

The Effect of Personality, Ability, Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment towards Lecturer Performance of Private University in Gorontalo

Darman

Ph.D. Candidate, Graduate School of Economics
Hasanuddin University, Makassar
South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Djabir Hamzah

Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Economics
Hasanuddin University, Makassar
South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Muhammad Idrus Taba

Ph.D. of Economics, Graduate School of Economics
Hasanuddin University, Makassar
South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Ria Mardiana Yusuf

Ph.D. of Economics, Graduate School of Economics
Hasanuddin University, Makassar
South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract- This study aims to analyze and describe: direct and indirect influence of the personality, ability and organizational support towards performance through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This study is an explanatory research. The sample of the study were 210 people. Method of analysis used is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). The result showed that personality had not significant positive effect towards performance, either directly or mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Ability has significant positive effect on the lecturer performance directly, but not significantly towards lecturer performance mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational support has a not significantly positive effect towards lecturer performance either directly or mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction has not significant positive effect on performance either directly or mediated by organizational commitment and has a positive significant effect towards organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has not significant positive effect to lecturer performance.

Keywords- Personality, Ability, Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Lecturer Performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

To achieve maximum performance, human resource in carrying out its function does not stand alone. Gibson, et.al. (1988) states that the resulting performance can not be separated from the factors that influence it, there are three groups of variables that affect work behavior, which further affects the performance, namely: individual, psychological and organizational variables. Individual factors that influence work behavior are skills, abilities, background and demographics. Psychological factors consist of perception, attitude, personality, learning and motivation. Furthermore, organizational factors consist of resources, communication, leadership, rewards, structures and work plans.

Previous research has found several factors that influence lecturer performance such as; personality, ability, job satisfaction, organizational commitment. The use of these variables refers to the theory developed by Colquitt, et. Al (2014).

Personality is an individual characteristic that is attached to a person and is stable over time. In this study personality measurement adapted from Costa and McCrae (Yang & Hwang, 2014). This theory is based on Big Five Personality as a representation of trait structure which is the main dimension of personality, namely; agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extroversion, and openness to experience. The relationship of personality to performance, has been studied with many different results; such as Thoresen, et. al. (2004) which states that big five personality simultaneously have a significant effect on performance, while Nikolaou (2003) stated that there is no relationship between personality and performance simultaneously.

Intellectual abilities are expressed as thinking competencies that have a function towards individual work with indicators; analytical thinking, conceptual thinking, professional technical skills (Spencer and Spencer, 1993). Lecturers are required to have a high competence consist of four clumps, namely: mastering the field of study, understanding the learner, mastering educational learning, as well as the development of personality and professionalism. Lecturers are also required to be professional such as mastering good teaching skills, having a lot of knowledge, and a professional attitude that is well supported by other ability. The relationship between ability to performance, has been done with different results; Varca & James-Valutis (1993) stated that individuals with high ability level will be significantly relevant to high job performance, while Colarelli, et. al. (Bounreau, et al., 2001) found not significant effects between cognitive ability to performance.

Organizational support refers to employe perceptions about the extent to which organizations assess the contributions, provide support, and care about their well-being. Organizational support means the extent to which organizations appreciated employees' contributions and care about their well-being. The measurement of organizational support is adapted from (Eisenberger, et.al, 1986), (Eisenberger, et al, 2002): fairness, superiors support, organizational rewards and working conditions. The relationship between organizational support to performance, has been largely done with different results; Rocha and Chelladurai (2011) found that the direct relationship between perceptions of organizational support towards performance is significant effect, whereas by Chiang and Hsieh (2012) stating that perceived organizational support has no positive effect on work performance.

Job Satisfaction is adapted from Yang & Hwang (2014), namely: intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. The relationship between job satisfaction to performance, has been done with different results, such as; Whitman, et. Al (2010) found satisfaction has a positive effect on performance. The not significant fundings on influence between job satisfaction towards performance conducted by (Karatepe, et al (2006) found that job satisfaction has no effect on performance.

Organizational commitment is adapted from Allen & Meyer (1990) using three indicators, namely: affective, continuance, normative commitment. The relationship between organizational commitment to performance, has been widely done with a different results, such as; Pinho, et. al. (2014) who found that organizational commitment has no significant effect on performance. While Jaramillo, et. al. (2005) found that there is a strong and positive effect between organizational commitment and work performance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Personality

Personality is the overall characteristic that come from the unique nature of a person in reacting and interacting with others. Personality combines a set of physical and mental characteristics that reflect how a person looks, thinks, plays, and feels (John R. Schermerhorn, 2007). Traits in the domains of the Big Five Personality by McCrae, et. al. (1998) are conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and openness to experience.

Ability

Ability is the capacity of an individual to perform various tasks in a job (Robbins and Judge, 2014). Spencer and Spencer (1993) describe the ability indicators that is analytical thinking, conceptual thinking, and technical/professional/managerial expertise. John A. Wagner and Hollenbeck (2010) devide the capabilities i.e. physical and cognitive abilities. Cognitive ability is divided into dimensions, namely: verbal, quantitative, reasoning, emotional and cultural intelligence.

Organizational Support

The growing perceived organizational support is driven by an employee's tendency to establish the characteristics of a human-like organization (Robert Eisenberger, et al., 1986). The perceived organizational support refers to how an employee perceives that their organizations appreciate their contributions to the workplace and care about their welfare (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The three main categories which are perceived by employees have a relationship with the perception of organizational support (Robert Eisenberger, et al., 1986). The three main categories are: fairness, supervisor's support, organizational awards and working conditions.

Job satisfaction

Locke (Colquitt, et al., 2014), job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional state resulting from a person's assessment for his job or his work experience. In other words, job satisfaction is how you feel about your job and what you think about your work. Employees will think positively when they feel that they have high job satisfaction with their duties and take part in the activity. Employees will think negatively when they feel that they have low job satisfaction with their duties and take part in the activity.

According to Griffin and Moorhead (2014), job satisfaction reflects the extent to which people find satisfaction or fulfillment in their work. Job satisfaction is a pleasant feeling resulting from someone perception that the job satisfies or allows for the fulfillment of the importance of the values from someone job (John A Wagner and Hollenbeck, 2010). Meanwhile, according to John R. Schermerhorn (2007) job satisfaction is an attitude that reflects a person's positive and negative feelings towards work, colleagues, and work environment. Furthermore, it is defined that job satisfaction is an attitude that reflects a person's judgment about his work or his work experience in a certain period of time.

Organizational Commitment

Mathis and Jackson (2001), states that commitment is the level of trust and acceptance of labor towards the organization and has a desire to remain in the organization. Organizational commitment is the power of individual identification with the organization's involvement (Mowday et al., 1979). In general it is often defined as: 1) a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, 2) a willingness to use greater effort for the benefit of the organization; 3) a definite confidence and acceptance of organizational values and goals. Commitment to the organization is mutualimensional. In its development, there are three components that drive the growth of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Smith, 1993). The three components are: 1) affective commitment is the emotional involvement of workers toward the organization. This commitment is influenced and/or developed, if involvement in the organization proved to be a satisfying experience. The organization provide an opportunities to do the job better or produce opportunities to gain valuable skills. 2) continuance commitment is commitment involvement based on cost incurred due to the release of workers from the organization. This commitment is influenced and/or developed when an individual invests. The value of investment will be lost or decreased when the individual moves away from his organization. 3) normative commitment is the involvement of workers' feelings towards tasks that exist in the organization. Normative commitment is influenced and/or developed as a result of the internalization of normative pressure to perform certain actions, and and receive a benefits that give rise to feelings of obligation which must be replied.

Lecturer Performance

Lecturer performance as ability in process, implementation, and learning process (teaching & learning) (Lucky & Yusoff, 2015). This involves the function of the lecturer in performing or completing a job. The Opinions of Darling-Hammond, et. al described by Lucky and Yusoff (2015), lecturer performance as the strength of academic background, academic publications, teaching professionals, experience level, number of guided students and overall performance.

Fortunato and Waddell (1981) stated that indicators in the measurement of lecturer performance are the implementation of tasks in the field of education and teaching, research and community service.

III. RESEARCH METHOD AND HYPOTHESES

The population in this research is all lecturers at private universities in Gorontalo with a number of 672 people. From the total lecturers population, 244 have functional positions of instructor, 71 people have functional positions of assistant professor and 7 persons who have functional positions of associate professor. In absolute term, lecturer with the rank of instructor to associate professor as many as 322 people. Sampling was done by using cluster method and stratified random sampling. While the sample determination of respondents that are use in this study is through non probability sampling on a certain quota, with the number of valid final sample of 210 people. Data analysis techniques used structural equation modeling analysis with AMOS 21. Variable measurements were performed using Interval scale between 1 (lowest score) to 5 (highest score). Hypothesis in this research formulated as mach as 22 hypothesis as follows:

- 1A** Personality directly effect towards job satisfaction.
- 1B** Ability directly effect towards job satisfaction.
- 1C** Organization support directly effect towards job satisfaction.
- 2A** Personality directly effect towards the organization.
- 2B** Ability directly effect towards organizational commitment.
- 2C** Organization support directly effect towards organizational commitment.
- 2D** Personality has a indirect effect on organizational commitment through job satisfaction.

- 2E** Ability has a indirect effect on organizational commitment through job satisfaction.
- 2F** Organization support has a indirect effect on organizational commitment through job satisfaction.
- 3A** Personality directly effect towards lecturer performance.
- 3B** Ability directly effect towards lecturer performance.
- 3C** Organizational Support directly effect towards lecturer performance.
- 3D** Personality has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction.
- 3E** Ability has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction.
- 3F** Organizations support has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction.
- 3G** Personality has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through organizational commitment.
- 3H** Ability has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through organizational commitment.
- 3I** Organizations support has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through organizational commitment.
- 4A** Job satisfaction directly effect towards lecturer performance.
- 4B** Job satisfaction has a indirect effect on lecturer performance through organizational commitment.
- 5A** Job satisfaction directly effect towards organizational commitment.
- 6A** Organizational commitment directly effect towards lecturer performance.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of validity testing for indicators in each variable indicate that all indicators are valid because Average Variance Extract (AVE) shows the number of variance of the indicators extracted by the developed latent variables. The acceptable value of AVE is at least 0,5. The minimum reliability value of an acceptable latent variable forming dimension is 0,7.

Table 1
Results for Validity And Reliability Test

Variabel	Indicator	Standard Loading	Standard Loading ²	Construct Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Interpretation Of Validity Testing	Interpretation Of Reliability Testing
Personality	PER1	0,226	0,051	0,850	0,712	Valid	Reliabel
	PER2	0,611	0,373				
	PER3	0,614	0,377				
	PER4	0,465	0,216				
	PER5	0,527	0,278				
	PER6	0,761	0,579				
	PER7	0,736	0,542				
	PER8	0,799	0,638				
	PER9	0,764	0,584				
Ability	AB1	0,543	0,295	0,797	0,591	Valid	Reliabel
	AB2	0,408	0,166				
	AB3	0,290	0,084				
	AB4	0,536	0,287				
	AB5	0,569	0,324				
	AB6	0,707	0,500				
	AB7	0,753	0,567				
	AB8	0,729	0,531				
Organizational Support	DO1	0,642	0,412	0,848	0,743	Valid	Reliabel
	DO2	0,888	0,789				
	DO3	0,903	0,815				
	DO4	0,545	0,297				
	DO5	0,591	0,349				
	DO6	0,548	0,300				

Variabel	Indicator	Standard Loading	Standard Loading ²	Construct Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Interpretation Of Validity Testing	Interpretation Of Reliability Testing
Job Satisfaction	KK1	0,838	0,702	0,923	0,890	Valid	Reliabel
	KK2	0,797	0,635				
	KK3	0,811	0,658				
	KK4	0,846	0,716				
	KK5	0,790	0,624				
	KK6	0,820	0,672				
Organizational Commitment	KO1	0,380	0,144	0,750	0,523	Valid	Reliabel
	KO2	0,529	0,280				
	KO3	0,583	0,340				
	KO4	0,461	0,213				
	KO5	0,684	0,468				
	KO6	0,793	0,629				
Lecturer Performance	KD1	0,375	0,141	0,806	0,656	Valid	Reliabel
	KD2	0,397	0,158				
	KD3	0,740	0,548				
	KD4	0,763	0,582				
	KD5	0,721	0,520				
	KD6	0,783	0,613				

Table 2
Evaluation of Goodness-of Fit Criteria

Goodness of Fit (GOF) Index	Cut-off Value	Value On The Research Model	Description
Chi-square (x2)	Smaller, more better	571,193*	Good Fit
p (Probabilitas)	> 0,05	0,920	Good Fit
CMIN/DF	< 2,0	0,921	Good Fit
RMSEA	< 0,08	0,000	Good Fit
GFI	> 0,90	0,888	Marginal
AGFI	> 0,90	0,844	Marginal
TLI	> 0,90	1,016	Good Fit
CFI	> 0,90	1,000	Good Fit

* Chi_Square value is smaller, when compared with the number of ChiInv using Excel program at 5% significance level, df = 620 the result of = 679,0358

The results of goodness of fit test on the proposed standard model will be described one by one as follows.

- A. The result of chi square calculation is 571,193 with significance probability 0,920, which means there is no difference between covarian matrix input which is observed with predicted model.
- B. $RMSEA \leq 0,06 - 0,08$ indicates the GoF model is quite good.
- C. The GFI value of 0,888 is above 0.90 which means marginal.
- D. The AGFI value of 0,844 is marginal because it is less than 0.90.
- E. The TLI value of 1,016 is good because it's more than 0,95.
- F. The CMIN/DF value obtained is 0,921. The result is good, because it meets the requirements that is smaller than 2,00.
- G. The CFI value obtained is 1,000 which is otherwise goog because it's more than 0,95.

The complete hypothesis of 22 paths as presented in tables 3 and 4 has 6 accepted and 16 rejected hypotheses. Further interpretation of the table can be explained as follows:

Table 3
Direct Effect Testing Results

Type Of Influence		Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Etc.
Job Satisfaction	<--- Personality	-0,048	0,350	-0,138	0,890	Not Significant
Job Satisfaction	<--- Ability	-0,130	0,153	-0,847	0,397	Not Significant
Job Satisfaction	<--- Organizational Support	0,892	0,116	7,702	0,000	Signifikan
Organizational Commitment	<--- Personality	0,003	0,256	0,010	0,992	Not Significant
Organizational Commitment	<--- Ability	0,603	0,157	3,847	0,000	Significant
Organizational Commitment	<--- Organizational Support	0,196	0,089	2,207	0,027	Significant
Organizational Commitment	<--- Job Satisfaction	0,188	0,064	2,930	0,003	Significant
Performance	<--- Personality	0,155	0,142	1,096	0,273	Not Significant
Performance	<--- Ability	0,451	0,112	4,037	0,000	Not Significant
Performance	<--- Organizational Support	0,062	0,046	1,350	0,177	Not Significant
Performance	<--- Job Satisfaction	0,010	0,033	0,306	0,759	Not Significant
Performance	<--- Organizational Commitment	0,006	0,060	0,106	0,915	Not Significant

Table 4
Results of Indirect Effect and Total Influence Testing

Independent Variable	Intervening Variable	Dependent Variable	Indirect Effect	Total Effect	C.R.	P	Etc
Personality	Job Satisfaction	Lecturer Performance	0,085	0,155	-0,125	0,901	Not Significant
Ability	Job Satisfaction	Lecturer Performance	0,612	0,454	-0,285	0,775	Not Significant
Organizational Support	Job Satisfaction	Lecturer Performance	0,143	0,073	0,303	0,762	Not Significant
Personality	Organizational Commitment	Lecturer Performance	0,085	0,155	0,012	0,991	Not Significant
Ability	Organizational Commitment	Lecturer Performance	0,612	0,454	0,099	0,920	Not Significant
Organizational Support	Organizational Commitment	Lecturer Performance	0,143	0,073	0,099	0,920	Not Significant
Kepuasan Kerja	Organizational Commitment	Lecturer Performance	0,031	0,011	0,099	0,920	Not Significant
Personality	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	0,001	-0,006	-0,048	0,891	Not Significant
Ability	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	0,419	0,579	-0,816	0,414	Not Significant
Organizational Support	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	0,232	0,364	2,744	0,006	Significant

Hypothesis 1A is rejected, p-value is $0,890 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,138$. So, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of personality on job satisfaction is not significant. This result is in line with Furnham, et. al. (2002) that big five personality has no effect on job satisfaction, because there are other factors that more influence job satisfaction that is salary. **Hypothesis 1B is rejected**, p-value is $0,397 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,847$. So, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of ability to job satisfaction is not significant. The results of this study are in line with a study from Meulmann and Barrett and Forbes research in Ganzach (1998) who found a negative relationship between intellectual ability and job satisfaction. **Hypothesis 1C is accepted**, p-value is $0,000 <$

0,05 (cut of value), and CR value is $7,702 > 2.00$ (CR value limit ± 2.00). So, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, organizational support have a significant effect on job satisfaction. Filipova (2011) states that there is a positive and significant relationship between perceived organizational support towards job satisfaction. Similarly, another study about direct influence of organizational support towards job satisfaction is suggested by Fu, et. al. (2013) which suggests that perceived organizational support is the most important factor in relation to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2A is rejected, p-value is $0,992 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $0,010$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of personality on organizational commitment is not significant. This study is in line with McCrae and Costa (1997) who found that teachers/lecturers with openness to experience are negatively correlated with normative commitment because their free thinking and wanting variation that cause it to be less valuable to something that is valuable to many people, for example a formal and informal rewards that are commonly applied so that employees have ties to the organization. Individuals with such personality traits generally have no moral responsibility or burden to survive in the organization. **Hypothesis 2B is accepted**, p-value is $0,000 < 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $3,847$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, the influence of ability towards organizational commitment is significant. These results are in line with Shaffar and Margaret (2003) who explained that individuals with high emotional intelligence are more committed to their organization. **Hypothesis 2C is accepted**, p-value is $0,027 < 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $2,207$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, the effect of organizational support towards organizational commitment is significant. The significant relationship between organizational support and organizational commitment is in line with research conducted by Tumwesigye (2010) who found that there is a positive relationship between perceived organizational commitment with increased affective commitment of employees in the organization. **Hypothesis 2D is rejected**. P-value is $0,891 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,048$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of personality towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction is not significant. **Hypothesis 2e is rejected**. P-value is $0,414 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,816$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of ability towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction is not significant. **Hypothesis 2f is accepted**, p-value is $0,006 < 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $2,774$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, the effect of organizational support towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction is significant.

Hypothesis 3A is rejected, p-value is $0,273 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $1,096$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of personality towards lecturer performance is not significant. This result is in line with the results of Nikolaou (2003) study which states that there is simultaneously no relationship between personality with performance. Barrick et. al. (2005) suggest that the big five personality characteristics (extroversion, emotional stability, and openness to experience) have weak relationships with interpersonal performance. **Hypothesis 3B is accepted**, p-value is $0,000 < 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $4,037$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, the influence of personality towards lecturer performance is significant. This result is in line with research conducted by Varca & James-Valutis (1993) who found that individuals with a high level of ability will significantly be relevant to high job performance. **Hypothesis 3C is rejected**, p-value is $0,759 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $1,350$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the effect of organizational support towards lecturer performance is not significant. The findings of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Chiang & Hsieh (2012) which states that perceived organizational support has no positive effect on work performance. Pazy & Ganzach (2009) who also stated that performance is not influenced by perceived organizational support. **Hypothesis 3D is rejected**, p-value is $0,901 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,125$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of Personality towards lecturer performance through job satisfaction is not significant.

Hypothesis 3E is rejected, p-value is $0,775 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,285$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of ability on lecturer performance through job satisfaction is not significant. This result is not in line with research conducted by Varca & James-Valutis (1993) who argued that job satisfaction mediates the relationship between ability towards performance. **Hypothesis 3F is rejected**, p-value is $0,762 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $-0,303$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of organizational support towards lecturer performance through job satisfaction is not significant. These results are not in line with the results of research conducted by Karatepe (2012) which states that the perceived organizational support affect the performance of service recovery and job performance through career satisfaction. Yang & Hwang (2014) argued that job satisfaction has a bilateral relationship that affects perceived organizational support with work performance. Guan, et. al. (2014) found that the relationship between perceived organizational support and work performance are mediated by job satisfaction. **Hypothesis 3G is rejected**, p-value is $0,991 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $0,012$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of personality towards lecturer performance through organizational commitment is not significant. **Hypothesis 3H is rejected**, p-value is $0,920 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is $0,099$. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of ability towards lecturer performance through organizational commitment is not significant. **Hypothesis 3I is rejected**, p-value is $0,920 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is

0,099. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of organizational support towards lecturer performance through organizational commitment is not significant. This result is not in line with previous research that examine the indirect effect of organizational support on performance through organizational commitment undertaken by Rocha & Chelladurai (2011) stating that the indirect influence of the perceived organizational support through affective commitment is significant.

Hypothesis 4A is rejected, p-value is $0,759 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is 0,306. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of job satisfaction towards lecturer performance is not significant. These results are in line with research conducted by Karatepe, et al (2006) which found that job satisfaction has no effect on performance. Another study from Crossman & Zaki (2003) found an insignificant relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Bowling (2007) also found that there is no relationship between satisfaction and performance. **Hypothesis 4B is rejected**, p-value is $0,920 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is 0,099. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is insignificant (rejected). That is, the influence of job satisfaction towards lecturer performance through organizational commitment is not significant.

Hypothesis 5 is accepted, p-value is $0,003 < 0,05$ (cut of value), and CR value is 2,930. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (acceptable). That is, the effect of job satisfaction towards organizational commitment is significant. The results of this study in line with Eliyana, et al (2012) which states that job satisfaction has a significant effect on organizational commitment. Gunlu, et al. (2010) also found that job satisfaction (extrinsic, intrinsic, and general) has a significant influence towards normative and affective commitment. Koh & Elfred H.Y. Boo (2004) found that there is a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of a research from Boles, et al. (2007) indicate that various aspects of job satisfaction are strongly associated with organizational commitment. Naderi Anari (2012) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Adio & Popoola (2010) stated job satisfaction has a significant influence on career commitment.

Hypothesis 6 is rejected, p-value is $0,915 > 0,05$ (cut of value), and the CR value is 0,106. Thus, it can be concluded that this hypothesis is significant (rejected). That is, the influence of organizational commitment towards lecturer performance is not significant. The results of this study are in line with (Meyer & Allen, 1991) but are not in line with (Suliman & Iies, 2000; Yousef, 2000).

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Referring to result of analysis and discussion, then the following conclusion as follows:

1. Personality has a direct, negative and insignificant effect towards job satisfaction. Ability has a direct, negative and insignificant effect towards job satisfaction. organizational support has a direct, positive and significant impact towards job satisfaction.
2. Personality has a direct, positive and insignificant effect towards organizational commitment, and has an indirect, positive and insignificant effect towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction. Ability has a direct, positive and significant effect towards organizational commitment, and has an indirect, positive and insignificant effect towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction. Organizational support has a direct, positive and significant effect towards organizational commitment, and has an indirect, positive and significant effect towards organizational commitment through job satisfaction.
3. Personality has a direct, positive and insignificant effect towards performance and has an indirect, positive and insignificant effect towards performance through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Ability has a direct, positive and significant effect towards performance, and has an indirect, positive and insignificant effect towards performance through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational support has a direct, positive and insignificant effect towards performance, and has an indirect positive and insignificant effect towards performance through job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
4. Job satisfaction has a direct, positive and insignificant effect towards lecturer performance, and has an indirect, positive and insignificant effect towards lecturer performance through organizational commitment.
5. Job satisfaction has a direct, positive and significant effect towards organizational commitment.
6. Organizational commitment has a direct, positive and insignificant effect towards lecturer performance.

In the next research can be tested the influence of other variables that may affect the lecturers performance such as stress, work environment, technology and some other variables, moreover, it can use the operational theory concepts of personality, abilities, organizational support, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well as the operational theories from other variables that are current and updated.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adio, G., & Popoola, S. O. 2010. Job satisfaction and career commitment of librarians in federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Library Review*, 593, 175–184
- [2] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
- [3] Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. 2005. Self-Monitoring As a Moderator of the Relationships Between Personality Traits and Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 745–767
- [4] Boles, J., Madupalli, R., Rutherford, B., & Wood, J. A. 2007. The Relationship Of Facets Of Salesperson Job Satisfaction With Affective Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 225, 311–321
- [5] Bounreau, J. W., Boswell, W. R., Judge, T. A., & JR, R. D. B. 2001. Personality and Cognitive Ability As Predictors of Job Search Among Employed Managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 25–50.
- [6] Bowling, N. A. 2007. Is the job satisfaction-job performance relationship spurious? A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 712, 167–185
- [7] Chiang, C.-F., & Hsieh, T.-S. 2012. The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: the mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180–190.
- [8] Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. 2014. *Organizational Behavior Improving Performance and Commitment in The Workplace*. Mc Graw Hill.
- [9] Crossman, A., & Zaki, B. A. 2003. Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 184, 368–376
- [10] Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. 1986. Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- [11] Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. 2002. Perceived supervisor support: contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565–573.
- [12] Eliyana, A., Mardiana, R., & Prabowo, K. 2012. The Influence of Employee 's Job Satisfaction Factors on Organizational Commitment. *American Journal of Economics*, JuneSpecial, 141–144
- [13] Filipova. 2011. Relationship among ethical Climates Perceived Organizational Support and Intent to Leave for Licensed Nurses and Skilled Nursing Facilities. *Journal of Applied Gerontology* February 2011, 30. p. 44-66.
- [14] Fortunato R. T. dan D. Waddell G, 1981. *Personnel Administration in Higer Education, Handbook of Faculty Staff Personnel Practices*. California: Jossey Bass Inc
- [15] Fu, J., Sun, W., Wang, Y., Yang, X., & Wang, L. 2013. Improving job satisfaction of Chinese doctors: The positive effects of perceived organizational support and psychological capital. *Public Health*, 12710, 946–951.
- [16] Furnham, Adrian et al. 2002. Do personality factors predict job satisfaction?. *Personality and individual Differences*, 33 (2002) 1325–1342
- [17] Ganzach Y. 1998. Intelligence of Satisfaction. *Academy of Management, Journal* Volume 41.
- [18] Gibson, James L. et.al. 1988. *Organizations, Behavior, Structure, Processes*. 4th ed, Richard D. Irwin Inc
- [19] Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. 2014. *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations* (11th ed). South-Western Cengage Learning.
- [20] Guan, X., Sun, T., Hou, Y., Zhao, L., Luan, Y.-Z., & Fan, L.-H. 2014. The relationship between job performance and perceived organizational support in faculty members at Chinese universities: a questionnaire survey. *BMC Medical Education*, 1450, 1–10
- [21] Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M., & Percin, N. S. 2010. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 225, 693–717
- [22] Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Marshall, G. W. 2005. A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational commitment and salesperson job performance: 25 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6), 705–714.
- [23] John A Wagner, & Hollenbeck, J. R. 2010. *Organizational Behavior Securing Competitive Advantage*. Routledge. Routledge.
- [24] John R. Schermerhorn, 2007. *Organizational Behavior* (11 edition). John Wiley & Sons.
- [25] Karatepe, O. M., Uludag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmedagic, L., & Baddar, L. 2006. The effects of selected individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 27, 547–560.
- [26] Koh, H. C., & Elfred H.Y. Boo. 2004. Organisational ethics and employee satisfaction and commitment. *Management Decision*, 425, 677–693
- [27] Lucky, E. & Yusoff, N. 2015. Evidence on teaching qualifications, characteristics, competence and lecturer performance in higher institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 9(2), 129–150.
- [28] Mathis, Robert L., Jackson, Jhon, H. 2001. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Buku I. Jakarta : Salemba Empat
- [29] McCrae, R.R & Costa Jr., P.T. 1997. Personality Trait Structure as a Human Universality. *American Psychologist*. Vol 52. No 5. 509-516.
- [30] McCrae, R., Costa, P. T. J., Del Pilar, G., Rolland, J.-P., & Parker, W. (1998). Cross-cultural assessment of the Five-Factor Model: The Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(1), 171–188.
- [31] Meyer, John P., & Natalie J. Allen, 1991, A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment, *Human Resource Management*, Vol.1, pp.61-69
- [32] Meyer, John P., & Catharine A. Smith, 1993, Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vo.78, No.4, 538-551
- [33] Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. 1979, The Measurement of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol.14, pp224-247
- [34] Naderi Anari, N. 2012. Teachers: emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 244, 256–269

- [35] Nikolaou, I. 2003. Fitting the person to the organisation: examining the personality-job performance relationship from a new perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7), 639–648.
- [36] Pazy, A., & Ganzach, Y. 2009. Pay Contingency and the Effects of Perceived Organizational and Supervisor Support on Performance and Commitment. *Journal of Management*, 354.
- [37] Pinho, J. C., Rodrigues, A. P., & Dibb, S. (2014). The role of corporate culture, market orientation and organisational commitment in organisational performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(4), 374–398.
- [38] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
- [39] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2014). *Essentials Of Organizational Behavior*. Pearson (Twelfth). Pearson.
- [40] Rocha, C. M., & Chelladurai, P. (2011). Relationship between organizational support and performance of college coaches: A mediational model. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(3), 301–319.
- [41] Shaffar, R & Margareth. 2003. Assessing the Relationship Between Workplace Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper*
- [42] Spencer, M. Lyle and Spencer, M. Signe, 1993, *Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance*, John Wiley & Son, Inc, New York, USA
- [43] Suliman, Abubakar., Paul Iles. 2000. Is Continuance Commitment Beneficial to Organizations? Commitment-Performance Relationship: A New Look. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (5)
- [44] Thoresen, C. J., Bradley, J. C., Bliese, P. D., & Thoresen, J. D. (2004). The big five personality traits and individual job performance growth trajectories in maintenance and transitional job stages. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 835–853.
- [45] Tumwesigye, G. 2010. The Relationship Between Perceived Organisational Support and Turnover Intentions In A Developing Country : The Mediating Role of Organisational Commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*. Vol. 4. No. 6 (942-952)
- [46] Varca, P. E., & James-Valutis, M. (1993). The Relationship of Ability and Satisfaction to Job-Performance. *Applied Psychology*, 42(3), 265–275.
- [47] Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 41–81.
- [48] Yang, C., & Hwang, M. 2014. Personality traits and simultaneous reciprocal influences between job performance and job satisfaction. *Chinese Management Studies*, 8(1), 6–26.
- [49] Yousef, Darwish A. 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*, Volume 15, Number 1.