The effect of Organizational Commitment and Job Pressure to Job Performance through the Job Satisfaction in Employees Directorate transformation Technology Communication and Information Indonesia

Waluya Winarja
Student Master of Management
Krisnadwipayana University Jakarta
Campus UNKRIS Jatiwaringin
P.O.Box 7774/Jat CM. Jakarta 13077
Indonesia

Akhmad Sodikin
Lecturer
Faculty of Economics
Krisnadwipayana University Jakarta
Campus UNKRIS Jatiwaringin
P.O.Box 7774/Jat CM. Jakarta 13077
Indonesia

Djoko Setyo Widodo
Lecturer
Faculty of Economics
Krisnadwipayana University Jakarta
Campus UNKRIS Jatiwaringin
P.O.Box 7774/Jat CM. Jakarta 13077
Indonesia

Abstract
This study aims to determine the effect of organizational commitment and the Job Pressure of the Job Performance partially determine the effect of organizational commitment the performance of employees through job satisfaction variables and determine the effect of work stress on job performance through job satisfaction. The study was conducted on the employees of the Directorate of transport and communications and information technology. The sampling technique using saturated samples involving 83 people. Analysis of data using path analysis.

The results of this study variables organizational commitment and job stress affect the performance of employees simultaneously variables affect organizational commitment to Job Performance partially. Variable Job Pressure affects the performance of employees partially. Satisfaction variables affect the performance of employees in the organization's commitment to partial Job Performance. Influence is 0.558. The influence of the organization's commitment to Job Performance through Satisfaction is 0.390X0.485=0.189. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable. The direct effect of work stress on Job Performance is 0.365. While the Job Pressure effect on Job Performance through Job satisfaction is 0.252X0.485=0.122. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable.
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1. Introduction
Organizational commitment is needed for every employee who works in an organization. Organizational commitment to these employees can lead to high performance. Organizational commitment is the attitude of the organization and the organization of the organization to make people feel at home and still want to stay in the organization for the sake of achievement of objectives and survival of the organization.
Organizational commitment expressed by the scale of organizational commitment. Aspects of the commitment expressed through the aspects raised Schultz and Schultz (2000), namely: "(1) acceptance of the values and goals of the organization (2) a willingness to strive for the organization and (3) have a desire to affiliate with the organization."

Job satisfaction is also an important thing in improving performance. Job satisfaction is related to the working conditions of employees in work whether she is expected to be fulfilled or not. If met, the employee can achieve satisfaction in work. Employees who gain satisfaction in work the employee will have a great motivation to work.

Research conducted by Syauta et al (2012) stated: "that affect organizational commitment to Job Performance." The research was conducted on a number of employees in Jayapura, Papua, Indonesia. Kottageswari and Sharief (2012) "states that the Job Pressure on the performance of employees who work at the company." Other studies conducted by Zafar et al (2015). This research resulted in the conclusion that the work on the performance of employees. The research was done at a number of companies in the state of Pakistan.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Job Performance

According Simamora (2003:45) performance is a "measure of the success of the organization in achieving its mission." While Shadily (1992:425), said the performance or performance is "useful achievements or results." Kumorotomo (1996) imposes limits on the concept of the performance of public organizations at least closely related to efficiency, effectiveness, fairness, and responsiveness."

This means that performance is an act that can be seen, observed and it is possible to achieve the expected things (destinations). Performance can also be said to be a combination of ability, effort and opportunity can be judged from their work acquired during a specific time period.

To determine the size of the organization's performance appraisal performance. The performance assessment is the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to a standard and then communicate this information to employees.

Based on the above understanding can be concluded that employees are people who work at a place that officially, have personal data and to have the force of law, Place the work in question is an organization, institution, or other entity associated with employee.

Work Assessment Methods

Gibson (1994:110) reveals some performance assessment method, comprising:

1. Method of Assessment Scale Graph
   The scale of assessment methods scale chart that lists a number of characteristics and range performance for each employee then assessed by identifying the score that best illustrates the level of performance for each trait.

2. Methods Behavioral Assessment Scale
   Behavior rating scale method is a method of assessment that aims to combine the benefits of critical incidents and an assessment based on the quantity to reach causality scale based on specific examples of good and bad performance.

3. Methods of Management by Objectives
   This method covers the determination of specific goals that can be measured with each employee and then periodically review the progress achieved.

The Elements of Job Performance

According Pasolong (2010:177) concluded that the employee's performance has several elements, namely:

1) The work accomplished individually or institutionally, meaning that performance is the final result obtained individually or groups.

2) In performing its duties, the person or institution is given the authority and responsibility, which means a person or institution, is given the right and power to act upon so that the work can be done well.
3) Work must be done legally, which means the individual or institution carrying out the task, of course, have to follow the rules that have been set.

4) Work is not contrary to morals or ethics, which means that in addition to following the rules that have been established, of course, the work must be in accordance morals and ethics generally accepted.

Dimensions of Job Performance
According to Mathis (2002) as indicators in measuring Job Performance or achievements are as follows:

a. The quantity of work
b. Quality of work
c. Utilization of time.
d. Cooperation

2.2 Organizational Commitment
According Cherrington (2000) in Khikmah (2005) "organizational commitment as personal value, which is sometimes referred to as a gesture of loyalty to the company." Robbins (2003) "expressed the commitment of the organization is one of the attitudes that reflect feelings of like or dislike for the organization workplace."

According Mowday (1982) in Sopiah (in2008) "The commitment to work as another term organizational commitment". Organizational commitment is an important behavioral dimension that can be used to assess the tendency of employees to remain a member of the organization. Organizational commitment is the identification and engagement of a person who is relatively strong against the organization. Organizational commitment is the desire of members of the organization to maintain their membership in the organization and is willing to strive for the achievement of organizational goals.

According to Lincoln (2000) in Sopiah, (2008), "organizational commitment includes members pride, loyalty members, and the willingness of members of the organization."

Aspects of the commitment expressed through the aspects raised Schultz and Schultz (2000), namely: "(1) acceptance of the values and goals of the organization (2) a willingness to strive for the organization and (3) have a desire to affiliate with the organization."

Employee Commitment Factors in Organizations
According to David (1997th) in Sopiah, (2008:163) suggests four factors that influence employee commitment to the organization, namely:

1. Personal factors such as age, gender, level of education, work experience, personality, etc;
2. Characteristics of the job, such as the scope of the office, challenges, conflicts, the role, the level of difficulty in work, etc;
3. Structural characteristics, such as large/small organization, forms of organization (centralization/decentralization), the presence of trade unions;
4. Work experience. Employee work experience greatly affects the level of employee commitment to the organization.

Dimensions of Organizational Commitment
Meyer and Allen (2000) suggest three components of organizational commitment:

a. Affective Commitment
b. Continuance Commitment
c. Normative Commitment

2.3 Job Pressure
Quick and Quick (1984) categorize the types of stress into two, namely:

1. Eustress, which is the result of the response to stress that is healthy, positive, and constructive (constructive). This includes the well-being of individuals and organizations associated with the growth, flexibility, adaptability, and a high level of performance.
2. Distress, which is the result of the response to stress is unhealthy, negative, and destructive. This includes individuals and organizations consequences such as cardiovascular disease and absenteeism is high, which is associated with sickness, decline, and death.

Causes of Job Stress
According to Robbins (2003), there are three things work stress-causing factors, namely:

1. Environmental Factors.
2. Factors organization
3. Individual Factors

Dimension Job Pressure
According to (Robbins, 2003) Job Pressure dimensions, including:
2.4 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction by Martoyo (1992:115), "is basically one of the psychological aspects that reflects one's feelings toward his work, he will be satisfied with the fit between the capabilities, the skills, and expectations with the job he faces." Satisfaction is actually a state of nature is the result of a conclusion of a comparison of what is received by an employee from work, as it is worthy or entitled to it. While every employee is satisfactory.

According to Tiffin (1958) in As'ad (1995:104) "job satisfaction is closely related to the attitude of the employees toward his own work, the work situation, the cooperation between the leadership and employees". Meanwhile, according to Blum (1956) in As'ad (1995:104) "suggests that job satisfaction is the general attitude is the result of some special attitude toward factors work, adjustment and individual social relationships outside of work."

In the opinion of Robbins (2003:91), the term "satisfaction work refers to an individual's general attitude towards the work he does." A person with a high level of job satisfaction shows a positive attitude towards the work; someone who is not satisfied with his work shows a negative attitude to work it, because in general, when people talk attitude employees, more often they mean job satisfaction.

Hasibuan (2006:202) "job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional attitude and loves her job." This attitude is reflected by morale, discipline, and work performance. Job satisfaction in the job, off the job, and the combination between the two. Rival (2004:475) "which describes the evaluation of a person's satisfaction is a top feeling of happy or not satisfied with attitude to work". Meanwhile, according to Cherington (2010) "job satisfaction basically refers to how much an employee enjoys his work"

Theory of Job Satisfaction

The theory of job satisfaction has been quite well-known are:

1. Theory of Conformity (Discrepancy theory).

This theory measure job satisfaction difference between someone with something that should calculate the perceived reality. So if satisfaction got beyond what they want, then people will be more satisfied longer, so there disparity, but is a positive disparity. One's work satisfaction depends on the difference between something considered to be achieved by what was achieved.

2. Theory of Justice (Equity theory).

These theories suggest that people who will feel satisfied or dissatisfied, depending on whether or not the presence or absence of justice in the situation. Particularly the employment situation. According to this theory, the main component in the theory of justice is input, the result of justice and injustice. The inputs are a valuable factor for employees who are looking to support the work such as education, experience, process, the number of tasks and equipment used to perform the work.

The result is something that is considered valuable by an employee who derived from his work as wage/salary, fringe benefits, symbol, status, awards and the opportunity to succeed or actualization himself. While people always compare someone in companies that may be the same, or elsewhere or can also with him in the past. According to this theory, every employee will compare other people input ratio results. If the comparison is considered fair, the employee will feel satisfied. If the comparison is not balanced but profitable bias leads to satisfaction, but can also be no. But if the comparison is not balanced there will be dissatisfaction.

3. The Theory of Two Factors.

According to this theory of job satisfaction and job, dissatisfaction is a different matter. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction towards work is not a continuous variable. This theory formulates the work become the characteristics of two groups that satisfy or motivator and dissatisfied. Satisfies are the factors or circumstances that are needed as a source of employment of comprising satisfaction: an interesting job, full of challenges, there is an
opportunity for achievement, the opportunity to gain rewards and promotions.

4. Motivator-Hygiene Theory (MH)

One of the theories that explain the job satisfaction is the motivator-hygiene theory (MH) developed by Herzberg. HM theory actually leads to job satisfaction. However, research shows the positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover of human resources and labor and commitment of human resources. In between the essence satisfaction, the theory HM is less agree with the provision of a high remuneration, such as golden handcuff strategy, because of the remuneration that high able to eliminate job dissatisfaction and be able to bring job satisfaction (fringe benefits are hygiene factors, not motivators).

Factors That Affect Job Satisfaction

Factors that influence job satisfaction can basically into two parts: extrinsic factors: factors derived from outside the self-employees include corporate policies, the physical condition of the working environment, interaction with other employees, the payroll system, and so on. Theoretical factors that can affect the work satisfaction are numerous, such as leadership styles, behavior, the locus of control fulfilling expectations payroll and work effectiveness.

Factors that are typically used to measure job satisfaction of an employee is: "(a) the content of the work, the appearance of an actual job duties and as control of work; (b) supervision; (c) organization and management; d) the opportunity to go forward; (e) the salaries and other financial advantages in the fields of incentives; (f) co-workers; and (g) conditions of employment (Chruden & Sherman 1972: 312-313)."

According to Hasibuan (2004: 203) employees’ job satisfaction is influenced by the following factors:

1. Remuneration decent and fair
2. Proper placement in accordance with the expertise
3. Heavy-light work
4. The atmosphere and the work environment.

Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

Nelson and Quick (2006) point out the dimensions of job satisfaction, including:
- a. Salary
- b. Promotion
- c. Supervision
- d. Co-workers

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study uses an explanatory analysis approach. This means that each of the variables presented in the hypothesis will be observed by testing the causal relationship of independent variables on the dependent variable. "Relationships between variables can be depicted in the diagrammatic form of path analysis (path analysis) as follows:

![Figure 1 Design Research](image-url)
3.2 Population and Sample
The population is a "region of generalization which consists of object/subject that has the quantity and specific characteristics defined by the researchers to learn and then drawn conclusions (Sugiyono, 2005)." The sample is "towing part of the population to represent the entire population (Surakhmad, 2000 )."

The sample used by the author in this study was employees of the company, the total number of employees 83 people. The number of employees fully involved in this study. So that this sampling method saturated samples.

3.3 Data Collection Techniques
To obtain a concrete and objective data that must be made a study of the problems examined, while the steps that researchers take in data collection are:

a. Primary data
Primary data is data obtained directly from the research object; In this case, primary data obtained from field research is the method of data collection does research premises directly on the object of study in question."

b. secondary data
Secondary data is data that obtained indirectly from the object of research. In this case, the secondary data obtained from library research is the method of the collection of data is done by studying and understanding the books of literary works of the authors who can be responsible for the basic theory."

3.4 Data Processing Techniques
In order for research analysis produces the correct information because the data-the data received is still a raw material, then the data must be processed first. As there are two data processing techniques, among other things:

a. Validity test
Validity or validity indicates the extent to which a measuring instrument is able to measure what you want to be measured (a valid measure if it successfully measures the phenomenon) (Syofian, 2013). In a study using the instrument in the form of a questionnaire, the validity of the test is used to see how much ability can find out respondents’ answers questions. The higher level of validity of a measuring instrument, the more precise the measurement tool to measure well, how that can be used to search for the homogeneity of the measuring instrument is to correlate the measurement value to the total value. A questionnaire considered valid if the questions in the questionnaire were able to reveal something that will be measured by the questionnaire (Ghozali, 2006).

b. Test Reliability
Reliability test is a tool to measure a questionnaire which is an indicator of variables or constructs. A questionnaire is said to be reliable if someone answers on the statement are consistent or stable over time. Reliability measurement is done by one shot or measurements once with SPSS statistical test Cronbach Alpha (α). A constructor a variable is said to be reliable if the value Cronbach Alpha > 0.60 (Nunnally in Ghozali, 2006).

4. Results and Discussion
4.1.1 Analysis of Organizational Commitment Variables
Variables include the organization's commitment 6 questions drawn from numbers 1 through 6. The question is then submitted to 83 employees. Before further analyzed the results of the questionnaire seen its validity and reliability. The validity of the test results can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>19.5181</td>
<td>14.155</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>18.5663</td>
<td>12.102</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>18.5663</td>
<td>12.102</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>19.0482</td>
<td>14.290</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>19.6506</td>
<td>12.937</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>18.5663</td>
<td>12.102</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017
Based on table 1, it is known that the correlation between multiple items with a total greater than the value 0.2159. This value is taken from r table with the level df = 83-2 = 96. This means that all items are valid questions that can be used for further analysis.

Additional testing needs to be done to look at the quality of data are to perform reliability testing. The test is performed by comparing the value of Cronbach's alpha with a value of 0.6. If the Cronbach alpha values greater than 0.6, it can be said that the question to be reliable. Calculating Cronbach's alpha using SPSS version 21 with the following results.

### Table 2. Results of the reliability of the organization's commitment question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on Table 2, data it is known that the Cronbach Alpha value of 0.721. The value of greater than 0.6 so that it can be said that the question of organizational commitment variables is reliable.

### 4.1.2. Analysis of Variable Job Pressure

The variable Job Pressure includes five questions prepared from number 7 to 11. The question is then submitted to 83 employees. Before further analyzed the results of the questionnaire seen its validity and reliability. The validity of the test results can be seen in the following table.

### Table 3. Results of the validity of the question in the variable Job Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>11.8675</td>
<td>10.897</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>12.4217</td>
<td>8.052</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>12.6024</td>
<td>11.779</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>12.2410</td>
<td>10.356</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>12.2651</td>
<td>8.319</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above table it is known that the correlation between the items with a total greater than the value 0.2159. This value is taken from r table with the level df = 83-2 = 81. This means that all items are valid questions that can be used for further analysis.

Additional testing needs to be done to look at the quality of data is to perform reliability testing. The test is performed by comparing the value of Cronbach's alpha with a value of 0.6. If the Cronbach alpha values greater than 0.6, it can be said that the question to be reliable. Calculating Cronbach's alpha using SPSS version 21 with the following results.

### Table 4. The result of the calculation work stress variables Cronbach Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above data it is known that Cronbach Alpha value of 0.692. the value is greater than 0, 6 so that it can be said that the question of job stress variables is reliable.
4.1.3. Analysis of Variable Satisfaction Results

Satisfaction Variables include 6 questions drawn from number 12 to 17. The question is then submitted to 83 employees. Before further analyzed the results of the questionnaire seen its validity and reliability. The validity of the test results can be seen in the following table.

Table 5. Results of the validity of the question in the variable Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Totol Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>16.1325</td>
<td>14.433</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>16.2530</td>
<td>11.411</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>16.0120</td>
<td>11.695</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>16.2048</td>
<td>8.799</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>16.3133</td>
<td>13.267</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X17</td>
<td>16.3133</td>
<td>10.096</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above table it is known that the correlation between multiple items with a total greater than the value 0.2159. This value is taken from $r$ table with the level df = 83-2 = 81. This means that all items are valid questions that can be used for further analysis.

Table 6. Results of calculation variables Cronbach Alpha Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.644</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above data it is known that Cronbach Alpha value of 0.644. The value of greater than 0.6 so that it can be said that the question of organizational commitment variables is reliable.

4.1.3. Analysis of Variable Job Performance

Job Performance variables include 9 questions compiled from numbers 18 to 27. The question is then submitted to 83 employees. Before further analyzed the results of the questionnaire seen its validity and reliability. The validity of the test results can be seen in the following table.

Table 7. Results of the validity of the question in the variable Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Totol Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>31.8434</td>
<td>19.865</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X19</td>
<td>32.0120</td>
<td>18.402</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X20</td>
<td>31.2651</td>
<td>19.417</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X21</td>
<td>31.7229</td>
<td>19.081</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X22</td>
<td>32.6386</td>
<td>21.356</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y23</td>
<td>32.0964</td>
<td>16.430</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y24</td>
<td>32.0120</td>
<td>16.793</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y25</td>
<td>31.6024</td>
<td>19.950</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y26</td>
<td>31.6627</td>
<td>19.056</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y27</td>
<td>31.6145</td>
<td>19.728</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017
Based on the above table it is known that the correlation between the items with a total greater than the value 0.2159. This value is taken from r table with the level df = 83-2 = 81. This means that all items are valid questions that can be used for further analysis.

Additional testing needs to be done to look at the quality of data are to perform reliability testing. The test is performed by comparing the value of Cronbach's alpha with a value of 0.6. If the Cronbach alpha values greater than 0.6, it can be said that the question to be reliable. Calculating Cronbach's alpha using SPSS version 21 with the following results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above data it is known that Cronbach Alpha value of 0.645. The value of greater than 0.6 so that it can be said that the question of Job Performance variables is reliable.

4.2. Discussion

4.2.1. Testing hypothesis Pressure Influence Organizational Commitment And Work On Job Performance

Linear analysis model can be based on calculations using SPSS program as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.080</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>6.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>5.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESSURE</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the tables above, the simultaneous structural equations can be described as follows

\[ Y = 0.528X_1 + 0.247X_2 \]

F count can be obtained from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>680.563</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>340.281</td>
<td>23.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residual</td>
<td>1151.100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1831.663</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above table it is known that calculated F value of 23.649 and significance of 0.05. This value is less than 0.05. This means that the variable organizational commitment and job stress affect the performance of employees simultaneously. The magnitude of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable can be seen from the value of r squared as follows:
Table 11. R-value squared regression model first

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.610A</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>3.79325</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PRESSURE, COMMITMENT  
b. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

In the above table it is known that the value of $r^2$ squared of 37.2% means that variable organizational commitment and job stress affect the Job Performance is 37.2% while the rest influenced by other variables that are not incorporated into the model equations.

### Analysis of the Effect of Organizational Commitment to Job Performance Partially

The analysis results the organization's commitment to performance can be partially seen in the following table.

Table 12. Results of the analysis of the second regression equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>21.085</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>8.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>6.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Structural equation of the above data can be seen as follows $Y = 0.558X1$

Based on the chart above it is known that the coefficient of organizational commitment at 0.558. T value of 6.053. The significant value of 0.00. The significance value smaller than 0.05. This means that variables influence organizational commitment to Job Performance partially. The amount of influence leadership to Job Performance can be seen in the following table.

Table 13. R-value squared second equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.558a</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>3.94584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), COMMITMENT

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the above table it can be seen $r^2$ squared value of 0.311. This means that the effect of variable Job Performance of the organization to the commitment of 31.1% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

### Analysis of the Effect of Job Pressure On Job Performance Partially

The analysis results on the performance of Job Pressure can be partially seen in the following table.

Table 14. Results of the analysis of the third regression equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.336</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>13.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESSURE</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>2.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017
Structural equation of the above data can be seen as follows:\[ Y = 0.312X^2 \]

Based on the chart above analysis it is known that the Job Pressure coefficient of 0.312. T value of 2.957. The significant value of 0.00. The significance value smaller than 0.05. This means that the variable pressure on the performance of employees works partially. The magnitude of the effect of work stress on Job Performance can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. R-value squared second equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant), PRESSURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above table it can be seen r squared value of 0.097. This means the effect of job stress variables on the performance of employees by 9.7% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

**Analysis of the Influence of Satisfaction on Job Performance Partially**

The analysis results of the job satisfaction partially performance can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Results of the fourth regression equation analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above table it can be seen r squared value of 0.235. This means that the effect of variable satisfaction with the performance of employees is 23.5% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

**Analysis of the Effect of Organizational Commitment to Job Performance through Variable Satisfaction**

Based on the partial path analysis above, it can be described as follows. The analysis is an analysis online with the structure of this sub-image.
Commitment influence coefficient of organization to Job Pressure can be seen in the following table

Table 4:21. Influence of Organizational Commitment to Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11.233</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>5.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>,360</td>
<td>,094</td>
<td>,390</td>
<td>3.817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SATISFACTION

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017

Based on the picture above can be seen that the influence of the organization's commitment to Job Performance is 0.558. The influence of the organization's commitment to Job Performance through Satisfaction is 0.390X0.485 = 0.189. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable.

**Analysis of Effect of Job Pressure on Job Performance through variable Satisfaction**

Based on the partial path analysis above, it can be described as follows:

The coefficient of organizational commitment to the pressures of work can be seen in the following table:

Table 4:22. Coefficient of influence of the Job Pressure to the satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.437</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>8.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESSURE</td>
<td>,261</td>
<td>,111</td>
<td>,252</td>
<td>2.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SATISFACTION

Source: Primary Data Processed Year 2017
Based on the picture above it can be seen that the direct effect of work stress on Job Performance is 0.365. While the Influence of pressure on work on Job Performance through Satisfaction is 0.252X0.485 = 0.122. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable.

5. Conclusions and Suggestions

Conclusion

Variable Organizational commitment and job stress affect the performance of employees simultaneously. Calculated F value of 23.649 and significance of 0.05. This value is less than 0.05. R squared value of 37.2% means that the organizational commitment and job stress affect the Job Performance is 37.2% while the rest influences by the equations.

Organizational commitment variables affect the performance of employees partially. T value of 6.053. The significant value of 0.00. The significance value smaller than 0.05. R squared value of 0.311. This means that the effect of variable Job Performance of the organization against the commitment of 31.1% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

Variable Job Pressure affects the performance of employees partially. T value of 2.957. The significant value of 0.00. The significance value smaller than 0.05. R squared value of 0.097. This means the effect of job stress variables on 9.7% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

Satisfaction variables affect the performance of employees partially. T value of 4.986. The significant value of 0.00. The significance value smaller than 0.05. R squared value of 0.235. This means that the effect of the satisfaction of the employees is 23.5% and the rest influenced by other variables not included in the model equations.

The influence of organizational commitment towards Job Performance is 0.558. The influence of the organization's commitment to Job Performance through Satisfaction is 0.390X0.485 = 0.189. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable.

The direct effect of work stress on Job Performance is 0.365. While the Job Pressure effect on Job Performance through Job satisfaction is 0.252X0.485 = 0.122. In this case, the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect that variables satisfaction as an intervening variable.

Suggestion

Organizational commitment to consider in developing Job Performance. Commitment can be improved by taking into account the elements that reinforce effective commitment, normative commitment, sustained commitment, and commitment. Affective commitment can be improved by realizing the presence of employees at organizations that are part of the organization. Sustained commitment can be made by increasing the employee wishes to remain in the organization and normative commitment to realize that every employee must defend his organization.

Besides management organizations need to pay attention to the Job Pressure of employees. The Job Pressure needs to be revisited. Job Pressure is too high can lead to employees feeling stress at work but also the impact of employee impact on the unpreparedness of employees in completing the work. Work becomes very slow.

Job satisfaction also needs to be improved. Satisfaction would happen if all the required employee. However, the organization also needs to consider the organization's ability to meet the wishes of these employees.
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