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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study is to analyze and interpret the effect of job insecurity, work motivation, organizational commitment and job satisfaction on employee performance. The population in this study were employees of PT Semar Beton Perkasa in Tuban Regency totaling 7 people. In this study the sampling used a saturated sampling technique. A number of samples equals the total population, which is 70 people. For this study data analysis used the Partial Least Square (PLS) approach. The results of the study show that job insecurity, work motivation, organizational commitment and job satisfaction have a significant effect on employee performance.
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INTRODUCTION
Employee performance in general is an embodiment of work carried out by employees which is usually used as a basis or reference for evaluating employees within an organization. Good performance is a step towards achieving organizational goals, therefore, performance is also a determining tool in achieving organizational goals so it needs to be sought to improve employee performance. Ridwan (2019; 2017; 2015) and Ridwan and Marti (2012) revealed that to improve organizational performance, organization needs to consider organizational context such as organizational culture and decision types.

Every company in carrying out its activities must have a goal to be achieved, to achieve or realize these goals every company must be clever in choosing a strategy, especially human resource planning which in essence is focused on certain steps taken by management. For the availability of a permanent workforce to occupy positions and the right time in order to achieve the goals and various targets set. They view work as something noble so that human resource factors in the implementation of work must not be ignored. This can be seen from the diminishing demand to pay attention to the human aspect not only focusing on the technological and economic aspects. Competition in the increasing world of work spurs companies to continue to improve performance, so that they can achieve the goals of the
companies that bring them the company is elective, of course, human resources (labor) are needed that are qualified and in accordance with their current field. Companies in increasing their productivity carry out a form of activity, namely the placement of workers or employees who have different levels of competency.

One of the interesting problems to be studied related to achieving a company's goals is regarding Employee Performance. One company that is suspected of having sub-optimal employee performance is PT Semar Beton Perkasa, Tuban Regency, a construction industry company that has experienced continuous growth over the past few years. But PT Semar Beton Perkasa in Tuban Regency found it difficult to get qualified workers and workers to do certain construction work. This is due to the number of skilled workers available and the number of available jobs is not balanced. This is one of the biggest problems faced today. This construction problem requires organizations or construction companies to spend and invest to train people for jobs needed along with providing additional payments. Studies and opinions taken from field engineers and contractors said that the lack of workers and inexperienced workers posed enormous security problems.

According to Ashford et al. (1989) job insecurity is a reflection of the degree to which employees feel their work is threatened and they feel inadequacy power to do everything about that. This condition arises because of the many jobs with status contracts and outsourcing that are quite widely applied by company. The increasing number of jobs with a temporary duration or not permanent, causes more and more employees to experience job insecurity. In general, job insecurity is lack security in working in a way psychological. Thus the job insecurity factor that arises in employees is an important variable to be identified in connection with the possibility of arising from the desire of employees to look for other jobs. The hierarchical theory of needs Maslow (Gibson, 1997) states that human needs are arranged in a hierarchy. One level of these needs is safety and security; that is, the need will be free from threats, namely the feeling of security from events and the environment that poses a threat. Organization also needs to consider environment in managing resources to achieve the best performance (Ridwan, 2016). The emergence of insecurity and threats to these individuals will result in a low level of satisfaction and commitment to the environment or the company where he works.

Motivation is a very important thing to pay attention to the company if you want every employee to give positive contribution to the achievement of company goals, because with motivation an employee will have high enthusiasm in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. The importance of motivation because motivation is the thing that causes it, channel, and support human behavior in order to work hard and enthusiastically achieve optimal results (Malay SP Hasibuan, 2007: 141). Thus the motivation is the driving factor or locomotion to work for employees in a company.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

The population in this study were employees of PT Semar Beton Perkasa in Tuban Regency totaling 70 people. In this study the sampling used a saturated sampling technique. A number of samples equals the total population, which is 70 people

**Definition of Variables and Conceptual Operations**
The variables in this study are defined as follows:

1. **job insecurity** (X1)
According to Ashford et al. (1989), job insecurity is a reflection of the degree to which employees feel their work is threatened and feel helpless to do everything about it.

2. Work Motivation (X2)
Motivation comes from the Latin word movere which means encouragement or movement. Motivation (Motivation) in management only aimed at HR.

3. Organizational commitment (X3)
Organizational commitment is a situation where individuals consider the extent to which their personal values and goals are in accordance with the values and goals of the organization, and the extent to which employees desire to maintain their membership in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Job Satisfaction (Z)

Robbins (2006) states that job satisfaction is defined as the general attitude of individuals to their work. Job Satisfaction Indicator according to Gilmer (1966) consists of:

1) Opportunity to progress. Whether or not there is an opportunity to gain experience and capacity building during work.
2) Work security. This factor is referred to as supporting job satisfaction, both for employees. Safe circumstances greatly affect the feelings of employees during work.
3) Salary. Salaries cause more dissatisfaction, and rarely people express their job satisfaction with the amount of money they earn.
4) Work management. Good work management is one that provides stable working conditions and conditions, so that employees can work comfortably.
5) Working conditions. Included here are site work conditions, ventilation, broadcasting, canteens and parking lots.
6) Supervision (Supervision). For employees, the supervisor is considered as a father figure and at the same time his boss. Poor supervision can result in absenteeism and turn over.
7) Intrinsic factors of work. Attributes in the work require certain skills. Difficult and easy and proud of the task can increase or reduce satisfaction
8) Communication. Smooth communication between employees and leaders is widely used to like his position. In this case the willingness of the leadership to want to hear, understand and acknowledge the opinions or achievements of their employees is very instrumental in generating job satisfaction.
9) Social aspects of work. It is one attitude that is difficult to describe but is seen as a supporting factor for being satisfied or dissatisfied at work. J) Facilities. Hospital facilities, leave, pension funds, or housing is the standard of a position and if it can be fulfilled it will lead to satisfaction

Employee Performance (Y)
According to Gibson et al. (1996) employee performance is a measure that can be used to determine the comparison of the results of the implementation of tasks, responsibilities given by the organization in a certain period and relative can be used to measure work performance or organizational performance. According to Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986) explain performance as a reflection of the success of the company that can be used as the results achieved from various activities carried out. Employee Performance Indicators according to Gomes (1995) consists of:

1) The quality of work (Quality of Work)
The quality of work is achieved based on the compliance requirements determined by the organization.

2) Cooperating (Cooperative)
It is a supervisor’s assessment of willingness to work with fellow organizational members.

3) Creativity (Creativeness)
Authenticity of ideas applied and actions to complete responsibilities in a new way.

4) Reliable (Dependability)
Employee awareness can be trusted in terms of attendance and work completion

5) Job Knowledge
The breadth of knowledge about work and skills.

6) Initiative
The enthusiasm for carrying out new tasks and in enlarging their responsibilities.

7) Personal Qualities
Regarding personality, leadership, hospitality, and personal integrity

Data Processing Techniques
For this study data analysis used the Partial Least Square (PLS) approach. According to Ghozali (2006), PLS is an alternative approach that shifts from a covariant-based SEM approach to variant based. Covariance based SEM generally tests causality / theory while PLS is more predictive model. PLS is a powerful analytical method (Ghozali, 2016), because it is not based on many assumptions. For example, data must be normally distributed, samples do not have to be large. Besides being used to confirm the theory, PLS can also be used to explain whether there is a relationship between latent variables. PLS can simultaneously analyze the constructs formed with reflective and formative indicators.

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analysis

Respondent Identity
The subjects used as respondents in this study were 70 employees of PT Semar Beton Perkasa, Tuban Regency. The following is the identity of the respondent:

1. Characteristics of Respondents by Gender
   Respondents used by researchers are determined based on the sex of the respondent, which the researcher presents in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Data Source: Primary Data, Processed 2019

2. Karakteristik Respondents by Educational Level End
   Respondents used by researchers are determined based on the type of education of respondents, which researchers present in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 / D2 / D3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA / SMK</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Data Source: Primary Data, Processed 2019

3. Characteristics of Respondents by Education
Respondents used by researchers are determined based on the Education Level of the respondents, which the researchers present in the table below:

**Table of Characteristics of Respondents Based on Employee Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 years old</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months - 1 Th</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 5 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Primary Data, Processed 2019

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

**Evaluate the Measurement (Outer) Model**

An indicator is declared valid if it has a *loading factor* above 0.5, according to Imam Ghozali (2014: 39). In empirical experience of research, the value of loading factor > 0.5 is still acceptable. Thus, the value of loading factor < 0.5 must be removed from the model (*in drop*) in the Smart-PLS Practical Guide towards the intended construct. The SmartPLS output for *loading factors* gives the following results:

**Table Convergent Validity Early**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value Outer Loading</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity (X1)</td>
<td>JI1</td>
<td>0.603466</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI2</td>
<td>0.667437</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI3</td>
<td>0.374783</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI4</td>
<td>0.893559</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI5</td>
<td>0.962455</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation (X2)</td>
<td>MK1</td>
<td>0.338169</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MK2</td>
<td>0.331258</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MK3</td>
<td>0.826254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MK4</td>
<td>0.848859</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MK5</td>
<td>0.709027</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment (X3)</td>
<td>KO1</td>
<td>0.671564</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KO2</td>
<td>0.922704</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KO3</td>
<td>0.127531</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (Z)</td>
<td>KEPKER1</td>
<td>-0.235731</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER2</td>
<td>0.535527</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER3</td>
<td>-0.113734</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER4</td>
<td>0.871845</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER5</td>
<td>0.516114</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER6</td>
<td>0.563635</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER7</td>
<td>0.894713</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER8</td>
<td>0.925631</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEPKER9</td>
<td>0.173125</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance (Y)</td>
<td>KINKAR1</td>
<td>0.977741</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR2</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR3</td>
<td>0.857308</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR4</td>
<td>0.649124</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR5</td>
<td>0.928585</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR6</td>
<td>0.924080</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR7</td>
<td>0.408720</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KINKAR8</td>
<td>0.109434</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the table, it can be seen that not all proxies have the value of the outer loading factor greater than 0.5. so that the value of the outer loading factor of less than 0.5 is assumed to be less feasible to be used as an indicator that can reflect each of the corresponding variables

Job Variable Insecurity (X1) reflected by 5 indicators with a JI 1 -JI5 proxy . The results of processing statistical data using software assistance SmartPLS version 2.0 to calculate the value of the outer loading factor shows that the proxy values of JI 1, JI 2, JI4 and JI5 are greater than 0.5 are feasible used as an indicator to reflect the Job Insecurity variable (X1 ), while the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the proxy value of JI3 smaller than 0.5 is not feasible used as an indicator to reflect Job Insecurity (X1) variable

Work Motivation Variable (X2) reflected by 5 indicators with MK 1-MK5 proxy . The results of processing statistical data using software assistance SmartPLS version 2.0 to calculate the value of the outer loading factor shows that the proxy value of MK3 , MK4 and MK5 is greater than 0.5 is feasible used as an indicator to reflect the Work Motivation variable (X2), while the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the proxy value of MK1 and MK2 is smaller than 0.5 is not feasible used as an indicator to reflect the variable Work Motivation (X2)

Variable Organizational Commitment (X3) reflected by 3 indicators with KO 1-KO3 proxy . The results of processing statistical data using software assistance SmartPLS version 2.0 to calculate the value of outer loading factor shows that the proxy value KO1 and KO2 is greater than 0.5 is feasible used as an indicator to reflect the Organizational Commitment variable (X3), while the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the proxy value of MK1 and KO3 smaller than 0.5 is not feasible used as an indicator to reflect the variable Organizational Commitment (X3)

Variable Job Satisfaction (Z) reflected by 3 indicators with KEPKER1 proxy - HEAD OFFICE 9 . The results of processing statistical data using software assistance SmartPLS version 2.0 for calculating the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the proxy value of KEPKER1 , KEPKER 2 - KEPKER 8 is greater than 0.5 is feasible used as an indicator to reflect the variable Job Satisfaction (Z) , while the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the KEPKER 3 and KEPKER 9 proxy values are smaller than 0.5 are not feasible used as an indicator to reflect the variable Job Satisfaction (Z)

Employee Performance Variables (Y) reflected by 8 indicators with KINKAR1 - KINKAR 8 . The results of processing statistical data using software assistance SmartPLS version 2.0 to calculate the value of the outer loading factor indicates that the proxy value KINKAR1 , KINKAR 3 - KINKAR 6 is greater than 0.5 is feasible used as an indicator to reflect variables Job Satisfaction (Z) , while the value of the outer loading factor shows that the proxy value of KINKAR 2, KINKAR 7 and KINKAR 8 is smaller than 0.5 is not feasible used as an indicator to reflect the variable Job Satisfaction (Z)

To obtain optimal results, the proxies cannot reflecting on the variables that have been determined are eliminated and carried out recalculating the outer loading value . The following images and tables illustrate the reflective values of the indicators for each variable after elimination for an indicator that has a value of the outer loading factor smaller than 0.5:

**H1: Job Insecurity (X1) has an effect on Job Satisfaction (Z)**
Based on the results of testing the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the effect of Job Insecurity (X1) on Job Satisfaction (Z) which shows the results of the coefficient value (standardized coefficient) is positive at 0.131640 and *t*-Statistics at 23.862669. Therefore, *sig*-value (0.131640) and *t*-statistics > *t*-table (1.96) then the hypothesis 1 is received, it can be assumed that the influence of Job Insecurity (X1) on the Job Satisfaction (Z) proved to have significant influence and support the direction in this study.

According to Grunberg et al., (2006 in Schreurs et al., 2012) *Job Insecurity* refers to the feeling of employees that jobs are currently at risk of losing their jobs or that employees tend to face loss of work within their organization.

Robbins (2015: 170) stated that job satisfaction is a general attitude towards one's work as a difference between the many rewards received by workers and the amount of rewards that are believed to be accepted.

The results of the hypothesis test output and theoretical review in this study provide a description that fits the situation in the field where workers have anxiety about the needs of work that is currently doing to meet the needs of life so that this situation provides satisfaction with the salary that fits the expectations of each employee in the other side of the tendency for the needs of this work is indeed very visible to the employee which is shown by dedication in every implementation of work in the field by coming on time and obeying the company's provisions, apart from fulfilling financial non-financial fulfillment, it gives a great expectation, one of which is the award of work results which also have an impact on job satisfaction especially employees with high school / vocational education to keep on developing their potential so *Job Insecurity* is not a big scourge for every employee.

Research Setiawan, I Nyoman Agus, Son, Made Surya (2016), Arsanti Tutuk Ari (2017), Kadek Sri Megantari, Komang Krishna Heryanda, Ni Made Dwi Ariani Mayasari (2017) mammu used empirical evidence to have the results of the same study

**H2: Work Motivation (X2) influences Job Satisfaction (Z)**

Based on the results of testing the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Job Satisfaction (Z) which shows the results of the coefficient value (standardized coefficient) is positive at 0.394133 and *t*-Statistics at 21.310491. Therefore, *sig*-values (0.394133) and *t*-statistics > *t*-table (1.96) then hypothesis 2 is accepted, it can be eaten that the effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Job Satisfaction (Z) is proven to have a significant effect and get support with the direction in this study.

According to Mc. Donald (in Sardiman 2007: 73), states that work motivation as a change of energy in a person that is characterized by the emergence of "feeling" and preceded by a response to the purpose. From Mc's understanding, Donald contains three important elements, namely: That motivation initiates changes in energy in each individual human being (although that motivation arises from within a human being), its appearance will involve human physical activities, Motivation is characterized by the appearance, feeling / "feeling" that is relevant with psychiatric problems, effects and emotions and can determine the level of human behavior, motivation will be stimulated because of the purpose and purpose of this will involve the matter of need.

Priansa (2014: 291) job satisfaction is the feeling of employees on their work, whether happy / likes or not happy / dislikes as a result of employee interactions with their work environment.
or as a perception of mental attitude, as well as the results of employee evaluations of their work.

The results of the hypothesis and theoretical review in this study illustrate that the first actor who influences job satisfaction is work motivation. Heller (1998) states that motivation is the desire to act, while according to Robbins (2003) states motivation as a process that causes intensity (intensity), direction (direction), continuous effort (persistence) individuals towards goal exhaustion. Motivation is a measure of how many people can take care of their business. Motivated individuals will carry out the task long enough to achieve their goals (Margareth, 2012). Some employees also do not have strong motivation to get awards or achievements. Lack of motivation for employees to make many employees do their jobs not on time, the accumulation of delayed work results in employees not being able to reach the specified deadlines. It influences achievement level employees and also delay promotions. The level of employee achievement has decreased because each employee or individual cannot complete the work that has been given.

**H3: Organizational Commitment (X3) has an effect on Job Satisfaction (Z)**

Based on the results of testing on the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Job Satisfaction (Z) which shows the results of the coefficient value (*standardized coefficient*) is positive at 0.548366 and *t-Statistics* at 32.810918. Therefore, *sig-value* (0.548366) and *t-statistics > t-table* (1.96) then Hypothesis s 3 is accepted, it can be eaten that the influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Job Satisfaction (Z) is proven to have a significant effect and get support with the direction of direction in this study.

**H 4 : Job Insecurity (X1) has an effect on Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the results of testing on the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the effect of Job Insecurity (X1) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows the results of the coefficient value (*standardized coefficient*) is positive at 0.227119 and *t-Statistics* at 19.795427. Therefore, *sig-values* (0.227119) and *t-statistics > t-table* (1.96) then Hypothesis s 4 is accepted, it can be eaten that the effect of Job Insecurity (X1) on Employee Performance (Y) is proven to have a significant effect and get support with the direction of the direction in this study.

**H 5 : Work Motivation (X2) influences Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the results of testing on the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows the results of the coefficient value (*standardized coefficient*) is positive at 0.433513 and *t-Statistics* at 13.462213. Therefore, *sig-values* (0.433513) and *t-statistics > t-table* (1.96) then hipotesi s 5 is received, it can dimakanai that influence work motivation (X2) on employee performance (Y) proved to have significant influence and support the direction influence the direction in this study.

**H 6 : Organizational Commitment (X3) influences Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the results of testing on the *Boostrapping Algorithm* table, the influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows the results of the coefficient value (*standardized coefficient*) is negative at -0.351702 and *t-Statistics* at 10.469633. Therefore, *sig-value* (-0.351702) and *t-Statistics > t-table* (1.96) then Hypothesis s 6 is accepted, it can be eaten that the influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) is proven to have a significant effect and get support with the direction of the opposite influence in this study.

**H 7 : Job Satisfaction (Z) influences Employee Performance (Y)**
Based on the results of testing on the **Boostrapping Algorithm** table, the effect of Job Satisfaction (Z) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows the results of the coefficient value (**standardized coefficient**) is positive at 0.770710 and t-Statistics at 22.508216. Therefore, **sig-value (0.770710)** and **t-statistics > t-table (1.96)** then hypothesis 7 is received, it can dimakani that influence job satisfaction (Z) of the Employee Performance (Y) shown to influence significantly and gain support by way influence the direction in this study.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results and explanation in the study, the conclusions in this study are as follows:

1. The influence of Job Insecurity (X1) on Job Satisfaction (Z) which shows results proved to have a significant effect and gained support with the direction of influence that was in the same direction in this study. This gives the meaning that with increased job security it will increase work satisfaction.

2. The influence of Work Motivation (X2) on Job Satisfaction (Z) shows that it has a significant effect and gets support with the direction of influence that is in the same direction in this study. This gives the meaning that with increased work motivation it will increase work satisfaction.

3. The influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Job Satisfaction (Z) which shows results proved to have a significant effect and gained support with the direction of the direction that was in the direction of this study. This gives the meaning that with increased organizational commitment it will increase work satisfaction.

4. The influence of Job Insecurity (X1) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows results proved to have a significant effect and gained support with the direction of influence that was in the same direction in this study. This gives the meaning that with the improvement of job security it will improve employee performance.

5. The influence of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows results proved to have a significant effect and gained support with the direction of the direction that was in the direction of this study. This gives the meaning that with increased work motivation it will improve employee performance.

6. The influence of Organizational Commitment (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows results proved to have a significant effect and gained support with the direction of the opposite influence in this study. This gives the meaning that by increasing organizational commitment in a situation that cannot be controlled it will reduce employee performance.

7. The Influence of Job Satisfaction (Z) on Employee Performance (Y) which shows significant effect and get support with the direction of influence in the direction of this study. This gives the meaning that with increased job satisfaction it will improve employee performance.
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