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Abstract:
Organizational commitment is the relative strength of an individual's involvement in a particular organization, which is indicated by a strong belief in the goals and values of the organization, a willingness to make sure efforts for the benefit of the organization, and a strong desire to continue being a member of the organization. This research aims to examine and analyze the influence of i) organizational commitment to discipline, ii) supervision influences discipline, iii) organizational commitment to job satisfaction, iv) supervision to job satisfaction, v) job satisfaction to discipline, vi) organizational commitment to discipline through job satisfaction, vii) supervision of discipline through job satisfaction. This research was conducted at the Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University, Malang, using an explanatory research approach with a census sample technique obtained from 74 educational staff. Data was collected using a questionnaire method given directly to respondents. Then, it was analyzed using path analysis. The results concluded that all the proposed hypotheses were accepted, namely: (i) organizational commitment had an effect on discipline, (ii) supervision had an effect on discipline, (iii) organizational commitment had an effect on job satisfaction, (iv) supervision had an effect on job satisfaction, (v) job satisfaction influences discipline, (vi) organizational commitment influences discipline through job satisfaction, (vii) supervision influences discipline through job satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

The role of human resources today is experiencing very significant changes due to increasingly complex environmental changes. Globalization, the development of information technology, democracy, and freedom of mass media are part of the drivers of environmental complexity. So, it requires organizations to constantly think about how to be able to adapt and even overcome changes in the environment so that they are able and able to continue the life cycle of their organization. To overcome environmental changes, organizations must have the support of qualified and competent human resources and adhere to innovative, professional, open, and flexible values. Nawawi (2018) said that in the 21st century, human resources must be of high quality, competitive, and qualified personnel require that every worker has high positive motivation so that they are willing to carry out their work enthusiastically and dedicatedly to the organization where they work.
Davis and New-Strom (2017) stated that providing satisfaction to employees is very important because the low level of empowerment, commitment, and motivation causes a lack of organizational stability. As a result, there are work strikes, absenteeism, high employee output (high turnover), and even decreased work productivity.

Furthermore, Nimran and Amirullah (2017) explained that dissatisfaction is the starting point for problems that arise in organizations, such as absenteeism, manager-worker conflict, ‘turnover,’ and many other problems that disrupt organizational goals. Even though the level of employee job satisfaction differs based on different needs and perceptions, what will always be the same is that their needs and desires, which the organization meets, will provide employee job satisfaction. On the other hand, if needs and desires are not met, it will lead to employee job dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, the implementation of work supervision also needs to be considered. According to Nawawi (2018), supervision is a monitoring, inspection, and evaluation process that is carried out efficiently and effectively by the head of the work unit/organization regarding the functions of all components to make work happen in their respective environments so that they continuously function optimally in carrying out their duties. Main points that are directed at achieving previously formulated goals. No less critical is organizational commitment because, according to Morrison (2017), organizational commitment (1) influences employee turnover, (2) is related to performance, which assumes that employees who are committed to the company tend to develop more extraordinary efforts for the company, (3) related to job satisfaction which assumes that employees who are committed to the company tend to be satisfied with their work so that the company’s goals can be achieved well.

Armstrong & Taylor (2017) also explain that commitment to the organization is a form of loyalty to the organization, which in the long term will produce good organizational citizenship, namely behavior that is beneficial to the organization without having to be required by job descriptions or orders from superiors. It is essential to research now to provide empirical evidence about the influence of workability, job rotation, and job satisfaction on employee performance. The difference between the current research and some studies lies in the analysis tools. The current research uses path analysis, while previous research used multiple linear regression analysis. So, the novelty of the current research is that there is a mediating variable in the form of job satisfaction, and the analysis tool uses path analysis.

METHODS

This research is designed to answer the problems formulated, the goals to be achieved, and, at the same time, test the hypothesis. The unit of analysis examined in this research is individuals, namely education staff at FH-UB Malang. The population in this study was 74 educational staff at FH-UB Malang, including (1) 19 civil servants, (2) 27 permanent non-PNS employees, and (3) 28 contract employees with UB.

This research uses qualitative data sourced from primary data, namely respondents. The qualitative data is related to the research variables, namely organizational commitment and supervision, as independent variables x1 and x2, job satisfaction as the mediating variable y1, and discipline as the dependent variable y2, sourced from 74 educational staff at FH-UB Malang. The qualitative data was then quantified using a Likert scale to be analyzed using parametric statistics (Ferdinand, 2018) with the help of SPSS version 26 software. Apart from qualitative data, this research also used quantitative data sourced from secondary data, namely the Administration/Personnel section at FH-UB Malang. The data is in the form of the number of educational staff at FH-UB Malang.
Research Conceptual Framework. The conceptual framework of this research was built from a theoretical review and the results of several previous research.
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**Figure 1.** Research Conceptual Framework

**H-1:** Organizational commitment has a positive effect on discipline

This hypothesis is explained as follows: organizational commitment is when an employee supports a particular organization, its goals, and the desire to maintain membership (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Meanwhile, discipline is a person's attitude, behavior, and actions that comply with company regulations, whether written or not (Hasibuan, 2018).

Thus, if organizational commitment is exemplary, work discipline is also good. It is supported by the research of Pratama and Dihan (2018), Manik (2019), Novriani et al. (2019), Febriati et al. (2020), Sutedi (2021), who prove that organizational commitment has a positive effect on discipline.

**H-2:** Supervision has a positive effect on discipline

Thus, if supervision is good, then discipline is also good. It is supported by research by Agustina and Bismala (2019), Novriani et al. (2019), Sutrisno (2020), and Febriati et al. (2020), which proves that supervision has a positive effect on discipline.

**H-3:** Organizational commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction

This hypothesis is explained as follows: organizational commitment is when an employee supports a particular organization, its goals, and the desire to maintain membership (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Meanwhile, job satisfaction is an employee's emotional state that occurs or does not occur at a meeting point between the value of remuneration for the employee's work and the company or organization with the level of remuneration value desired by the employee concerned (Martoyo, 2018).

Thus, if organizational commitment is exemplary, job satisfaction is also reasonable. Research by Situmorang and Kasmiruddin supports it. (2018), Dwiyanti, and Bagia (2020) prove that organizational commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

**H-4:** Supervision has a positive effect on job satisfaction

This hypothesis is explained as follows: supervision is an effort or action to examine whether everything is achieved or going according to a predetermined plan based on instructions set by superiors (Peterson & Plowman, 2017). Meanwhile, job satisfaction is an employee's emotional state that occurs or does not occur at a meeting point between the value of remuneration for the employee's work and the company or organization with the level of remuneration value desired by the employee concerned (Martoyo, 2018).

Thus, if supervision is good, then job satisfaction is also reasonable. Research by Situmorang and Kasmiruddin supports it. (2018), Dwiyanti, and Bagia (2020) prove that supervision has a positive effect on job satisfaction.
H-5: Job satisfaction has a positive effect on discipline

This hypothesis is explained as follows: job satisfaction is an employee's emotional state that occurs or does not occur at a meeting point between the value of remuneration for the employee's work and the company or organization with the level of remuneration value that is desired by the employee concerned (Martoyo, 2018). Meanwhile, discipline is a person's attitude, behavior, and actions that comply with company regulations, whether written or not (Hasibuan, 2018).

Thus, if job satisfaction is reasonable, work discipline is also good. It is supported by the research of Pratama and Dihan (2018), Sipahutar (2019), Agustina and Bismala (2019), Manik (2019), Novriani et al. (2019), Febriati et al. (2020) which proves that job satisfaction has a positive effect on discipline.

H-6: Organizational commitment has a positive effect on discipline through job satisfaction

This hypothesis is explained as follows: organizational commitment is when an employee supports a particular organization, its goals, and the desire to maintain membership (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Meanwhile, job satisfaction is an employee's emotional state that occurs or does not occur at a meeting point between the value of remuneration for the employee's work and the company or organization with the level of remuneration value desired by the employee concerned (Martoyo, 2018).

H-7: Supervision has a positive effect on discipline through job satisfaction

This hypothesis is explained as follows: supervision is an effort or action to examine whether everything is achieved or going according to a predetermined plan based on instructions set by superiors (Peterson & Plowman, 2017). Meanwhile, job satisfaction is an employee's emotional state that occurs or does not occur at a meeting point between the value of remuneration for the employee's work and the company or organization with the level of remuneration value desired by the employee concerned (Martoyo, 2018).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test. Validity test results using the Pearson correlation model. Furthermore, summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig Value Results</th>
<th>Criteria&lt;\alpha</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1.1 =&gt; X1 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.2 =&gt; X1 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.3 =&gt; X1 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.4 =&gt; X1 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.5 =&gt; X1 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.1 =&gt; X2 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.2 =&gt; X2 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.3 =&gt; X2 total</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results above show that the correlation between the score of each indicator and the total score is smaller than 0.05. It means that the indicator can reflect the variable. For example, the correlation between Y2.5 and Y2, totaling 0.000, is smaller than 0.05. So, the data collected is valid.

**Reliability Test.** Reliability test results using Cronbach's alpha. Furthermore, summarized in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th>Criteria &gt; 0.60</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that Cronbach's alpha value for each variable exceeds 0.6. For example, Cronbach's alpha for variable X1 is 0.767, more significant than 0.6. It means that the data collected is said to be reliable.

**Classic Multicollinearity Assumption Test.** The results of the classical multicollinearity assumption test using the VIF approach are summarized in Table 3 below.

X2.4 => X2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
X2.5 => X2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y1.1 => Y1 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y1.2 => Y1 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y1.3 => Y1 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y1.4 => Y1 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y1.5 => Y1 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y2.1 => Y2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y2.2 => Y2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y2.3 => Y2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
Y2.4 => Y2 total 0.000 < 0.05 Valid
### Table 3. Summary of Classical Multicollinearity Assumption Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1=&gt;Y1</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2=&gt;Y1</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1=&gt;Y2</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2=&gt;Y2</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1=&gt;Y2</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity did not occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed by Researchers in 2022

In the table above, the VIF value shows less than 10. It means that there is no multicollinearity.

**Test of the Classical Assumptions of Heteroscedasticity.** Test results of the classic assumption of heteroscedasticity using the scatter plot approach. The following is a scatter plot image of variables X1 X2 against Y.

![Scatterplot](image)

The following is a scatter plot image of variables X1, X2, and Y1 against Y2.

![Scatterplot](image)

The image above shows an image that does not form a particular pattern or shows an irregular image. It indicates that heteroscedasticity does not occur.
Classic Assumption Test of Normality. Results of normality testing with Kolmogorov-Smirnov. It is further summarized in the following table.

Table 4. Summary of Normality Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normally Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normally Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normally Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normally Distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed by Researchers in 2022

In the table above, the normality test with Kolmogorov-Smirnov shows that the variables X1, X2, Y1, and Y2 have Kolmogorov-Smirnov values with Asymp Sig values (2-tailed) more than alpha 5% (0.05). So, the research data is declared to be normally distributed.

Analysis Results. The path analysis results are summarized in Table 5

Table 5. Summary of Path Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>koes. Standardized track</th>
<th>p-value (sig value)</th>
<th>Hypothesis Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-1: X1 =&gt; Y2 (direct influence)</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2: X2 =&gt; Y2 (direct influence)</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3: X1 =&gt; Y1</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4: X2 =&gt; Y1</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5: Y1 =&gt; Y2</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6: X1 =&gt; Y1 =&gt; Y2 (influence influence)</td>
<td>1.198*1.209 = 1.448 &gt; 1.113</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7: X2 =&gt; Y1 =&gt; Y2 (indirect influence)</td>
<td>1.201 *1.209 = 1.452 &gt; 1.134</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed by Researchers in 2022

Based on Table 4.10 above, it can be explained that:

1. The path coefficient standardized on the influence of x1 on y2 is positive. It means that organizational commitment is positively related to discipline. If the indicators of organizational commitment are improved, then discipline will also increase.
2. The path coefficient standardized on the influence of x2 on y2 is positive. It means that supervision is positively related to discipline. If supervision indicators are improved, discipline will also increase.
3. The path coefficient standardized on the influence of x1 on y1 is positive. It means that organizational commitment is positively related to job satisfaction. If the indicators of organizational commitment are improved, then job satisfaction will also increase.
4. The path coefficient standardized on the influence of x2 on y1 is positive. It means that supervision is positively related to job satisfaction. If supervision indicators are improved, job satisfaction will also increase.
The path coefficient standardized on the influence of y1 on y2 is positive. It means that job satisfaction is positively related to discipline. If the indicators of job satisfaction are improved, then discipline will also increase.

**Hypothesis Testing.** Based on Table 4.10, the results of the hypothesis test can be explained as follows:

1. The sig value of the influence of x1 on y2 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that organizational commitment affects discipline. Thus, the first hypothesis is accepted.
2. The sig value of the influence of x2 on y2 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that supervision affects discipline. Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted.
3. The sig value of the influence of x1 on y1 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that organizational commitment affects job satisfaction. Thus, the third hypothesis is accepted.
4. The sig value of the influence of x2 on y1 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that supervision affects job satisfaction. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is accepted.
5. The sig value of the influence of y1 on y2 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that job satisfaction affects discipline. Thus, the fifth hypothesis is accepted.
6. The sig value of the influence of x1 on y1 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), and the influence of y1 on y2 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that organizational commitment influences discipline through job satisfaction. Thus, the sixth hypothesis is accepted.
7. The sig value of the influence of x2 on y1 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), and the influence of y1 on y2 is 0.000 < 0.05 (5%), meaning that supervision affects discipline through job satisfaction. Thus, the seventh hypothesis is accepted.

Furthermore, based on Table 4.10, direct and indirect influences can be identified with the following explanation:

1. The direct influence path coefficient X1 => Y2 is 1.113. In contrast, the indirect influence path coefficient Thus, it can be stated that organizational commitment influences discipline through job satisfaction because the path coefficient is greater than the direct effect.
2. The direct influence path coefficient X2 => Y2 is 1.134. In contrast, the indirect influence path coefficient Thus, it can be stated that supervision influences discipline through job satisfaction because the path coefficient is greater than the direct effect.

Furthermore, based on the Sobel test, it appears that the path X1 => Y1 => Y2 p-value or sig value. 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. It shows that organizational commitment influences discipline through job satisfaction. Likewise, based on the Sobel test, it appears that the path X2 => Y1 => Y2 p-value or sig value. 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. It shows that supervision influences discipline through job satisfaction.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Organizational Commitment Influences Discipline
2. Supervision Affects Discipline
3. Organizational Commitment Influences Job Satisfaction
4. Supervision Affects Job Satisfaction
5. Job Satisfaction Influences Discipline
6. Organizational Commitment Influences Discipline through Job Satisfaction
7. Supervision Influences Discipline Through Job Satisfaction
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