Revenue Administration.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Abstrak

Studi ini meneliti bagaimana disiplin kerja dan koordinasi berkaitan dengan kinerja karyawan yang dilaporkan sendiri di Bekasi City Regional Revenue Agency. Berdasarkan teori koordinasi dan perbedaan antara perilaku kerja yang patuh dan pencapaian tugas, studi ini menelaah kembali survei kuesioner lintas seksi terhadap 30 karyawan yang diambil dari populasi lembaga sebanyak 100 orang. Manuskrip yang disediakan melaporkan ringkasan deskriptif dan model persamaan struktural kuadrat terkecil parsial yang diperkirakan dengan SPSS dan SmartPLS. Skor rata-rata adalah 4,82 untuk disiplin, 4,81 untuk koordinasi, dan 4,75 untuk kinerja pada skala respons lima poin yang dilaporkan. Jalur positif yang dilaporkan untuk kinerja adalah 0,225 untuk disiplin ($t = 2,775$) dan 0,741 untuk koordinasi ($t = 2,435$), dengan R^2 dalam sampel sebesar 0,847. Koefisien koordinasi yang lebih besar menunjukkan bahwa penyelarasan tugas dan informasi mungkin penting terutama dalam administrasi pendapatan yang saling bergantung, meskipun desain tidak dapat menetapkan efek kausal. Audit aritmatika juga menemukan bahwa matriks validitas diskriminan yang dipublikasikan tidak berkompensasi dengan koefisien jalur dan R^2, sementara satu nilai p yang dilaporkan tidak konsisten dengan statistik t-nya. Kontribusi tersebut oleh karena itu merupakan akun terbatas dari kedua hubungan tersebut dan penilaian transparan terhadap bukti yang mendukungnya. Manajer dapat menggunakan pola ini untuk meninjau penyerahan tugas dan kejelasan prosedural, sementara klaim kinerja memerlukan indikator administratif independen dan estimasi ulang model pengukura.

Kata Kunci : Disiplin Kerja, Koordinasi Organisasi, Kinerja Karyawan, Pemerintahan Lokal, Administrasi Pendapatan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Revenue agencies depend on employees who follow procedures while moving information across functions and deadlines. Discipline supports attendance, care in using organisational resources, and adherence to prescribed tasks. Coordination connects those individual actions when a case, document, or decision crosses a unit boundary. These mechanisms are related, but they solve different operational problems: reliable execution within a role and the alignment of interdependent roles (Gittell, 2002; Malone & Crowston, 1994; Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). Performance must, in turn, be defined as what employees accomplish and contribute through their work, rather than inferred solely from compliance or collegiality (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015; Koopmans et al., 2014).

The Bekasi City Regional Revenue Agency provides a useful setting in which to examine these relationships. The original manuscript described concerns about unfinished work, uneven understanding of standard procedures, unclear allocation of responsibilities, and incomplete communication between supervisors and staff. These were preliminary observations, not audited counts of delayed cases or service failures. More strikingly, the eventual respondents rated discipline, coordination, and their own performance near the upper end of the questionnaire scale. The research problem is thus both substantive and evidential: do these perceived practices vary with perceived performance, and how far can a small, single-source survey support the proposed explanation?

Studies in Indonesian public organisations offer relevant but uneven comparisons. Harits, (2020) examined coordination among property-tax collection staff, and Syaputra et al., (2026) found a positive association in a sub-district office, whereas (Setiadi, 2024a) reported a positive coordination–performance relationship in an Indramayu local government office. (Setiadi, 2024b) also showed that coordination practices can be described at the level of authority, guidelines, and forums without treating a favourable mean score as proof of organisational outcomes. By contrast, Rani & Permoni, (2025) did not find a significant direct coordination path in a land-agency model, suggesting

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

that task design and managerial control can alter the observed relationship. These studies make a blanket claim that coordination always improves performance untenable.

The discipline literature likewise shows associations across differing settings and model specifications. Maryani et al., (2021) found a positive relationship in the Bogor City Secretariat, as did Kartikasari & Rodiyah, (2022) in a regional personnel office, and Juheti & Sulaeman, (2021) reported a discipline association in a Subang district office. Evidence from a higher education institution (Akib et al., 2022), a hospital (Hermawan & Sary, 2025), and private-sector organisations (Bahasoan & Baharuddin, 2023; Sitopu et al., 2021; Triana & Suratman, 2022) broadens the conversation but cannot substitute for an agency-specific estimate. Riwayati et al., (2025) further indicate that job satisfaction may form part of the relationship, which a two-predictor model cannot test. These differences in context, measures, and covariates call for restrained interpretation of any single coefficient.

Coordination theory defines the problem as managing dependencies among activities, people, and resources (Malone & Crowston, 1994). Integrative accounts identify accountability, predictability, and shared understanding as the conditions that allow separate contributions to become collective work (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). Relational coordination adds that timely, problem-solving communication can support performance when tasks depend on one another (Gittell, 2002). Discipline is conceptually distinct: it concerns the consistency with which employees observe schedules, obligations, and work rules. Goal-setting theory offers a complementary reason why clear responsibilities and feedback could connect disciplined effort to results, without implying that the present survey has observed this mechanism directly (Locke & Latham, 2002).

This article asks whether work discipline and coordination are positively associated with employees' reported performance at the Bekasi City Regional Revenue Agency when considered together. It examines two directional hypotheses: H1, discipline is positively associated with performance; and H2, coordination is positively associated with performance. The combined model is assessed through its reported in-sample explanatory power, not a separate unreported omnibus significance test. The article contributes a context-specific comparison of individual rule-following and cross-role alignment while testing whether the supplied statistical summaries warrant the strength of the original conclusions.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The study used a quantitative, cross-sectional employee survey. This design compares reported discipline, coordination, and performance at one point in time; it is suited to estimating associations but cannot determine temporal order or causal impact (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The supplied manuscript identifies an agency population of 100 employees and 30 questionnaire respondents. It does not record the sampling frame, recruitment sequence, response rate among those invited, fieldwork dates, or a probability-selection procedure; the 30 cases are therefore treated as the analysed respondents rather than a demonstrably representative random sample. The reference to a sample-size rule in the original abstract does not establish selection quality or statistical power (Cohen, 1992).

The questionnaire supplied the primary data. Ten discipline statements addressed attendance, permission, responsibility, care with office equipment, and compliance with work rules; ten coordination statements covered communication, supervisory direction, shared plans, task boundaries, follow-up, and oversight. Fourteen performance statements concerned quality, timeliness, initiative, target attainment, communication, and mediation. Some coordination items measure compliance or supervision, and some performance items measure communication; this conceptual overlap must be considered when interpreting correlations. The original tables suggest a five-point response scale, but the questionnaire anchors and scoring protocol are not supplied. Prior literature provides the secondary conceptual material; no personnel records, revenue targets, or service logs were available for triangulation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The supplied analysis reports descriptive statistics from SPSS and reflective measurement and structural results from SmartPLS. Descriptive means were read alongside item-level extremes rather

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

than used as independent evidence of actual service quality. Measurement assessment considered indicator loadings and Cronbach's alpha, followed by a check of convergent and discriminant validity against the published Fornell–Larcker matrix (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015). Structural interpretation considered the two reported path coefficients, their t statistics, and R^2; no new bootstrapping, confidence intervals, effect sizes, or out-of-sample prediction statistics could be generated from the aggregate tables (Hair et al., 2019).

An editorial arithmetic check recalculated average variance extracted and its square root from the published loadings and compared the reported coefficients with the correlation matrix. This check tests internal consistency of the reported summaries; it does not replace analysis of respondent-level data. Because the three constructs came from the same self-report instrument, favourable response tendencies and shared wording may inflate their associations (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The source does not document consent, anonymisation procedures, data storage, or a formal common-method diagnostic. No claim of completed ethical approval, independent outcome validation, or procedural triangulation is made.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

High self-ratings and the gap between practices and outputs

The three scale means cluster near the upper end of the reported response range. This pattern differs from the initial narrative of low performance and poor coordination. It need not mean that either account is false: preliminary observations and employee ratings refer to different forms of evidence. It does mean that the manuscript cannot present poor agency performance as an established baseline. A respondent can report conscientious conduct while particular tasks remain delayed, and the present material contains no case-level records to determine how frequently that occurs.

Table 1. Reported construct means and selected questionnaire items (30 respondents)

Construct	Mean	Highest reported item	Lowest reported item
Work discipline	4.82	Careful use of office equipment (4.93)	Seeking permission when absent (4.67)
Work coordination	4.81	Understanding one's task boundaries (4.87); following work rules (4.87)	Ease of task-related communication with colleagues (4.73)
Self-reported performance	4.75	Assessable work quality and initiative (each 4.87)	Consistently exceeding targets (4.57)

Source: Primary data processed by the researchers using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, 2026.

Table 1 shows that all three constructs received high average ratings from the 30 respondents. The lowest performance item concerns exceeding targets, which is more demanding than reporting punctuality or initiative. Coordination's weakest selected item concerns colleague communication, an operational issue despite its favourable absolute mean. These ratings describe employees' perceptions and cannot establish whether revenue, processing times, or service standards improved.

The distinction matters for public management. A five-point average of 4.75 does not mean that 95% of tasks met their targets, and a mean difference of 0.07 between discipline and performance is not a tested difference in actual outcomes. Moreover, the statement that colleagues obey work rules appears in the coordination scale even though it closely resembles the discipline construct. The performance scale also includes communication with peers and supervisors, behaviours close to coordination itself. These overlaps offer one plausible explanation for a high shared variance, alongside a substantive relationship.

Setiadi, (2024b) descriptive study provides a useful parallel: perceptions of coordination and performance can both be positive without identifying the mechanism or validating service-level outcomes. Campbell & Wiernik, (2015); Koopmans et al., (2014) distinguish the content of work performance from convenient proxy behaviours. In the revenue-agency context, completed cases, error rates, timeliness, and defensible target attainment would give these ratings an external point of

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

comparison. Such indicators were not collected in the present material, so the analysis remains at the level of employee perceptions.

Measurement strength and unresolved construct separation

All 34 reported indicator loadings exceed 0.70, from 0.715 to 0.956 for discipline, 0.712 to 0.971 for coordination, and 0.715 to 0.896 for performance. Cronbach's alpha is above 0.90 for every construct. These values indicate internally consistent responses, though very high alpha can also accompany repetitive items. They do not, by themselves, show that discipline, coordination, and performance are empirically distinct. Fornell & Larcker, (1981) require a comparison of shared variance with the variance extracted by each construct; Henseler et al. (2015) also caution that the traditional criterion may miss separation problems.

Table 2. Measurement statistics and arithmetic check

Construct	Indicators	Loading range	Reported alpha	AVE calculated from reported loadings	Square root of calculated AVE	Reported Fornell–Larcker diagonal
Work discipline	10	0.718–0.956	0.910	0.665	0.816	0.853
Work coordination	10	0.712–0.971	0.936	0.656	0.810	0.801
Self-reported performance	14	0.715–0.896	0.945	0.638	0.799	0.869

Source: Primary data processed by the researchers using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, 2026.

Table 2 shows that the reported loadings and reliability estimates meet conventional initial screening levels. The square roots calculated from the listed loadings differ from all three diagonals in the original Fornell–Larcker table. The discrepancy is especially large for performance, where the computed value is 0.799 rather than 0.869. Thus, indicator consistency is supported by the displayed statistics, while the published discriminant-validity assessment cannot be accepted without the underlying SmartPLS output.

The original Fornell–Larcker matrix reports correlations of 0.776 between discipline and performance, 0.744 between discipline and coordination, and 0.708 between coordination and performance. Its diagonal entries exceed those displayed off-diagonal values except that the recalculated performance diagonal still narrowly exceeds 0.776. Yet the matrix is inconsistent with the structural model when interpreted as the same standardised construct scores. With two predictors, standardised path coefficients of 0.225 and 0.741 and their reported correlation of 0.744 imply a coordination–performance correlation of approximately 0.908, not 0.708. Conversely, the listed correlations and path coefficients imply R^2 of approximately 0.699 rather than 0.847. The model may use different scores, a cell may have been transcribed incorrectly, or the summaries may come from different runs; the available material cannot identify which explanation is correct.

Table 3. Published construct correlations and calculated structural implications

Comparison	Value in published matrix	Value implied by published standardised paths and predictor correlation
Discipline–performance	0.776	0.776
Discipline–coordination	0.744	0.744 (input correlation)
Coordination–performance	0.708	0.908
Model R^2	0.847 (reported separately)	0.848 from the two paths and predictor correlation; 0.699 from the displayed correlations and paths

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Source: Primary data processed by the researchers using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, 2026

Table 3 shows that the discipline–performance correlation is internally compatible with the reported paths. The coordination–performance cell is not compatible with the same paths and predictor correlation under a standardised model. The resulting discrepancy also changes the value reconstructed for explained variance by roughly 0.15. The table therefore prevents a defensible claim that construct separation and the structural estimates have both been verified from the published outputs.

Work discipline and reported performance

The reported discipline path is positive but smaller than the coordination path. Its *t* statistic of 2.775 passes a conventional two-sided 5% large-sample threshold. The original abstract gives $p = 0.001$; a two-sided normal approximation to that *t* value is approximately 0.0055, while the exact bootstrapped value cannot be checked without the resampling output. The positive direction can be discussed as reported, but the exact *p* value should be replaced only after consulting the original run.

Table 4. Reported structural estimates for self-reported performance

Predictor	Reported path coefficient	Reported *t* statistic	Reported *p* value	Interpretation from available output
Work discipline	0.225	2.775	0.001	Positive association; reported *p* inconsistent with *t* under a standard two-sided reference
Work coordination	0.741	2.435	0.015	Positive association; sampling uncertainty needs original bootstrap intervals
Combined model	—	—	—	Reported $R^2 = 0.847$; no separate omnibus test supplied

Source: Primary data processed by the researchers using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, 2026.

Table 4 shows positive conditional paths from both perceived practices to reported performance. Discipline's coefficient of 0.225 represents a standardised model estimate, not a 22.5% performance gain. Coordination's larger coefficient suggests a stronger conditional relationship within this specific survey and specification. The reported R^2 concerns variation in respondents' performance ratings, and no independent test establishes a combined causal or service-level effect.

The discipline association is consistent in direction with the Bogor City Secretariat study by Maryani et al., (2021), the Subang district study by Juheti & Sulaeman, (2021), and Hermawan and Sary's hospital analysis (Hermawan & Sary, 2025). Studies in a public higher education institution and private firms also find favourable discipline relationships, although the operational settings and covariates differ (Akib et al., 2022; Bahasoan & Baharuddin, 2023; Sitopu et al., 2021). Riwayati et al., (2025); Triana & Suratman, (2022) place satisfaction among relevant work conditions, underscoring that the Bekasi estimate is a conditional association within a deliberately narrow model. These comparisons support a plausible link, not a universal effect size.

At the agency level, punctuality and adherence to procedures can reduce avoidable interruptions, but strict observance alone cannot resolve unclear task ownership. Locke & Latham, (2002) show why specific goals and feedback matter to performance, yet the present questionnaire does not measure goal-setting quality. A sensible administrative response would be to examine whether attendance and procedural adherence coincide with completed work of acceptable quality, using routine records before adjusting sanctions or rewards. That implication follows from the observed distinction between compliance items and output items, rather than from an experimental test of disciplinary policy.

Coordination, interdependence, and the scope of the model

The coordination path of 0.741 is the larger reported coefficient. In a revenue agency, information passed between units, agreement on who owns a case, and timely supervisory resolution can plausibly determine whether individual effort becomes completed work. Malone & Crowston,

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

(1994) describe this as the management of interdependencies, while Okhuysen & Bechky, (2009) emphasise accountability, predictability, and common understanding. Gittell (2002) similarly links coordination mechanisms to performance when tasks require reciprocal adjustment. The present data measure employee perceptions of these practices but do not observe a particular transfer or workflow failure.

Setiadi, (2024a) found a positive coordination relationship in an Indonesian local-government office, and Harits, (2020) examined the issue directly among property-tax collection staff. The Bekasi pattern is compatible with those results, especially where completing a task depends on information or approval from another role. Rani & Permoni, (2025), however, found no significant direct coordination relationship in the Buleleng land-agency model. Their contrary finding suggests that coordination's apparent contribution can depend on job descriptions, control practices, or the inclusion of other predictors. The Bekasi model lacks those comparisons and cannot distinguish a direct coordination mechanism from overlapping questionnaire wording.

The R^2 of 0.847 indicates strong in-sample fit for the reported performance ratings if the structural output is correct. It does not mean the two practices caused 84.7% of actual performance, and the remaining 15.3% cannot be assigned to identified external factors. The near-ceiling means and shared questionnaire source create further reasons for caution (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Hair et al., (2019) recommend a fuller account of bootstrap intervals, effect sizes, collinearity, and predictive assessment; none is available in the source. More importantly, the contradictory correlation cell in Table 3 must be resolved before the model's fit and construct separation are presented as jointly established.

For managers, the most actionable reading is procedural. They could map where a revenue task changes hands, specify who closes each step, and compare handover delays with case completion and correction rates. This would test the proposed coordination mechanism using administrative traces rather than further self-assessment alone. The recommended audit also protects against treating high staff ratings as evidence that taxpayers receive timely, accurate service. It is a practical implication of the pattern, not an intervention effect estimated by this survey.

4. CONCLUSION

The study examined whether work discipline and coordination are associated with employee-reported performance at the Bekasi City Regional Revenue Agency. Both reported paths are positive, with coordination's coefficient (0.741) exceeding discipline's (0.225) in the two-predictor model. The combined output reports an in-sample R^2 of 0.847 for respondents' performance ratings. These findings answer the associational question but do not establish changes in actual agency outputs or a causal ordering of the practices.

The conceptual contribution lies in reading discipline as reliable execution and coordination as the alignment of dependent tasks. This distinction helps explain why the two practices can coexist while carrying different reported coefficients. It also directs attention to questionnaire overlap: several items assigned to coordination or performance resemble compliance and communication behaviours. The interpretation is consequently conditional on the measures and on a small, single-agency sample.

The agency can review task ownership, handovers, supervisory feedback, and procedural adherence against independently recorded timeliness and quality indicators. Such a review would show whether the favourable staff perceptions correspond to completed cases and service standards. Managers should prioritise the points at which information or responsibility is lost before attributing gains to stricter disciplinary enforcement. The present evidence supports an operational diagnostic, not a quantified forecast of policy impact.

The original sampling and ethics procedures are incompletely documented, and all analysed constructs were rated by the same respondents. More decisively, the published Fornell–Larcker entries and one p value conflict with other reported model statistics. Re-estimating the model from the original responses and obtaining independent performance records are necessary to settle those discrepancies.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Until then, the positive associations remain informative but the reported magnitude and discriminant validity require qualification.

5. REFERENCES

Akib, A., Mansyur, M., Kurdin, K., & Demina, D. (2022). The effect of compensation and work discipline on employee performance in state Islamic religious higher education. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *6*(2), 586–602. https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v6i2.3480

Bahasoan, S., & Baharuddin, I. (2023). Work discipline, work motivation and employee performance. *Advances in Human Resource Management Research*, *1*(2), 90–101. https://doi.org/10.60079/ahrmr.v1i2.92

Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *2*(1), 47–74. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111427

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th Editio). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Gittell, J. H. (2002). Coordinating mechanisms in care provider groups: Relational coordination as a mediator and input uncertainty as a moderator of performance effects. *Management Science*, *48*(11), 1408–1426. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.48.11.1408.268

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, *31*(1), 2–24.

Harits, B. (2020). Pengaruh koordinasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pemungut PBB pada Kecamatan Pataruman Kota Banjar. *Kebijakan: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, *11*(2), 10–21. https://doi.org/10.23969/kebijakan.v11i2.2895

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hermawan, E. P., & Sary, F. P. (2025). The effect of self efficacy and work discipline on employee performance at Ciamis Regional General Hospital. *Eduvest: Journal of Universal Studies*, *5*(2), 2617–2634. https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v5i2.50860

Juheti, A., & Sulaeman, E. (2021). Effect of work discipline and compensation on the performance of employees of Subang District Trade and Industrial Cooperative Office. *APTISI Transactions on Management*, *5*(2), 128–136. https://doi.org/10.33050/atm.v5i2.1447

Kartikasari, S., & Rodiyah, I. (2022). The influence of work discipline on the employee performance study at Badan Kepegawaian Daerah. *Indonesian Journal of Public Policy Review*, *19*. https://doi.org/10.21070/ijppr.v19i0.1236

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *56*(3), 331–337. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000113

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, *57*(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Malone, T. W., & Crowston, K. (1994). The interdisciplinary study of coordination. *ACM Computing Surveys*, *26*(1), 87–119. https://doi.org/10.1145/174666.174668

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Maryani, Y., Entang, M., & Tukiran, M. (2021). The relationship between work motivation, work discipline and employee performance at the Regional Secretariat of Bogor City. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, *2*(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v2i2.14

Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. (2009). Coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, *3*(1), 463–502. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047533

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Rani, W. H., & Permoni, N. L. E. A. (2025). The influence of employee skills, coordination, and job description on employee performance: The mediating role of managerial control in the National Land Agency in Buleleng Regency. *Jurnal Manajemen*, *16*(3), 917–928. https://doi.org/10.32832/jm-uika.v16i2.20796

Riwayati, H. E., Winarti, C. E., Cahaya, Y. F., & Khairunnisa, K. (2025). The effectiveness of job satisfaction in mediating work motivation and work discipline towards employee performance. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *28*(1), 111–130. https://doi.org/10.24914/jeb.v28i1.8346

Setiadi, A. (2024a). Effects of organizational coordination dimensions on employee performance: Evidence from an Indonesian local government. *International Journal of Science Education and Cultural Studies*, *3*(2), 90–104. https://doi.org/10.58291/ijsecs.v3i2.633

Setiadi, A. (2024b). Evaluating coordination practices and employee performance in local government organizations: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Science Education and Cultural Studies*, *3*(1), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.58291/ijsecs.v3i1.631

Sitopu, Y. B., Sitinjak, K. A., & Marpaung, F. K. (2021). The influence of motivation, work discipline, and compensation on employee performance. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, *1*(2), 72–83. https://doi.org/10.52970/grhrm.v1i2.79

Syaputra, D., Telaumbanua, F., Gobal, R., Nadeak, S. I., & Syafriyandi, S. (2026). Examining the influence of coordination on employee performance. *Advances in Human Resource Management Research*, *4*(2), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.60079/ahrmr.v4i2.917

Triana, N., & Suratman, A. (2022). The influence of work life balance and work discipline on employee performance. *Selekta Manajemen: Jurnal Mahasiswa Bisnis & Manajemen*, *1*(1), 222–247. https://journal.uii.ac.id/selma/article/view/23900