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ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine how much the contribution of satisfaction and work commitment to work motivation and discipline, the contribution of work motivation to work discipline, and the contribution of satisfaction and work commitment to work discipline indirectly through work motivation. This research is quantitative. The population in this study were all employees in the Central Kalimantan LPMP which numbered 107 people. The sampling technique used was a simple random sampling technique which amounted to 91 people. The technique of collecting data using a Likert scale questionnaire. Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis and path analysis. The results of the study show that the variables of satisfaction, commitment, and work commitment contribute significantly to work discipline, both contributions are given directly or indirectly.
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Introduction

An organization in carrying out its program, demanded the implementation time following the planning so that it required discipline of all employees to be able to complete the work according to the organization’s goals (Agyare et al., 2016).

Discipline is very important for organizational growth, used primarily to motivate employees to be able to discipline themselves in carrying out work both individually and in groups. Also, the discipline is beneficial in educating employees to comply with and enjoy existing regulations, procedures, and policies so that they can produce good performance ((Mangkunegara & Octorend, 2015; Eka, 2018). High discipline can be influenced by several things, including the presence of motivation that grows in employees, satisfaction in work, and high commitment to the organization (Sari, Siburian, & Wau, 2017; Sohail et al., 2014; Arifin, Sullaida, & Nurmla, 2018).

Job satisfaction is an individual thing (Belias et al., 2015). Each individual has a different level of satisfaction according to the value system that applies to him (Kadarisman, 2012; Hajdukova, Klementova, & Klementova, 2015). Job satisfaction is an attitude or emotional reaction that arises from an employee, which describes his feelings for the work that is charged to him.
Work motivation is a work motivation that arises in a person to behave in achieving a predetermined goal (Wahjosumidjo, 1994). Behavior that arises in a person or subordinate in the framework of motivation as a management concept, driven by the need. Thus, the need is the driving force (motivation) of someone to behave in the direction of achieving goals (Kuswati, 2020). Some things that can arouse employee motivation include decent wages, a pleasant working atmosphere, opportunities to develop, the need for recognition, and the need for achievement (Rimadias, Ferli, & Hertingkir, 2016; Azar & Shafighi, 2013; Ali et al., 2015).

Organizational commitment is the level at which a worker identifies himself with the organization and its objectives - and wants to maintain its membership in the organization (Handoko, 2004; Rossenberg et al., 2018). His desire to maintain work in the organization is something that supports employee commitment to the organization (Pranita, 2017; Al Zeifiti & Mohamad, 2017; Sharma & Sinha, 2015). This can occur if employees feel security and satisfaction in work (Hakim & Hidayat, 2018; Dalkrani & Dimitriadi, 2018; Gangai & Agrawal, 2015), following the opinion of Steers (Sopiah, 2008) states three factors that influence the commitment of an employee, those are (1) personal characteristics of workers, including his tenure in the organization and variations in needs and different desires of each employee, (2) the characteristics of work, such as job identity and the opportunity to interact with colleagues, (3) work experience, such as the reliability of the organization in the past and the ways other employees express and discuss their feelings about the organization.

To achieve organizational goals and individual development of employees, discipline is one part of the integration function which is also part of operative functions in managing human resources (Mangkunegara, 2004). Understanding of discipline taken from the opinion of Keith Davis (Mangkunegara, 2004), can be interpreted as the implementation of management to strengthen organizational guidelines.

One problem that often arises in organizations is work discipline. This happens to employees because of dissatisfaction or indeed disrespectful attitudes and behavior. This guess is strengthened by the empirical results of Parwita’s research (2013) which states that job satisfaction is related to the level of discipline in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. This attitude and behavior are theoretically related to the low commitment of employees which causes indiscipline behaviors. Complaints that arise include discrepancies between types of work with the ability to work, workloads that are considered not balanced with other jobs, less suitable between workload and benefits obtained, and lack of attention in completing work. This is also what causes a decrease in employee motivation.

Generally, if satisfaction and motivation in working decreases, it will result in a decrease in the level of discipline of employees at work (Dewi, Mahanggoro, & Urmila, 2018). Based on the observation of identity in the form of employee trust in the organization, the existing organizational goals have not fulfilled some of the employee's personal goals (Sabir, 2017). Besides, employee involvement or participation in work activities has not shown the involvement of all employees in working together, both with leaders and colleagues (Tepret & Tuna, 2015). This causes employees to feel heavy in carrying out the decision because they feel that it is not the result of a joint decision (Saleem, 2015). In other words, the commitment of employees becomes low (Sariwulan et al., 2017).
Contribution of job satisfaction, commitment, and work motivation to the work discipline

Material and Methods

This research is quantitative, using quantitative methods which are interpreted as research conducted on a particular population or sample with the aim of testing the predetermined hypothesis (Sugiyono, 2014). Quantitative research is used to answer the problem formulation in the study, namely to find out is there a contribution to satisfaction and work commitment to work motivation, contribution to satisfaction and work commitment to work discipline, contribution to work motivation on work discipline and to determine the effect of independent variables on dependent variables directly or indirectly through intervening variables. Following the formulation of the problem, the analysis technique that will be used is path analysis.

The population of this research is 107 employees in the Central Kalimantan LPMP. The sampling technique uses a simple random sampling technique, with a total sample of 91 people. The method of collecting data using a Likert scale questionnaire using five choices of answers. Before the questionnaire is used, the validity test and reliability test are first performed. After that, it is necessary to know whether the data collected has met the analysis requirements with the planned technique. Considering that the study uses correlation analysis, then some of the required test requirements analysis includes homogeneity test, normality test, linearity test, heteroscedasticity test, and multicollinearity test.

Furthermore, the data analysis technique in this study uses path analysis. In the path analysis, the variables analyzed by causality are divided into two groups, namely exogenous variables and endogenous variables. Exogenous variables are variables whose variables are assumed to occur not because of the causes in the model or in other words this variable does not affect. While endogenous variables are variables whose variations are explained by exogenous variables or other endogenous variables in the system (Juanim, 2004: 20). Exogenous variables in this study are job satisfaction and work commitment and exogenous variables are work motivation and work discipline. The results of determining the path diagram model and structural equation are presented as follows:

![Figure 1. Research structure variable model](image)

Results and Discussion

Data Description

From the results of the class interval calculation and the total score of the research data, it is included in the table according to the category as shown in the following table.
Table 1. Summary of data description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary in Table 1 shows that of the 91 respondents as the research sample, it can be seen that the job satisfaction variable respondents chose the answer in the Very High category of 8.79, the answers in the High category were 71.43%, the Enough category was 19.78%, and other categories 0%. In the variable work commitment, the respondent's answer chose the High category of 67.03%, the Enough category was 32.97%, and the other category was 0%. In the variable work motivation, the respondent's choice of the High category is 94.51%, the Enough category is 5.49%, and the other category is 0%. Furthermore, in the work discipline variables, respondents who chose the answer in the High category were 81.32%, the Enough category was 18.68%, while the other categories were 0%. Generally, each variable as a percentage in the High and Sufficient categories, this indicates that in the four variables, the respondent already feels that his expectations are met for the organization.

**Homogeneity test**

Testing is done by comparing the significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ with the rules of decision as follows:

- $p$-value $> \alpha$, then the variance is normal
- $p$-value $< \alpha$, then the variance is not normal

The summary of the homogeneity test results can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Homogeneity test of variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with work motivation</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0,254</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with work discipline</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0,201</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment to work motivation</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0,087</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment to work discipline</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0,055</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation towards work discipline</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0,293</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the test results, it appears that all $p$-values (significance) are greater than significance $\alpha = 0.05$, or $p$-value $> 0.05$. So, it can be concluded that all variables are homogeneous.

**Normality test**

Test for normality or suitability of distribution using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as a test statistical tool used to test the distribution of sample values. The rules of decision as follows:

- $p$-value $> \alpha$, then the variance is normal
- $p$-value $< \alpha$, then the variance is not normal

The summary of the results of the normality test for each variable can be seen in the following table:
Table 3. Normality test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value of Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work discipline</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the test results, it appears that all p-values (significance) are greater than significance $\alpha = 0.05$, or p-value $> 0.05$. So it can be concluded that all variables are homogeneous.

**Linearity test**

The guideline used to see the linearity of relationships in the SPSS version 21 application is to observe the path of *dev. from linearity*. If the path is smaller than the F table, it can be concluded that the relationship is linear, provided that:

- Fcount $>$ Ftable, data is not a linear pattern
- Fcount $<$ Ftable, linear pattern data

The summary of the linearity test results can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. Linearity test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction for work motivation</td>
<td>Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>Linier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction for work discipline</td>
<td>Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>Linier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment for work motivation</td>
<td>Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>Linier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment to work discipline</td>
<td>Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>Linier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation for work discipline</td>
<td>Deviation from Linearity</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>Linier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the value Fcount of job satisfaction on motivation of 1.352, variable on job satisfaction on discipline is 0.822, commitment on motivation variable is 1.722, commitment on discipline variable is 1.747, and discipline on work motivation variable is 1.603. While the value of F table is obtained from each variable in sequence, namely: 1.64; 1.64; 1.80; 1.80; and 1.74. The value of Fcount the entire variable $<$ Ftable, thus it can be concluded that there is no deviation from linearity.

**Heteroscedasticity test**

The Glejser test is done by regressing between the independent variables and their residual absolute values. If the significance value between the independent variables with absolute residuals is more than 0.05 then there is no problem with heteroscedasticity.

The summary of the heteroscedasticity test results can be seen in the following table:

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction and commitment to work motivation</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>No problem of heteroscedasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>Satisfaction and commitment to work motivation</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>No problem of heteroscedasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction, commitment, and motivation</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>No problem of heteroscedasticity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be continued
Data stated that there is no problem of heteroscedasticity if the value of Sig. > 0.05. Table 6 shows that the Sig. for satisfaction and work commitment in the satisfaction model and work motivation to work motivation are 0.767 and 0.112 respectively. While the value of Sig. for satisfaction, commitment, and motivation in the satisfaction model, commitment, and work motivation for work discipline, each of them is 0.432; 0.563; and 0.680 Value Sig. all variables > 0.05, so it can be concluded that there is no problem of heteroscedasticity.

### Multicollinearity test

Multicollinearity test by looking at the value inflation factor (VIF) in the regression model and comparing the value of the individual coefficient of determination ($r^2$) with the value of determination simultaneously ($R^2$). In general, if VIF is greater than 5, then the variable has a multicollinearity problem with other independent variables.

The summary of the multicollinearity test results can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction and commitment</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>No problem with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to work motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>Satisfaction and commitment</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>No problem with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to work motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction, commitment,</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>No problem with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and motivation towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>Satisfaction, commitment,</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>No problem with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and motivation towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation</td>
<td>Satisfaction, commitment,</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>No problem with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and motivation towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Path diagram of analysis results
Data stated that there is no multicollinearity problem if the VIF value is ≥ 5. Table 7 shows that the VIF value of satisfaction and work commitment in the satisfaction and work commitment model on work motivation is 1.015. While the value of Sig. for satisfaction, commitment, and motivation in the satisfaction model, commitment, and work motivation towards work discipline, each amounting to 1.068; 1.113; and 1.132. VIF values are all variables <5, so it can be concluded that there are no multicollinearity problems.

Based on the results of the path coefficients in substructure I and substructure II, it can be described as a whole which illustrates the causal relationship between exogenous variables towards endogenous as follows:

The results of the path coefficients in substructure I and substructure II are changed to the structural equation as follows.

Substructure Equations I:
\[ Z = \rho ZX_1 + \rho ZX_2 + \rho X_1 \text{ and } R^2_Z = 0.117 \]
\[ Z = 0.215X_1 + 0.294X_2 + 0.940 \text{ and } R^2_Z = 0.117 \]

Substructure Equations II:
\[ Y = \rho YX_1 + \rho YX_2 + \rho YZ + \rho X_2 \text{ and } R^2_Y = 0.557 \]
\[ Y = 0.147X_1 + 0.369X_2 + 0.529Z + 0.666 \text{ and } R^2_Y = 0.557 \]

### Table 7: Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Info</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job satisfaction contribution (X1) on work motivation (Z)</td>
<td>Direct influence (negative)</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>-0.215 x -0.215 = 0.046 (4.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contribution of job satisfaction (X1) to work discipline (Y)</td>
<td>Direct influence (negative)</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-0.147 x -0.147 = 0.022 (2.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work commitment contribution (X2) on work motivation (Z)</td>
<td>Direct influence</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.294 x 0.294 = 0.086 (8.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contribution of work commitment (X2) to work discipline (Y)</td>
<td>Direct influence</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.369 x 0.369 = 0.136 (13.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contribution of work motivation (Z) to work discipline (Y)</td>
<td>Direct influence</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.529 x 0.529 = 0.280 (28.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contribution of job satisfaction (X1) to work discipline (Y) through work motivation (Z)</td>
<td>Indirect influence</td>
<td>-0.215; -0.147; 0.529</td>
<td>-0.215 x -0.147 x 0.529 = 0.0167 (1.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contribution of work commitment (X2) to work discipline (Y) through work motivation (Z)</td>
<td>Indirect influence</td>
<td>0.294; 0.369; 0.529</td>
<td>0.294 x 0.369 x 0.529 = 0.0574 (5.74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution of job satisfaction to work discipline**

The variable job satisfaction significantly contributes directly to the work discipline of 2.20% with changes in the opposite direction. This study found that job satisfaction contributes significantly to the work discipline of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees. But because of the nature of the change in the opposite direction, then if job satisfaction has been fulfilled, it will reduce the discipline of...
employees to work. In other words, if employee job satisfaction has been achieved, it will reduce discipline in work. This can be understood because in the results of this study, descriptively the level of job satisfaction has been achieved in high and very high categories. Job satisfaction is closely related to employee needs, so that if his life needs are stagnant (unchanged), then his discipline in work will also be reduced because he doesn’t know what else he works harder.

Job satisfaction can be realized if the analysis of job satisfaction is associated with work performance, absenteeism, desire to change the age of the worker, level of office, and size of the organization (Ayranci & Ayranci, 2015; Bahani, 2013). The job satisfaction affects the level of discipline of employees, meaning that if satisfaction is obtained from work then the discipline of employees is good.

Some supporting studies were conducted by Fitria and Amar (2015) in the Tanah Datar District Financial and Asset Management Service (DPPKA) which resulted in a significant influence between job satisfaction and work discipline. Likewise, with the results of the research by Parwita (2013) who conducted a study at a Lecturer at the Mahasaraswati University in Denpasar, one of the conclusions stated that job satisfaction is positively correlated with work discipline.

Contribution of job satisfaction to work motivation

Job satisfaction variables significantly contribute directly to work motivation of 4.60% with changes in the opposite direction. This study found that job satisfaction contributed significantly to the work motivation of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees. But because of the nature of the change in the opposite direction, then if job satisfaction has been fulfilled, it will reduce the motivation of employees to work. In other words, if employee job satisfaction has been achieved, it will reduce his motivation to work (Suhartono, 2015). This can be understood because in the results of this study, descriptively the level of job satisfaction has been achieved in high and very high categories. Generally, someone works to fulfill their needs. If his life needs are stagnant (unchanged), then his motivation to do something more will also decrease.

Mangkunegara (2004) states that "job satisfaction is a feeling that supports or does not support employees who are related to their work or their condition". This is if associated with the understanding of work motives following the opinion of Winkel (1983) which states, "motives are forces that encourage individuals to carry out certain activities to achieve goals". Even Herzberg’s Two-Factor Motivation Theory (Thoha, 2007) always connects work motivation to work satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Some of the supporting studies include Wardhani, Susilo, and Iqbal (2015) at PT. ABC Industrial Malang shows that motivation consisting of hygienic factors and motivator factors has a significant effect on job satisfaction, and hygiene factors more influence than motivator factors. Also, research conducted by Can (2016) on Bank Nagari employees concluded that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction at Bank Nagari. This means that if the employee’s work motivation is getting better at carrying out the tasks given to him, it indicates the level of satisfaction is getting better.

Contribution of work commitment to work discipline

The variable work commitment significantly contributes directly to work discipline by 13.6%. This means that the higher the work commitment of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees, the higher the work discipline of employees. Discussion of commitment is more on the emphasis on individuals (employees) in identifying themselves in the acceptance of values, rules, and goals of the organization. Ivancevich, Konopaske, and Matteson (Sandjojo, 2011) explain that "commitment to an organization involves three attitudes, those are: (i) a sense of recognizing organizational goals, (ii) a sense of involvement in organizational tasks, and (iii)
feeling loyalty to the organization ". The same thing was also conveyed by Sopiah (2008) who concluded that "organizational commitment is a psychological bond of employees in organizations that are characterized by the presence of (1) trust and strong acceptance of organizational goals and values, (2) willingness to strive for achievement the interests of the organization, and (3) a strong desire to maintain a position as a member of the organization ".

The results of this study are supported by research conducted previously by Parwita (2013) in the form of study results at the Lecturers of Denpasar Mahasaraswati University Foundation who in one conclusion stated that organizational commitment is positively correlated with work discipline. This can be interpreted that if the lecturers are committed to Mahasaraswati University, then they will be more disciplined. Other research was conducted by Fitriani (2015) conducted on teachers at the SMPN Kampar District, who also concluded that there was a significant effect of organizational commitment to the work discipline of the teachers of SMPN Kampar District. Also, a study conducted by Septiani, Sunuharyo, and Prasetya (2016) conducting a study on employees of AJB Bumiputera 1912 Celaket Malang Branch, revealed that organizational commitment had a significant influence on work discipline with a beta value of 0.639.

**Contribution of work commitment to work motivation**

Work commitment variables significantly contribute directly to work motivation of 8.60%. This means that the higher the work commitment of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees, the higher the work motivation of employees.

Commitment is an attitude that reflects employee loyalty to the organization and the ongoing process of the organization, where members of the organization express their concern for the success of the organization. Commitment is also part of the attitude that affects various individual behaviors so that an organization can run effectively. This is according to what was stated by Luthans (2006) which states, "organizational commitment is most often defined as (1) a strong desire to remain as a member of a particular organization; (2) the desire to strive according to the wishes of the organization; and (3) certain beliefs and acceptance of organizational values and objectives ".

The results of this study are supported by the results of previous studies conducted by Wardhani, Susilo, and Iqbal (2015) for employees at PT. ABC Industrial Malang. In one of the conclusions, it was stated that the results of the study showed that hygiene factors and motivator factors had a significant effect on organizational commitment, and hygiene factors had more influence on organizational commitment than motivator factors. Also, research conducted by Can (2016) on employees at Nagari Bank also concluded that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on Bank Nagari organizational commitment. The hope is, by paying attention to the issue of work commitment, not only does work motivation improve, but also performance will improve (Suharto, Suyanto, & Hendri, 2019). Previous research conducted on 274 public elementary school teachers in Banjarmasin City showed that there was a significant relationship between commitment and performance (Suriansyah, 2014).

**Contribution of work motivation to work discipline**

Work motivation variables significantly contribute directly to work discipline by 28.0%. Compared to the other two variables, work motivation variables have the greatest influence on work discipline. This shows that the higher the work motivation of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees, the higher the work discipline of employees.

Motivation is a desire in someone who influences or encourages him to act or behave in a certain way to achieve certain goals based on his needs. In line with Herzberg’s opinion (Thoha, 2007) with Herzberg’s Two-Factor Motivation Theory, which divides motivation into two factors, namely hygiene
factors and motivational factors. Herzberg’s theory is supported by Usman (2011) mentioning hygienic factors as health (extrinsic) factors consisting of supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, pay and security, and company policy. While motivational factors as satisfying factors (intrinsic) consisting of achievement (achievement), recognition (recognition), work itself, responsibility, as well as growth and development.

Some supporting studies include the research conducted by Fitriani (2015) on teachers at the SMPN Kampar District, where one of the research conclusions reads that there is a significant effect of motivation on the work discipline of the teachers of SMPN Kampar District. The correlation value was obtained at 0.440 (p<0.05). Motivational contribution to teacher work discipline is 0.189 or 18.9%, while the remaining 82.1% is influenced by other factors. Then, the research conducted by Fitria and Amar (2015) in the Tanah Datar District Financial and Asset Management Service (DPPKA) found that the direct effect of work motivation on work discipline was 10.6%. The remaining 4.4% and 3.6% and indirect effects of work motivation on work discipline because there is a relationship (relationship) with a commitment to provide additional influence by 85%. Also, a study conducted by Prihantoro (2012) in a madrasa case study in the Salafiyah Foundation, Kajen, Margoyoso, Pati can be taken as an explanation that motivation influences the performance of human resources means that better motivation will improve the performance of human resources, while discipline also affects the performance of human resources, meaning that the better the discipline will improve the performance of human resources.

Contribution of job satisfaction to work discipline through work motivation

Job satisfaction variables contribute indirectly to work discipline through work motivation of 1.67%. This means that the higher the satisfaction and work motivation of LPMP Central Kalimantan employees, it will give the effect of increasing employee work discipline.

Contribution of work commitment to work discipline through work motivation

Work commitment variables contribute indirectly to work discipline through work motivation of 5.74%. This means that the higher the commitment and work motivation of LPMP Central Kalimantan employees, it will give an effect of increasing employee work discipline.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Following the results of the research and discussion conducted in this study, conclusions can be drawn as follows: 1) There is a significant contribution of job satisfaction to the work discipline of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees with a contribution value of 2.20%. 2) There is a significant contribution of job satisfaction to work motivation of LPMP Central Kalimantan employees with a contribution value of 4.60%. 3) There is a significant contribution of work commitment to the work discipline of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees with a contribution value of 13.6%. 4) There is a significant contribution of work commitment to work motivation of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees with a contribution value of 8.60%. 5) There is a significant contribution of work motivation to the work discipline of Central Kalimantan LPMP employees with a contribution value of 28.0%. 6) There is an indirect contribution of job satisfaction to work discipline through work motivation of LPMP Central Kalimantan employees with a contribution value of 1.67%. 7) There is an indirect contribution of work commitment to work discipline through work motivation of LPMP Central Kalimantan employees with a contribution value of 5.74%.

Recommendations are conveyed to 1) Central Kalimantan LPMP leaders should be able to maintain employee work motivation because in general provide the greatest contribution to work discipline, pay attention to the competence of each employee in carrying out their duties because this is closely related
to the level of employee discipline, paying attention to the attitude of each employee in working groups to be able to increase satisfaction in work, maintain continuance of employee commitment to the organization because it contributes greatly to discipline, and increases supervision of employees to be able to improve employee motivation. 2) For Central Kalimantan LPMP employees who want to improve and improve their discipline, it is better to maintain motivation in work, improve competence in carrying out their duties, maintain attitudes towards fellow employees, maintain the continuity of the organization and continuance commitment to the organization, and make improvements from the supervision of the leader.
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