

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: The Role of Motivation, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment

Mochamad Irfan Maulana¹, Perengki Susanto^{2*}

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia ✉ ifanmaul22@gmail.com

² Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia ✉ perengki@fe.unp.ac.id

Corresponding author. Email: perengki@fe.unp.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of job satisfaction on job performance and the role of motivation, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational commitment as a mediator in the relationship of job satisfaction and job performance at PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra. The sampling technique was proportional random sampling with the number of respondents was 325. Data collection techniques were questionnaires by using the Structured Equation Model (SEM) with Smart PLS 3.0 software as data analysis. Job satisfaction did not have a significant effect directly on job performance. Job satisfaction had an effect significantly on indirect job performance with the motivation and behavior of organizational citizenship as a mediator.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, job performance, motivation, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment.

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have discussed the effect of job satisfaction on performance. Vrooms (1964) states that job satisfaction can have a positive impact on performance where employees who are satisfied with their needs will get better performance. Job satisfaction and performance are connected to each other and they have a number of possibilities regarding the relationship of job satisfaction with performance (Hakim & Bono, 2001). Brief and Weiss (2002) state that job satisfaction can be caused by affective experience at work and job satisfaction can be measured from employee reports about the effects affecting the workplace. The cognitive component for job satisfaction consists of assessments and beliefs of work while the feelings and emotions which are associated with work becoming an affective component (Organ & Near, 1985).

Al-Ahmadi (2009) describes that job satisfaction is one of the strong predictors of performance. Job satisfaction has both direct and indirect effects on job performance (Nurnaningsih, 2017). Heidarzadeh Hanzae & Mirvaisi (2013) and Hutabarat (2015) express that job satisfaction affects the job performance of both positively and significantly. There is an empirical relationship between job complexity and job satisfaction and job performance (Fried and Ferris, 1987). The increasing complexity of work is expected to lead to increasing satisfaction. This is because the increased complexity of the work is formed from job characteristics and makes employees more responsible and has a sense of meaningfulness to their work (Robbins & Judge, 2013).

On the other hand, some parties have contradictory opinions about this. Bowling (2007)

expresses that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is largely false. Way et al. (2010) find that job satisfaction does not impact job performance. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is caused by the results of other causal processes.

The possibility of a relationship between fake satisfaction – performance has important theoretical and practical implications. The majority of lay people believe that there is a causal relationship from job satisfaction to job performance. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance especially in public sector organizations (state-owned companies). This study also uses mediating variables including motivation, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational commitment. These variables have been empirically confirmed in public administration and previous studies, such as performance - work motivation (Alonso & Lewis, 2001; Belle, 2013), job satisfaction - motivation (Bright, 2008;

Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Taylor, 2014; Westover & Taylor, 2010), job performance - organizational citizenship behavior (Klotz et al., 2018; Nurmaningsih, 2017; Suzana, 2017), job satisfaction - organizational citizenship behavior (LePine et al., 2002; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010), job performance - organizational commitment (Eliyana et al., 2019; Yeh, 2009), and job satisfaction - organizational commitment (López-Cabarcos et al., 2015; Testa, 2001; Yousef, 2000). The relationship between these variables was tested in this study to determine its effect on job performance and job satisfaction.

METHOD

The population in this study were all employees of PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra with a number of 1,732 employees. This study used a proportional random sampling method with total respondents were 325 respondents from all units of PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra.

Table 1 Determination of Research Samples

No.	Unit	Number of Population Pk	Number of Samples $n_k = \frac{P_k}{P} \times n$
1	Banda Aceh UPT	122	23
2	UPT Medan	190	36
3	UPT Pematang Siantar	189	35
4	UPT Padang	197	37
5	UPT Palembang	160	30
6	Tanjung Karang UPT	169	32
7	UPT Pekanbaru	174	32
8	UPT Bengkulu	129	24
9	UPT Jambi	113	21
10	UP2B North Sumatra	47	9
11	UP2B Central Sumatra	47	9
12	UP2B South Sumatra	53	10
13	Headquarters	142	27
	Total	P = 1732	N = 325

Calculation of the number of samples using the Slovin formula

Data used questionnaire from Talukder et al. (2018) for job performance and job satisfaction, Bosch et al. (2018) for motivation, Li et al. (2017) for organizational citizenship behavior, and Hofmann & Stokburger-Sauer (2017) for organizational commitment. The exogenous variable in this study was job satisfaction. Mediation variables consist of motivation, organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. The endogenous variables in this study were job performance.

This research used quantitative data. The data used were primary data obtained by distributing online questionnaires to employees in all units of PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra. Data collection was online surveys to eliminates the need for paper, printing, shipping, data entry, and other costs (Ilieva et al., 2002), and allowed researchers to reach many employees in a short period time. Questionnaires were distributed online by sending links through social media to predetermined respondents. The questionnaire used in this study consisted of two parts. The first part contained questions about employee self-data. This section contained questions about names, ages, recent education, gender, marital status, number of children, and years of service. The second part consisted of questionnaire questions about the research variables. Measurement of variables used Likert scale 5-point -type ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

This study used SmartPLS 3.0 for data analysis. Test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire data and test the hypothesis of the study conducted using this analysis software. There were several advantages possessed by SmartPLS including being able to show the value of latent variables, being able to process data with small sample size, being able to predict complex models with many latent variables, manifests, and errors, and being able to process reflective and formative measurement models (Henseler et al., 2009).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Each respondent was directed to pay attention to things that became important points of the questionnaire. All respondents successfully filled out the questionnaire according to instructions so that 325 answers from respondents could be processed. In table 2 it could be seen that the number of male respondents is more that as many as 275 people and the number of female respondents as many as 50 people. The age of the majority of respondents was 26-35 years. The most dominant educational background was in high school. The majority of respondents had a service life > 3-5 years. Most respondents came from UPT Padang as many as 37 respondents.

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender		
Men	275	85.62%
Woman	50	15.38%
Old		
17-25 years old	128	39.38%
26-35 years old	157	48.31%
36-55 years old	40	12.31%
Education		
High school	124	38.15%
Diploma	105	32.31%
Bachelor / Master	96	29.54%
Years of service		
<1 year	17	5.23%
1-3 years	57	17.54%
> 3-5 years	98	30.15%
> 5-10 years	68	20.92%
> 10 years	85	26.15%
Work unit		
UPT Banda Aceh	23	7.08%
UPT Medan	36	11.08%
UPT Pematang Siantar	35	10.77%
UPT Padang	37	11.38%
UPT Palembang	30	9.23%
UPT Tanjung Karang	32	9.85%
UPT Pekanbaru	32	9.85%
UPT Bengkulu	24	7.38%
UPT Jambi	21	6.46%
UP2B North Sumatra	9	2.77%
UP2B Central Sumatra	9	2.77%
UP2B South Sumatra	10	3.08%
Headquarters	27	8.31%

There were two parts of the assessment in the SmartPLS analysis including the assessment of the measurement model and the structural model assessment. There were three tests in the

measurement model assessment including the reliability test, convergent validity test, and discriminatory validity (Hair Jr et al., 2017).

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Components	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite reliability	Description
Job satisfaction	0.897	0.924	<i>Reliable</i>
Job performance	0.933	0.945	<i>Reliable</i>
Organizational commitment	0.908	0.929	<i>Reliable</i>
Motivation	0.906	0.934	<i>Reliable</i>
Citizenship organizational behavior	0.897	0.924	<i>Reliable</i>

Based on Hair Jr et al (2017), the value of Cronbach's Alpha must be greater than 0.6. Then for the reliability of the composite must be greater than 0.7. Based on the data in table 3, it is known that all variables had Cronbach's Alpha values and composite reliability according to specified standards.

convergent validity, the AVE value should be at least 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Table 4 shows the results of convergent and discriminant validity.

Table 4 shows the results of the analysis of convergent and discriminant validity. In testing

Table 4. Results of Convergent and Discriminant Validity Analysis

Components	AVE	Job satisfaction	Job performance	Organizational commitment	Motivation	OCB
Job satisfaction	0.709	0.842				
Job performance	0.681	0.481	0.825			
Organizational commitment	0.686	0.607	0.539	0.828		
Motivation	0.780	0.484	0.726	0.489	0.883	
OCB	0.709	0.491	0.785	0.527	0.702	0.842

According to table 4, all AVE values of all constructs are greater than 0.5, so the results for the convergent validity can be accepted. For

discriminant validity, the square root value of the AVE value, also known as diagonal, must be greater than the value of the diagonal number

(Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The discriminant validity test is valid because the value of in diagonals is always higher than off diagonals(Ibrahim et al., 2016).

The structural model assessment is carried out after the measurement model has been validated.

PLS algorithm and resampling and bootstrap techniques are used to assess structural models. The coefficient of determination (R²), path coefficient, and effect size are used as basic concepts in the assessment of structural models (Ringle et al., 2014; Urbach Frederik, 2010).

Table 5. R-Square results

Components	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Job performance	0.687	0.683
Organizational commitment	0.369	0.367
Motivation	0.234	0.231
Citizenship organizational behavior	0.241	0.239

The coefficient of determination (R²) explains the level of difference explained by the dependent latent variable(Hair Jr et al., 2017). The coefficient of determination (R²) can also be used to show the explanatory power of the structural model. Hair Jr et al. (2017) revealed a coefficient of determination (R²) with a value of about 0.190 interpreted as weak, a coefficient with a value of about 0.333 was interpreted as moderate and a coefficient with a value of around 0.670 was interpreted as substantial. Table 5 shows the results of the variable R² with the coefficient of determination for job performance is 0.687, which is greater than 0.6. These results are in a substantial category. From the value of R², it can be seen that variables (job satisfaction, motivation, organizational

citizenship behavior, and organizational commitment) have explained 68.7 percent of the variants of job performance.

Table 6 Effect Size Test Results (f²)

Components	Score	Effect
Job satisfaction	0.001	Small
Organizational Commitment	0.023	Small
Motivation	0.150	Moderate
Citizenship organizational behavior	0.361	Strong

Changes in the value and definition of exogenous constructs that must be removed from the model can be measured through an effect size assessment (f2). The assessment is needed in evaluating the impact of constructs on values (R2) in the model(Hair Jr et al., 2017). The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable can be seen through the effect size assessment (Urbach Frederik, 2010). The effect size (f2) with a value of around 0.02 is included in the small effect category, 0.15 is included in the moderate effect category and 0.35 is included in the strong effect category. Table 7 shows that organizational citizenship behavior has a strong

measure of influence on job performance. Furthermore, job satisfaction has a small effect on job performance.

The next concept after the assessment of the coefficient of determination (R2) and effect size (f2) is the assessment of the path. The strength of the relationship between latent variables can be measured through the path assessment with a significant value category that must be at least 0.05 (Urbach Frederik, 2010). In path assessment, the p-value must be less than 0.05 and the t value is above 1.96 to make the relationship considered significant(Hair Jr et al., 2017).

Table 7. Path Assessment

Pathway Assessment	Original sample (HI)	Sample Mean (M)	T Statistics (O / STDEV)	P value	Description
Job Satisfaction -> Job Performance	0.017	0.022	0.339	0.735	Not significant
Motivation -> Job Performance	0.314	0.318	5,551	0,000	Urgent
Organizational Citizenship Behavior -> Job Performance	0.497	0.486	7,610	0,000	Urgent
Organizational Commitment -> Job Performance	0.113	0.115	1,778	0.075	Not significant
Job Satisfaction -> Motivation	0.484	0.483	6,736	0,000	Urgent
Job Satisfaction -> Motivation -> Job Performance	0.152	0.154	4,642	0,000	Urgent
Job Satisfaction -> Organizational Citizenship Behavior	0.491	0.494	6,515	0,000	Urgent
Job Satisfaction -> Organizational Citizenship Behavior -> Job Performance	0.244	0.240	5,772	0,000	Urgent
Job Satisfaction -> Organizational commitment	0.607	0.610	9,563	0,000	Urgent
Job Satisfaction -> Organizational commitment -> Job Performance	0.069	0.067	1853	0.064	Not significant

This study has ten hypotheses. The first hypothesis (H1) was the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. This relationship

had a P-value of 0.735 and a t value of 0.339. P-values less than 0.05 and t value less than 1.96 showed insignificant results. Thus, job

satisfaction does not have a significant effect on job performance directly.

The second hypothesis (H2) was the relationship between motivation and performance. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 5.55. A P-values less than 0.05 and t value greater than 1.96 which shows significant results. These results indicate that motivation has a significant effect on performance. Therefore, PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra must give priority to increasing motivation among employees.

The third hypothesis (H3) was the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and job performance. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 7,610 which shows significant results. Organizational citizenship behavior has a significant effect on job

The sixth hypothesis (H6) was the relationship between job satisfaction and performance with motivation as a mediator. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 4,642 which indicates a significant value. The results prove that there is a significant effect on job satisfaction through work motivation on performance. Motivation can mediate the effect of job satisfaction on job performance significantly.

The seventh hypothesis (H7) was the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 6.515 which shows significant results. Job satisfaction has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

The eighth hypothesis (H8) was the relationship between job satisfaction and performance with organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 5.772 which shows significant results. There is a significant influence of job satisfaction on performance.

The ninth hypothesis (H9) was the relationship between job satisfaction and

performance. PT. PLN UIP3B Sumatra must maintain and enhance organizational citizenship behavior among employees.

The fourth hypothesis (H4) was the relationship between Organizational Commitment and performance. This relationship has a P-values of 0.075 and a t value of 1.778. P-values are greater than 0.05 and t value less than 1.96, which shows insignificant results. Thus, organizational commitment does not have a significant effect on job performance.

The fifth hypothesis (H5) was the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 6,736 which shows significant results. There is a significant influence between job satisfaction and motivation.

organizational commitment. This relationship has a P-values of 0,000 and a t value of 9.563 which shows significant results. Job satisfaction does not have a significant effect on organizational commitment.

The tenth hypothesis (H10) was the relationship between job satisfaction and performance with organizational commitment as a mediator. This relationship has a P-values of 0.064 and a t value of 1.853. P-values greater than 0.05 and t value less than 1.96, which shows insignificant results. Organizational commitment cannot mediate the effect of job satisfaction on job performance.

The results of this study stated that there was no significant effect of job satisfaction on job performance directly. Thus, organizational commitment does not have a significant effect on job performance. Organizational commitment cannot mediate job satisfaction on job performance. Job satisfaction has a significant effect on job performance indirectly through mediating the motivation and behavior of organizational citizens.

This research was in line with research Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985). In that study,

they found that satisfaction and performance were actually not related (Bowling, 2007). This study is different from Al-Ahmadi (2009) who claim job satisfaction is a strong predictor of job performance.

The results showed that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance was influenced by the mediation of motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. The results for the influence of organizational citizenship behavior as mediating variables are in accordance with the study Nurnaningsih (2017) which states that job satisfaction indirectly affects job performance through OCB. OCB has also been proven to be able to mediate the effect of job satisfaction on performance. This finding is consistent with research conducted by Garg (2017) states that motivation has a significant effect on employee job performance and motivation becomes a mediation that strengthens the influence of workplace spirituality on employee job performance. The findings of this study are also in line with FW Taylor's motivation theory.

These results found that organizational commitment did not have a significant effect on job performance. This is different from Hettiararchchi and Jayarathna (2014) which states that an employee with a high level of organizational commitment will have positive behavior towards the organization. They will try to provide the best for the organization and have a high level of loyalty. An employee with a low level of organizational commitment tends not to care about the organization and is not responsible for the achievement of work (low level of job performance). This result can occur because employees at PT PLN UIP3B Sumatra feel that their organizational commitment does not have a significant effect on job performance at the company.

This research contributes to the proof of Frederick Herzberg's (1968) motivation-cleanliness theory, that employees with higher satisfaction will show better job performance. It

also confirms McClelland's theory and research that examines the relationship between motivation and performance.

There are important implications in this study. Most people assume that job satisfaction causes job performance (Fisher, 2003). Based on the results of this study it is known that this relationship may not be causal. Job satisfaction can affect performance when job satisfaction is accompanied by the motivation and behavior of organizational citizens. Thus, the organization's efforts to improve job performance must not only increase job satisfaction but must also improve by increasing the motivation and behavior of organizational citizens.

However, this result does not mean that job satisfaction is not important. Companies have to continue to improve the welfare and satisfaction of their employees. Even if job satisfaction does not improve performance directly, job satisfaction can benefit the company in other ways.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result, it can be concluded as follows:

1. Job satisfaction did not affect significantly and directly to job performance.
2. Job satisfaction had an indirect effect significantly on organizational citizenship motivation and behavior as a mediator. To improve job performance, companies are suggested not only to focus on increasing job satisfaction, but also to increase motivation and positive employee behavior including organizational citizenship behavior.
3. The effect of organizational commitment on job performance was less significant.
4. Organizational commitment couldn't mediate the relationship of job satisfaction with job performance.

Thanks to:

The author thanks to:

1. Perengki Susanto, SE, M.Sc, Ph.D as a main author in completing this study.
2. Management and employees of PT PLN (Persero) UIP3B Sumatra.
3. To my parents, my wife, my son, my brother, and my friends.

REFERENCE

- Al-Ahmadi, H. (2009). Factors affecting performance of nurses in Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526860910927943>
- Alonso, P., & Lewis, GB (2001). Public Service Motivation and Job Performance: Evidence from the Federal Sector. *American Review of Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740122064992>
- Belle, N. (2013). Experimental Evidence on the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Performance. *Public Administration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02621.x>.Experimental
- Bosch, MJ, Heras, M. Las, Russo, M., Rofcanin, Y., & Grau i Grau, M. (2018). How context matters: The relationship between family supportive supervisor behavior and motivation to work is moderated by gender inequality. *Journal of Business Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.08.026>
- Bowling, NA (2007). Is the job satisfaction-job performance relationship spurious? A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.007>
- Brief, AP, & Weiss, HM (2002). Organizational Behavior: Affect in the Workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>
- Bright, L. (2008). Does public service motivation really make a difference on job satisfaction and turnover intentions of public employees? *American Review of Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074008317248>
- Eliyana, A., Ma'arif, S., & Muzakki. (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment effect in the transformational leadership towards employee performance. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iemeen.2019.05.001>
- Fisher, CD (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.219>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, DF (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Errors. *Journal of Marketing Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>
- Fried, Y., & Ferris, GR (1987). the Validity of the Job Characteristics Model. *Personnel Psychology*.
- Garg, N. (2017). Workplace Spirituality and Employee Well-being: An Empirical Exploration. *Journal of Human Values*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685816689741>
- Hair Jr., J., Hult, GT, Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) - Joseph F. Hair, Jr., G. Tomas M. Hult, Christian Ringle, Marko Sarstedt. In Sage.
- Heidarzadeh Hanzaee, K., & Mirvaisi, M. (2013).

- A survey on the impact of emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction on employees' performance in the Iranian hotel industry. *Management Science Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2013.04.010>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, CM, & Sinkovics, RR (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. *Advances in International Marketing*. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979\(2009\)0000020014](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014)
- Hettiararchchi, HA., & Jayarathna, SMD. (2014). The effect of Employee Work Related Attitudes on Employee Job Performance: A Study of Tertiary and Vocational Education Sector in Sri Lanka. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-16447483>
- Hofmann, V., & Stokburger-Sauer, NE (2017). The impact of emotional labor on employees' work-life balance perception and commitment: A study in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.06.003>
- Hutabarat, W. (2015). Investigation of teacher job-performance models: Organizational culture, work motivation and job-satisfaction. *Asian Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n18p295>
- Iaffaldano, MT, & Muchinsky, PM (1985). Job Satisfaction and Job Performance. A Meta-Analysis. In *Psychological Bulletin*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.251>
- Ibrahim, Z., Ismail, A., Mohamed, NAK, & Raduan, NSM (2016). Association of Managers' Political Interests towards Employees' Feelings of Distributive Justice and Job Satisfaction in Performance Appraisal System. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.429>
- Ilieva, J., Baron, S., & Healey, NM (2002). Online surveys in marketing research: Pros and cons. In the *International Journal of Market Research*.
- Judge, TA, & Bono, JE (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits - Self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - With job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. In the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
- Klotz, AC, Bolino, MC, Song, H., & Stornelli, J. (2018). Examining the nature, causes, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2259>
- LePine, JA, Erez, A., & Johnson, DE (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.52>
- Li, J. (Justin), Kim, WG, & Zhao, X. (Roy). (2017). Multilevel model of management support and casino employee turnover intention. *Tourism Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.006>
- López-Cabarcos, M. Á., Machado-Lopes-Sampaio-de Pinho, AI, & Vázquez-Rodríguez, P. (2015). The Influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitments in Portugal's Hotel Industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965514545680>
- Moynihan, DP, & Pandey, SK (2007). Finding

- workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707305546>
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.05.001>
- Nurnaningsih, S. (2017). Economic Education Analysis Journal The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Work Motivation and Organizational Commitment on Performance Through Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) As Intervening Variable Info Articles. Gosh.
- Organ, DW, & Near, JP (1985). Cognition Vs Affect In Measures Of Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207598508247735>
- Ringle, CM, Silva, D., & Bido, DS (2014). Structural Equation Modeling with the Smartpls. *REMark - Revista Brasileira de Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.5585/remark.v13i2.2717>
- Robbins, S., & Judge, TA (2013). Perception and Individual Decision Making. In *Organizational Behavior*.
- Suzana, A. (2017). Effect of Organizational Citixenship Behavior (OCB) on Employee Performance (Study in: PT. Tanspen (Persero) Cirebon Branch Office. *Logic Journal*.
- Talukder, AKM, Vickers, M., & Khan, A. (2018). Support and work-life balance supervisors: Impacts on job performance in the Australian financial sector. *Personnel Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-12-2016-0314>
- Taylor, J. (2014). Public service motivation, relational job design, and job satisfaction in local government. *Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2012.02108.x>
- Testa, MR (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980109603693>
- Urbach Frederik, N. and A. (2010). Structural Equation Modeling in Information Systems Research Using Partial Least Squares. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application (JITTA)*.
- Way, SA, Sturman, MC, & Raab, C. (2010). What matters more ?: Contrasting the effects of job satisfaction and climate service on hotel food and beverage managers' job performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965510363783>
- Westover, JH, & Taylor, J. (2010). International differences in job satisfaction: The effects of public service motivation, rewards and work relations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401011089481>
- Yeh, CW (2009). Climate service, professional commitment and job performance of flight attendants in Taiwan. *Journal of Air Transport Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2009.05.001>
- Yousef, DA (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010305270>