International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

The Effect Of Procedure Compliance On Employee Performance In The Aviation Industry

Soulthan Saladin Batubara[1*], Muhammad Yalzamul Insan[2], M. Aulia Rifangga Bangun[3]

[1,2,3] Study Program of Management, Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia.

Email : soulthanbatubara@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

Abstract

Employee performance is critical in aviation, where reliable task execution, service quality, and adherence to operational standards are essential. This study examined the relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance among employees at Kualanamu airport, Indonesia. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted involving 140 employees drawn from a population of 579. Respondents were selected using proportional stratified random sampling across five organizational units. Both constructs were measured using five questionnaire items on a five-point Likert scale. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, and simple linear regression in IBM SPSS Statistics.

The procedure compliance scale demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .940), while the employee performance scale showed satisfactory reliability (α = .885). The mean score for procedure compliance was 4.304 (SD = 0.714), compared with 3.266 (SD = 0.794) for employee performance. Regression analysis revealed a positive and statistically significant association between procedure compliance and employee performance (B = 0.675, β = .607, t = 8.969, p < .001). The regression model explained 36.8% of the variance in employee performance (R^2 = .368; adjusted R^2 = .364) and was statistically significant, F(1, 138) = 80.446, p < .001. These findings suggest that adherence to established procedures is associated with employees' reported work performance. The results highlight the relevance of clear operational procedures, employee training, and performance feedback. However, the cross-sectional design does not establish causality. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as evidence of statistical association, with additional diagnostic analysis and future research using objective performance indicators recommended to strengthen the conclusions.

Keywords: Procedure Compliance; Employee Performance; Aviation Industry

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is a critical determinant of organizational effectiveness, particularly in industries characterized by operational complexity, stringent safety requirements, and strict regulatory oversight. In the aviation industry, employees are expected not only to achieve work targets but also to execute their responsibilities consistently, maintain service quality, and comply with established operational standards. Employee performance therefore extends beyond the completion of assigned tasks to include the reliability, quality, and consistency of work outcomes under demanding operational conditions (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015; DeNisi & Smith, 2014).

These requirements are particularly important in High Reliability Organizations (HROs), where operational success depends on the ability to prevent human error and maintain reliable system performance. In aviation, deviations from established procedures can compromise operational safety, disrupt service delivery, and affect coordination across interdependent functions. Consequently, employees' consistent adherence to operational procedures is an important behavioral factor in maintaining reliable operations and supporting employee performance (Christian et al., 2009; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). Understanding how procedural compliance relates to employee performance is therefore particularly relevant in highly regulated and operationally complex environments.

In Indonesia, airport operators face increasing demands to improve operational efficiency while maintaining compliance with national and international aviation regulations. The digitalization of airport operations, changing service expectations, and the need for effective coordination require employees to perform their duties accurately and consistently. Under these conditions, technical competence alone may not be sufficient to ensure reliable performance. Employees must also follow established procedures, apply operational standards consistently, and fulfill their responsibilities in accordance with organizational requirements (International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO], 2024).

The relevance of this issue is evident at PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero), Kualanamu. According to the source article, a preliminary assessment was conducted in February 2026 through field observations, reviews of operational documents including standard operating procedures (SOPs), employee performance reports, and internal safety and compliance audit reports and semi-structured interviews with seven managerial informants from the Directorate of Operation and Service and the Directorate of Human Capital. The assessment identified several recurring operational issues, particularly inconsistent compliance with operational and safety procedures, limited procedural training and feedback, and delays in ground-handling services. The relevant findings are summarized in Table 1.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 1. Preliminary Operational Issues Relevant to Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance

Preliminary issue	Operational Consequences	Evidence basis
Inconsistent compliance with operational and safety procedures	Increased operational and safety risks	Identified through interviews and corroborated by safety and compliance audit reports
Limited procedural training and feedback	Potential recurrence of operational errors	Reported during interviews and consistent with gaps identified in performance and audit documentation
Ground-handling service delays	Reduced operational efficiency and service quality	Reported by informants from the Directorate of Operation and Service and consistent with performance report findings
Partially integrated operational systems	Information delays and coordination inefficiencies	Consistently raised during interviews and corroborated by reviews of operational documents

Note. The preliminary assessment was conducted in February 2026 through field observations, a review of internal operational documents, and semi-structured interviews with seven managerial informants.

Source: Primary Data Processed (2025)

The findings in Table 1 highlight operational challenges that may be associated with the consistency of employees' work practices. In particular, inconsistent compliance with operational and safety procedures raises concerns about whether established standards are being implemented reliably in daily operations. Limited procedural training and feedback may also constrain employees' understanding and consistent application of required work practices. Although the preliminary assessment does not establish a causal relationship between these issues and employee performance, it provides a practical basis for examining the relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance in the aviation sector.

Procedure compliance refers to the extent to which employees consistently perform their core job activities in accordance with formally established organizational policies, operational standards, and work procedures. As conceptualized in the source study, procedure compliance concerns adherence to formal work requirements across safety, service delivery, quality, and other operational activities. It is distinct from voluntary behavior that extends beyond prescribed job responsibilities because it focuses

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

on the consistent execution of required work practices (Griffin & Neal, 2000; Neal et al., 2000). In highly regulated organizations, procedure compliance is therefore not merely an administrative obligation; it is an observable work behavior that helps translate organizational standards into consistent task execution.

The relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance can be explained through the role of standardized procedures in guiding task execution. Established procedures provide employees with defined expectations regarding how work should be performed, helping reduce inconsistencies and prevent avoidable errors. When employees follow these procedures consistently, they may be better positioned to maintain work quality, complete tasks reliably, and deliver services according to organizational standards (Insan & Batubara, 2025). Previous research has identified links between compliance behavior, safety performance, and individual performance, particularly in operational environments where reliability and consistent work practices are essential (Christian et al., 2009; Curcuruto et al., 2015; Neal & Griffin, 2006).

Nevertheless, the relationship warrants further examination in the aviation context. Although prior research has emphasized the importance of compliance and safety-related behavior, the strength of the relationship between general procedure compliance and employee performance may vary across organizational settings and operational requirements. Airport operations involve interdependent activities in which inconsistent execution of procedures can affect not only an individual employee's task completion but also coordination and service delivery across operational units. Examining this relationship in an airport organization can therefore provide context-specific evidence regarding the relevance of procedural adherence to employee performance.

Against this background, the present study focuses specifically on the direct relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance among employees of PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero), Kualanamu. Unlike broader models that incorporate additional explanatory or mediating variables, this study examines procedure compliance as the predictor and employee performance as the outcome. This focused approach allows for a direct assessment of whether employees' consistent adherence to established procedures is positively associated with their performance in a highly regulated operational environment.

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the effect of procedure compliance on employee performance in the aviation industry, using PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero), Kualanamu, as the empirical setting. The study is expected to contribute to the literature on employee performance and organizational behavior by providing evidence on the relationship between procedural adherence and employee performance in an airport operating environment. From a practical perspective, the findings may inform initiatives

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

to strengthen procedural implementation, employee training, performance feedback, and the consistent execution of operational standards.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Employee performance refers to the behaviors and work outcomes through which employees contribute to organizational objectives. Campbell and Wiernik (2015) emphasize the importance of defining and assessing work performance as a multidimensional construct, rather than treating it as a single undifferentiated outcome. Performance can involve the effective execution of core job responsibilities, the quality and accuracy of work, and the extent to which employees fulfill the requirements of their roles.

In operational environments, performance is closely connected to the reliable execution of tasks. Work activities may depend on prescribed sequences, coordination among employees, and consistent application of established standards. When employees deviate from required procedures, the resulting inconsistencies may increase the likelihood of operational errors, rework, delays, and service-quality problems. Conversely, employees who follow appropriate procedures can be better positioned to execute their tasks accurately and consistently.

Nevertheless, employee performance should not be equated with compliance itself. Procedure compliance describes how work is carried out in relation to prescribed requirements, whereas employee performance concerns the effectiveness of employees' work execution and its contribution to expected objectives. Maintaining this conceptual distinction is necessary to avoid overlap between the predictor and outcome constructs, especially when developing survey indicators.

Procedure Compliance

Procedure compliance refers to the extent to which employees consistently execute their assigned work activities in accordance with established organizational policies, operational standards, and work procedures. The construct concerns employees' adherence to prescribed methods for completing their responsibilities, including procedures related to operational accuracy, service delivery, quality assurance, and safety. In this study, procedure compliance is conceptualized as a work-related behavioral construct rather than merely an administrative requirement.

The conceptual distinction between procedure compliance and safety compliance is important. Griffin and Neal (2000) distinguish safety compliance, which involves the execution of activities required to maintain workplace safety, from safety participation, which refers to discretionary contributions to the broader safety environment. Neal et al.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

(2000) further examine compliance with safety regulations and procedures as a component of individual safety behavior. These studies provide a foundation for understanding compliance as observable work behavior, although their original focus is specifically on safety rather than the full range of organizational procedures.

The Relationship Between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance

The relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance can be explained through the role of standardized work behavior in supporting reliable task execution. Established procedures encode organizational expectations concerning the sequence, method, and standards required to perform a task. When employees apply these procedures consistently, they may reduce avoidable deviations and improve the accuracy and predictability of work outputs. This mechanism is particularly relevant where tasks are interdependent and errors in one activity can affect subsequent operational processes.

Research on safety performance provides relevant empirical foundations for this argument. Griffin and Neal (2000) distinguish compliance with required safety activities from discretionary safety participation, demonstrating the importance of examining prescribed work behavior as a distinct performance-related dimension. Neal et al. (2000) also identify relationships between organizational climate, safety climate, and individual safety behavior, including compliance with safety regulations and procedures. Neal and Griffin (2006) extend this line of inquiry by examining lagged relationships among safety climate, safety motivation, safety behavior, and accidents at individual and group levels (Firmansyah & Andika, 2025; Wakhyuni *et al*., 2024). Collectively, these studies support the relevance of compliance-related behavior in operational settings, but they do not, by themselves, establish that general procedure compliance has a causal effect on overall employee performance.

Broader research on workplace safety also indicates that individual and situational factors are relevant to safety outcomes. Christian et al. (2009), through a meta-analysis, examine factors associated with workplace safety, while Curcuruto et al. (2015) investigate the roles of prosocial and proactive safety behaviors in predicting safety performance. These studies reinforce the importance of work behavior in environments where reliable task execution and safety are essential. However, safety performance and general employee performance remain conceptually distinct outcomes; their findings should therefore be used as supporting context rather than direct substitutes for evidence concerning overall employee performance (Waruwu, 2025).

Evidence from the aviation sector is also relevant. Supriyadi et al. (2025) examined operational discipline, job satisfaction, and professional competence in relation to employee performance in airport operational support services. Their findings report a

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

positive and significant relationship between operational discipline and employee performance. Although operational discipline is not identical to procedure compliance, this result provides sector-specific support for investigating whether adherence to prescribed work requirements is associated with employee performance in aviation operations.

Taken together, the literature provides a theoretical and contextual basis for expecting a positive relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance. However, the relationship must be tested directly in the study context rather than inferred solely from research on safety behavior, operational discipline, or organizational climate. Accordingly, the present study examines whether employees' compliance with established work procedures is positively associated with their performance in the aviation sector, focusing on the Kualanamu operational context.
H1: Procedure compliance is positively associated with employee performance.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to examine the relationship between procedure compliance and employee performance in the aviation sector. The analysis focused on the direct association between the two constructs, with procedure compliance specified as the independent variable and employee performance as the dependent variable. The cross-sectional design enables the examination of statistical associations based on data collected at a single point in time; however, it does not establish temporal precedence or support definitive causal conclusions.

Population, Sampling, and Sample Size

The study population comprised 579 employees of PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero) Kualanamu, distributed across five work units: Operation & Service (N = 153), Commercial & Business Development (N = 46), Finance (N = 79), Human Capital (N = 116), and Corporate Office (N = 185). The sampling frame was the employee list of these five work units, and employees of the five work units were eligible to participate. The target sample of 140 respondents was allocated proportionally to unit size, $n_h = 140 \times (N_h / 579)$, rounded to the nearest whole number, which gave 37, 11, 19, 28, and 45 respondents for the five units, respectively. Within each unit, respondents were randomly selected from the employee list. The final sample matched the target allocation in every unit (Table 2).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 2. Population Distribution and Proportional Sample Allocation

Work Unit	Population (N)	Population (%)	Target Sample (n)	Actual Sample
Operation & Service	153	26.42	37	37
Commercial & Business Development	46	7.94	11	11
Finance	79	13.64	19	19
Human Capital	116	20.03	28	28
Corporate Office	185	31.95	45	45
Total	579	100.00	140	140

Source: Primary Data Processed (2026)

The study involved 140 respondents drawn from a population of 579 employees at PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero), Kualanamu, representing approximately 24.2% of the total population. Respondents were selected using proportional stratified random sampling across five organizational units to ensure that each unit was represented according to its share of the employee population. Within each stratum, respondents were randomly selected from the employee list.

Data Collection and Measurement

Data were collected in October 2025 using a self-administered questionnaire distributed through Google Forms and in person at the research site. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that their responses would be treated confidentially. Procedure compliance was measured using five questionnaire items adapted from the compliance-related measurement approach reported in the original study, drawing on the safety compliance literature. The items captured employees' adherence to prescribed work procedures and operational requirements. Employee performance was measured using five questionnaire items intended to represent employees' execution of their work responsibilities. Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating stronger agreement with the statements.

For this derivative article, the analysis included only the procedure compliance and employee performance measures. Items measuring religious values were excluded from the analytical model. Composite scores for each construct were calculated from the corresponding items after the data had been checked and the item coding had been verified.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Data Screening and Instrument Assessment

Before hypothesis testing, the dataset was screened for missing responses, invalid values, and potentially inconsistent response patterns. Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize respondent characteristics and the distributions of the study variables. The internal consistency of the procedure compliance and employee performance scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Corrected item–total correlations were also examined to evaluate the consistency of individual items with their respective scales. A Cronbach's alpha value of .70 or higher was treated as an indicative benchmark for acceptable internal consistency. These analyses were conducted separately for the two constructs.

The assumptions relevant to simple linear regression were evaluated before estimating the relationship between the variables. These included linearity, the distribution of regression residuals, and homoscedasticity. Potentially influential observations were also considered when interpreting the regression results.

Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics. The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize the respondents and the central tendency and variability of procedure compliance and employee performance. Second, scale reliability was examined using Cronbach's alpha and corrected item–total correlations. Third, simple linear regression was performed to estimate the association between procedure compliance and employee performance.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Respondent Profile

Table 3. Respondent Demographic Profile (N = 140)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	84	60.0
	Female	56	40.0
Age	Under 26 years	17	12.2
	26-30 years	46	32.8
	31-35 years	35	25.0
	36-40 years	18	12.8
	41-45 years	10	7.2
	46-50 years	8	5.7
	51-55 years	5	3.5

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

	Above 55 years	1	0.8
Education	Senior secondary school	14	10.2
	Diploma (D3)	61	43.5
	Bachelor's degree (S1)	55	39.2
	Master's degree (S2)	10	7.1
Job level	Officer/Staff	54	38.5
	Technician	29	20.8
	Supervisor	28	20.1
	Junior Manager	19	13.5
	Manager	6	4.3
	Head of Division	4	2.8
Work unit	Corporate Office	45	32.1
	Operation & Service	37	26.4
	Human Capital	28	20.2
	Finance	19	13.5
	Commercial & Business Development	11	7.8

Source: Primary Data Processed (2026)

Table 3 presents the demographic characteristics of the 140 respondents. The sample comprised 84 men (60.0%) and 56 women (40.0%). The majority were aged 26-35 years (57.8%), with the remainder distributed across younger and older age groups. Regarding education, 43.5% held a diploma (D3), 39.2% held a bachelor's degree (S1), 10.2% had completed senior secondary education, and 7.1% held a master's degree (S2). By job level, respondents were predominantly Officer/Staff (38.5%) and Technician (20.8%), with the remainder holding Supervisor (20.1%), Junior Manager (13.5%), Manager (4.3%), and Head of Division (2.8%) positions. By work unit, respondents were distributed across Corporate Office (32.1%), Operation & Service (26.4%), Human Capital (20.2%), Finance (13.5%), and Commercial & Business Development (7.8%), reflecting representation from all main organizational units.

Descriptive Statistics

The analysis was conducted using responses from 140 employees of PT Angkasa Pura Aviasi at Kualanamu. The two constructs examined were Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance, each measured using five questionnaire items. Composite scores were calculated as the mean of the corresponding items.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Research Constructs

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Procedure Compliance	140	4.304	0.714	2.00	5.00

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Employee Performance	140	3.266	0.794	1.80	4.80

Source: Data Analysis (2026)

As presented in Table 4, Procedure Compliance had a mean score of 4.304 (SD = 0.714), indicating generally favorable responses regarding employees' adherence to established procedures. Employee Performance had a lower mean score of 3.266 (SD = 0.794). The difference between these descriptive scores suggests that favorable perceptions of procedural compliance did not correspond to equally high ratings of employee performance in the sample. This descriptive pattern is relevant because it indicates that compliance and performance should not be treated as interchangeable constructs. Although employees reported relatively high levels of procedure compliance, their performance ratings were comparatively moderate. However, the difference between the means alone does not establish why this pattern occurred. Further interpretation requires consideration of the regression results and the specific content of the questionnaire items.

Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha for each five-item scale.

Table 5. Reliability Statistics

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Procedure Compliance	5	0.940
Employee Performance	5	0.885

Source: Data Analysis (2026)

The Procedure Compliance scale produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.940, while the Employee Performance scale produced a value of 0.885. Both values exceed the commonly applied benchmark of 0.70, indicating satisfactory internal consistency for the two scales. The corrected item–total correlations also showed positive associations between individual items and their respective scales. These findings support the internal consistency of the measures in the current sample. Nevertheless, Cronbach's alpha does not independently establish construct validity or demonstrate that the two constructs are empirically distinct. Those conclusions require additional evidence, including examination of the questionnaire content and appropriate validity assessments.

Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression was conducted to examine the association between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance. Procedure Compliance was specified as the predictor, while Employee Performance was specified as the dependent variable.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 6. ANOVA Results for Simple Linear Regression

ANOVA[a]

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32.207	1	32.207	80.446	.001 [b]
	Residual	55.244	138	0.400		
	Total	87.451	139			

a. *Dependent Variable:* Employee Performance (Y)

b. *Predictors*: (*Constant*) Procedure Compliance (X)

Source: Data Analysis (2026)

The ANOVA results indicate that the regression model was statistically significant, $F(1, 138) = 80.446$, $p < .001$. This result indicates that Procedure Compliance provides statistically significant information for predicting Employee Performance in the fitted linear model.

Table 5. Regression Coefficients

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	Constant	0.362	0.328		1.103	.272
	Procedure Compliance	0.675	0.075	0.607	8.969	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Note: B = unstandardized coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized coefficient; CI = confidence interval.

Source: Data Analysis (2026)

The coefficient for Procedure Compliance was positive and statistically significant ($B = 0.675$, $\beta = 0.607$, $t = 8.969$, $p < .001$). The 95% confidence interval for the unstandardized coefficient ranged from 0.526 to 0.823 and did not include zero. These results provide statistical support for the proposed positive association between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance. The unstandardized coefficient indicates that a one-unit increase in the Procedure Compliance composite score was associated with an estimated 0.675-unit increase in the Employee Performance composite score, on the five-point measurement scale. This interpretation describes the estimated linear association and should not be understood as a causal effect.

The hypothesis that Procedure Compliance is positively associated with Employee Performance is therefore supported by the initial regression analysis.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Tabel 6. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.607[a]	.368	.364	0.63321

a. Predictors: (Constant), Procedure Compliance

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data Analysis (2026)

The coefficient of determination (R^2) was 0.368, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.364. This indicates that Procedure Compliance statistically explained 36.8% of the variation in Employee Performance among the 140 respondents in the fitted regression model. The remaining 63.2% of the variation was not explained by Procedure Compliance in this model and may be associated with other factors not included in the analysis, measurement variation, or random error. These findings suggest that Procedure Compliance represents a relevant predictor of Employee Performance in the study context. However, given the cross-sectional design, the explanatory power of the model should be interpreted as a statistical association rather than evidence of a causal effect.

DISCUSSION

Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance

The results provide initial empirical support for a positive association between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance among employees in the Kualanamu aviation operational context. The estimated standardized coefficient was 0.607, and the model explained 36.8% of the observed variation in Employee Performance. These findings suggest that employees' adherence to established procedures is meaningfully associated with how they evaluate or report their work performance. One plausible explanation is that established procedures provide a standardized framework for executing work activities. In operational settings, procedures specify expected task sequences, requirements, and work standards. Consistent adherence may help reduce avoidable deviations, support coordination, and promote more predictable task execution. When employees carry out interdependent activities, procedural consistency may also reduce discrepancies between individual work practices and the requirements of the wider operational system.

This interpretation is consistent with Campbell and Wiernik's (2015) discussion of work performance as a construct concerned with behaviors and outcomes relevant to organizational objectives. It also aligns with Griffin and Neal's (2000) distinction between

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

prescribed compliance behavior and discretionary participation in the safety domain. Their framework highlights the analytical importance of separating required behaviors from other contributions to organizational performance (Ferine *et al*., 2021). However, the present findings should not be interpreted as demonstrating that procedure compliance is equivalent to employee performance. Compliance concerns adherence to prescribed work requirements, whereas performance concerns the execution of job responsibilities and contribution to expected outcomes. The positive association observed here supports treating compliance as a potentially important correlate of performance, while retaining the conceptual distinction between the two constructs.

Relevance to Aviation Operations

The relationship is particularly relevant in aviation because operational activities are regulated, interdependent, and sensitive to deviations from established standards. Research on workplace safety has emphasized the importance of individual and situational factors in safety-related outcomes (Christian et al., 2009). Curcuruto et al. (2015) also examined how prosocial and proactive safety behaviors relate to safety performance. Together, these studies provide a relevant foundation for considering prescribed work behavior in operational environments where reliability and coordination matter. Nevertheless, these studies primarily address safety behavior or safety performance rather than the broader construct of employee performance used in this article. Their relevance is therefore theoretical and contextual; they should not be presented as direct empirical confirmation of the specific relationship tested in the current sample.

The present results extend this line of reasoning by examining Procedure Compliance in relation to Employee Performance in an airport organizational setting. The findings suggest that adherence to formal procedures may be associated with employees' ability to meet work expectations. This interpretation is consistent with the operational importance of standardization, although the study does not directly measure error rates, safety incidents, service quality, or operational efficiency. Claims about those outcomes would require additional indicators or objective organizational data.

Interpreting the Difference Between Compliance and Performance Scores

An additional finding is the difference between the mean scores of Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance. Procedure Compliance had a mean of 4.304, whereas Employee Performance had a mean of 3.266. This pattern indicates that respondents reported relatively favorable procedural compliance alongside more moderate performance ratings. The difference offers an important descriptive insight: compliance alone may not capture all the factors associated with employee performance.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Performance can also depend on competence, resources, workload, coordination, training, role clarity, and the conditions under which tasks are performed.

These factors are plausible explanations based on general organizational reasoning, but they were not directly tested in the present model and should not be reported as established findings of this study. The descriptive results therefore reinforce the value of distinguishing compliance from performance. Employees may report that they follow prescribed procedures while their overall performance ratings remain moderate. Further research could investigate whether work resources, professional competence, task complexity, or operational support help explain this difference.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, this study contributes a focused examination of the relationship between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance without including additional predictors or mediating variables. By testing the direct association, it provides a more narrowly specified empirical assessment of whether procedural adherence is related to employee performance in the study context. Practically, the results suggest that organizations may benefit from examining not only whether procedures are followed but also how procedural adherence relates to performance outcomes. Management initiatives could therefore combine clear operational procedures with appropriate training, performance feedback, and review of work processes. Such initiatives should be treated as potential management implications rather than interventions whose effectiveness has been demonstrated by this study.

The moderate mean score for Employee Performance also suggests the value of examining the specific performance items and their organizational meaning. In the current dataset, EP2 had the lowest item mean (2.886), followed by EP1 (3.007). Because the precise wording of these items is not reproduced in the present results, their substantive implications cannot be determined from the numerical values alone. Reviewing the item wording alongside relevant performance records would help identify whether particular dimensions of work performance warrant managerial attention.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of 140 respondents identified a positive and statistically significant association between Procedure Compliance and Employee Performance ($B = 0.675$, $\beta = 0.607$, $p < .001$). The regression model explained 36.8% of the observed variation in Employee Performance. Both measurement scales demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency. These findings support the proposed hypothesis that Procedure Compliance is positively associated with Employee Performance in the study sample. Nevertheless, the cross-sectional design limits causal interpretation, and the significant test indicates

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

that the linear model requires further diagnostic assessment. The results should therefore be regarded as evidence of a meaningful statistical association, subject to confirmation through additional model checks and, ideally, future research using multiple sources of performance data.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design does not establish temporal ordering or causal effects. Although the regression coefficient is positive and statistically significant, it remains possible that the relationship is influenced by other variables or by the way the constructs were measured. Second, the data were obtained from self-reported questionnaire responses. Consequently, the observed relationship may partly reflect common response tendencies or shared measurement characteristics. Future research could combine employee surveys with supervisor ratings, objective performance indicators, or operational records to provide a more comprehensive assessment.

Third, the significant test result indicates that the assumed linear functional form requires further investigation. Residual plots, scatterplots, and alternative functional specifications should be examined before the model is treated as fully adequate. Although the positive coefficient remained significant using HC3 robust standard errors, this sensitivity check does not resolve possible model-specification concerns. Finally, the study was conducted within one airport organizational context. The findings should not automatically be generalized to all aviation organizations or other industries. Future studies could examine additional organizational settings and incorporate relevant explanatory variables to determine whether the observed association remains consistent across different operational conditions.

REFERENCES

Bashatah, J. A., & Sherry, L. (2025). Comparative analysis of standard operating procedures across safety-critical domains: Lessons for human performance and safety engineering. *Systems*, *13*(8), 717. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems13080717

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

Christian, M. S., Bradley, J. C., Wallace, J. C., & Burke, M. J. (2009). Workplace safety: A meta-analysis of the roles of person and situation factors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(5), 1103–1127. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016172

Curcuruto, M., Conchie, S. M., Mariani, M. G., & Violante, F. S. (2015). The role of

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

prosocial and proactive safety behaviors in predicting safety performance. Safety Science, 80, 317–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2015.07.032

DeNisi, A., & Smith, C. E. (2014). Performance appraisal, performance management, and firm-level performance: A review, a proposed model, and new directions for future research. The Academy of Management Annals, 8(1), 127–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.873178

Ferine, K. F., Aditia, R., Rahmadana, M. F., & Indri. (2021). An empirical study of leadership, organizational culture, conflict, and work ethic in determining work performance in Indonesia's education authority. Heliyon, 7(7), e07698–e07698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07698

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Firmansyah, & Andika, R. (2025). Determination of motivation, work discipline, and work environment in improving employee performance. In Proceedings of International Conference on Islamic Community Studies (pp. 555–570). Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi.

Griffin, M. A., & Neal, A. (2000). Perceptions of safety at work: A framework for linking safety climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5(3), 347–358. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.3.347

Insan, M. Y., & Batubara, S. S. (2025). Career development of Generation Z employees: The role of organizational support, performance, and job fit. In Proceedings of The International Conference on Computer Science, Engineering, Social Science, and Multi-Disciplinary Studies (CESSMUDS) (Vol. 1, pp. 629–633). https://doi.org/10.64803/cessmuds.v1.121

International Civil Aviation Organization. (2024). Safety report 2024. https://www.icao.int/safety/pages/safety-report.aspx

Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). A study of the lagged relationships among safety climate, safety motivation, safety behavior, and accidents at the individual and group levels. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4), 946–953. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.946

Neal, A., Griffin, M. A., & Hart, P. M. (2000). The impact of organizational climate on safety climate and individual behavior. Safety Science, 34(1–3), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7535(00)00008-4

Supriyadi, A., Dudija, N., & Indiyati, D. (2025). Aviation workforce optimization: Examining the interdependence of operational discipline, job satisfaction, and professional competence. Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13(5), 3663–3674. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i5.3751

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Wakhyuni, E., Nurhayati, S., Rafianti, F., & Tarigan, K. (2024). The dynamics of the relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior among tourism employees in Lau Gumba. In International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework (pp. 1156–1166).

Waruwu, A. A. (2025). The effect of work discipline on employee performance: A study of motivation mediation as a connecting factor in the Medan City Revenue Office. Journal of Management, Economic, and Accounting, 4(2), 1051–1054.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). Managing the unexpected: Sustained performance in a complex world (3rd ed.). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119175834

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.