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This study analyses the empirical effect of organizational commitment on job performance mediating by innovative behavior, organizational citizenship (OCB), and job involvement. The research data was collected by a questionnaire through the survey method. The sample of this research is 245 lecturers selected by purposive sampling. Data analysis uses path analysis supported by descriptive statistics. The results revealed that organizational commitment had a significant effect on job performance, both direct and indirect effects mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. Thus, the lecturer’s job performance can be improved through organizational commitment, innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. Besides, this research also found a fit research model about the effect of organizational commitment on job performance mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. This model can discuss as a reference or discourses among researchers and practitioners in developing job performance models in various contexts and organizations.
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Introduction

Private higher education in Indonesia has not prepared skilled and competent workers in their respective fields. As an illustration, in 2019, the educated unemployment level of diplomas and bachelor amounts is 13.13%. This reality reflects that Indonesian’s private higher education in Indonesia embraces a high organizational commitment from lecturers as the main actors in the teaching, research, and community service process. According to Mowdey, Porter, and Steers,
as quoted by Slocum and Hellriegel (2007), organizational commitment refers to the strength of an employee’s involvement in the organization and its identification. Organizational commitment also reflects the degree to which an employee identifies with the organization and wants to continue actively participating in it, willing to put forth effort on its behalf (Newstrom, 2015; Noe et al., 2015). Moreover, organizational commitment is the attitudinal experience of commitment that occurs apart from, or as a consequence of, day-to-day work activity (Beardwell & Thompson, 2014). Organizational commitment has three indicators; they are affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment involves the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization; continuance commitment involves commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization; and normative commitment involves employees’ feelings of obligation to stay with the organization because they should; it is the right thing to do (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Based on several research and studies in various countries, industrial, occupational, and organizations, organizational commitment influences innovative behavior, OCB, job involvement, and job performance. For example, studies by Tang, Shao, and Chen (2019) show that organizational commitment influences innovative behavior. The other studies carried out by Naiemah et al. (2017), Purnomo and Hadi (2018), López-Cabarcos et al. (2019), Teresa, Yasmina, and Sangwon (2019), Suryani, Gama, and Parwita (2019), and Grego-Planer (2019) concluded that organizational commitment affects OCB. Besides, the research result by Kappagoda (2013), Nazem and Mozaïini (2014), and Patil, Ramjaneyalu, and Ambekar (2016) prove that organizational commitment influences job involvement. Moreover, studies among scholars in various contexts and fields also indicated that organizational commitment influences job performance (e.g., Renyut et al., 2017; Destari, Lumbanraja, & Absah, 2018; Khunsoonthornkit & Panjakajornsak, 2018; Fajrin, Saragih, & Indratjahjo, 2018; Lin & Shiqian, 2018; Metin & Aslı, 2018, Suharto, Suyanto, & Hendri, 2019; Aryani & Widodo, 2020).

Similar to these studies, several kind of research and studies also showed that innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement influence job performance. For example, the research result conducted by Shanker et al. (2017), Schuh et al. (2018), and Widodo and Mawarto (2020) revealed that innovative behavior had a significant effect on job performance. The other studies by Mallick et al. (2014), Andrew and León-Cázares (2015), Sadeghi, Ahmadi, and Yazdi (2016), Aval, Haddadi, and Keikha (2017), Hidayah and Harnoto (2018), and Lestari and Ghaby (2018) concluded that OCB influences job performance. Meanwhile, research carries out by Amah and Ahiauzu (2013), Nankervis (2016), Qi and Wang (2016), and Lunardi, Zonatto, and Nascimento (2018) proves that job involvement affects job performance.
Literature Review and Hypothesis

Innovative Behavior

The various innovation literature explains that a critical innovation strategy that determines an organization’s effectiveness in managing its new product development processes is its openness to different types of knowledge sources (Robertson, Casali, & Jacobson, 2012; Gambardella & Panico, 2014; Laursen & Salter, 2014). Recently, with increasing demands and expectations and the global expansion of markets, innovation has become important for companies (Anderson et al., 2018). Hence, innovation is significant for the organization, its effectiveness, and its success (Yuan & Woodman, 2010; Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014; Razmus & Laguna, 2018). This reality indicates that innovation is essential for organizations, so modern organizations need innovative behavior from employees as an actor to create innovation in the sundry level of management and departments. Several scholars in various studies have different views about innovative behaviors, although its essence is similar. For example, innovative behavior is defined as coming up with new ideas and implementing them (Seibert et al., 2001; Ahuja et al., 2008; Bălău et al., 2012). A similar definition states that innovative behavior is the intentional introduction of new products/services or new ways of doing things through the process of idea generation and implementation (Janssen, 2000; Krizaj et al., 2014). Besides, innovative behavior also refers to the promotion and realization/implementation of ideas; the creativity concept has been seen to be only involved in idea generation (Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003) or intentional generation, promotion, and realization of new ideas within a work role, group, or organization (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Moreover, particularly in the employee context, innovative behavior relates to a method used to develop creative products and a process through which employees generate and implement new ideas to improve performance or solve work-related problems and outward expression of the inner creativity of employees (Zhou & George, 2001; Janssen, Van de Vliert, & West, 2004). According to Kleysen and Street (2001), innovative behavior, among others, can be measured through five indicators; they are opportunity, exploration, generativity, informative investigation, championing, and application.

OCB

According to Nelson and Quick (2006), OCB is one dimension of individual performance that spans many jobs. OCB also refers to employee behavior that exceeds the work-role requirement and discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee’s formal job requirements but which promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Kinicki & Fugate, 2012; Robbins & Coulter, 2016). OCB also reflects employee actions carried out based on volunteerism and outside of their role that can make a positive contribution to the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization (Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Organs in Günay, 2018), and individual behavior that is not regulated by the organization, and that reward systems are not formally calculated, for example, to help a colleague, to work overtime if needed. However, this behavior will drive
the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization's overall functioning (Peleaşă, 2018; Spitzmuller, van Dyne, & Ilies, in Hanafi, Soebyakto, & Afriyanti 2018). Bolino and Turnely, as quoted Schultz and Schultz (2006), state OCB related to putting forth the effort, doing more for your employer than the minimum requirements of your job. It includes such behaviors as taking on additional assignments, voluntarily assisting other people at work, keeping up with the developments in one’s field or profession, following company rules even when no one is looking, promoting and protecting the organization, and keeping a positive attitude and tolerating inconveniences at work. As quoted by Tschannen-Moran (2004), Organs identify five indicators of OCB; these are altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue.

Altruism is related to the priority of other people's interests. Conscientiousness reflects the nature of caution. Courtesy is linking to being polite and obedient. Sportsmanship refers to sportiveness and positivity. In contrast, civic virtue is an association with wisdom or good membership.

**Job Involvement**

The variety of organizations needs job involvement from all members, in particular, to develop job performance. High-performance work systems and high job involvement have been demonstrated in the literature on strategic human resources management (Olievera & Rocha, 2017). Job involvement is the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, concerned with one’s present job, and also the positive feelings felt by employees related to the work, as well as the motivation and effort they give in the job (Paullay et al., 1994; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Besides, job involvement also represents the degree to which an individual identifies with his or her work, both at work and outside it (Brown, 1996), and how much work can meet the needs of an individual (Christian, Garza, & Slaugher, 2011). Therefore, job involvement reflects the work-related attitude, which refers to the relative strength of employees’ emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with their employing organization (Macinati & Rizzo, 2016). There are three indicators that can be used to see an employee involved in his work. First, participation active in work. Active participation can interpret as someone's attention to something, and with that attention, it can be seen how much employee attention, care, and control are part of it. Second, showing work is the main thing. If the employee feels that his work is the main thing, the employee will always try his best. Third, he/she considers work as important to his/her self-esteem. If the work is considered meaningful and valuable both materially and psychologically for the worker, then the worker will appreciate and will do his job as well as possible so that work involvement can achieve, and the employee feels that their work is important to his self-esteem (Robbins & Judge, 2013).
Job Performance

Job performance is very important for organizations, including educational organizations, such as universities. Vosloban (2012) states that employee performance largely determines organizational growth. According to Brumbruch, as quoted by Armstrong (2009), performance means both behaviors and results. Behaviors emanate from the performer and transform performance from abstraction to action. Not just the instruments for results, behaviors are also outcomes in their right - the product of mental and physical effort applied to tasks and judges apart from results. In perspective human resources management, job performance is about behavior or what employees do, or a set of employees accomplish organizational goals, not about what employees produce or the outcomes of their work (Aguinis, 2013; Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2016). Besides, job performance also refers to the function of individual performance on the specific tasks consisting of standard job description (Yozgat, Yurtkoru, & Bilginoglu, 2013), or the value of the set of employee behavior that contributes, either positively or negatively, to organizational goal accomplishment (Colquitt, Lepine, & Wesson, 2015). According to Aguinis (2013), job performance can be viewed from a contextual performance, which includes those behaviors that contribute to the organization’s effectiveness by providing a suitable environment in which task performance can occur, such as: persisting with enthusiasm and exerting extra effort as necessary to complete one’s task activities successfully; volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job; helping and cooperating with others; following organizational rules and procedures; and endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives.

Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis

Based on several kinds of research and studies in various countries, industrial, occupational sectors, and organizations can develop a conceptual framework with the effect of organizational commitment on job performance, either direct or indirect effect mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement as visualized in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework
In line with the conceptual framework above, the research hypothesis can formulate as follows:

H₁: Organizational commitment had a direct effect on innovative behavior.
H₂: Organizational commitment had a direct effect on OCB.
H₃: Organizational commitment had a direct effect on job involvement.
H₄: Organizational commitment had a direct effect on job performance.
H₅: Innovative behavior had a direct effect on job performance.
H₆: OCB had a direct effect on job performance.
H₇: Job involvement had a direct effect on job performance.
H₈: Organizational commitment had an indirect effect on job performance mediating by innovative behavior.
H₉: Organizational commitment had an indirect effect on job performance mediating by OCB.
H₁₀: Organizational commitment had an indirect effect on job performance mediating by job involvement.

**Research Methods**

This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. The survey involved a research participant of 245 permanent lecturers of private higher education in Indonesia spread across 10 provinces determined by purposive sampling based on certain characteristics (Widodo, 2019), namely permanent lecturers. The number of samples is by following Hair et al. (2010) who argue that the suitable sample size is between 200 to 300. If the sample size becomes too large (> 300), the method becomes very sensitive so it is difficult to get good goodness-of-fit measurements.

The data was collected by a questionnaire in the form of a Likert scale model with five alternative answers: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. The questionnaire was made by researchers themselves based on the theoretical indicators of the experts. The organizational commitment questionnaire consists of 10 items with an alpha coefficient = .935, innovative behavior consists of 10 items with an alpha coefficient = .978, OCB consists of 10 items with an alpha coefficient = .877, job involvement consists of 10 items with an alpha coefficient = .871, and job performance consists of 10 items with alpha coefficients = .884. Data analysis using the path analysis and to test the significance of the path coefficient uses a t-test and Sobel (Z) test supported by descriptive statistics. The profile of research participants is present as follows:
Table 1. Profile of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>65.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. &lt; 26 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 26 – 35 Year</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 36 – 45 Year</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 46 – 55 Year</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &gt; 55 Year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bachelor (S1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Postgraduate (S2)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PhD (S3)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Married</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>86.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unmarried</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. &lt; 5 Year</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 6 – 10 Year</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 11 – 15 Year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &gt; 16 Year</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the majority of gender is male (65.71%), ages 26 - 35 years (35.51%), postgraduate education (73.88%), marital status (86.12%), and length of work <5 years (33.47%).

Result and Discussion

Result

The descriptive statistical analysis for the five research variables is present, as followed in Table 2. The mean values of the five variables from the lowest to the highest in succession are innovative behavior (40.31), OCB (40.50), job performance (41.82), organizational commitment (42.75), and job involvement (44.06).
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>40.31</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>41.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>5.234</td>
<td>7.963</td>
<td>6.460</td>
<td>4.550</td>
<td>4.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>27.393</td>
<td>63.413</td>
<td>41.735</td>
<td>20.705</td>
<td>21.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>10474</td>
<td>9877</td>
<td>9923</td>
<td>10795</td>
<td>10245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of hypothesis testing with path analysis of the effects of organizational commitment on innovative behavior, OCB, job involvement, and job performance are summarised in Table 3 and visualized in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. All the hypotheses were supported (t-value/Z value > t-table/Z table at α= .01 and .05). That means the organizational commitment had a significant direct effect on innovative behavior, OCB, job involvement, and job performance; innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement had a significant direct effect on job performance; and organizational commitment had a significant indirect effect on job performance mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement.

Table 3. Summary of path coefficients and t values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>T Value / Z Value</th>
<th>Hypothesis Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁: Organizational commitment (X) on innovative behavior (Y₁)</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂: Organizational commitment (X) on OCB (Y₂)</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃: Organizational commitment (X) on job involvement (Y₃)</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄: Organizational commitment (X) on job performance (Y₄)</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅: Innovative behavior (Y₁) on job performance (Y₄)</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆: OCB (Y₂) on job performance (Y₄)</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₇: Job involvement (Y₃) on job performance (Y₄)</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₈: Organizational commitment (X) on job performance (Y₄) mediating by innovative behavior (Y₁)</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₉: Organizational commitment (X) on job performance (Y₄) mediating by OCB (Y₂)</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₀: Organizational commitment (X) on job performance (Y₄) mediating by job involvement (Y₃)</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
As present in Figure 2 and Figure 3, the test results of the goodness of fit statistics indicate significant with Chi-Square = 0.000, df = 0, p-value = 1.00000 > .05 and RMSEA = .000 < .08, so that the model tested is fit. That means empirical data from lecturers in Indonesia support the theoretical model being test.

**Discussion**

The result of this research proves that organizational commitment had a significant effect on job performance, either directly or indirectly, mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. The result also indicates that the theoretical model was in accordance (fit) with empirical data from lecturers in Indonesia. This finding confirms that organizational commitment, innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement are essential determinants for job performance. Moreover, innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement play a significant role as a mediator of organizational commitment to job performance. These findings were consistent with other research results in various countries, industrial, occupational, and organizations used as a reference to develop this research hypothesis.

Besides, the results of this study also indicate the vitality of organizational commitment as an antecedent for innovative behavior, OCB, job involvement, and job performance. Organizational commitment of the lecturer of private higher education manifested in affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991) and turned out to encourage the development of innovative behavior, OCB, job involvement, and job performance among lecturers. This is in line and consistent with studies conducted by researchers that organizational commitment influences innovative behavior (Tang, Shao, & Chen, 2019), OCB (e.g., López-Cabarcos et al., 2019; Teresa, Yasmina, & Sangwon, 2019; Suryani, Gama, & Parwita, 2019; Grego-Planer, 2019), job involvement (e.g., Kappagoda, 2013; Nazem & Mozaiini, 2014; Patil, Ramanjaneyalu, & Ambekar, 2016), and job performance (e.g., Khunsoonthornkit & Panjakajornsak, 2018; Lin & Shiqian, 2018; Suharto, Suyanto, & Hendri, 2019; Aryani & Widodo, 2020). This empirical fact confirms that organizational commitment is vital for private higher education so that leaders of private higher education need it, and it is crucial to accelerate the lecturer’s organizational commitment. Consequently, private higher education leaders must
actively drive the lecturer’s organizational commitment through various activities such as training, workshops, and counseling, both internal and external.

This study also found that innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement play an important role as mediators in organizational commitment to job performance. This evidence reveals empirical facts that the existence of innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement needs to consider in the context of increasing job performance through organizational commitment. Efforts to increase job performance will be better if conducted by improving organizational commitment to improving innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. This has the consequence that leaders and managers of private higher education need to develop and manage optimally innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement through various possible approaches, strategies, and methods.

This study also finds a new empirical model of the effect of organizational commitment on job performance mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement based on private higher education lecturer's data in Indonesia. This model can be discussed, used as a reference, or adopted by researchers and practitioners as inbuilt job performance models.

**Conclusion**

This research proves that organizational commitment significantly affects job performance, either directly or indirectly, by mediating innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. Therefore, a fit research model about the effect of organizational commitment on job performance mediating by innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement with the lecturer's research field of private higher education in Indonesia was found as a new model. This model can be discussed, used as a reference, or adopted by researchers and practitioners with inbuilt models of job performance based on actual conditions and context. For the researcher, the model can be further developed and explored into research more comprehensively, by adding variables and indicators or another statistical approach, for example, structural equation modeling (SEM) by SmartPLS. For practitioners, the model can use or adopted to increase the job performance of the lecturers or employees through improving organizational commitment, innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement. In practice, the leaders or managers of organizations need to manage and maintain organizational commitment, innovative behavior, OCB, and job involvement optimally through approach, strategy, and methods.
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