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Abstract- Lecturers as teaching staff are the spearhead in higher education, play a strategic and responsible role in preparing their students to become the next generation of the nation who are able to compete in the era of globalization, for the progress and existence of the Indonesian nation in the future. Optimization of intentions is influenced by performance which is strongly supported by painful actions, hurting and the work environment on employee performance with motivation. The low performance of lecturers is suspected to have causes that influence it such as the lack of development of scientific competence, not yet optimal monitoring by direct superiors and those in charge of resources for the process of implementing the Tri Dharma of Higher Education, not yet optimal financial support for research and community service, a pattern of career management that has not been optimal, less communicative and harmonious working relationships, lack of well-being, self-motivation, and lack of job satisfaction felt by lecturers. Based on the results of this study, the competence variable, compensation has a significant influence on lecturer motivation and performance. Work motivation has a mediating role in the effect of competence and compensation on lecturer performance.


INTRODUCTION

The implementation of the education system today is still facing many problems, when compared with the expectations of the community (stakeholders) and also when compared with higher education in other countries which are still in the category of developing countries. One of the problems is the low performance of lecturers due to various factors, both internal factors of the lecturers themselves and external factors or environmental factors (Mujiyanto et al., 2020; O. Oyetunji, 2012). The lecturer performance data in implementing the Tri Dharma of Higher Education at the Jember State Polytechnic used in proposing Academic Positions in the last 5 years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers who meet the time requirements</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jember State Polytechnic Personnel Data (2023).

The data above shows that in the number of lecturers who meet the criteria for the time of proposal, 24-26% exercise their rights to use the results of the implementation of the Tri Dharma of Higher Education, in numbers it shows an increase every year but the percentage shows a decrease. Jember State Polytechnic as Vocational Higher Education requires teaching resources who have skills in implementing their knowledge, this is because vocational education has more weight in skills than theory. According to (Mujiyanto et al., 2020) Complaints that are often expressed by students regarding lecturer performance include: Lack of preparation of lecture material to be taught; Often does not go to class/does not come to campus; Often delegates teaching duties to assistants; Does not discuss assignments and exercises/exams given so students know where mistakes are; Make different test assessment provisions between fellow lecturers; Difficult to contact or find if you want to consult or ask for an explanation of something. This condition also occurs at the Jember State Polytechnic.

The low performance of lecturers is also indicated by the following facts: Lecturers teach not according to the syllabus; The media and methods used in the teaching and learning process are less varied; Have a tendency to teach the same subject matter in the following school year; The results of upgrading are less socialized; Lecture hours started on time by some lecturers (Zamora-Ramos et al., 2023). The occurrence of phenomena or symptoms of low lecturer performance is suspected to have causes that influence it...
such as a lack of scientific competency development, not yet optimal monitoring by direct superiors and those in charge of resources for the process of implementing the Tri Dharma of Higher Education, not yet optimal funding support for research and community service, handling patterns careers that are not yet optimal, work relationships that are less communicative and harmonious, lack of welfare, self-motivation, and lack of job satisfaction felt by lecturers.

The research gap (research gap or black box) that exists can be formulated based on previous studies which show differences in the results studied, especially in the absence of the influence of competence, compensation and work environment on performance. Based on the phenomena and concepts above, researchers are interested in conducting further research on the effect of competence, compensation and work environment on employee performance with motivation as intervening at Jember State Polytechnic lecturers. The addition of the motivational variable as an intervening is hoped to provide new findings in solving the gaps in existing research results.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Human Resources**

Human resources are productive individuals who work as a driving force for an organization, both in institutions and institutions that have the function of being an asset so that their abilities must be trained and developed. The definition of macro human resources in general consists of two, namely macro human resources, namely the number of people of productive age in an area and micro human resources in a narrow sense, namely individuals who work in an institution or institution.

**Human Resource Management**

Human Resource Management is a field of management that specifically studies human relations and roles in institutional organizations. Human Resource Management is a matter that includes development, use and protection of human resources both in work relationships and those who are self-employed. Human Resource Management is a matter related to the utilization of humans in carrying out a job to achieve the maximum level or be effective and efficient in realizing the goals to be achieved in institutions, an employee and also the community. According to Mangkunegara (2017) human resource management is a planning, organizing, coordinating, implementing and supervising procurement, development, remuneration, integration, maintenance and separation of workforce in order to achieve organizational goals. According to Handoko (2015), human resource management is the withdrawal, selection, development, maintenance, and use of human resources to achieve both individual and organizational goals. According to Hasibuan (2017) human resource management is a science and art that regulates the relationships and roles of the workforce so that they are active and efficient in helping to achieve institutional, employee and community goals.

**Competence**

Placement of lecturers according to their academic competence is one of the determining factors in increasing job satisfaction. Competence is a basic characteristic of a person (individual) that influences the way of thinking and acting, makes generalizations for all situations encountered and lasts long enough in humans (Umran, et al., 2019). Competence in relation to performance can be classified into two groups Wilson & Schnabel (2022), namely threshold competencies, namely the minimum criteria that must be met by position holders in order to work effectively and differentiating competencies, namely criteria that distinguish people who achieve superior performance and those whose performance is average.

**Compensation**

Compensation is all income in the form of money, goods directly or indirectly received by employees in return for services provided to institutions, apart from involving employees in decision making, one of the things that must be considered by organizations related to the role of human resources is the issue of compensation. Compensation is an important factor that can affect the commitment of organizational members. The size of the compensation is a measure of the level of employee performance in the organization. Fair compensation will stimulate employees to carry out their work better and more responsibly. Besides being able to foster motivation for employees, the purpose of providing compensation is as a form of institutional appreciation to employees (Sahban, 2015). The Compensation System according to Israhadi (2020) the compensation payment system that is commonly applied is: The time system in the time system, the amount of compensation (salary, wages) is determined based on time standards such as hours, weeks, or months. Results System (output) in the results system, the amount of compensation/wages is determined for the unit units produced by workers, such as per piece, meters, liters and kilograms. The wholesale system is a wage method in which the amount of service is determined based on the volume of work and the length of time it takes to do it.

**Motivation**

Priansa (2016) motivation are extrinsic factors originating from outside oneself that also determine one's behavior in one's life. Motivation is a set of attitudes and values that influence individuals to achieve specific things according to individual goals (Rivai, 2011). Motivation is defined as an attitude of leaders and employees towards work situations in their organizational environment. Those who have a positive attitude towards their work situation will show high work motivation and vice versa if they have a negative attitude towards their work situation they will show low work motivation. Based on several theories about motivation put forward by the experts above, it can be concluded that the forms of motivation include: achievement/performance motivation, power motivation, social motivation, reward/feedback, and personal motivation. The purpose of motivation is to increase the morale and enthusiasm of employees so that they continue to excel and be disciplined at work. Work motivation is the driving force that will make employees want to increase their ability to carry out their duties and responsibilities (Veth et al., 2019). In carrying out its obligations, it is intended to be able to meet predetermined institutional targets, the outline of which is contained in the vision and mission. Basically there are many types of indicators of work motivation and can
be selected according to the character of each individual. Enthusiasm, desire, and willingness to work are elements that can strengthen motivation and need to be grown. If all three are not there, it is feared that it will have a negative impact such as being lazy to work or working carelessly.

**Performance**

Performance is measured through the level of achievement of business and social goals and responsibility from the perspective of the assessor (Ershadi et al., 2019). The main indication of work performance is individual personal characteristics including competence and ability to deal with role conflicts (Hager, 2019). Performance is related to willingness and openness to try and achieve new aspects of work which in turn will lead to increased individual productivity (Elmezain et al., 2021). Most of the previous studies have shown that job performance involves the micro-level of employee actions and behavior contributing to organizational goals where the argument refers to all employee behavior involved in the workplace (Li et al., 2016; Mlekus & Maier, 2021; Wendler et al., 2018).

So, performance is the result or output of a process. To better understand the performance of lecturers, Educational performance criteria according to Spohn (2015) aim to: a) Improve educational performance, capabilities, and output, b) Facilitate communication and exchange of information about best educational practices with various types of educational institutions, and c) As a tool for understanding and improving performance of educational institutions as well as guidelines in strategic planning. For an organization, performance is the result of cooperative activities among members or organizational components in order to realize organizational goals. The process that occurs in the organization is the functioning of management through its fundamental functions, namely planning, organizing, actuating and controlling (POAC) in an integrated manner.

**Conceptual Framework**

This conceptual framework is used systematically to help explain the main issues to be studied. Based on the picture of this conceptual framework, it can be seen the relationship between the influence of competency, work environment, compensation and motivation variables on the performance of Jember State Polytechnic lecturers. This conceptual framework as a whole describes the influence of the independent variables, namely competence, work environment and compensation through the intervening variable motivation which influences the dependent variable on the performance of teaching staff.

![Figure 1. Research Conceptual Framework](image)

Information:
- : Direct Influence
- : Indirect Influence (Mediation)

Based on Figure 1, this study will test whether there is an influence between competency and compensation on lecturer performance, and the work motivation variable is included as a mediating variable that explains how competence and compensation can improve lecturer performance. Competence and compensation will be able to improve lecturer performance because these variables can increase work motivation, so that later it will be able to create acts of honesty, obedience, initiative, and self-motivation at work.

**Research Hypothesis Development**

**The Effect Of Competence On Work Motivation**

According to Sutrisno (2016), competence is an ability that is based on skills and knowledge supported by work attitudes, and their application in carrying out tasks and work in the workplace, with reference to the specified work requirements. According to Susilowati (2018) Competence and motivation have a close relationship to performance. Effective employee development, by increasing employee expertise and skills or increasing competence and providing motivation also provides opportunities for employees to be able to improve work performance. Low competence will also have an effect on decreasing work motivation, with low competence the employee will take longer to complete the task, so it will affect the decrease in work motivation.

Based on the research conducted by Basori et al. (2017), employee competence has a positive and significant influence on work motivation. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Mudayana & Suryoko (2016) which states that competence has a positive and significant effect on motivation. This means that if employees have high competence or ability to complete tasks,
it will affect the increase in employee motivation. Based on the literature and studies above, a concept can be taken in making a hypothesis, namely:
H1: competence has a positive and significant effect on work motivation.

Effect Of Compensation On Work Motivation
Compensation according to Marwansyah (2016a, p. 269), is a reward or direct or indirect reward, financial or non-financial, that is fair and proper to employees, as a reward or contribution/service to achieving institutional goals. Compensation received by employees and in accordance with the duties and responsibilities of employees has a real impact on the perceived motivation of employees. Compensation that is appropriate and sufficient to be felt by employees is able to stimulate employee motivation, so that with the motivation that is embedded in the personality of each employee, employees will always be motivated at work. Based on research conducted by Meutia et al. (2017), compensation has a positive and significant effect on motivation. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Mudayana & Suryoko (2016) which states that compensation has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. This means that with satisfactory compensation, it can provide enthusiasm in the form of benefits so that it can motivate employees to do their work. Based on the literature and studies above, a concept can be taken in making a hypothesis, namely:
H2: compensation has a positive and significant effect on work motivation.

The influence of competence on performance
According to Edison et al. (2016, p. 142), competency characteristics that underlie individuals related to causal or causal relationships of effective and/or superior performance in work or circumstances. Competence consists of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Through these actions achieved results. Competence can be linked to performance. A person who has high competence in the knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to his position will work more effectively, efficiently and productively in his job. This is because the better the competence possessed by employees, the more capable employees are to carry out the assigned duties and responsibilities. Kasrianto (2019), states that there is a positive and significant relationship between competency suitability and performance. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Pertiwi (2016), which states that competency has a positive and significant relationship to performance. If the competency possessed by employees is higher, then employee performance will also increase. Based on the literature and studies above, a concept can be taken in making a hypothesis, namely:
H3: competence has a positive and significant effect on performance.

Effect Of Compensation On Performance
Compensation is something that employees receive as remuneration for their achievements in carrying out tasks Nurjaman (2014, p. 179). The compensation provided by the institution aims to help employees meet their daily needs. If the compensation provided by the institution is proportional to the workload provided, it can improve employee performance. Employees need to be given a stimulus to bring hope in carrying out their responsibilities or duties in order to produce better performance. Based on research conducted by Meutia et al. (2017), compensation has a positive and significant effect on performance. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Candradewi & Dewi (2019), which states that compensation has a positive and significant effect on performance. The positive and significant influence between compensation and performance means that, if employees receive compensation in accordance with the workload received, then employee performance will also increase. Appropriate compensation will create a healthy cooperative relationship in improving lecturer performance. Based on the literature and studies above, a concept can be taken in making a hypothesis, namely:
H4: compensation has a positive and significant effect on performance.

Effect Of Work Motivation On Performance
According to Priansa (2016, p. 202) is "the willingness to carry out high efforts to achieve organizational goals conditioned by the ability of efforts to meet certain individual needs". Motivation as a person's behavior towards something to be achieved and encouragement because of the need for fulfillment of oneself and others. Employee motivation for institutions is an important thing because it is expected that every employee will work harder and be more active in their work. The more employees are motivated, the totality of employees at work will increase and will have an impact on improving employee performance. Taylor's conventional motivation theory is included in content theory, assuming that an employee will improve performance, if the desire arises to fulfill his needs. A person will be motivated to do what is ordered by his superiors if he gets a reward for what he does. Based on research conducted by Candradewi & Dewi (2019), states that there is a positive and significant influence between the suitability of motivation and performance. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Mudayana & Suryoko (2016) which states that there is a positive and significant influence between the suitability of motivation and performance. This means that if employees have high motivation, then employee performance will also increase. Based on the literature and studies above, a concept can be taken in making a hypothesis, namely:
H5: work motivation has a positive and significant effect on performance.

The Effect Of Competence On Performance Is Mediated By Motivation
According to Wibowo (2018), competence is an ability to carry out or perform a job or task that is based on skills and knowledge and is supported by the work attitude required by the job. Competence possessed by employees scientifically and educational degrees
affect the mindset of employees, so that high motivation appears due to insight and experience in work which indirectly has an impact on employee performance (Kasiyanto, 2019).

Based on research conducted by Mudayana & Suryoko (2016) motivation mediates the influence between competence on performance. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Anggraini (2018) which states that motivation mediates the influence of competency on performance. This means that if the better the competence possessed by employees, the better the work motivation that is formed and will have an impact on improving employee performance. Referring to the theoretical concepts and research results, the hypothesis is as follows:

H6: work competence has a positive and significant effect on performance through work motivation.

H7: compensation has a positive and significant effect on performance through work motivation.

The Effect Of Compensation On Performance Is Mediated By Motivation

Compensation according to Marwansyah (2016b), is a direct or indirect reward or reward, financial or non-financial, that is fair and proper to employees, as a reward or contribution/service to achieving institutional goals. According to Kasiyanto (2019), motivation is a feeling of satisfaction with the compensation provided in the form of salary, bonus allowances and various adequate facilities, will foster high motivation at work, because employees feel valued and supported at work so that it will affect employee performance. The compensation given by the institution must be in accordance with the workload that has been borne by the employee. Compensation that is not in accordance with the burden borne by employees, can reduce the level of work motivation. The impact that occurs when work motivation decreases, will affect the decrease in employee performance.

Based on research conducted by Candradewi & Dewi (2019), motivation mediates the effect of compensation on performance. Other research that supports this is research conducted by Ari (2018) which also states that motivation mediates the effect of compensation on performance. This means that if the compensation provided by the institution is appropriate, and employees feel more motivated, it will have an impact on employee performance. Referring to the theoretical concepts and research results, the hypothesis is as follows:

H7: compensation has a positive and significant effect on performance through work motivation.

RESEARCH METHOD

Population and Sample

Population

According to Sugiyono (2017) population is a generalized area consisting of objects/subjects that have certain quantities and characteristics set by researchers to study and then draw conclusions. The population is all research subjects who have the same traits or characteristics. If certain characteristics are restricted in defining the population, then the entire unit of analysis is referred to as the target population. The population in this study are permanent lecturers who work at the Jember State Polytechnic. The following is a presentation of population data in this study:

Table 2. Research Population Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural Production</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agricultural Technology</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language, Communication and Tourism</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personnel Data, Jember State Polytechnic (2023).

Sample

The sample is part or a certain number of samples taken from a population and examined in detail (Tjiptono & Gregorius, 2016). The research sample was taken using a non-probability sampling technique, namely a sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunities or opportunities for each element or member of the population to be selected as a sample (Sugiyono, 2017). In this study, the sampling technique used was purposive sampling and accidental sampling. Purposive sampling is a sampling technique from the population based on certain criteria (Hair Jr. & Page, 2015).

Based on the opinion of Ferdinand (2013) in SEM analysis requires a sample of at least 5 times the number of indicator variables (parameters) to be analyzed, because in the submission of Chi-Square SEM models that are sensitive to the number of samples, good samples are needed ranging from 100 – 200 samples. Based on this opinion, as well as consideration of the Jember State Polytechnic staffing data for the number of permanent lecturers who already have lecturer certification, the number of samples in this study was set at 165 respondents. The sampling technique used in this study is proportional random sampling where the sample is carried out proportionally with the following formula (Harini et al., 2020):

\[
Mi = \left( \frac{Ni}{N} \right) \times M
\]

Information: \( M \) = Sample size \( Ni \) = The size of the \( i \) subpopulation

Table 3. Total Distribution of Research Samples
Data collection
The measurement technique used in this study uses differential semantics. This measurement scale was developed by Osgood (1952), this scale is used to measure attitudes only in the form of not multiple choice or a checklist but arranged in a continuum line where the answer "Very Positive" is located on the right of the line, and the answer "very negative" is located on the left, line, or vice versa. The data obtained is interval data and this scale is used to measure certain attitudes/characteristics possessed by an object. Respondents can provide answers in the range of positive to negative answers, this depends on the respondent's perception of the object being assessed. Respondents who give an assessment with a number 5 means that the perception of the response to the object is very positive, whereas if they give an answer at number 3 it means neutral, and if they give an answer at number 1, then the respondent's perception of the object is very negative. Each question was made with a simple sentence and then measured using a Likert scale to obtain interval data measurements with scores ranging from 1 to 5, where score 1 stated "strongly disagree", score 2 stated "disagree", score 3 stated "neutral", the 4th score is stated by "agree" and the 5th score is stated by "strongly agree". The data that has been collected from the results of distributing the questionnaires will then be analyzed using statistical analysis methods.

Instrument Test
1. Validity Test
Validity test is used to measure whether the questionnaire is valid/valid or not. Validity states the accuracy or accuracy of the data obtained at the time of taking the questionnaire. Valid data is accurate data or the right data. Meanwhile, the validity test in the study states the degree of accuracy of the research measuring instrument for the content or true meaning. The validity test was carried out using confirmatory factor analysis for each latent variable. The indicators of a variable are said to be valid if they have a loading factor > 0.05 and are significant at (α = 5.00%) (Hegazy et al., 2020).

2. Reliability Test
Reliability is a tool for measuring a questionnaire which is an indicator of construct variables (Maykot et al., 2022). An instrument is said to be reliable if the measuring instrument obtains consistent results, so that this instrument can be used safely because it can work well at different times and under different conditions. So reliability shows how much a measurement can give results that are relatively the same when repeated measurements are carried out on the same subject. Reliability in this study is a measure of the internal consistency of the indicators of a variable that shows the degree to which each indicator identifies a general form of the variable. There are two ways that can be used, namely, composite (construct) reliability and variance extracted. The cut-off value for construct reliability is at least 0.70 and the cut-off value for variance extracted is at least 0.50 (Westland, 2019).

Data Analysis Technique
1. Descriptive Analysis
Descriptive analysis is a statistical analysis that aims to provide an overview of the information available where the tendencies and characteristics of the variables that exist both latent and manifest variables by using the existing scores on the respondents' answers to the questions in the questionnaire. Besides that, the output from the descriptive analysis study is in the form of a frequency distribution table that will be interpreted.

2. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Analysis
The analysis technique used in this study is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the help of AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structure) version 24 software. SEM is a multivariate analysis technique that allows for analysis of a series of natural relationship variables in the study, simultaneously which will provide statistical efficiency. SEM has main characteristics that differentiate it from other multivariate analysis techniques. SEM has the following characteristics:

a. Estimation of multivariate dependency relationships.
b. It is possible to represent previously unobserved concepts in existing relationships and consider and calculate the error in the measurement of a model (error = e).
c. The ability to present a comprehensive model along with the ability to confirm the dimensions of a concept or 82 factors as well as the ability to measure the influence that occurs on a relationship that theoretically exists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Proportions Calculation</th>
<th>Number of Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural Production</td>
<td>55/331 x 165</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agricultural Technology</td>
<td>29/331 x 165</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>30/331 x 165</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>49/331 x 165</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>55/331 x 165</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Language, Communication and Tourism</td>
<td>25/331 x 165</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>56/331 x 165</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>32/331 x 165</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount: 165

Source: Jember State Polytechnic Personnel Data (2023).

Based on the number of sample distributions that have been determined in Table 3, it can be seen that the number of samples selected from each Department within the Jember State Polytechnic are representatives of lecturers evenly with functional positions consisting of Expert Assistants, Lectors, and Head Lectors.
SEM analysis makes it possible to test some of the variables in this study where the dependent variable or independent and intervening variables will form a model that will be built in this study through a literature review and then analyze the model using SEM. The following are the steps that will be carried out in using SEM analysis, namely:

a. Developing a model based on theoretical studies The first step in using a structural equation model is to develop a model that has a strong model justification within a conceptual framework. The structural equation model is a confirmatory technique. Testing is carried out using SEM to test the development of causality which has theoretical justification. A latent variable must be described by a number of manifest variables (indicators). The measurement model is a chart of the SEM model that describes the relationship between the latent variables and their indicators.

b. Developing a path diagram (Path Diagram) The model will be presented in the form of a path diagram by differentiating several groups of latent variables or constructs.

1. Exogenous Variables are independent variables that affect the dependent variable (Singgih, 2018: 9) where the constructs in this study are competence (KT) and compensation (KN).

2. Endogenous variable is the dependent variable which is influenced by the independent (exogenous) variable (Singgih, 2018: 9) where the construct in this study is lecturer performance (KD).

3. An intervening variable is a variable that theoretically affects the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable into a relationship that cannot be directly observed and measured (Sugiyono, 2019: 39). construct in this research is work motivation (MK).

The model to be developed in the form of a Path Diagram can be seen in the image below:

![Figure 2. SEM - AMOS Research Model](image)

c. Selecting the input matrix and model estimation In the process of constructing a model based on complete specifications, the next step is selecting the type of input (covariance and correlation). Interpretation of the results is more difficult when using a covariance matrix because the coefficient values must be interpreted on the basis of construct measurement units, the correlation matrix has a general range that allows direct comparison of the coefficients in the model. The coefficients obtained from the correlation matrix are always in the form of standardized units equal to the beta coefficients in the regression equation and their values range from -1.0 to +1.0. If you only want to see the relationship pattern and do not see the total explanation needed in the theory test, then using a correlation matrix is acceptable (Westland, 2019).

d. SEM assumption test This SEM assumption test is carried out after testing the validity and reliability of each latent variable, then proceed with testing the assumptions to see whether the prerequisites needed in the SEM modeling can be met. Prerequisites that must be met are:

1. Normality Test Normality is the distribution of data that will be analyzed to see whether the normality assumptions can be met, so that further data is used for this SEM modeling. The normality test needs to be carried out both for normality for univariate data and for multivariate normality with several variables used simultaneously in the analysis. To find out whether or not there is a violation of the normality assumption, this can be done by looking at the critical ratio (CR) value at a significant 5%, with a CR value between -1.96 to +1.96 or -1.96 ≤ CR ≤ 1.96 which identifies normal distribution data, both univariately and multivariately (Westland, 2019).

2. Outliner Test Outliner is an observation that appears with extreme values both univariate and multivariate, because there is a combination of unique characteristics that are owned and look very much different from other observations. Detection of the multivariate outliner is carried out by taking into account the value of the mahalnobis distance. The criteria used are based on the Chi Squares value at the degree of freedom of the number of indicator variables used latent variables used at a significance level of 0.05 (5%). If the value of the mahalnobis distance is greater than the implied chi squares value, then the case is a multivariate outliner.
3. Multicollinearity Test The assumption of multicollinearity requires that there be a perfect or large correction between the independent variables. Multicollinearity can be detected from the covariance matrix determinants. The very small determinant value of the covariance matrix indicates a multicollinearity or singularity problem.

e. Evaluation of goodness-of-fit (GOF) criteria The step taken before assessing the feasibility of the structural model is to assess whether the data meets the assumptions of the structural equation model by using several model feasibility indices. Evaluation using the goodness of fit test based on the following criteria:

1. χ² (Chi Square Statistic) expected small.
2. Probability is the probability value for the Chi Square Statistics that is expected to be greater than or equal to 0.05 (5%).
3. CNIN/DF (Normed Chi Square) is the allowable measure of the chi square value divided by the degree of freedom. (Dimyati, 2019) explains that the recommended value for accepting the suitability of a model is a CMIN/DF value that is less than or equal to 2.0 or 3.0.
4. RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) to measure the deviation of parameter values in a model with its population covariance matrix. The RMSEA value between 5% (0.05) to 8% (0.08) is a measure that can be tolerated (Westland, 2019).
5. The GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) is used to calculate the weighted proportion of the variance in the sample covariance matrix that is explained by the estimated population covariance matrix. This index reflects the level of fit of the model as a whole which is calculated from the predicted residual squared value of the model compared to the actual data. The GFI value ranges from 0 to 1. A high GFI value indicates a model that has a good fit. A good GFI value is if it is greater than or equal to 0.90.
6. AGFI (adjusted GFI) is a development of GFI which is adjusted to the degree of freedom available to test the acceptability of the model. The level of acceptance that is recommended if it has a value equal to or greater than 0.90.
7. TLI (Tucker-Lewis Indexes) is an alternative incremental fit index that compares a tested model to a baseline model. The recommended value as a reference for accepting a model is if the value is equal to or greater than 0.95. If the TLI value is close to 1 it indicates a very good fit model.
8. CFI (Comparative Fit Index) is a measure of comparison between the tested model and the null model. An index that identifies that the model being tested has a good fit, if the CFI is greater than or equal to 0.95.

f. Model interpretation and modification After model estimation is done, modifications can be made to the developed model if possible. Modifications can only be made if there is sufficiently strong theoretical justification, because SEM is not to produce a model, but towards a model, to provide an interpretation of whether the theory-based model being tested is acceptable or needs further development, it must look at the predictive power of this model, namely by observing the amount of residual generated. If the standard residual value is greater than the t-table, it is necessary to modify the model. Interpretation can be done by looking at the direct effect and indirect effect as well as the total effect between the variables studied. The direct effect is the coefficients of all coefficient lines with one-pointed arrows. The indirect effect is the effect that appears through an intermediate variable. Meanwhile, the total effect is the effect of various relationships (Dimyati, 2019).

g. Hypothesis testing Hypothesis testing is used to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable through the Partial Test or t test. According to Ghozali (2016) partial hypothesis testing was carried out to show the effect of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable. The t test is a test of the regression coefficient of each independent variable on the dependent variable to find out how much influence the independent variables have on the dependent variable. The form of the test is:

\[ H_0 : b_i = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad H_a : b_i \neq 0 \]

Information:
H₀ = Initial hypothesis format (null hypothesis)
Hₐ = Alternative hypothesis format

The following is the sequence of testing the hypothesis with the t test distribution:

a. Formulate hypotheses
1) Ho : bi = 0, meaning that the independent variable has no significant effect on the dependent variable
2) Ha : bi ≠ 0, meaning that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable
b. Determine the significance level using 0.05 (5%)
c. Determine t arithmetic and t table
1) t count (coefficients table)
2) t table can be found in the statistical table at a specified significance of 0.05/2 = 0.025 because it uses a 2-tailed or two-tailed test with the formula:

\[ df = n - k - 1 \]

Where:
df = degree of freedom
n = number of samples
k = number of independent variables
d. Decision-making
1) t count ≤ t table then Ho is accepted
2) t count ≥ t table then Ho is rejected

If Ho is accepted, it can be interpreted that there is a partial independent variable influence on the dependent variable which is considered to have no significant effect and if Ho is rejected, this means that the independent variable has a partial effect on the dependent variable which is considered to have a significant effect.
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**Descriptive Analysis**

The description of each variable is explained in each indicator that has been assessed in the form of an attitude scale statement by respondents from strongly disagree (score 1) to strongly agree (score 5). Descriptive analysis was carried out to reveal the assessment or classification of each indicator in that variable. The commitment variable with 15 statement items obtained from 44 respondents obtained an average rating level of 75.48 percent of the maximum score. This means that the respondent's perception of commitment in the distribution is relatively good. The intensity of respondents' answers to the compensation variable is 74.68 percent of the maximum score. This means that the respondent's perception of compensation in the distribution is relatively good. The respondent's perception score on lecturer performance was obtained at 78.58 percent of the variable's maximum score. This means that the performance level of lecturers is relatively good, because the level of achievement is more than 70 percent. This perception indicates that each variable has been able to measure according to what will be measured.

**Hypothesis Testing Results**

The results of the regression analysis with the help of the SPSS for Windows program obtained a summary of the model as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.795&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.19040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, a multiple correlation value of 0.795 is obtained. This value indicates a moderate positive relationship between Commitment and Compensation and Lecturer Performance at the Jember State Polytechnic. The coefficient of determination (R2) of 0.615 indicates that the model can explain the variation in the existing data of 61.5 percent. Simultaneous testing was carried out by analysis of variance (ANOVA - Analysis of Variance) using F-test statistics. The results of calculating the analysis of variance and the results of testing the hypothesis are obtained as shown in Table 5.

**Table 4.10 ANOVA for Commitment and Compensation Models with Lecturer Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression Residual Total</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>35,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows an F-value of 35.285 or a p-value (Sig.) of 0.000, because the p-value < α, then H0 is rejected. Based on Table 6 it can be concluded as follows. 1. The value of the regression coefficient for the Commitment factor is 0.261 with a t-value of 4.044 and a p-value of 0.000. Because the p-value < 5%, then H0 is rejected. This means that with a confidence of 95% it can be stated that there is a positive and significant influence between Commitment and Compensation on Lecturer Performance at the Jember State Polytechnic. The regression coefficient values of the estimation results using the Ordinary Least Square method of the influence of each factor or variable on the performance of Jember State Polytechnic Lecturers are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6 Regression Coefficient Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommiten</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompensasi</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 6 it can be concluded as follows. 1. The value of the regression coefficient for the Commitment factor is 0.261 with a t-value of 4.044 and a p-value of 0.000. Because the p-value < 5%, then H0 is rejected. This means that with a confidence of 95% it can be stated that there is a positive and significant influence between Commitment and Compensation on Lecturer Performance at the Jember State Polytechnic. 2. The value of the regression coefficient for the Compensation factor is 0.505 with a t-value of 6.354 and a p-value of 0.000. Because the p-value < 5%, then H0 is rejected. This means that with a confidence of 95% it can be stated that the Compensation factor has a significant effect on Lecturer Performance at the Jember State Polytechnic.

**Validity and Reliability Test**

a. Validity and Reliability Test Results on Competency Variables

Competency variable is a latent variable that is measured by three indicators, namely personal quality improvement (KT1), general knowledge (KT2) and specific skills (KT3). Based on the results of testing the validity test with confirmatory factor analysis presented in Table 7 where the value is known that the probability is less than 0.05 and the loading factor value is more than 0.05, so it can be concluded that all variables are significantly related to Competency variables (all indicators valid). Construct Reliability on the Competency variable is 0.805. Thus the value of all indicators on the Competency variable is valid. The following is a table of validity and reliability tests on competency variables (KT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable Indicator</th>
<th>Validity test</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>Info.</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>KT1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>KT2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The results of the validity and reliability tests on the compensation variable

Compensation variable is a latent variable that is measured by three indicators, namely salary (KN1), lecturer certification (KN2), honorarium (KN3) and functional allowances (KN4). Based on the results of testing the validity test with confirmatory factor analysis presented in table 4.13 where the value is known that the probability is less than 0.05 and the loading factor value is more than 0.05, so it can be concluded that all variables are significantly related to the Compensation variable (all indicators valid). Construct Reliability on the Compensation variable is 0.762. Thus the values of all indicators in the Compensation variable are valid. The following is a table of validity and reliability tests on the Compensation variable (KN):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable Indicator</th>
<th>Validity test</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>Info.</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>KN1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>KN2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>KN3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>KN4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Validity and Reliability Test Results on Motivational Variables

Variable Motivation is a latent variable that is measured by three indicators, namely the need for achievement (MT1) and the need for affiliation (MT2). Based on the results of testing the validity test with confirmatory factor analysis presented in table 4.14 where the value is known that the probability is less than 0.05 and the loading factor value is more than 0.05, so it can be concluded that all variables are significantly related to motivation variables (all indicators valid). Construct Reliability on the Motivation variable is 0.753. Thus the value of all indicators on the variable Motivation is valid. The following is a table of validity and reliability tests on the variable Motivation (MT):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable Indicator</th>
<th>Validity test</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>Info.</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MT1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MT2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Validity and Reliability Test Results on Lecturer Performance variables

Lecturer performance is a latent variable that is measured by three indicators, namely quality of work (KD1), time efficiency (KD2), quantity of work (KD3), effectiveness (KD4) and independence (KD5). Based on the results of testing the validity test with confirmatory factor analysis presented in table 4.15 where the value is known that the probability is less than 0.05 and the loading factor value is more than 0.05, so it can be concluded that all variables are significantly related to lecturer performance variables (all valid indicator). Construct Reliability on the lecturer performance variable is 0.844. Thus the value of all indicators on the lecturer performance variable is valid. The following is a table of validity and reliability tests on lecturer performance variables (Y):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable Indicator</th>
<th>Validity test</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>Info.</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>KD1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>KD2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>KD3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>KD4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>KD5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural Equation Modeling Assumption Test

The structural equation modeling assumption test is a test that is carried out after testing the validity and reliability tests on each latent variable. Structural assumption test is an assumption test to see the requirements needed in SEM modeling can be met. The requirements that must be met are the normal multivariate assumptions, outliers, and the absence of multicollinearity or significance.

a. Normality test

The normality test needs to be carried out both for normality for univariate data and for multivariate normality where several variables are used simultaneously in the final analysis. To test whether or not the assumption of normality is violated, this can be done by using the z statistical value for skewness and kurtosis and empirically this can be seen in the critical ratio (CR). If a significant level of 5% is used, the CR values between -1.96 to 1.96 (-1.96 ≤ CR ≤ 1.96) are said to be normally distributed data, both univariately and multivariately (Prof. Dr. H., Imam Ghozali, M.Com, 2008). The results of the normality test on the research data gave a multivariate CR value of 1.567. This indicated that the data was normally distributed because the CR values were between -1.96 to 1.96.

b. Test Outliers

Outliers are observations that appear with extreme values both univariately and multivariately, that is, they arise because of a combination of unique characteristics that are possessed and look very much different from other observations. If an outlier occurs,
special treatment can be carried out on the outlier as long as it is known how the outlier appears. Detection of the multivariate outlier is carried out by taking into account the maholnobis distance value. The criterion used is based on the Chi Square value at the degree of freedom of the number of indicator variables at a significant level of 1% (Ghozali, 2005). Outlier results in research. Look at the distance or maholnobis d-squared. To calculate the maholnobis distance value based on the Chi Square value at degrees of freedom 15 (number of indicator variables) at the level of P <0.05 (X2 0.01) is 163.116 (based on the distribution table X2). So data that has a mahalnobis distance greater than 163.116 is an outlier. The results of the calculations in this study can be seen in which none of the cases had a mahalnobis distance value greater than 163.116, due to the high maholnobis distance value, it can be concluded that there is no multivariate outlier in the research data.

c. Multicollinearity Test
Multicollinearity can be seen through the determinants of the covariance matrix. The determinant value is very small or close to zero, indicating an indication of the presence of a multicollinearity or singularity problem, so that the data cannot be used for research (Barbara G. Tabachnick, 2018). The results of this test give a determinant value of the sample covitarity matrix of 15.544, this value is far from zero so it can be concluded that the data does not have multicollinearity and singularity problems in the data being analyzed, so the data can be continued as research.

Feasibility Test of Structural Equation Model (SEM)

a. Model Fitment Test (Goodness of Fit Test)
Before testing the hypothesis, first assess the suitability of the goodness of fit. Testing on the SEM model aims to see the suitability of the model, the results of the model suitability test are presented in Table 11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cut Off Value</th>
<th>Test result</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Probability</td>
<td>≥ 0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>≤ 0.05</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 11 it can be seen that of the eight criteria there are two criteria that have good criteria. Ferdinand (2014: 211) states that based on the parsimony rule, if some of the fit criteria for the model are good, then the model is declared fit:

b. Improvements to the Goodness of Fit Test
Based on the results of the model suitability test, only two criteria were met, namely the RMSEA and RMR criteria. Furthermore, this study made improvements to the research model by correlating errors in modification indices. Based on these improvements, the fit model is obtained as shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cut Off Value</th>
<th>Test result</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Probability</td>
<td>≥ 0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>≤ 0.05</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>Marjinal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the SEM model, the results of the model suitability test are presented in Table 11 below:

Figure 3 Goodness of Fit Test
**Table 12** shows that all the criteria have been fit, thus the research model that has been repaired meets all the criteria for the suitability of the SEM model.

### Causality Test

After testing the suitability of the research model, the next step is to test the causality developed in this study. The causality test is used to test the effect of each of the proposed hypotheses, namely the influence of exogenous variables namely Competence (KT) and Compensation (KN) on endogenous namely, Motivation (MT) and Lecturer Performance (KD). Detailed path coefficient testing is presented in table 13 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>KN</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>1.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>KN</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 13, the interpretation of each path coefficient is explained as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Competence has a significant effect on work motivation

Competence was found to have a significant effect on work motivation. This is evidenced by the CR value of 1.833 and a significant probability (p) of 0.027 is obtained, which is smaller than the required significant level of 0.05. The path coefficient has a positive value of 0.634 which indicates if competence increases, it will increase work motivation, and conversely if competence decreases, it will decrease work motivation. The results of the analysis support the first research hypothesis (H1).

**Hypothesis 2:** Compensation has a significant effect on work motivation

Compensation was found to have no significant effect on work motivation. This is evidenced by the CR value of 1.617 and a significant probability (p) of 0.016 is obtained, which is smaller than the required significant level of 0.05. The path coefficient is positive by 0.511 which indicates if compensation increases, it will increase work motivation. The results of the analysis support the second research hypothesis (H2).

**Hypothesis 3:** Competence has no significant effect on lecturer performance

Competence was found to have no significant effect on lecturer performance. This is evidenced by the CR value of 0.476 and a significant probability (p) of 0.634 is obtained which is greater than the required significant level of 0.05. The path coefficient is negative of -0.046 which indicates if competence increases, it will increase lecturer performance, and vice versa if competence decreases, it will decrease lecturer performance. The results of the analysis reject the third research hypothesis (H3).

**Hypothesis 4:** Compensation has a significant effect on lecturer performance

Compensation was found to have a significant effect on lecturer performance. This is evidenced by the CR value of 0.864 and a significant probability (p) of 0.038 is obtained, which is smaller than the required significant level of 0.05. The positive path
coefficient is 0.464 which indicates if compensation increases, it will increase lecturer performance and vice versa if compensation decreases, it will decrease lecturer performance. The results of the analysis support the fourth research hypothesis (H4).

Hypothesis 5: Work motivation has a significant effect on lecturer performance

Motivation was found to have no significant effect on lecturer performance. This is evidenced by the CR value of 1.060 and a significant probability (p) of 0.043 is obtained, which is smaller than the required significant level of 0.05. The positive path coefficient is 0.845 which indicates if motivation increases, it will increase lecturer performance, and vice versa if motivation decreases, it will reduce lecturer performance. The results of the analysis support the fifth research hypothesis (H5).

Hypothesis 6: Competence has a significant effect on lecturer performance through work motivation

Competence was found to have a significant effect on lecturer performance. This is evidenced by the results of the Sobel test on the effect of competence (KT) on lecturer performance (KD) through work motivation indicating that work motivation is a significant mediation. This can be seen from the Sobel test value of 3.06 which is greater than the T table value (1.65). This shows that motivation can mediate the influence of competence on lecturer performance. The results of the analysis support the sixth research hypothesis (H6).

Hypothesis 7: Compensation has a significant effect on lecturer performance through work motivation

Motivation was found to have a significant effect on lecturer performance. This is evidenced by the results of the Sobel test on the effect of compensation (KN) on lecturer performance (KD) through work motivation indicating that work motivation is a significant mediation. This can be seen from the Sobel test value of 2.15 which is smaller than the T table value (1.65). This shows that motivation can mediate the effect of compensation on lecturer performance. The results of the analysis support the seventh research hypothesis (H7).

Influence Between Variables

a. Direct Influence Between Variables

In the research, the direct effect relationship occurs between exogenous latent variables consisting of Competence (KT) and Compensation (KN), with the endogenous variable Motivation (MT), and the endogenous latent variable, namely Lecturer Performance (KD). A summary of the direct influence of these variables can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Influence</th>
<th>Motivation (MT)</th>
<th>Lecturer Performance (KD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency(KT)</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (KN)</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (MT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 14 it can be seen that the value of the direct effect of the competency (KT) variable, compensation (KN), on motivation (MT), as well as for the direct effect of motivation (MT) on lecturer performance (KD). The biggest direct effect is on the competency variable (KT) with a value of 0.634. So it can be concluded that work motivation is influenced by the competency variable (KT) of 0.634, and compensation (KN) of 0.511. Meanwhile, lecturer performance is influenced by work motivation variable of 1.845.

b. Indirect influence between variables

The indirect effect relationship occurs between the exogenous latent variables consisting of Competence (KT) and Compensation (KN), with the endogenous variable Motivation (MT), and the endogenous latent variable, namely lecturer performance (KD). A summary of the indirect effects of these variables can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Influence</th>
<th>Motivation (MT)</th>
<th>Lecturer Performance (KD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency(KT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (KN)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (MT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 15 it can be seen the value of the indirect effect of the Competency (KT), Compensation (KN) variables on Lecturer Performance (KD) through Work Motivation (MT). So it can be concluded that lecturer performance is indirectly influenced by Competence (KT) of 0.580 and Compensation (KN) of 0.762. If the indirect effect of the Competency (X1) and Compensation (X2) variables on lecturer performance (KD) is greater than the direct effect, then the work motivation variable (MT) acts as a mediation. Based on the results of the analysis, it shows that the value of the indirect effect on the competency and compensation variables is greater than the direct effect on lecturer performance, so it can be concluded that the work motivation variable acts as a mediating variable on the effect of compensation and compensation on lecturer performance.

c. Total Influence Between Variables

The total effect is the effect caused by the existence of various relationships between variables, both directly and indirectly. A summary of the direct influence of the research variables can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Impact</th>
<th>Motivation (MT)</th>
<th>Lecturer Performance (KD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency(KT)</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (KN)</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (MT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the total effect, it can be seen that the greatest total influence value on lecturer performance is in the work motivation variable with a value of 1.845. This explains if work motivation is an important variable in improving lecturer performance. Thus, institutions in improving their performance need to increase their work motivation.

**Sobel test**
The Sobel test is used to test the significance of the mediation role. The results of the t test from the Sobel test were compared to the T table value in this study, which was 1.65 in a sample of 165. Then, if the calculated T value obtained from the Sobel test was greater than the T table, it could indicate that there was a mediating effect, and vice versa. Sobel test in this study was measured by the following formula:

\[ \text{Sobel} = \frac{ab}{\sqrt{(a^2Sb^2) + (b^2Sa^2)}} \]

Sobel test results are described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Hasil Uji Sobel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT --- KT</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT --- KN</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD --- MT</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Sobel test on the effect of Competence (KT) on lecturer performance (KD) through work motivation indicate that work motivation is a significant mediation. This can be seen from the Sobel test value of 3.06 which is greater than the T table value (1.65). In the second variable, the role of work motivation (MT) as a mediator of the influence of Compensation (KN) on lecturer performance (KD) was found to be a significant mediation with a Sobel test value of 2.15 which is smaller than the T table value (1.65).

**CONCLUSIONS**

**Conclusion**
Based on the descriptions that have been disclosed in the discussion, several conclusions can be drawn as answers to the main issues raised in this study, namely indicating that:

a. Competence has a significant effect on motivation. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the higher the competency, the higher the work motivation. The results of this study support the first hypothesis.

b. Compensation has a significant effect on motivation. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the higher the compensation, the higher the work motivation. The results of this study support the second hypothesis.

c. Competence has a significant influence on lecturer performance. The coefficient is positive, which indicates that the higher the competence, the lecturer's performance will increase. The results of this study support the third hypothesis.

d. Compensation has a significant influence on lecturer performance. The coefficient is positive, which indicates that the higher the compensation, the lecturer's performance will increase. The results of this study support the fourth hypothesis.

e. Work motivation has a significant influence on lecturer performance. The coefficient is positive, which indicates that the higher the work motivation, the lecturer's performance will increase. The results of this study support the fifth hypothesis.

f. Work motivation has a mediating role in the influence of competence on lecturer performance. These results then support the sixth hypothesis.

g. Work motivation has a mediating role in the influence of competence on lecturer performance. These results then support the seventh hypothesis.
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