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ABSTRACT

Objective: The research objective was to analyze the influence of Employee competency significantly on work commitment and employee performance, the influence of work Competence on Work Commitment and Employee Performance, the influence of Work commitment on Employee Performance, and the role of work commitment as a variable mediating the relationship between competence and work motivation and employee performance.

Methodology: This type of research uses survey research methods with a quantitative research approach. Survey research is intended to explain causal relationships and test hypotheses using the SEM-PLS model. SmartPls 4 v.4.0.9.4 is a multivariate statistical technique that compares exogenous with endogenous variables. The population of the study are members of Asttatindo, namely 24,000 construction workers who have had education and training and/or are members of Asttatindo. Sampling uses incidental sampling and purposive or judgment sampling, namely sampling based on the number of respondents who fill out the instrument and must match the proportion of the sample required in the SEM-SmartPls model. A minimum sample of 130 employee respondents is required. Incidental sampling can be achieved with 130 (between 130 -1000) respondents.

Findings: Based on the results of hypothesis testing using Smart PLS it shows that: the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted because the t-count value is 8.483 < t table = 1.97 and the p-value significance value is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05 while the path coefficient value (β) = 0.624. The hypothesis test on H2, H3, H4, and H5 is also accepted because the p-value of 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. In addition, the mediation hypotheses H6 and H7 are accepted because the p-value is lower than 0.05. The indirect effect of work competence and work motivation on employee performance through work commitment is a partial mediation category since the VAF value is greater or equal to 20%, and smaller or equal to 80% (20%≤VAF ≤80%).

Conclusion: Work competency has a significant effect on work commitment; work competency has a significant effect on employee performance; work motivation has a significant effect on work commitment and employee performance. Commitment is not only influenced by competency and motivation variables but also affects employee performance. The effect or prediction of the structural commitment model and employee performance are at medium and strong (substantial) levels, respectively. In addition, the model in this study has an average f² value at the medium level or the construction of this research model has medium predictive power. The mediation test for the indirect effect of work competence and work motivation on employee performance through work commitment is a partial mediation.

Keywords: Work Competency, Work Motivation, Work Commitment, and Employee Performance.
INTRODUCTION

A seminar at the Bandung Institute of Technology (October 31, 2017) attended by the author stated that some of the construction experts from 127,090 contractors in Indonesia have been able to work well and some of them have qualified competencies. This was conveyed by Kajima Corporation (a Japanese contractor) to PT. Wijaya Karya (Indonesian state-owned contractor) that many Indonesian construction experts are better than experts from Japan, Korea, and Germany (even Indonesian construction workers are 300% more effective than Algerian workers). The effectiveness of work here is based on the criteria presented by Bangun (2012) such as the amount of work they can complete within a certain time limit, the quality of the work, punctuality, attentiveness, and the ability to cooperate.

Considering the spectrum of the role of the construction service community, it should be understood that the Construction Services Law made in 1999 in conjunction with Law No. 2 of 2017 has a reform spirit that hands over some government affairs to the community. For this reason, an independent institution in the field of construction services was formed to represent the interests of the construction services community, namely the Construction Services Development Institute (LPJK) (which exists today) which is a representative of company associations, professional associations, government agencies, experts in the field of construction services, and representatives from universities. The description suggests that Asttatindo has an important role in improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the construction service workforce in Indonesia. Currently, Asttatindo has a membership of (approximately) 24,000 construction workers who have been certified as of the end of 2021 throughout Indonesia and is the second largest professional association in Indonesia (out of 25 similar professional associations) in terms of certificate products produced and has 34 management boards at the provincial level throughout Indonesia (Asttatindo, 2023). This shows that Asttatindo has a very large human resource pool that requires a study from the HRM perspective. This means that the performance of the workforce that has been certified by Asttatindo is certainly influenced by various factors. Job performance is defined here as the record of outcomes produced on specified job functions or activities during a specified period (Bernardin, 2010). Behavior and results are also factors where behavior originating from an individual is transformed into action and besides that, behavior is also a result that is produced psychologically and physically from task performance (Armstrong, 2010). The concept of employee performance shows that employee performance is not only determined by the quantity of work but also the quality or behavior of employee work. In addition, employee performance can be influenced by various factors including competence, motivation, and work commitment.

Personal competence can contribute effectively when it has effective knowledge, skills, behavior, and attitudes (Slocum & Hellriegel., 2009). Competence is a strength that while personally owned, can contribute to the organization. Competence is a characteristic that individuals have and use in the right way, consistently to achieve the desired performance (Dubois & Rothwell, 2004). Meanwhile, work commitment or organizational commitment relates to feelings and beliefs about the work of the organization comprehensively (George & Jones, 2008; Triyani & Saratian, 2021). An employee's belief about work will and has been done are related to attitudes and cognitive behavior regarding a task that is charged positively and negatively, ultimately giving birth to work actions.

Based on the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report as of December 15, 2015, Indonesia's Human Development Index (HDI) ranks 111th out of 188 countries measured by UNDP. Indonesia's HDI ranking continues to decline from year to year. According to a UNDP official's statement to a Tempo magazine reporter in September 2016,
Indonesia's HDI between 1980 and 2015 increased by 43% but is still not growing fast enough compared to other countries. Thus, the competence of the construction workforce is an essential thing that we need to build together to realize solid national development in the context of high-performance national infrastructure to cope with regional and global competition.

Research Gaps. Based on previous research, Noor et al., (2020) explained that employee competence has an impact on commitment and career management where it is concluded that employee performance increased. This empirical finding shows that HR management acts as a mediator between employee competence and local government commitment in Indonesia. Siri et al., (2020) explained that competence needs to be improved because it can create organizational commitment which ultimately has an impact on task performance. Martini et al., (2020) confirmed that competence can be proxied through knowledge, skills, and attitudes which has a direct impact on organizational commitment. The empirical study provides important information that employee competence is one of the key factors in determining the level of employee commitment to an organization. Gayathri & Aithal (2023) in their study clarified that a corporate organization can achieve increased organizational commitment, innovation, high market share, and long-term survival when it must engage in building the competency capabilities of its employees. In addition, it is also explained that when employees feel that the company cares about their career development and competence, the employee's perception of their internal abilities will increase which in turn makes the employee feel more committed to their company. In addition, Martini et al., (2018) emphasized that employee competence is a reflection of the dimensions of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that can have a meaningful influence on employee performance through task performance, adaptive performance, and contextual performance. Suriadi et al., (2018) provide an explanation in their research explaining that competence makes a high contribution to the performance of government employees so there needs to be collaboration between employees and government organizations to improve employee performance continuously. Suharto et al., (2019) explain that competencies are related to the ability of employees to interact with their work environment and are also related to knowledge and skills to improve employee performance. Kwarteng & Servoh (2022) in their research conveyed that job training carried out professionally by companies affects work competence to produce superior employee performance and the evaluation carried out can minimize errors that can affect employee performance. Furthermore, the results of research by Gani et al., (2018) concluded that work motivation can increase work commitment but motivation in his study makes a weak contribution to employee commitment. Melati et al., (2021) concluded that employee commitment has increased significantly due to the high work motivation of employees which made Melati et al., postulate that good work motivation will result in high employee commitment to the organization and vice versa if work motivation is not good, employee commitment will decrease. Marnisah et al., (2022), and Lutfi et al., (2022) in their writings inform that employee motivation has a positive impact on organizational commitment but the two authors have different arguments, namely: Lutfi et al.'s research suggests that companies should issue a written policy to increase employee motivation because it directly increases employee commitment. Meanwhile, Marnisah et al., (2022) argued that work motivation can be used as a company strategy in increasing employee commitment to the company but it needs to synergize with organizational culture. Tella & Ibinaiye (2020) provide information that professional employee work motivation is higher than non-professional work motivation which resulted in varying performance. Salim et al., (2023) confirm that employee work motivation results in higher performance while undisciplined employees have a less than maximum impact on task performance. Sutrisna (2023) explained that the existence of external and internal employee motivation will consistently have an impact
on employee performance, namely the contribution of his research has a high correlation value of 82.20%. In the end, work commitment can have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Affective commitment and normative commitment have a significant effect on employee performance, but continuance commitment does not affect employee performance (Metin & Asli, 2018). Work commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (for example research by Khushk, 2019; Azmy, 2022; Paramita et al., 2020; and Nguyen & Ngo, 2020). Based on these empirical studies, it indicates that many studies explain competence, work motivation, and organizational commitment as having a significant effect on performance. However, especially in Indonesia, research on competence and work motivation of employees who obtain competency certification is still relatively very little, even related research on employee commitment is very rare. Therefore, it is important to analyze this factor in a behavioral and human resources approach.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Competence

Armstrong (2010) defines competence as a fundamental characteristic of individuals that is causally related to effectiveness or excellent performance. Meanwhile, according to Scale 1975 cited by Sutrisno (2009), competence means proficiency, ability, and authority while etymologically, competence is defined as the behavioral dimensions of expertise or excellence of a leader or staff who has good skills, knowledge, and behavior. This is in line with the opinion of Stone (2017) that competency or competence is often used in measuring the ability of people to carry out a job. Slocum & Hellriegel., (2009) explained competency is a combination of knowledge, skill, behaviors, and attitudes that contribute to personal effectiveness.

Competency refers to the underlying characteristics of behavior that describe the motives, personal characteristics (characteristics), self-concept, values, knowledge, or skills of someone who is a superior performer in the workplace (Palan, 2007). The research describes different types of characteristics, that drive behavior, asserting that competencies are about people as such and what they can do, not what they might do. Therefore, competencies are job-related knowledge, skills, and attitudes that affect a large part of one's job (role or responsibility) which correlate with performance on the job and can be measured against accepted standards (Bernardin, 2010). Abilities are described as descriptions that describe capabilities to perform specific jobs and include specific skills or specialized knowledge to define all competencies with specific, observable, and verifiable descriptions that are reliably and logically classified together. Spencer & Spencer (1993) emphasize physical and non-physical competencies where competency is an underlying characteristic of an individual and is causally related to criterion-referenced effective and/or superior performance in job situation”. Competence is an underlying characteristic of an individual's behavior that can determine superior performance and/or influence organizational goals. This opinion is similar to the opinion of the head of the Construction Labor Sub-directorate on the Competence and Productivity of Construction. Nazir (2023) notes the competence of the construction service workforce (employees) is related to the knowledge that underlies the implementation of their work which can be obtained from formal education, training, or based on experience.

Spencer & Spencer (1993) describe competence as having 5 characteristics that are currently also used by the Ministry of Public Works Nazir namely: (1) Motives: Everything that is consistently thought or desired to happen. Motives control, direct, and select behavior towards certain actions or goals. (2) Traits: Physical characteristics and consistent responses to situations or information. (3) Self-Concept: A person's attitudes, values, or self-image. (4) Knowledge: Information that a person possesses in a specific area. (5) Skill: An employee's
physical and mental ability to complete a specific job. This index was also cited as an index by Purnama & Widayati (2023) in their study.

Work Motivation

The term motivation comes from the Latin word “movere” which means “to move”. Motivation is a process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need to activate the behavior or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive. Thus, the key to understanding the process of motivation lies in the meaning of and relationship between needs, drives, and incentives (Luthans, 2008). Robbins & Judge (2013) define motivation as a process that contributes to the intensity, direction, and duration of individual effort toward achieving goals where intensity is related to how hard a person tries. However, high intensity will then not result in the desired performance if the effort is not channeled in a direction that benefits the organization. In the end, motivation has a long-lasting dimension. Meanwhile, Schemerhon et al., (2002) definition stated “motivation refers to forces within an individual that accounts for the level, direction, and persistence of effort expended at work”. Supporting this opinion, other authors explain that motivation is the set of processes that arouse, direct, and maintain human behavior toward attaining goals (Greenberg & Baron, 2003). This shows that work motivation owned by employees can affect employee performance. As Siagian (2016) and Rajak & Soleman (2022) argue, motivation is the driving force for someone to make the greatest possible contribution to the success of the organization in achieving its goals. There are three needs from McCelland’s study, the need for achievement (n Ach); the need for affiliation (n Aff); and the need for power (n Pow).

Motivation based on Alderfer's ERG Theory agrees with the theory put forward by Maslow, that individual needs are organized in a hierarchy. However, the hierarchy he proposes only involves three sets of needs, namely: “(1) existence related to needs that are satisfied by factors such as food, air, rewards, and working conditions; (2) relatedness related to needs that are satisfied by meaningful social and interpersonal relationships; and (3) growth related to needs that are satisfied if individuals make productive or creative contributions" (Ivancevich & Konopaske, 2013). In addition, Alderfer's theory is divided into Existence (E), Relatedness (R), and Growth (G) which is abbreviated as ERG and relates to Maslow's theory in that Existence needs are similar to Maslow's Physiological and Safety categories; Relatedness needs are similar to the Togetherness, Social and Love categories; and Growth needs are similar to the Self-Esteem, and Self-Actualization categories.

Work Commitment

George & Jones (2008) suggest that organizational commitment or work commitment relates to feelings and beliefs about the work of the organization as a whole. An individual's belief about the work that will and has been done. This belief is related to the attitude a person has where a worker will think (cognitively) about a task he/she is charged with positively and negatively, ultimately manifested through actions in carrying out jobs. Supporting the above opinion, according to McShane & Glinow (2008): "Organizational commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in a particular organization". In other words, "work commitment is the loyalty and attachment of employees to the organization" (Daft, 2010). This statement is supported by (Gibson et al., 2006) that work commitment is the sense of identification, involvement, and loyalty expressed by an employee toward the company. Meanwhile, according to Davis & Newstrom (2002), “organizational commitment or employee loyalty is the extent to which employees identify with the organization and want to actively participate to continue a job related to organizational goals".
Zabri & Ghazzawi (2019) organizational commitment (OC), is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”.

According to Robbins & Judge (2013), organizational commitment is “the degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization”. In line with this, Luthans (2008) describes work commitment as an attitude, organizational commitment is most often defined as (1) a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, (2) a willingness to exert a high level of effort on behalf of the organization, and (3) a definite belief in and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization. This is in accordance with the concept of attitude which is "a cognitive and affective evaluation that initially encourages a person to take certain actions” (Daft, 2010). Many studies use the postulate of Meyer, Allen, and Smith, as cited by Robbins & Judge (2013), that organizational commitment can be known through "three separate dimensions, namely: “(1) affective commitment, which is an emotional feeling towards the organization and belief in its values, (2) continuance commitment is the perceived economic value of staying in an organization when compared to leaving the organization, and (3) normative commitment is the obligation to stay in the organization for moral or ethical reasons”.

**Employee Performance**

Performance is defined here as the record of outcomes produced on specified job activities during a specified period (Bernardin, 2010). Performance is the documentation of an individual's work results according to the specified time. This definition sees performance as work behavior where work results have a relationship with personal characteristics (for example: dependability, integrity, perseverance, knowledge, attitude, and loyalty), even though these factors are not actual performance measurements, they contribute to determining the overall performance (Bernardin, 2010). In other words, performance is not only measured based on the quality and quantity or amount of work but it is also necessary to have an assessment related to work attitudes and behavior. Performance as a result and behavior is also stated by Campbell (1990): “Performance is a behavior and should be distinguished from the outcome because they can be contaminated by systems factors”. This definition not only sees performance as an outcome but performance is also as a behavior that needs to be distinguished since work outcomes and behavior can be influenced by organizational system factors (Soelton et al., 2019; Widodo et al., 2022; Asda & Nilasari, 2022, and Sunatar, 2023).

Another opinion that supports this statement by Brumbach cited by Armstrong (2010) is that performance means both behaviors and results. Behaviors emanate from the performer and transform performance from abstraction to action. Behaviors are also outcomes in their own right, they are the product of mental and physical effort which is applied to the task and can be assessed separately from the outcome. Indications of behavior that originate from an individual are transformed into an action and besides that, behavior is also a result that is produced psychologically and physically to produce performance. Research by Jufrizen et al., (2021) also explains that performance is a person's success in carrying out tasks, work results that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities or how a person is expected to function and behave in accordance with the tasks assigned to him and the quantity, quality and time spent in carrying out tasks. In the research of Kumari et al., (2021), the author made there created a traditional dimensional model and structure that broke down job performance into contextual and task performance. When talking about task performance, encompasses individual behaviors while performing their defined roles. On the other hand, contextual performance considers the
interpersonal relationships that the people forge voluntarily to help perform the task which boosts the organization's effectiveness (Imran & Abbas, 2020).

In principle, performance is not only seen from the perspective of results but also from the behavior of individuals or employees in the organization to carry out various activities. This is in line with the opinion Bernardin (2010) that there are six performance indicators, namely: Quality: related to the process or results are close to perfect / ideal to meet the intent or purpose; Quantity: related to the amount of production, expressed in certain units or the number of activity completion cycles; Timelines related to the timeliness required in completing a job or the level at which an activity is completed in a period faster than the set time and utilizes the time available for other activities; Cost-effectiveness is related to the level of use of organizational resources (people, money, materials, technology) in obtaining results or reducing waste in the use of organizational resources; Need for supervision is related to the ability of individuals to complete work or job functions without the existence of leaders or supervisory intervention of leaders; Interpersonal impact is related to the ability of individuals to increase self-esteem, goodwill, and cooperation among fellow workers.

Employee Competencies and Work Commitment
According to Spencer & Spencer (1993), competence is a basic characteristic of individual behavior that can determine superior performance and/or influence organizational goals. Supporting this opinion, (Palan, 2007) believes that employee competence (such as knowledge and skills) can make work in a superior way (superior performer). Meanwhile, organizational commitment (work commitment) is defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification or involvement in a particular organization. The knowledge and skills of employees who use it to work following the wishes of the company are also loyal or attached to the company. In other words, employee competence (for example, knowledge, skills, and self-concept) can affect the level of loyalty or work commitment. Many authors find that employee competence has a positive impact on loyalty which includes affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Noor et al., 2020; Siri et al., 2020; Martini et al., 2020; Gayathri & Aithal, 2023; and Lestari et al., 2022). Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:
H1: Employee competency has a significant influence on work commitment.

Work Competencies and Employee Performance
Draganidis and Mentzas state that employee competence is a combination of tacit and explicit knowledge, behaviors, and skills that give a person the potential for effectiveness in performing tasks (Otoo, 2019). Similarly, several other authors postulate that employee competence needs to be a continuous concern of the company since it can improve employee performance (Parman et al., 2020). This is consistent with several other authors who found that increasing employee competence has a positive and significant impact on employee performance (Suriadi et al., 2018; Kwarteng & Servoh, 2022; Darmavika & Ridwan, 2023; and Mayastinasari, 2023). However, there is research that shows employee competencies do not influence employee performance (Wijaya & Setaryangrum, 2023). Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:
H2: Employee competency has a significant influence on employee performance.

Work Motivation and Work Commitment
Motivation refers to forces within an individual that account for the level, direction, and persistence of effort expended at work (Schermerhorn, 2013). In line with this opinion, Sonandg
(2016) suggested that work motivation is the driving force for someone to contribute to organizational goals. Indicating that employees' efforts to work following the wishes of the company continuously, give birth to a sense of attachment and/or loyalty to the company. Meaning that employees are motivated because they have a sense of need to achieve work results that are relevant to company goals. Work commitment, for example, normative work commitment, namely the tendency of employees to remain in the organization is the effect of encouragement (intensity) to achieve individual, group, and organizational goals while intensity is how hard a person tries (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Studies show that work motivation has a direct influence on the level of work commitment (Gani et al., 2018; Melati et al., 2021; Marnisah et al., 2022; Lutfi et al., 2022; Badrianto & Permatasari, 2022; and Wibowo et al., 2023). Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Work Competence has a significant influence on Work Commitment.

**Work Motivation and Employee Performance**

Employee performance is not only a result but also a behavior that needs to be distinguished, because work results and behavior can be influenced by organizational system factors (Campbell, 1990). Work results that meet company goals are the needs of every company. Therefore, all employee efforts in achieving maximum work results can contribute to company performance in the long term. The results of research conducted by (Langat et al., 2019; Salim et al., 2023; Sutrisna, 2023; Tella & Ibinaiye, 2020; Apex-Apeh et al., 2020; Eliyana et al., 2020; Al-Jedaia & Mehrez, 2020; and Syamsir, 2020) show that work motivation directly has a significant effect on employee performance. For example, the results of research (Prabowo & Yulianti, 2022) concluded that employee work motivation is a critical factor in consistently improving employee performance. Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4: Work Motivation has a significant influence on Employee Performance.

**Work Commitment and Employee Performance**

Various studies reveal that work commitment consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment can improve employee performance (Abdirahman et al., 2018; Azmy, 2022; Paramita et al., 2020; Nguyen & Ngo, 2020; Purkan et al., 2023; Sari et al., 2023; Fachrudi et al., 2021; Loan, 2020; and Kareem et al., 2019). Although the author found there was no effect of affective commitment on employee performance. Similarly, other researchers, namely Metin & Asli (2018) revealed that affective commitment has a positive and significant effect on work performance while normative commitment and continuance commitment do not affect work performance. Overall, the literature review of this paper indicates a significant relationship between work commitment and employee performance. Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H5: Work Motivation has a significant influence on Employee Performance.

**Work Commitment Mediating the Effect of Work Competence on Employee Performance**

As previously explained, that previous authors revealed work commitment and work competence have a direct effect on employee performance. Work commitment can also mediate the influence of competence on employee performance. The study (Nugroho et al., 2019) using a sample of 160 employees revealed that employee work commitment that increased can have a strengthening impact on individual performance. Supporting this, other researchers also reported that work commitment mediates the effect of competence with employee performance (Silaban et al., 2021, Hafid et al., 2022; Wahyuningtyasti, 2023; Sutaguna et al., 2023; and
Anggriawan et al., 2023). This paper is the same as the previous authors (Sari et al., 2020; and Anwar & Aima, 2020) but the population and/or sample are employees in the public sector. The research focuses on the performance of private sector employees, especially labor (employees) in Construction Companies in Indonesia that are registered as Asttatinco members. Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hs: Work Commitment Significantly Mediates the Effect of Work Competence on Employee Performance

**Work Commitment Mediating the Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Performance**

Work motivation has an impact on employee performance directly where this influence can also be mediated by work commitment. Previous research explains that work motivation improves employee performance, directly and indirectly (Erawati & Wahyono., 2019). Work motivation is the driving force for someone to make the greatest contribution to achieving the goals of an organization (Siagian, 2016). Organizational goals can be achieved along with employee performance that is relevant to organizational goals. The process of employee identification (commitment) with the organization and wanting to actively participate to continue a job is related to organizational goals (Davis & Newstrom, 2002). Supporting this, previous research revealed that work commitment significantly mediates the effect of work motivation on employee performance (Dewi et al., 2021; Mubarak et al., 2022; Kawiana, 2024; Nawangasari et al., 2023; and Sudama, 2022). Based on the discussion above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hy: Work Commitment Significantly Mediates the Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

---

**Figure 1. Research Framework**

---

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This research is descriptive and verifying, carried out through primary data collection in the field. Therefore, the research method used is an explanatory survey method which aims to collect data on objects in the field by taking samples from a population and using a questionnaire as the main data collection tool. This type of research uses survey research methods with a quantitative research approach. Survey research is intended to explain causal relationships and test hypotheses using the SEM-PLS model. The test tool using SmartPLs 4 v.4.0.9.4 is a multivariate statistical technique that compares exogenous variables, namely: work competence (X1-CY) = 13 items and work motivation (X2-MN) = 12 items while
mediation and endogenous variables consisting of work commitment (X3-CT) = 12 items and employee performance (Y-EP) = 15 items, respectively.

The score on each question item for variables X1, X2, X3, and Y uses a weighting approach of 1 to 5. The weighting numbers have meaning: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (disagree); 4 (agree); and 5 (strongly agree). The sample size in this study is based on the opinion of Hair et al., (2014) that the research sample is obtained from the number of research indicators of exogenous variables (the largest number) multiplied by 10. Asttatindo has a membership of 24,000 construction workers who have been certified at the end of 2021 throughout Indonesia. The population is Asttatindo members, namely construction workers who have been trained and/or as Asttatindo members. Sampling used incidental sampling and Purposive or Judgment sampling, namely sampling based on the number of respondents who filled out the instrument and must be in accordance with the sample proportions required in the SEM-SmartPls model. In this study, the number of indicators with the most arrows on the exogenous variable is work competence, which is 13 multiplied by 10 (13 x 10) equals 130. Therefore, the minimum sample is 130 employee respondents. It is likely that incidental sampling can be achieved with more than 130 respondents (between 130 -1000).

According to Hair et al., (2019), PLS-SEM is carried out to evaluate the measurement model (outer model) reflective model consists of indicator loadings ≥ 0.708; Convergent Validity (AVE ≥ 0.50); Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT< 0.90), and Composite Reliability (≥0.60 – 0.70). Evaluation model structural (inner model) consists of Collinearity (VIF ≥ 3-5), R² value (R² values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 are considered substantial, moderate, and weak), Q² value (Values higher than 0, 0.25 and 0.50 depict small, medium and large), and PLSpredict (Compare the MAE (or the RMSE) value with the LM value of each indicator), and Goodness-of-fit (acceptable = 0.08 - 0.10).
RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Outer Model Evaluation

The first step to assessing a reflective measurement model involves assessing indicator loading. The next steps are convergent validity, Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)), and Composite Reliability. A summary of the reflective measurement model can be seen in Table 1. However, it needs to be explained that the results of the outer model test using SEM-SmartPls 4 for the first time show that there are indicators that have a loading factor smaller than 0.708, namely: CT2, CT11, MN6, MN10, MN11, MN12, PE11, PE12, PE13, PE14, PE15.

Apart from these indicators, all of them have a loading factor > 0.70. This is according to Hair et al., (2014) reflective indicator loading ≥ 0.708. Therefore, the indicators of exogenous variables and endogenous variables that have not been valid are removed and tested again.

Table 1. Summary of Reflective Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR*</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th>DC**</th>
<th>CV***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1-EP</td>
<td>CY1</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY2</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY3</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY4</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY5</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY12</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CY13</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN</td>
<td>MN1</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN2</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN3</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN5</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN7</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN8</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN9</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3-CT</td>
<td>CT3</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT4</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT5</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT6</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT12</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-PE</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE10</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Composite Reliability; **= discriminant validity; ***= convergent validity
Source: Processed by the Authors, 2023.
Based on Figure 2, it shows that not all valid research indicators are involved in the SEM-Smart PLS 4 estimation. In other words, some (partially) valid indicators also drop out because the outer loading algorithm output causes HTMT greater than 0.90. These indicators are \(CT_1, CT_7, CT_8, CT_9, CT_{10}, CY_6, CY_7, CY_8, CY_9, CY_{10}, CY_{11}, MN_4, PE_5, PE_6, PE_7, PE_8, PE_9\). Estimation of indicator loading (outer loading) after this step is carried out.

Based on the results of the 2nd outer loading evaluation, it show that the convergent validity test with reflective indicators as a whole is significant since the loading factor of some indicators (table 1) on the research variables is more than 0.708. In addition, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value of the Indicator Loading variable work competence \((X_1-CY)\), work motivation \((X_2-MN)\), work commitment \((X_3-CT)\) and employee performance \((Y-PE)\) is greater than the loading factor value (rule of thumbs) which is 0.50 or the average variance extracted value has a value of more than 0.50 \((\text{AVE} \geq 0.50)\) (Hair et al., 2019). This also means that all indicators of exogenous and endogenous variables are suitable for use in this study.

The next step is to evaluate discriminant validity which is the extent to which a construct is empirically different from other constructs in the structural model. Based on the Fornell-Larcker value in SmartPls 4 output, it shows that the AVE of the average variance is higher than the correlation involving latent variables (indicators). For example: the \(X_1-CY\) reflective construction has a value of 0.794 higher than the correlation value in column \(X_1\). Thus, all items on this research instrument are valid or can be used in research. However, according to Henseler et al., 2015 cited by Hair et al., (2019) that the Fornell Larcker criterion does not work well, especially when the indicator load on the construct is only slightly different (e.g. all indicator loads are between 0.65 and 0.85). Instead, proposed the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) of correlations (Voorhees et al., 2016 cited by Hair et al., 2019) average value of item correlations across constructs relative to the (geometric) average of correlations for items measuring the same construct. The procedure for assessing discriminant validity uses the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) method as discussed by Henseler et al., (2015) which uses the standard measurement value of 0.85 as the upper limit of the ratio and states that the distribution of ratio values below 0.85 and/or <0.90 is declared discriminant valid. The entire distribution of values shows that it is still below 0.90 \((0.720; 0.794; 0.770; 0.888; 0.893, \text{and } 0.857)\) so it is stated that the overall construct is discriminant valid (Henseler et al., 2015). Meaning, that the average value of the items of all constructs relative to the (geometric) average of the average correlation of indicators measuring the same construct is in the good category (good discriminant validity). In addition, all measurement items have discriminant validity since each item is correlated greater than all loading on other constructs (cross-loading). For example, digital marketing indicator loading \((MN_1 - MN_9)\) of 0.612; 0.648; 0.601; 0.506; 0.422; 0.478; and 0.514 are greater than all other variable indicator loading (cross loading), respectively.
Finally, composite reliability is assessed. Assessing internal consistency reliability uses the Jöreskog (1971) composite reliability. For example, reliability values between 0.60 and 0.70 are considered “acceptable in exploratory research,” and values between 0.70 and 0.90 range from "satisfactory to good" (Hair et al., 2019). Based on the SmartPLS output results in Table 1, it shows that all constructs have a composite reliability value above 0.60 to 0.70. In addition, Cronbach's alpha is above 0.60. So, it can be stated that the construct has good reliability according to Hair et al., (2019). Cronbach's alpha is another measure of internal consistency reliability that assumes the same threshold but produces a lower value than composite reliability.

Reflective Inner Model Evaluation

Based on the results of the VIF calculation in the table, it show that the model in this study does not have a collinearity problem because it has a VIF (inner models) value that is smaller than ≥ 3-5. As Hair et al., (2019) argue, the ideal research model does not experience multicollinearity if the VIF value is ≥ 3-5. The R² (R-Squares) value is the coefficient of determination where this value represents the effect of the combination of exogenous latent variables on endogenous latent variables in the structural model. In addition, the R² value is the result of a linear regression test, namely the amount of endogenous variability that can be explained by exogenous variables. The model is said to be strong if it has an R-Squares value of 0.67, the moderate model requires an R-Square value of 0.33 and an R-Squares value of 0.19 indicates a weakly predicted model (Ghozali & Latan, 2015).
Table 2. Summary of Reflective Structural (Inner) Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Model</th>
<th>Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)</th>
<th>Coefficients of Determination (R²)</th>
<th>Effect Size – f²</th>
<th>Q² predict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1-CY -&gt; X3-CT</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>X3-CT = 0.624</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>X3-CT = 0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1-CY -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>Y-PE = 0.760</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>Y-PE = 0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN -&gt; X3-CT</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3-CT -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed by the Authors, 2023.

Based on Table 2, the determination coefficients can be explained as follows: (1) work competence and work motivation effect on work commitment is 0.624. This means that the exogenous variables can predict the endogenous variable (work commitment) by 62.40% which is in the moderate category; then (2) work competence, work motivation, and work commitment affect employee performance of 0.760 which is in the strong (substantial) category. This means that the exogenous variables can predict the endogenous variable, namely employee performance by 76.00% which is in the strong category. Next is Testing f² endogenous construct evaluation to see the amount of exogenous substantive influence (f² effect sizes) and total effect. The f² value will see the substantive effect of exogenous on endogenous constructs.

Changes in the value of f² effect sizes when certain exogenous constructs are removed from the model can be used to evaluate whether the removed construct has a substantive impact on endogenous constructs. Hair et al., (2019) state: “Guidelines for assessing f² are that values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, represent small, medium, and large effects of the exogenous latent variable”. This means that the model in the study has an average value of f² at the medium level or the construction of this research model has medium predictive power.

Q² predictive relevance value on endogenous variables, namely: X3-CT (work commitment) and Y-PE (employee performance) are 0.616 and 0.731 respectively (see Table 2). Q² predict has the predictive power of exogenous variables on endogenous variables in the large (Q² = 0.616 ≥ 0.50) and medium (Q² = 0.652 <0.50) categories or large predictive accuracy of the PLS path model. This explanation is in line with the opinion of Hair et al. (2019) that the guidelines for the Q² value are based on values higher than 0 (small); 0.25 (medium); and 0.50 (large) of the PLS path model. Next is PLSpredict's inner model evaluation of the predictive power of a model. The method is to compare the root mean squared error (RMSE) value with the linear regression model (LM). PLSpredict output is presented in the table below.

Table 3. Comparing the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) with Linear Regression Model (LM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Q²predict</th>
<th>PLS-SEM_RMSE</th>
<th>PLS-SEM_MAE</th>
<th>LM-RMSE</th>
<th>LM_MAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT19</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT3</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT4</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT5</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT6</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE10</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the PLSpredict evaluation (RMSE versus LM), it shows that PLS-SEM-RMSE and PLS-SEM-MAE from PLS-SEM analysis have a higher majority prediction error than the linear regression model (LM). These results indicate that the model in this study has low predictive power. This evaluation is in accordance with the opinion of Hair et al. (2019), “the majority (low predictive power), the minority or the same number (medium predictive power) or none of the indicators (high predictive power).”

The GoF index of the study also needs to be evaluated, and can only be calculated from the reflective measurement model which is the root geometric product of the mean communality with the mean R square (Yamin, 2023). Communality is the square of the loading factor. According to Wetzels et al (2009), the interpretation GoF index value is 0.1 (low), 0.25 (medium), and 0.36 (high). For example, the calculation results show that the GoF index of X3-CT and Y-PE are √(0.624 x 0.621) = 0.6224 (62.24%) and 0.760 x 0.757 = 0.7583 (75.83%) respectively, including the high GoF category. In other words, the empirical data is able to explain the measurement model and measurement model with a high level of fit. In addition, you can also see the Standardized Square Root Mean Residual (SRMR) based on the Saturated model value = 0.104 and Estimated model = 0.104. The recommended SRMR value is less than 0.08. However, another opinion by Karin Schermelleh et al (2003) states that SRMR between 0.08 - 0.10 is still acceptable (Yamin, 2023). The SRMR value shows that this research model is = 0.10 which means that the model built matches the empirical data.

**Hypothesis Testing**

To assess the significance of the prediction model in testing the structural model, it can be seen from the t-statistic value between the exogenous and endogenous variable in Table 4 Bootstrapping output of SmartPLS 4 Version 4.0.9.4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Original sample (O)</th>
<th>T statistics (O/STDEV)</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1-CY -&gt; X3-CT</td>
<td>0,484</td>
<td>8,483</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1-CY -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>0,344</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN -&gt; X3-CT</td>
<td>0,375</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>0,408</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3-CT -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>0,218</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1-CY -&gt; X3-CT -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>0,106</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-MN -&gt; X3-CT -&gt; Y-PE</td>
<td>0,082</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>0,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed by the Authors, 2023.
Based on Table 4, the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted because the t-count value of 8.483 < t table = 1.97, and the significance value $\rho$-value of 0.000 is smaller than 0.05 while the path coefficient value (β) = 0.624. The same applies to hypothesis tests H2, H3, H4, and H5 are accepted because the $\rho$-value of 0.000 is smaller than 0.05. In addition, the mediation hypotheses H6 and H7 are accepted because the $\rho$-value is lower than 0.05. Next is to determine the mediation between exogenous and endogenous variables "whether full mediation or partial mediation", it is necessary to use the formula: $\text{VAF} = (\rho_{12} \cdot \rho_{23}) / (\rho_{12} \cdot \rho_{23} + \rho_{13})$ (Hair et al., 2014). The calculation results show that the indirect effect of work competence and work motivation respectively on employee performance through work commitment is a partial mediation category because the VAF value is greater than 20% and smaller than 80% ($20% \leq \text{VAF} \leq 80\%$). Based on Table 4, it is determined that the role of X_{3-CT} (work commitment) in mediating the indirect effect is the effect at the structural level of the low group because the value of partial mediation is 0.02. While the role of X_{3-MN} in mediating the indirect effect of X_{2-MN} on Y-PE has no mediating effect. The mediation level is determined based on Cohen's opinion in Ogbeibu et al., (2020), namely 0.175 (high mediation effect), 0.075 (medium mediation effect), and 0.01 (low mediation effect).

**Discussion**

**The Effect of Work Competence on Work Commitment and Employee Performance**

Work competence has a positive and significant effect on work commitment because the t count is greater than the t table and the p-value is smaller than 0.05. The results of this study are in accordance with the opinion expressed by Spencer & Spencer (1993) that employee competence is a basic characteristic of individual behavior that can determine superior performance and/or influence organizational goals. This means that an employee who consistently uses knowledge and skills in carrying out his work is a form of loyalty to his work, including his job. The results of this study also support previous research, that employee competence has a significant effect on employee performance (Noor et al., 2020). The results of Noor et al.'s research also concluded that his research only examined public sector employees and still requires further research using other variables and/or adding certain relevant variables. This indicates that affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment from construction service employees in Indonesia can be maintained by employees if employees understand and use their competencies at work. For example, employees who have traits tend to use physical abilities and consistently respond to situations or information directly related to their work.

The results of this study also show that the effect of the construction of this research model has medium predictive power. Thus, work competency contributes positively and significantly to work commitment but there is still a need for competency management in the future. Therefore, it is necessary to group competencies in the company according to the work of construction service employees, especially employees who have been certified. Competency groupings include achievement and action, helping and human service, impact and influence, and managerial. In addition, employees need to understand the concept of competence so that they can control themselves well, be able to evaluate work independently, be disciplined, and understand and be able to use knowledge and skills in accordance with job qualifications. For example, the qualifications of operator employees, at least, are required to understand and carry out walk-around inspections, and check fuel lubricants, water cooling, batteries, and others.

Competency in this study not only affects commitment but also affects employee performance. The effect is because the t-count value is greater than the t table and the p-value is smaller than 0.05. These results support Bernardino's (2010) statement that an employee's
knowledge, skills, and attitudes can affect most of a person's work or responsibilities which correlates to having an impact on task performance. So, it is clear that competency is an important factor to be owned by construction service employees, especially competencies that are hidden, namely motives, traits, and self-concept. According to Spencer & Spencer (1993), trait and motive competencies are like an “iceberg” related to personality and are more difficult to assess and develop. However, the results of this study support previous research that work competence has a significant effect on work commitment (Noor et al., 2020; Siri et al., 2020; Martini et al., 2020; Gayathri & Aithal, 2023; and Lestari et al., 2022). Other research results also support that competency has a significant effect on employee performance (Nguyen & Ngo, 2020; Purkan et al., 2020; Sari et al., 2020; Fachrudi et al., 2021; Loan, 2020, and Karem et al., 2019).

The Effect of Work Motivation on Work Commitment and Employee Performance

The results of the second (H2) and third hypothesis tests (H3) show that work motivation has a significant effect on work commitment and affects employee performance. These results are implicitly in accordance with the opinion of Schermerhorn (2013) that work motivation refers to the strength that exists in individuals which includes the level, direction, and persistence of effort in doing their work. A construction service employee who has been certified is likely to have qualified knowledge and skills. However, this ability cannot be separated from intrinsic factors (employee self). Employee loyalty to the company needs to be supported by employee motivation. Employee motivation which includes existence, relatedness, and growth is able to change employee behavior to stay involved in the company. This is a form of employee commitment to work and/or organization. For example, mechanically qualified construction employees not only have mechanical knowledge but also need to understand the basis or hierarchy of their needs since work motivation is a part of the personality that cannot be copied from and to another person.

In relation to the above, companies need to pay attention to several things in the dimensions of work motivation, namely: existence, relatedness, and growth. For example, existence is related to needs that are satisfied by factors such as food, air, rewards, and working conditions. Thus, companies need to understand this so that they can formulate policies that benefit the company and its employees. Previous research found that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on work commitment (Melati et al., 2021; Marnisah et al., 2022; Lutfi et al., 2022, and Badrianto & Permatasari, 2022). In addition, the authors concluded that work motivation can improve employee performance in both the public and private sectors (Langat et al., 2019; Salim et al., 2023; Sutrisna, 2023; Tella & Ibinaive, 2020; Apex-Apeh et al., 2020; Eliyana et al., 2020; Al-Jedaia & Mehrez, 2020, and Syamsir, 2020). In line with this, Prabowo & Yulianti (2022) concluded that employee work motivation is an important factor in consistently improving employee performance. The research provides inspiration or an overview of the importance of work motivation of construction service employees in synergizing with employee competency factors (visible and hidden competency).

The Effect of Work Commitment on Employee Performance

The results showed that work commitment has a significant effect on employee performance because the p-value is smaller than 0.05. The results are relevant to the opinion of Colquitt et al., (2014) work commitment is related to the desire of employees to keep the organization in mind. It is further explained that the effect of organizational commitment is related to whether employees stay at work or leave to continue or move to a new job or another
company. If employees no longer feel an attachment to the organization, they tend to look for and/or work for other companies.

Many previous relationships between variables have shown significance or positive predictions. However, the effect of work commitment on employee performance (H5 accepted) has a VIF value greater than other variables and has a low path coefficient. Therefore, construction service companies today should not only identify the competence or knowledge and skills of their employees but also need to identify and evaluate the level of employee commitment. For example, companies need to evaluate their employees in relation to obligation-based reasons (Colquitt et al., 2014) which formulates instruments about employee responses to company leadership at various levels (such as responses to leadership on various problems faced by employees). In addition, the results of this study are still consistent with previous authors that work commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Paramita et al., 2020; Nguyen & Ngo, 2020; Purkan et al., 2023; Sari et al., 2023; Fachrudi et al., 2021; Loan, 2020, and Karem et al., 2019).

The Effect of Work Competence and Motivation on Employee Performance Through Work Commitment

Work commitment is able to mediate the effect of work competency on employee performance significantly with the category of partial mediation. However, it partially mediates the effect on the low level. While at a medium level when mediating the effect of motivation on employee performance. As explained earlier, construction service companies currently need to understand and identify employee commitment systematically. This also provides important information that although Asttatindo has carried out certification to the construction workforce in accordance with its vision and mission, the labor owner (company) must also be responsible for maintaining employee competence on an ongoing basis. In other words, employees certified by Asttatindo are the company's assets or human resources and the company should manage the needs of its human resources comprehensively, especially as the commitment and competence are difficult to gauge. Apart from that, the results of the study are in line with previous research which shows that work commitment mediates the effect of competency and work motivation on job performance (Anggriawan et al., 2023; Silaban et al., 2021 Nugroho et al., 2019; Sutaguna et al., 2023; Mubarak et al., 2022; Sari et al., 2020; and Anwar & Aima, 2020).

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the research conclusions are: work competency has a significant effect on work commitment. Employees who have competencies (for example, knowledge and skills) are able to increase employee work commitment; work competency has a significant effect on employee performance which means that employee competencies are able to be used by employees in creating work results that are relevant to company goals; work motivation has a significant effect on work commitment and employee performance. Employees who have intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation are able to have a significant effect on commitment and ultimately contribute positively to employee performance; finally, commitment is not only influenced by competency and motivation variables but also affects employee performance. Work commitment has an important role in improving performance because commitment is closely related to affective, normative, and continuance. However, the influence or prediction of the structural model of commitment and employee performance is at the medium and strong (substantial) levels, respectively. In addition, the model in this study has an average value of $I^2$
at the medium level or the construction of this research model has medium predictive power. The mediation test of the indirect effect of work competence and work motivation respectively on employee performance through work commitment is a partial mediation category. As a result, employee commitment from normative, affective, and continuous perspectives has a dual impact, helping to both boost performance and foster a positive relationship between competency and work motivation variables on worker performance.

Based on these conclusions, the suggestions of this study are: Companies need to identify trait and motive competencies because they are directly related to personality. In addition, companies need to hold training, psychotherapy, and/or knowledge-sharing activities to instill confidence in job success. In other words, employees who have received competency certification need to understand competencies academically, and practically, and voluntarily evaluate their performance periodically.

In addition, the practical contribution of this research provides an important note to companies in Indonesia including Asttatindo that employee performance can not only be improved through knowledge and skills sourced from competence certification but requires understanding and manifestation of employee motivation and work commitment that requires collaboration between companies and employees in improving employee performance. In addition, employee motivation and commitment are not only the responsibility of Asttatindo but the main responsibility of the company as a consequence of one of the functions of labor recruitment.

For future researchers, future studies can add research variables while the population stays consistent with employees of Asttatindo. Since, there is currently a lack of HRM research on construction service employees in Indonesia, especially workers who have competency certification.
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