

DIGITAL LITERACY , SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP, AND COMPETENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH SELF-EFFICACY AT BATAM TYPE B CUSTOMS AND EXCISE KPU

Ardian Ramerta , ¹ Chablullah Wibisono, ² Sri Yanti, ³ Faris Ramadhan. ⁴

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Batam

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Batam

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Batam

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Batam

Chablullahwibisono@univbatam.ac.id , sri.yanti@univbatam.ac.id , farisramadhan@univbatam.ac.id

Received: 04/08/2026 | Revised: 15/08/2026 | Accepted: 02/09/2026 | Published: 23/09/2026

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of digital literacy, situational leadership, and competence on employee performance and examine the role of *self-efficacy* as an intervening variable at the Batam Type B Customs and Excise Main Service Office. The study used a quantitative approach with an associative research type. The study population was 445 employees, while the sample was 211 respondents determined using the Slovin formula. Data collection was carried out through a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Data analysis used the Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method. The results showed that digital literacy had a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a path coefficient of 0.588 and a *p-value* of 0.000. Situational leadership had a positive and significant effect on performance with a coefficient of 0.327 and a *p-value* of 0.030. Competence had a positive but insignificant effect on performance with a coefficient of 0.229 and a *p-value* of 0.123. *Self-efficacy* had a significant effect on performance with a *p-value* of 0.003. Digital literacy has a positive and significant effect on *self-efficacy* , while situational leadership has no significant effect on *self-efficacy* . Competence has a significant effect on *self-efficacy* . Testing for indirect effects shows that *self-efficacy* mediates the influence of digital literacy and competence on performance, while mediation in the relationship between situational leadership and performance is not significant. The R^2 value of 0.665 indicates that 66.5% of the variation in employee performance can be explained by the variables in the model.

Keywords: digital literacy, situational leadership, competence, *self-efficacy* , employee performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Advances in information technology have brought significant changes to the delivery of public services. Digital transformation requires government organizations to not only provide technological infrastructure but also ensure that human resources have the skills to utilize technology effectively. The Batam Type B Customs and Excise Main Service Office (KPU) is a vertical agency within the Directorate General of Customs and Excise, strategically tasked with providing customs and excise services and supervision in the Batam region. Batam's position as a free trade zone and free port makes customs activities relatively complex. This requires employees to possess optimal adaptability, competence, and performance.

The increasing volume of trade transactions, regulatory complexity, and demands for digital-based public services have made employee skills in utilizing technology increasingly important. Previous research in this thesis indicates that digital literacy is seen as helping employees work more efficiently, reducing administrative errors, and supporting an organization's digital transformation. However, there is still considerable variation in digital literacy skills among employees.

In addition to digital literacy, leadership also plays a crucial role in determining employee behavior and performance. Situational leadership is an approach that adapts leadership style to the level of readiness, abilities, and characteristics of subordinates. In this study, situational leadership was measured through the aspects of instruction, consultation, participation, and delegation. The next factor is competence. Competence relates to the abilities, knowledge, skills, and characteristics that enable employees to perform their jobs effectively. Competency development is a crucial tool in ensuring employees are able to make optimal contributions to the organization.

In addition to organizational factors and technical capabilities, the psychological factor of *self-efficacy* is also important. *Self-efficacy* is an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks and achieve specific goals. Employees with confidence in their abilities are expected to be better able to face work challenges and persist in the face of adversity. Based on these conditions, this study tests a model that places digital literacy, situational leadership, and competency as independent variables, *self-efficacy* as an intervening variable, and employee performance as the dependent variable. This research model is explicitly designed to determine the direct and indirect influences between the variables.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Digital Literacy

Digital literacy is an individual's ability to understand, use, evaluate, and utilize information through digital technology. In the context of government organizations, digital literacy encompasses not only the ability to operate technological devices, but also the ability to search for and select information, communicate, collaborate, think critically, and maintain security when using technology.

According to Elpira (2018), *digital literacy* is the cohesion or perspective and implicit skills of individuals in using *digital technology* and communication systems to search, organize, connect, analyze, and evaluate information, create something cool, and connect with others in order to play a dynamic role in society. Therefore, the ability to operate information technology that simplifies work is one factor that can currently significantly influence organizational performance. This study measures digital literacy through the ability to operate technology, creativity, collaboration, communication, the ability to search and select information, critical thinking and evaluation, cultural and social understanding and *e-safety*.

2.2 Situational Leadership

Situational leadership is a leadership style that adapts the leader's behavior to the conditions and level of readiness of subordinates. This approach allows leaders to apply instructive, consultative, participative, or delegative styles as needed. According to Thoha (2015:318), situational leadership consists of four basic leadership styles: instruction, consultation, participation, and delegation. Through these four basic situational leadership styles, leaders can choose the most appropriate method to guide their followers through the current situation within the company.

2.3 Competence

Competence is the combination of knowledge, skills, abilities, and characteristics that a person needs to perform a job effectively. Competence development can be achieved through education and training, leadership support, work experience, and professional development activities. Armstrong (2014) "Competency development is the process of improving employees' knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics so that they are able to meet current and future job demands." Mangkunegara (2014) "Competency development is the improvement of employee work abilities through training programs, education, and experience that are relevant to job duties."

2.4 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to organize and execute the actions necessary to achieve goals. In a work context, *self-efficacy* can influence an employee's effort, persistence, and response when facing challenges. Self-efficacy theory is a branch of Social Cognitive Theory proposed by Bandura (known as *Social Learning Theory*). A person's belief in their ability to control their own functioning and their environment is called self-efficacy. Furthermore, self-efficacy is a factor in cognitive changes in adolescents, a person's ability to display actions at a demonstrated level. Self-efficacy will determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave. Adolescents in solving problems, or in the process of adjusting to stressful situations, require confidence in their own abilities because this will determine the actions taken and the results shown (Artha & Supriadi, 2013).

2.5 Employee Performance

Employee performance indicates the level of employee success in achieving work targets. This study used indicators of work quantity, work quality, work knowledge, creativity, and the ability to work together. According to (JS Hasibuan & Bayzura, 2021), performance is the success or failure of an individual or group in carrying out a task that has been assigned and assigned to employees by an organization. According to (Trang, 2019), employee performance is a measure that can be used to determine the comparison of the results of task implementation and

responsibilities given by the organization over a certain period and can be used to measure work achievement or organizational performance.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach with an associative research type to examine the relationship and influence between variables. The research model consists of digital literacy (X1), situational leadership (X2), competence (X3), *self-efficacy* (Z), and employee performance (Y). The study was conducted at the Batam Type B Customs and Excise Main Service Office, Jalan Kuda Laut, Batu Ampar. The study population was 445 employees. The sample was determined using the Slovin formula to obtain 211 respondents. Primary data were collected through a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Data analysis was carried out using PLS-SEM. Tests included validity, reliability, *outer model* , *inner model* , *direct effect* , *indirect effect* , and coefficient of determination. Respondent Characteristics Of the 211 respondents, 184 people (87.2%) were male and 27 people (12.8%) were female. The largest age group was 20–30 years old, with 119 people (56.4%). Based on education, bachelor's degree graduates were the dominant group, with 154 people (73%). Meanwhile, respondents with a work period of more than 10 years numbered 117 people (55.5%), and based on position, the majority were implementers, amounting to 169 people (80.1%).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 RESULTS

Validity and Reliability Test

Digital Literacy Validity Test Results (X1)

Item	Calculated r value	Table r value	Information
1	0.414	0.361	Valid
2	0.126	0.361	Invalid
3	0.403	0.361	Valid
4	0.506	0.361	Valid
5	0.397	0.361	Valid
6	0.573	0.361	Valid
7	0.462	0.361	Valid
8	0.242	0.361	Invalid
9	0.324	0.361	Invalid
10	0.173	0.361	Invalid
11	0.513	0.361	Valid
12	0.407	0.361	Valid
13	0.404	0.361	Valid
14	0.488	0.361	Valid
15	0.450	0.361	Valid
16	0.389	0.361	Valid
17	0.584	0.361	Valid
18	0.500	0.361	Valid
19	0.350	0.361	Invalid
20	0.378	0.361	Valid
21	0.493	0.361	Valid
22	0.388	0.361	Valid
23	0.644	0.361	Valid
24	0.480	0.361	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Leadership Validity Test (X2)

Item	Calculated r value	Table r value	Information
1	0.637	0.361	Valid
2	0.392	0.361	Valid
3	0.608	0.361	Valid
4	0.412	0.361	Valid
5	0.385	0.361	Valid
6	0.372	0.361	Valid
7	0.348	0.361	Valid
8	0.389	0.361	Valid
9	0.524	0.361	Valid
10	0.450	0.361	Valid
11	0.495	0.361	Valid
12	0.367	0.361	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Competency Validity Test Results (X3)

Item	Calculated r value	Table r value	Information
1	0.496	0.361	Valid
2	0.529	0.361	Valid
3	0.577	0.361	Valid
4	0.344	0.361	Valid
5	0.421	0.361	Valid
6	0.530	0.361	Valid
7	0.384	0.361	Valid
8	0.429	0.361	Valid
9	0.408	0.361	Valid
10	0.475	0.361	Valid
11	0.470	0.361	Valid
12	0.390	0.361	Valid
13	0.484	0.361	Valid
14	0.452	0.361	Valid
15	0.381	0.361	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Self Efficacy Validity Test Results (Z)

Item	Calculated r value	Table r value	Information
1	0.762	0.361	Valid
2	0.601	0.361	Valid
3	0.563	0.361	Valid
4	0.378	0.361	Valid
5	0.465	0.361	Valid
6	0.621	0.361	Valid
7	0.404	0.361	Valid
8	0.572	0.361	Valid
9	0.370	0.361	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Performance Validity Test Results (Y)

Item	Calculated r value	Table r value	Information
1	0.284	0.361	Invalid
2	0.452	0.361	Valid
3	0.383	0.361	Valid
4	0.410	0.361	Valid
5	0.324	0.361	Invalid
6	0.272	0.361	Invalid
7	0.534	0.361	Valid
8	0.705	0.361	Valid
9	0.397	0.361	Valid
10	0.632	0.361	Valid
11	0.481	0.361	Valid
12	0.478	0.361	Valid
13	0.514	0.361	Valid
14	0.385	0.361	Valid
15	0.472	0.361	Valid

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2026

Test results showed that a number of initial items that did not meet validity criteria were removed from the instrument. Five items were invalid for the digital literacy variable, while three were invalid for the performance variable.

The results of the reliability test show that all constructs meet the reliability criteria with the following Cronbach's Alpha values:

B. Reliability Test

Reliability Test Results

No	Variables	Reliability Value (Cronbach's Alpha)	Reliable Standard Value	Information
1	Digital Literacy (X1)	0.777	0.60	Reliable
2	Situational Leadership (X2)	0.701	0.60	Reliable
3	Competence (X3)	0.706	0.60	Reliable
4	Self-Efficacy (Z)	0.680	0.60	Reliable
5	Performance (Y)	0.712	0.60	Reliable

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

All values are above 0.60 so the instrument is declared reliable.

4.1.2. Outer Loading

Table 4.8. Outer Loading

	PERFORMANCE (Y)	COMPETENCY (X3)	DIGITAL LITERACY (X1)	SELF EFFICACY (Z)	SITUATIONAL LEDEASHIP (X2)
X1.1			0.767		
X1.2			0.759		
X1.3			0.762		
X1.4			0.723		
X1.5			0.734		
X1.6			0.737		
X1.7			0.802		
X1.8			0.713		
X1.9			0.726		

DIGITAL LITERACY , SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP, AND COMPETENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH SELF-EFFICACY AT BATAM TYPE B CUSTOMS AND EXCISE KPU

Ardian Ramerta *et al*

X1.10			0.768		
X1.11			0.770		
X1.12			0.756		
X1.13			0.742		
X1.14			0.767		
X1.15			0.740		
X1.16			0.763		
X1.17			0.745		
X1.18			0.713		
X1.19			0.756		
X1.20			0.766		
X1.21			0.762		
X1.22			0.716		
X1.23			0.768		
X1.24			0.764		
X2.1					0.722
X2.2					0.711
X2.3					0.730
X2.4					0.749
X2.5					0.733
X2.6					0.830
X2.7					0.767
X2.8					0.700
X2.9					0.728
X2.10					0.769
X2.11					0.708
X2.12					0.748
X3.1		0.714			
X3.2		0.756			
X3.3		0.709			
X3.4		0.829			
X3.5		0.710			
X3.6		0.773			
X3.7		0.757			
X3.8		0.764			
X3.9		0.770			
X3.10		0.722			
X3.11		0.833			
X3.12		0.704			
X3.13		0.730			
X3.14		0.810			
X3.15		0.789			
Y1.1	0.749				
Y1.2	0.770				
Y1.3	0.755				

DIGITAL LITERACY , SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP, AND COMPETENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH SELF-EFFICACY AT BATAM TYPE B CUSTOMS AND EXCISE KPU

Ardian Ramerta **et al**

Y1.4	0.754				
Y1.5	0.767				
Y1.6	0.712				
Y1.7	0.767				
Y1.8	0.752				
Y1.9	0.745				
Y1.10	0.764				
Y1.11	0.727				
Y1.12	0.724				
Y1.13	0.765				
Y1.14	0.761				
Y1.15	0.769				
Z1.1				0.726	
Z1.2				0.737	
Z1.3				0.740	
Z1.4				0.886	
Z1.5				0.795	
Z1.6				0.924	
Z1.7				0.805	
Z1.8				0.769	
Z1.9				0.734	

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2026

outer loading results show that the indicators used in the model have values that meet the convergent validity criteria. Digital literacy has an *outer loading* of 0.713–0.802; situational leadership 0.700–0.830; competence 0.704–0.833; performance 0.712–0.770; and *self-efficacy* 0.726–0.924. Thus, the research indicators are able to represent the constructs being measured and are suitable for use in structural model analysis.

4.1.3 Discriminant Validity

	Heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT)
COMPETENCY (X3) <-> PERFORMANCE (Y)	0.724
DIGITAL LITERACY (X1) <-> PERFORMANCE (Y)	0.762
DIGITAL LITERACY (X1) <-> COMPETENCY (X3)	0.866
SELF _EFFICACY (Z) <-> PERFORMANCE (Y)	0.563
SELF _EFFICACY (Z) <-> COMPETENCY (X3)	0.781
SELF _EFFICACY (Z) <-> DIGITAL _LITERACY (X1)	0.832
SITUATIONAL _LEDEASHIP (X2) <-> PERFORMANCE (Y)	0.705
SITUATIONAL _LEDEASHIP (X2) <-> COMPETENCY (X3)	0.800
SITUATIONAL _LEDEASHIP (X2) <-> DIGITAL LITERACY (X1)	0.831
SITUATIONAL _LEDEASHIP (X2) <-> SELF _EFFICACY (Z)	0.753

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

HTMT testing showed that all inter-construct values were below the 0.90 threshold, with an overall range of 0.563–0.866. Thus, the constructs of digital literacy, situational leadership, competence, *self-efficacy* , and performance have adequate discriminant validity.

4.1.4. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Direct Influence Results

Variable Relationship	Path Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value	Information
Digital Literacy → Performance	0.588	4,329	0,000	Significant
Situational Leadership → Performance	0.327	2,174	0.030	Significant
Competence → Performance	0.229	1,542	0.123	Not significant
Self-Efficacy → Performance	-0.351*	2,945	0.003	Significant
Digital Literacy → Self-Efficacy	0.500	2,991	0.003	Significant
Situational Leadership → Self-Efficacy	0.176	1,158	0.247	Not significant
Competence → Self-Efficacy	0.493	5,791	0,000	Significant

Source: Research data, processed using PLS, 2026.

The results of the study showed that digital literacy had a positive and significant impact on performance. Situational leadership also had a positive and significant impact. Conversely, competency did not show a significant direct effect on performance. Digital literacy has a positive and significant effect on *self-efficacy* , while situational leadership has no significant effect. Competence has a significant effect on *self-efficacy* .

4.1.5 Indirect Influence

Indirect Influence Results

Mediation Relationship	Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value	Information
Digital Literacy → Self-Efficacy → Performance	0.096	6,424	0,000	Significant
Situational Leadership → Self-Efficacy → Performance	-0.062	1,061	0.289	Not significant
Competence → Self-Efficacy → Performance	0.060	3,791	0,000	Significant

These results indicate that *self-efficacy* acts as a mediator in the relationship between digital literacy and performance and competence and performance. Conversely, *self-efficacy* was unable to mediate the influence of situational leadership on performance.

4.1.6 Coefficient of Determination

Table 4.121 R-Square Test

	R-square	R-square adjusted
PERFORMANCE (Y)	0.665	0.659
SELF EFFICACY (Z)	0.715	0.711

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2026

The R^2 value for performance was 0.665, while the R^2 for *self-efficacy* was 0.715. This means the research model can explain 66.5% of the variation in employee performance and 71.5% of the variation in *self-efficacy* . The remainder is explained by factors outside the model.

4.2. DISCUSSION

1. Digital Literacy on Employee Performance

Digital literacy has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. The path coefficient of 0.588 indicates a positive relationship, while a *p-value* of 0.000 indicates statistical significance. These findings indicate that employee skills in using technology, searching for information, communicating, collaborating, and evaluating digital information can support job performance. In a Customs and Excise environment increasingly reliant on digital systems, these skills are crucial for employee productivity.

2. Situational Leadership on Performance

Situational leadership has a positive and significant effect on performance. A coefficient of 0.327 and a *p-value* of 0.030 indicate that leaders' ability to adapt their leadership style to their subordinates' circumstances contributes to improved performance. Leaders who are able to determine when to provide instructions, consultation, participation or delegation will be better able to adapt their approach to the characteristics of their employees.

3. Competence towards Performance

Competence has a positive coefficient of 0.229 but is not statistically significant ($p = 0.123$). This result indicates that employee competency does not directly guarantee improved performance. Employee abilities may require other supporting factors, such as motivation, work environment, leadership, or self-confidence, to translate into better performance.

4. Self-Efficacy on Performance

Self-efficacy has a significant influence on performance with a *p-value* of 0.003. The research document concludes that increased *self-efficacy* is followed by increased employee performance.

5. Digital Literacy towards Self-Efficacy

Digital literacy has a positive and significant effect on *self-efficacy*, with a coefficient of 0.500 and a *p-value* of 0.003. This indicates that mastering technology can increase employee confidence in their ability to complete tasks using digital technology.

6. Situational Leadership on Self-Efficacy

Situational leadership has a positive coefficient of 0.176 but is not significant ($p = 0.247$). Leadership has a positive but insignificant effect. Thus, the application of situational leadership is not sufficient to statistically explain changes in employee *self-efficacy*.

7. Competence towards Self-Efficacy

Competence has a positive and significant effect on *self-efficacy*, with a coefficient of 0.493 and a *p-value* of 0.000. This finding indicates that increasing job skills and mastery can strengthen employees' confidence in their own abilities.

8. The Role of Self-Efficacy as a Mediator

The results of the mediation test show that *self-efficacy* mediates the effect of digital literacy on performance with a *t-statistic* of 6.424 and a *p-value* of 0.000. *Self-efficacy* also mediated the relationship between competence and performance with a *t-statistic* of 3.791 and a *p-value* of 0.000. Conversely, the mediation of the relationship between situational leadership and performance was not significant with a *t-statistic* of 1.061 and a *p-value* of 0.289. These findings show that digital skills and competencies not only provide direct benefits, but can also increase employee confidence in their own abilities, which in turn is related to performance.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

1. CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that:

1. Digital literacy has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.
2. Situational leadership has a positive and significant influence on employee performance.
3. Competence has a positive but insignificant effect on employee performance.
4. Self-efficacy has a significant influence on employee performance.
5. Digital literacy has a positive and significant effect on self-efficacy.
6. Situational leadership has a positive but insignificant effect on self-efficacy.
7. Competence has a positive and significant effect on self-efficacy.
8. Self-efficacy significantly mediates the influence of digital literacy on employee performance.
9. Self-efficacy significantly influences situational leadership on employee performance but does not mediate fully.
10. Self-efficacy significantly mediates the influence of competence on employee performance.

The R^2 value of 0.665 on performance shows that the research model has quite strong explanatory power because 66.5% of the performance variation can be explained by the variables contained in the model.

2. SUGGESTION

Based on the research results, Batam Type B Customs and Excise KPU can take several strategic steps. First, improving digital literacy needs to be done sustainably through technology training, digital competency certification, *self-learning*, and strengthening digital culture. Second, leaders need to maintain the application of situational leadership by adapting their leadership style based on the abilities and readiness levels of employees. *Coaching* , *mentoring* , and leadership evaluation programs can be strengthened. Third, competency development programs need to be more practice-oriented through job simulations, mentoring and post-training evaluation. Fourth, organizations need to build a work environment that can strengthen *self-efficacy* through constructive feedback, recognition of achievement, success experiences, career development, *coaching* and *mentoring* . Fifth, human resource management policies need to integrate competency development, digital literacy, *self-efficacy* , and situational leadership in an integrated manner. Further research can add variables such as work motivation, *employee engagement* , organizational culture, organizational commitment, *organizational citizenship behavior* , job satisfaction, *psychological empowerment* and *readiness for change* .

REFERENCES

- Abdi, MN (2024). Digital skills: Future needs for Gen Z. In *Generation Z and the Digital Economy: Facing Global Challenges* .
- Armstrong, M. (2014). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (13th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory* . Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control* . WH Freeman.
- Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2004). Digital literacy: A conceptual framework for survival skills in the digital era. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 13 (1), 93–106.
- Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital Literacy* . Wiley Computer Publishing.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- 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.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2013). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Kane, G.C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A.N., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). *Strategy, Not Technology, Drives Digital Transformation* . MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte University Press.
- Mangkunegara, AP (2014). *Corporate Human Resource Management* . Rosdakarya Youth.
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Human Resource Management: Bureaucratic Reform and Improving Human Resource Quality* . Mandar Maju.
- Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance* . John Wiley & Sons.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Quantitative Research Methods* . Alfabet.
- UNESCO. (2018). *Digital Literacy Global Framework* . UNESCO Publishing.
- Van Laar, E., van Deursen, AJAM, van Dijk, JAGM, & de Haan, J. (2017). The relationship between 21st-century skills and digital skills: A systematic literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72 , 577–588.
- Wibowo. (2017). *Performance Management* (5th ed.). Rajawali Pers.