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Abstract-The purpose of this research is to know and to analyze the influence of work motivation on the lecturers' performance, either directly or indirectly. Respondents numbered 106 people. The study technique used path analysis. The predicted structural equation model is lecturers' satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.39 and lectures' performance with r square of 0.43. The motivation has a direct effect on lecturer satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.62; the job satisfaction of lecturer has a direct effect on lecturer performance of 0.57; the motivation has a direct effect on lecturer performance of 0.12. Indirect influence on lecturer performance with a coefficient of 0.357and total influence of work motivation on lecturer performance of 0.48

Keywords-Lecturer’s satisfaction, Performance of lecturer, Work motivation

I. INTRODUCTION

The total system in a university consists of input-process-output-outcome. The four sub-systems are interrelated. Lecturer management is one component of the process. Aspects of motivating lecturers, lecturer’s satisfaction, and the lecturers’ performance are important managed optimally in achieving the goals of the Akademi Pariwisata dan Perhotelan Darma Agung (APP-DA). Potential demand for APP-DA is still low; it can be seen that the number of new students who registered for the last three years has not met the target. The study period of graduates is still above three years on average. Likewise, the waiting period for graduates obtaining the first job by the field has not met the institution's target of <2 months.

The Lecturer’s Performance has a positive influence on faculty job satisfaction[1]. If the lecturer’s performance is higher, it means that satisfaction with the position or job is increasing. Contrary to the results of the research [2] stated that the lecturers' job satisfaction affects their performance. Job satisfaction for lecturers is the main thing that should get serious attention from institutional management, because how the lecturer will perform optimally if his job satisfaction is neglected.

The work motivation positively influences and significant to lectures' performance with compensation as moderating variables[3]. The motivation for lecturers will improve their performance through compensation. Performance is enhanced through compensation after encouraging lecturers. So the performance of lecturers is enhanced through compensation, not through job satisfaction. Motivation is influenced significantly and positively to job satisfaction[4]. The motivation is not influenced indirectly to the lecturer's performance, but it is influenced significantly and positively to the lecturer's performance indirectly through job satisfaction; Job satisfaction as an intervening variable is influenced significantly and positively to the accounting lecturer performance.

According to the argument of [5]suggest that one of the motivation goals is to increase employee job satisfaction. Various incentives such as salary, incentives, and facilities provided are expected to make the employee more satisfied working in an organization. Furthermore, [6] suggest that one of the psychological factors that influence employee performance is motivation. The direct performance will increase with more optimal motivation. Job satisfaction can be used to measure lecturer’s performance. Lecturer’s satisfaction is very important. The argument that there is a positive relationship between work motivation and performance achievement[7]. The various incentives given to lecturers will improve lecturer performance.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research was done by qualitative with a causal approach. The study in the effect of associative independent variables, which are measured through hypothesis testing based on data in the field 3 (three) variables that will be measured is the work motivation, job satisfaction, and lecturers’ performance. The measured aspects area direct, indirect, and total influence.

The research was conducted at the Akademi Pariwisata dan Perhotelan Darma Agung Medan. The implementation lasts for six months, from February 2018 to June 2018. The type of data that will be processed through the input model in this study is the data metric (interval). The questionnaire distributed to respondents or lecturers was developed by giving a closed answer (Close-ended). The Likert’s scale used is within the range of 1-7. The opinions of the lecturers are collected in ordinal data. Successive interval method is used to convert ordinal data to interval data types.

The population is the whole research subject[8]. In this study, the population is that all Darma Agung Academy of Tourism and Hospitality lecturers are 106 people. The next, it is stated that the research sample is part or representative
of the population under study. According to [9], the sample size required for multivariate data is between 100-200. In this study, 106 respondents were used. It means that the sample is the same as the population.

Data collection was carried out through a questionnaire survey. All the APP-DA’s lecturers were given a questionnaire containing items of statement or question to fill out. The completed questionnaire was collected. Recapitulation of respondent answers is ordinal data. Before the instrument or questionnaire developed is used against real respondents, it must first be tested. What is the level of understanding of the stated statement items, is called the validity test. What is the level of consistency of the answers given, called instrument reliability test? The distribution normality of each data observation must be tested first before being processed through an input model (path analysis). If the data distribution is not normal, it cannot be used as an input path analysis.

If the independent variable or the dependent variable consists of more than one variable, it must be tested. Is there a very strong relationship between the independent variable or the dependent variable. Variable work motivation and job satisfaction are independent variables. Therefore it is necessary to examine the correlation between whether it is very strong or not. If the correlation very strong (> 0.8) then the two independent variables are better combined in one variable. In the research model, there are two equations.

Each equation has an error (residual). Equation 1 has residual e1, but it does not need to be tested for heteroscedasticity. Equation 1 consists of only one independent variable and one dependent variable. Equation 2 has a residual e2. This equation is multivariate, so it needs to be tested for heteroscedasticity. The residual variant needs to be examined whether the same or different. If the residual variant of the distribution of observation data is different, then there is heteroscedasticity. It means that the model cannot be used as a data distribution estimator. The Path analysis is an analytical technique used to analyze the inherent causal relationships between variables arranged in a temporary sequence by using path coefficients as a value in determining the magnitude of the effect of exogenous independent variables on the endogenous dependent variable [10].

### III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.

Data observation variable distribution namely motivation, job satisfaction, and lecturers’ performance are normally distributed. There is no multi-collinability among the independent variables (motivation and job satisfaction). The model is recursive. Sample size = 106. Minimum was achieved. Chi-square = 0.000. Degrees of freedom = 0. Probability level cannot be computed. The number of samples is the same as the population. So it is population research.

Therefore, the significant aspect is not considered in the justification. The processing the distribution of data observation (X, Y, and Z) with the help of Amos 18 software.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table 1, the structural equation Y = 0.62X (equation 1) and Z = 0.12X + 0.57Y (equation 2). The highest direct influence is on the influence of motivation on job satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.625. Providing optimal motivation will be very important in improving lecturer job satisfaction. The direct influence of motivation on performance is relatively low when compared to other direct influences. Evaluation of giving motivation directly can be seen from the level of satisfaction of the lecturer.

Equation 1 has a coefficient of 0.39 (see table 2). Changes in job satisfaction variable can be explained by motivation by 39%. Equation 2 has a coefficient of 0.43. Performance changes can be explained by motivation and job satisfaction by 43%. The structural equation above shows that there are still more factors beyond work motivation and job satisfaction that affect the performance of Akademi Pariwisata danPerhotelan DarmaAgung’s lecturers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of work motivation and job satisfaction in relation to the performance of lecturers can be seen from 3 dimensions, namely direct, indirect, and total effect. Direct effect coefficients are presented in table 3. The direct effect of work motivation (X) on job satisfaction (Y) is 0.625. The direct effect of work motivation (X) on lecturers’ performance (Z) is 0.122. The direct effect of job satisfaction (Y) on lecturers’ performance (Y) is 0.572.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direct influence of work motivation is greater than the direct influence of work motivation on lecturer performance. Increased motivation for lecturers will have a greater direct impact on their satisfaction. Lecturers who are satisfied in carrying out their tasks will have an immediate impact on improving performance. Lecturer performance measures include teaching, research, community service, plus supporting activities. Indirect influence coefficients are presented in table 4. The indirect effect of work motivation on lecturer performance is 0.357.

The changes in the performance of lecturers as a result of their satisfaction in working. The job satisfaction as a result
of work motivation given. In this dimension, there is no direct impact of work motivation on lecturer performance.

**TABLE IV. STANDARDIZED INDIRECT EFFECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direct effect of work motivation on performance (0.122) is smaller than the indirect effect of work motivation on lecturer performance (0.357). Giving work motivation that has an impact on lecturer job satisfaction will be more useful. The total effect of work motivation on lecturer performance can be seen in table 5. The total effect is a direct influence combination of work motivation on the lecturers’ performance with the indirect influence of work motivation on the lecturers’ performance. The motivation given to the lecturers had a direct impact on the lecturer's performance, on the other hand, it had an indirect impact on the performance of the lecturer. In the next stage, job satisfaction is the one that has a direct impact on the lecturer's performance.

**TABLE V. STANDARIZED TOTAL EFFECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of total work motivation on performance is 0.480. This influence is still smaller than the influence of work motivation on lecturer job satisfaction in the DA-APP.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

From the analysis of the data, we concluded:

1) The direct effect of work motivation on the performance of the APP-DA lecturers at 0.122

2) The direct effect of work motivation on the APP-DA lecturer job satisfaction is 0.62.

3) The direct effect of job satisfaction on the performance of the APP-DA lecturers is 0.572

4) The indirect effect of work motivation on job satisfaction of APP-DA lecturers is 0.357

5) The total effect of work motivation on the performance of the APP-DA lecturers of 0.480
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