

Analysis of The Effect of Self-Efficiency, Position Promotion, and Work Environment on Employee Loyalty Through Job Satisfaction on Outsourcing Employees at PT Siemens Indonesia

^{1*}Dimas Prihantoro, ²Wahyu Ari Andriyanto, ³Nani Ariani

University of National Development Veterans Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email : [*dimas.prihantoro92@gmail.com](mailto:dimas.prihantoro92@gmail.com)

(Received: July 2022; Reviewed: August 2022; Accepted: August 2022;
Available online: September 2022; Published: September 2022)

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to analyze the effect of self-efficacy, job promotion, and work environment on employee loyalty through job satisfaction on outsourced employees of PT. Siemens Indonesia. Companies must pay attention to employee self-efficacy, promotion opportunities, and the employee's work environment that can lead to employee job satisfaction. These things also have an important role in increasing employee loyalty. Several studies related to this writing have also been submitted by several authors, which resulted in a positive and significant influence between these variables. The research sample used is as many as 40 respondents outsourcing employees who work at PT. Siemens Indonesia. Analysis of the data in this study using PLS analysis using PLS software Version 3.0. The results showed that there was a positive but not significant effect between self-efficacy on job satisfaction, there was a positive and significant effect between job promotions on job satisfaction, there was a positive but not significant effect between work environment on job satisfaction, and there was a positive and significant effect between job satisfaction and loyalty to outsourcing employees at PT. Siemens Indonesia.

Keywords: Self-Efficacy, Promotion, Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Employee Loyalty

INTRODUCTION

The function of human resources for the implementation and development of the company is considered important because the presence of human resources in the company is increasingly needed. The demands of business and the business world are getting bigger in the era of globalization, so that the human resources department must also have more responsibility in terms of managing and developing employees for the progress of the company. According to Hutapea and Nuriana (2008: 85-86), "the role of human resources that was previously only as a support has been changed to a strategic one, where the management of human resources needs to be aligned with the company's strategy".

Several things or strategies are carried out by companies in the context of efficiency, namely by doing their core work, while non-core work is submitted by other parties. According to Libertus (2008: 1) "one way is to hand over certain jobs to other parties through chartering services or workers/labor service providers with the aim of reducing the company's burden or known as outsourcing". According to Indrawati and Sukarni (2017), "Manpower recruitment through outsourcing is considered profitable by outsourcing service hire companies because the company can reduce operational costs and increase company efficiency. Outsourcing is the delegation of activities and daily management of a business process to an outside party (outsourcing service provider company).

According to Husni (2012: 186), "Outsourcing is basically the

practice of using labor to produce or carry out a job by a company through a labor service provider company. This shows the existence of a third party who acts as a bridge between workers and the company that requires the services of workers to do a certain job so that the company's efficiency can be carried out properly, for example, companies do not need to spend a lot of time, effort, and big costs to find prospective workers. .

According to Doni Judian (2014: 163-165), "there are 5 types that become obstacles for outsourcing workers. These 5 problems include the problem of low wages, the problem of the gap between outsourced workers and permanent workers, lack of future security, certificates being held hostage by outsourcing service providers, discrimination in the workplace". Outsourced workers in this case feel in a disadvantaged position because there are no clear regulations regarding the standard of wages received, promotions, and compensation that may be obtained if their status changes to become employees or permanent employees. The problems mentioned above cause dissatisfaction for workers so that workers tend to look for other jobs or in other words are not loyal to the company. Previous research concerning outsourcing workers with the title "Outsourcing Workforce Satisfaction Analysis of Company Services Using the Importance Performance Analysis Method" written by Fuji Rahayu Wilujeng and Reynaldi Kusumo in 2018, shows that the company's service performance has not been maximized for outsourcing employees which causes

dissatisfaction from employees. Outsourced workers. This is reflected in the accuracy of salary payments and the nominal salary received by outsourcing workers every month.

According to Nadiri and Tanova (2010) regarding the notion of job satisfaction is the result of employees' perceptions of the extent to which their work can provide such a positive emotional state. It is important for managers who believe that a company has employees who have high job satisfaction are judged to be accountable if given challenging and rewarding work.

Another thing was conveyed by Hasibuan (2003: 203) regarding job satisfaction, "a person tends to work with enthusiasm if satisfaction can be obtained from his work and employee job satisfaction is the key to driving morale, discipline, and employee performance in supporting the realization of company goals". Job satisfaction according to Handoko (2000: 193) is "a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state in which employees view their work, so employees must be placed in jobs that are in accordance with their abilities and background skills, so that they can achieve individual or company goals".

According to Robbins (2009: 113) regarding job satisfaction can increase loyalty, when employees are satisfied with their work they will try to keep coming to work and eliminate external factors, while employees who are dissatisfied with their work will stay at home. A person with a high level of satisfaction has a positive attitude about the job, on the other hand someone who is dissatisfied with his job has a negative

attitude towards his job.

Success in an organization absolutely requires loyalty from employees. According to Tommy et al. (2010) loyalty is defined as a person's loyalty to something that is not only in the form of physical loyalty, but rather non-physical loyalty such as thoughts and attention. Loyalty of employees in a company is absolutely necessary for the success of the company itself. The higher the loyalty of the employees in a company, the easier it is for the company to achieve the company's goals that have been previously set by the company owner.

The world of work today knows the word beliefs, as quoted in (www.karyaone.co.id downloaded on January 29, 2020) which is "a belief from an individual that is shown in what is said or done. Beliefs can explain how individuals can assess or evaluate an event which is then conveyed through their behavior. As explained by Bandura (1997: 116) that "self-efficacy has an effect on human behavior through various processes including cognitive processes, motivational processes, affection processes, and selection processes". Self-efficacy according to Luthans (2006) is "a reference that refers to an individual's belief about his ability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources and actions needed to successfully carry out tasks in a particular context". Self-efficacy affects employees in completing their responsibilities in order to achieve goals, both personal and corporate. Someone with a high level of efficacy is able to survive in any situation because they believe they can get through it. On the other hand, an

employee with low self-efficacy will be worried that he will not be able to complete his work and responsibilities so that it can affect his performance and company. Mishra et al (2016) stated that "increased self-efficacy is likely to encourage the growth of job satisfaction".

There is an important role in promotion where it is something that every employee or employee looks forward to. Promotions are generally given as rewards based on past efforts and achievements. According to Sondang (2010: 169) defines "promotion when an employee is transferred from one job to another with greater responsibility, a higher level of the hierarchy of positions, and a higher income". Promotion is considered to have an influence on job satisfaction because when an employee gets a promotion, it means that there is an acknowledgment of the employee's ability so that it has a positive influence for employees to work optimally.

Companies need to provide a sense of satisfaction to their employees when doing work, namely by providing a good work environment, where if the work environment is considered good, the employees will be satisfied, secure, and comfortable so that employees will be loyal to the company where they work, on the contrary environmental conditions. Bad work will cause negative effects on employees such as low morale and high turnover rates. Where it can harm the company. Sedarmayanti (2011: 21) defines the work environment as "all the tools and materials encountered, the surrounding environment in which a

person works, his work methods, and work arrangements both as individuals and as groups. The work environment includes working relationships formed between fellow employees, working relationships between subordinates and superiors, as well as the physical environment where employees work.

Companies will continue to strive to improve competitiveness by improving their management (especially human resources) and operations to make them more effective and efficient. Companies use service providers as a form of way to be able to compete and develop in the future that offers the principles of effectiveness and efficiency. According to Faslah (2010: 147), "the reality that happens a lot is that employees still think that they are company assets is just a slogan and all of that is considered far from reality". This happened because there was a discrepancy between the statement and company policy. This problem occurred in outsourced employees who worked at PT. Siemens Indonesia. Cases that occur, for example, are when the service provider sometimes does not pay their rights on time, such as overtime pay, travel (transport) fees, and annual bonuses, even though the first party (in this case PT Siemens Indonesia) has completed the payment to the service provider. Difficulty getting promotions to be appointed as permanent employees at PT. Siemens Indonesia and the influence of the work environment are another problem in this paper.

Based on the above background the authors are interested in knowing and proving the effect of self-efficacy

on job satisfaction, to find out and prove the effect of job promotion on job satisfaction, to determine and prove the effect of the work environment on job satisfaction, to determine and prove the effect of self-efficacy, promotion, and the work environment affects employee work loyalty through job satisfaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Loyalty

According to Sudimin (2003: 5) which states that "loyalty means the willingness of employees with all abilities, skills, thoughts, and time to participate in achieving company goals and keeping company secrets and not taking actions that harm the company as long as that person is still a member of the company employee".

2. Job satisfaction

According to Hasibuan (2014: 202) job satisfaction is "an emotional attitude that is pleasant and loves his job. This attitude is reflected by work morale. Another understanding of job satisfaction according to Sutrisno (2009: 74), "job satisfaction is an individual attitude towards work related to work situations, cooperation between employees, rewards received at work, and matters relating to physical and psychological factors"

3. Self Efficacy

Kreitner and Kinicki (2005:79) state "self-efficacy is a person's belief about his chances of successfully achieving a certain task". Cherian & Jolly (2013)

argue that "self-efficacy is closely related to self-control and resilience in a person in the face of failure, performance and effort in solving a problem faced by a person". Self-efficacy is "self-assessment, whether it can do good or bad actions. This efficacy is different from aspiration, because ideals describe something ideal that should be achieved, while self-efficacy describes an assessment of self-ability" (Alwisol, 2009: 287).

4. Promotion

According to Martoyo (2007:71) promotion is "a move from one position to another that has a higher status and responsibility". Meanwhile, according to Hasibuan (2008:108) promotion is "a move that enlarges the authority and responsibility of employees to higher positions within a company so that their rights, status and income obligations are getting bigger".

5. Work Environment

According to Nitisemito (2002:27), "the work environment is everything that is around the employee and can affect the employee in menjalankan tugas yang dibebankannya".

Hypothesis Developmen

- tH1: It is suspected that self-efficacy has a positive effect on job satisfaction.
- H2: It is suspected that promotion has a positive effect on job satisfaction.
- H3: It is suspected that the work environment has a positive

effect on job satisfaction.

H4: It is suspected that self-efficacy, promotion, and work environment have a direct influence on employee loyalty

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research took place at PT Siemens Indonesia, having its address at Arkadia Office Park Tower F Jl. TB. Simatupang Kav 88, Jakarta. With the aim of studying the effect of self-efficacy, promotion, and work environment on job satisfaction that results in employee loyalty. The research implementation time starts from July 2019 to December 2019.

According to Nursalam (2003: 81) research design is a strategy in achieving research objectives that have previously been set and become a guide for researchers in the entire research process. The implementation of this research will discuss the effect of the three independent variables on the two dependent variables. The variables studied consist of 5 variables, 3 are independent variables and 2 dependent variables, including: (1) Self-Efficacy, (2) Position Promotion, (3) Work Environment, (4) Job Satisfaction and (5) Employee Loyalty. Of the 5 variables, job satisfaction and employee loyalty are the dependent variables, while the other 3 variables are: (1) Self-Efficacy, (2) Position Promotion, and (3) Work Environment are independent variables.

The analytical method in this study uses partial regression analysis (Partial Least Square) to test the 4 hypotheses proposed in this study. SmartPLS 2.0 software is used to test the relationship between variables

based on each of these hypotheses. According to Abdillah & Jogianto (2009: 11), PLS is a multivariate statistical technique that makes comparisons between multiple dependent variables and multiple independent variables. PLS is a variant-based SEM statistical method designed to solve multiple regression when specific data problems occur, such as a small research sample size. According to Yamin (2011: 23-26) there are several steps in the analysis using Partial Least Square (PLS):

1. The first step is to design a structural model (inner model)
2. The second step, designing the measurement model (outer model)
3. The third step is to construct a path diagram.
4. Fourth step, model estimation.
5. The fifth step, Goodness of Fit or model evaluation includes evaluation of the measurement model and evaluation of the structural model.
6. Sixth step, hypothesis testing and interpretationasi.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of Respondent Data:

- a. Gender consists of 20% female, 80% male.
- b. age range 21-25 years with 5 respondents (12.5%), age range 26-30 years with 14 respondents (35%), age range 31-35 years with 8 respondents (20 %), 36-40 years old with 6 respondents (15%), 41-45 years old with 2 respondents (5%), 46-50 years old with 3 respondents (7.5%), and the age range is 51-55 years with 2 respondents (5%).
- c. The last education of the respondents was S1 with a total of

24 respondents or 60%. The next highest number is with high school education as many as 14 people or about 35% of the total respondents, while respondents with the last education D3 there are as many as 2 people or about 5%.

- d. Employees with 0-5 years working period are as many as 20 people or about 50%. The next highest number is with 6-10 years of service, which is 9 people or about 17.5%. The three employees with a length of service of 21-25 years are 5 people or around 12.5%, then with a length of work of 11-15 years as many as 4 people or about 10%, and with a length of service of 16-20 years as many as 2 people or 5%. Finally, there are 2 employees who have worked between 26-30 years or about 5% of the total sample, while there are no employees who have worked for 31-35 years.
- e. Measurement Model (Outer Model)
- f. The results of the validity test of the SmartPLS 3.0 initial path diagram show the Outer Mode resultsl.

Tabel 1 Outer Loading Factor Value

| | Efikasi Diri | Kepuasan Kerja | Lingkungan Kerja | Loyalitas Karyawan | Promosi Jabatan |
|-----|--------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Eda | 0.614 | | | | |
| Edc | 0.810 | | | | |
| Ede | 0.742 | | | | |
| Edf | 0.797 | | | | |
| Edh | 0.655 | | | | |
| Edj | 0.725 | | | | |
| Kkc | | 0.741 | | | |
| Kkd | | 0.784 | | | |
| Kkf | | 0.816 | | | |
| Kkh | | 0.812 | | | |
| Kki | | 0.896 | | | |
| Kkj | | 0.638 | | | |
| Lia | | | 0.680 | | |
| Lid | | | 0.767 | | |
| Lif | | | 0.695 | | |
| Lig | | | 0.728 | | |
| Lih | | | 0.669 | | |
| Lii | | | 0.804 | | |
| Lij | | | 0.697 | | |
| Lkb | | | | 0.774 | |
| Lkc | | | | 0.786 | |
| Lke | | | | 0.730 | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|-------|-------|
| Lki | | | | 0.725 | |
| Lkj | | | | 0.619 | |
| Lkm | | | | 0.767 | |
| Lkn | | | | 0.726 | |
| Pja | | | | | 0.775 |
| Pjb | | | | | 0.865 |
| Pjd | | | | | 0.758 |
| Pje | | | | | 0.785 |
| Pjf | | | | | 0.773 |
| Pjg | | | | | 0.718 |
| Pjh | | | | | 0.799 |
| Pji | | | | | 0.769 |
| Pjj | | | | | 0.775 |

The table above shows that all loading factor values are above 0.6 with the smallest value being 0.614, namely the Eda indicator and the largest value being the Kki indicator which has a value of 0.896. This shows that the indicators used in this study can be declared valid or have met convergent validity. The next way to see discriminant validity is to look at the value of the square root of average variance extracted (AVE), the goal is to find out whether an indicator in the study is valid or not. Recommended value is above 0.50

Tabel 2 Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

| | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| Efikasi Diri | 0.529 |
| Kepuasan Kerja | 0.617 |
| Lingkungan Kerja | 0.520 |
| Loyalitas Karyawan | 0.539 |
| Promosi Jabatan | 0.609 |

The next step after obtaining the validity of each variable question instrument is a reliability test. This reliability test can be seen from the results of the Smart-PLS 3.0 software output, the Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values are obtained. The table below shows that all variables can be said to have good reliability on each variable, namely self-efficacy, job promotion, work environment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty and is strengthened by the results of Cronbach's Alpha showing that all variables have good reliability. to each of the constructs.

Tabel 3 Composite Reliability

| | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Efikasi Diri | 0.820 | 0.870 |
| Kepuasan Kerja | 0.873 | 0.905 |
| Lingkungan Kerja | 0.846 | 0.883 |
| Loyalitas Karyawan | 0.857 | 0.891 |
| Promosi Jabatan | 0.920 | 0.933 |

The table above shows the results of the Cronbach Alpha output showing that the Cronbach Alpha value for all variables of Compensation, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave is above 0.6 which indicates that all variables in the estimated model meet the criteria.

Structural Model (Inner Model)

The next step is after all statements per variable are declared valid, all variables are also declared reliable, then the next step is to test the research structural model through the R Square test. The output results of the Smart-PLS 3.0 software related to the R square test are as follows:

Tabel 4 R-Square dan Adjusted R-Square Value

| | R Square | R Square Adjusted |
|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Kepuasan Kerja | 0.724 | 0.701 |
| Loyalitas Karyawan | 0.857 | 0.840 |

The value of R-Square (R2) job satisfaction is 0.724 which indicates that the contribution of the variables of self-efficacy, job promotion, and work environment to employee loyalty indirectly through job satisfaction is 72.4% while the remaining 27.6% is influenced by factors others outside of this study. The use of R-square still often causes problems, where if there is an additional independent variable then in a model the value will also increase even though the variable has a relationship or not with the dependent variable, so it is recommended to use

an adjusted R-square where when there is an additional independent variable its value can increase or decrease depending on the correlation or relationship with the dependent variable. The adjusted R-square value is definitely less than R2 and can even be negative which indicates the model is not good.

T-statistic Test

Tabel 5 Uji t-stastistik result

| | Original Sample (O) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Efikasi Diri -> Kepuasan Kerja | 0.106 | 0.596 | 0.552 |
| Promosi Jabatan -> Kepuasan Kerja | 0.538 | 3.488 | 0.001 |
| Lingkungan Kerja -> Kepuasan Kerja | 0.290 | 1.598 | 0.111 |
| Kepuasan Kerja -> Loyalitas Karyawan | 0.441 | 2.795 | 0.005 |

Based on the results of the data processing output in the table, it was obtained that H1 was rejected because even though "the failure was due to my inability to achieve it", it did not increase the employee's job satisfaction. H2 is accepted because "honesty in doing work" can increase the employee's job satisfaction. H3 was rejected because although "access to the internet needs to be improved so as not to disturb co-workers who are doing work activities" but it cannot increase the employee's job satisfaction. H4 is accepted because "the relationship with co-workers is well established" can increase the loyalty of the employee.

Discussion

Based on the results of this study indicate that there is a positive but not significant effect between self-efficacy on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis (H1) is rejected, which is indicated by the lowest mean value of the indicators on the self-efficacy variable, namely "the failure that I experienced because of my inability to achieve it" which

caused the employee's job satisfaction not to increase. This is indicated by the tcount $0.596 < t_{table} 2.03$ and the P Value $0.552 > 0.05$, where the original sample value is positive at 0.106 or in other words H1 is rejected.

Based on these results indicate a positive and significant influence between job promotions on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis (H2) is accepted, which is indicated by the highest mean value of the indicator on the job promotion variable, namely "honesty in doing work" which can increase the employee's job satisfaction. This is indicated by the tcount $3.488 > t_{table} 2.03$ and the P Value of $0.001 < 0.05$, where the original sample value is positive at 0.538 or in other words H2 is accepted.

Based on these results indicate that there is a positive but not significant effect between the work environment on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis (H3) is rejected, which is indicated by the lowest indicator on the work environment variable, namely "access to the internet needs to be improved so as not to disturb coworkers who are doing work activities" which is one of the factors that employee job satisfaction cannot increase. This is indicated by the tcount $1.598 < t_{table} 2.03$ and the P Value $0.111 > 0.05$, where the original sample value is positive at 0.290 or in other words H3 is rejected.

Based on these results indicate a positive and significant influence between job satisfaction on employee loyalty. This means that the hypothesis (H4) is accepted, which is indicated by the highest mean value on the indicator on the job satisfaction

variable, namely "relationships with coworkers are well established" which can increase employee loyalty. This is indicated by the tcount $2.795 > t_{table} 2.03$ and the P Value of $0.005 < 0.05$, where the original sample value is positive at 0.441 or in other words H4 is accepted.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate a positive but not significant effect between self-efficacy on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis (H1) is rejected which is indicated by the lowest indicator on the self-efficacy variable, namely "the failure that was experienced because of my inability to achieve it" which caused no increase in job satisfaction of outsourcing employees at PT. Siemens Indonesia. These results prove that outsourcing employees at PT. Siemens Indonesia is not satisfied if it fails to do the work they do.

- a. The results of this study indicate that there is a positive and significant influence between job promotions on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis is accepted because "honesty in doing work" which is able to increase job satisfaction of outsourcing employees of PT. Siemens Indonesia. These results reflect that employees who are honest in doing work will benefit the company because the company will judge that honest employees will have good responsibilities and experiences for the progress of the company.
- b. The results of this study indicate a positive but not significant effect

between the work environment on job satisfaction. This means that the hypothesis (H3) is rejected which is indicated by the lowest indicator on the work environment variable, namely "access to the internet needs to be improved so as not to disturb coworkers who are doing work activities" which is one of the job satisfaction factors for outsourcing employees at PT. Siemens Indonesia cannot improve. This shows that access to the internet is a factor that can increase employee job satisfaction, where nowadays access to the internet has become a necessity even in everyday life.

- c. These results indicate that there is a positive and significant influence between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. This means that the hypothesis (H4) is accepted which is indicated by the highest mean value on the indicator on the job satisfaction variable, namely "relationships with coworkers are well established" which can increase employee loyalty. This shows that the relationship between employees in the company must be maintained so that the company can get loyal employees for the company so that it is in line with the company's strategy and the achievement of company goals.

Sugesstion

- a. The research is expected to be able to conduct research on similar companies other than PT. Siemens Indonesia is different and the distribution of respondents is more diverse.

- b. This research is expected to be able to develop existing models and hypotheses by adding other variables to expand the study of science.
- c. Improving research so that the results of future research can be seen significantly on the variables of self-efficacy and work environment, namely by adding an indirect influence on further research.
- d. This research can also be applied to all types of workers, both white-collar workers, blue-collar workers, and gray-collar workers.

REFERENCES

Abdillah, W. & Jogiyanto, H. M. 2009. Concepts and Applications of PLS (Partial Least Square) for Empirical Research. Yogyakarta: Publishing Agency Faculty of Economics.

Cherian, J. & Jacob, J. 2013. Impact of self-efficacy on motivation and performance of employees. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 8(14), 80-88. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm/article/view/26770/16992>

Faslah, Roni. 2010. "The Relationship between Work Involvement and Turnover Intention of Employees of PT. Main Trimitra Guard". In the journal *Ecoscience*, volume 8 No. 2 Pg 146-151.

Ghozali, I. Latan, H. (2012). *Partial Least Square: Concepts, Techniques and Applications of SmartPLS 2.0 M3*. Semarang:

- Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.
- Ghufron, M. Nur and Risnawita S, Rini. 2010. Psychological Theories. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Handoko, T Hani. 2000. Personnel Management and Human Resources. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Hasibuan, Malaysia. 2014. Management: basics, understanding, and problems. Revised Edition. Jakarta: PT. Earth Literature.
- Henry Simamora. 2010. Human Resource Management. Grammar, Jakarta. Lubis Ibrahim.
- Husni, Then. 2012. Introduction to Indonesian Employment Law, Revised Edition. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Hutapea, Parulian and Nurianna Thoha. 2008. Competence Plus. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Main Library
- <https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20190121/12/880788/masih-relevankah-sistem-outsourcing-di-tanah-air> downloaded on 15 May 2019 at 06.36 WIB
- <https://www.karyaone.co.id/blog/efikasi-diri-karyawan/> downloaded on January 29, 2020 at 23.01 WIB
- Indrawati, C. W. and Sukarmi (2017) "The ideal concept of making a certain time outsourcing work agreement deed (study at Bank Jateng)," *Journal of Deed*, 4(3), p. 317–322.
- Jehani, Liberty. 2008. Rights of Contract Employees. Jakarta: Friends Forum.
- Yusuf, Husayn. 2010. Increase Loyalty to Improve Work Performance and Career.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. 2005. Organizational behavior. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Kuswadi. (2004). How to Measure Employee Satisfaction, Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo
- Lazear, Edward P. 2000. "Performance Pay and Productivity." *American Economic Review* 90:1346 – 61.
- Luthans, Fred. 2006. Organizational treatment. Edition 10. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Martoyo, Susilo. 2007. Human Resource Management Edition 5. First Printing. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Mishra, U.S., Patnaik, S. & Mishra, B.B., (2016). Augmenting human potential at work: an investigation on the role of self-efficacy in workforce commitment and job satisfaction. , *Polish Journal of Management* 13(1), pp.134–144.
- Nadiri, H., and Tanova, C. 2010. An Investigation of the Role of Justice In Turnover Intentions, Job Satisfaction, And Organizational Citizenship Behavior In Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, pp: 33-41.
- NitiseMITO, Alex S. 2002. Personnel Management. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia
- Nursalam. 2003. Concepts and Applications of Nursing Research Methodology Guidelines for Thesis, Thesis

- and Nursing Research Instruments. Jakarta: Salemba Medika.
- Poerwopoespito, FX. Oerip and Tatag Utomo. (2000). *Overcoming the Human Crisis in the Company*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Prabu, Anwar. *The Influence of Motivation on Employee Job Satisfaction at the National Family Planning Coordinating Board in Muara Enim Regency*. *Sriwijaya Journal of Management and Business*, Vol. 3, No. 6, December 2005.
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. 2009. *Organizational Behavior*. 13th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Sarjono Haryadi. and Julianita, Winda. 2011. *SPSS vs LISREL: An Introduction, Application to Research*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Sedarmayanti. 2011. *Human Resources and Work Productivity*. Bandung: CV Mandar Maju.
- Siagian. Sondang P. 2010. *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- Soegandh. et al. 2013. *The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Job Loyalty on Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employees of PT. Surya Timur Sakti Jatim agora*. Vol. 1, No. 1
- Sudimin. 2003. *Whistleblowing: The Dilemma of Loyalty and Public Responsibility*. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurs*. vol. 12 No. 11. p. 3-8.
- Sugiyono. 2014. *Educational Research Methods Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Approaches*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sutrisno, Edy. 2009. *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group
- Tommy, Stefanus et al. 2010. *Analysis of Motivation and Loyalty of Marketing Department Employees of PT PALMA ABADI SENTOSA in Palangka Raya*. Vol. 1 No. 2.
- Triyanto, Djoko. 2004. *Work Relations in Construction Service Companies*. Semarang: CV Mandar Maju.
- Utomo, Budi. 2002. *Determine the factors of job satisfaction and the level of influence of job satisfaction on employee loyalty PT P*. *Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 7(2), 171-188.
- Wijono, Sutarto. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Wilujeng, Fuji Rayayu and Reynaldi Kusumo. 2018. *Analysis of Outsourcing Workforce Satisfaction on Company Services Using Importance Performance Analysis Method*. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Systems*. Vol. 11, No. 2, 64-69, 2018.
- Yamin, Sofia. 2011. *New Generation Processing Research Data with Partial Least Square Path Modeling*. Jakarta: Salemba Infotek.