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This study aims to determine the effect of task competence, placement and organisational commitment on the performance of the lecturers of the Airforce command and staff college. This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. The total population of 108 lecturers and a sample of 85 peoples was obtained through Slovin, based on the formula, which was taken by stratified random sampling. Data collection using a questionnaire with a Likert scale of 1 to 5. Analysis equipment using path analysis with Excel and SPSS version 22. The results showed that: 1) Task competence has a positive and significant effect on performance; 2) Placement has a positive and significant effect on performance; 3) Organisational commitment has a positive and significant effect on performance; 4) Task competence has a positive and significant effect on organisational commitment; 5) Placement has a positive and significant effect on organisational commitment; 6) Task competence has a positive and significant effect on placement.
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Introduction

Air Force Command and Staff College as a vocational education institution is tasked with educating Indonesian Air Force officers who are experts in strategic and operational air force operations. Success dimension depends on lectures, because lecturers are professionals in charge of planning and implementing the learning process, assessing the results of learning,
coaching and training, and conducting research and community service (Law 20/2003: Article 39, paragraph 2).

This phenomenon shows the duplication of tasks between the specific education (vocational) and scientific dimension. The low performance is because of less precisely competent and academic qualifications of lecturers, i.e., not by the Law on Teachers and Lecturers stating that the faculty have minimum academic qualification for a doctoral program graduates (Law 14/2005: Article 46, paragraph 2b).

While at the time the post of Air Force lecturers minimum of two years and a maximum of three years (Air Force HQ, 2012). In a short time, the post of lecturer affects the performance. The condition of lecturer's effect the attitude and commitment where the lecturer covers the principles of life, corps spirit, and moral responsibility for this duty. The fact that the lecturers have been soldiers since recruitment does not specially prepare them to be a lecturer. The main tasks are air defence, which raised the organisation's strong commitment of main instruments and air weapons systems.

Armstrong and Taylor (2014) state behavioural performance and results. Performance as a result of work can be achieved by a person in a work unit by the authority and responsibility of each in achieving the objectives of the unit legally which does not violate the law, and is not contrary to morals and ethics (Air Force HQ, 2012). The standard refers to various aspects of the performance of specific purposes, including quality, quantity, and timing (Aguinis, 2013). The dimensions of performance consist of quality work, a quantity of work, knowledge of the work, creativity, cooperation, reliable, initiative and personal qualities (Sedarmayanti, 2013).

Dessler (2013) defines competence as a characteristic that can be represented by a person including knowledge, skills, and behaviours that lead to increased performance. Air Force HQ (2012) defines competence as the capabilities and characteristics of the form of knowledge, skills, and behaviour. Measurement of competency is based on three things: knowledge of the field of duty, expertise/skills of task areas and behaviour. Placement or placement process of assignment or reassignment of workers is to do a job or occupy a new position in the company (Hanggraeini, 2014). Staffing must match the qualifications of employees with the needs and requirements of an office or employment (Yuniarsih and Suwatno, 2011) (Dessler, 2009). The basic policy positions placements in the Air Force officers are officers' proper placement in the right position, with qualified soldiers. The timing of the post of Air Force officers for soldiers is at least two years and a maximum of three years taking into account the needs of the organisation and coaching career (Air Force HQ, 2012). In the proposed placement of the office for the Air Force officers, the factors taken into consideration are: qualifications required in each office; work performance and potential; individual quality with attention to talents, interests and personal characteristics;
experience position/assignment; education and training; seniority without compromising quality; duty officer for a minimum period of office promotion; career patterns and turn the assignment/placement area (Air Force HQ, 2012).

The attitudes and principles of a soldier's life, and sacrifices of high consequence become a strong commitment, because: 1) a warrior should uphold the values and ethics of heroism; 2) Sapta Marga and the soldier's oath as a spirit of devotion and code of ethics soldering should be carried out; 3) loyalty among fellow soldiers, compactness, and the corps spirit felt very beautiful; 4) The soldier as a life choice has given pride and outstanding joy (ArmyHQ, 2006). If their commitment to the organisation is high, they will carry out their duties to the maximum and produce high performance. This performance affects organisational performance in achieving its goals (Wirawan, 2014). A study shows that a positive relationship exists between organisational commitment and desired outcomes such as high performance (Luthans, 2011).

Method

This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. A population of 108 lecturers and a sample of 85 people who obtained this based on the formula by Slovin was taken by stratified random sampling. Collecting data using a questionnaire with a Likert scale of 1 to 5 to reveal their attitudes towards work. The attitude scale instrument contains both positive and negative statements that have been tested for validity and reliability. Data were analysed using path analysis with Excel and SSPS 22 version.

Results

The results of the significance test and linearity test regression are summarised in table 1.
Table 1: Summary Significance Test Results and Linearity Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Regression equations</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Linearity test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y over X1</td>
<td>( Y = 112.07 + 0.99X1 )</td>
<td>35.31 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y over X2</td>
<td>( Y = 65.98 + 0.62X2 )</td>
<td>33.24 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y over X3</td>
<td>( Y = 77.88 + 0.62X3 )</td>
<td>38.56 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 over X1</td>
<td>( X_3 = 83.79 + 0.62X1 )</td>
<td>13.50 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 over X2</td>
<td>( X_3 = 54.15 + 0.39X2 )</td>
<td>13.34 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 over X1</td>
<td>( X_2 = 107.70 + 0.45X1 )</td>
<td>7.32 *</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information:
* : Significant (F> Ftable)
ns: Non-significant (linear regression): (F<Ftable)

Significance and Regression Linearity Performance \((Y)\) on Task Competency \((X1)\)

From the regression equation \( \hat{Y} = 112.07 + 0.99X1 \), because score greater F = 35.31 by a score Ftable = 3.96, then conclude the performance regression equation \((Y)\) on the competence of the assignment \((X1)\) is significant. Linearity test, a score of F = 0.59, and Ftable = 1.80 score on the error rate \( \alpha = 0.05 \). These results indicate that the smaller F score by a score Ftable that concluded the performance regression equation \((Y)\) on the competence of the assignment \((X1)\) linear.

Linearity Regression Significance Test and Performance \((Y)\) on Placement \((X2)\)

From the regression equation \( \hat{Y} = 65.98 + 0.62X2 \), because the score of F = 33.24 less than the score of Ftable = 3.96, then conclude the performance regression equation \((Y)\) on the placement \((X2)\) is significant. Linearity test, a score of F = 1.11 and Ftable = 1.73 score on the error rate \( \alpha = 0.05 \). These results indicate that the score of F smaller than the score Ftable then concluded the performance regression equation \((Y)\) on the placement \((X2)\) linear.

Linearity Regression Significance Test and Performance \((Y)\) on Organisational Commitment \((X3)\)

From the regression equation \( \hat{Y} = 77.88 + 0.62X3 \), scores of F = 38.56, while the Ftable = 3.96 score on the error rate \( \alpha = 0.05 \). Because the score of F = 38.56 is greater than the score Ftable = 3.96, it can then be concluded that the performance regression equation \((Y)\) on
organisational commitment (X3) is significant. A linearity test obtained a score of $F = 1.13$ and $= 1.71$. The $F$-table score on the error level $\alpha = 0.05$. These results indicate that the score of $F$ smaller than the score $F$-table then concluded the performance regression equation ($Y$) on the linear organisational commitment (X3).

**Linearity Regression Test Significance and Organisational Commitment (X3) on Task Competence (X1)**

From the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 83.79 + 0.62X_1$, scores of $F = 13.50$, while the $F$-table = 3.96 score on the error rate $\alpha = 0.05$. Because the score of $F = 13.50$ is greater than the score $F$-table = 3.96, it can then be concluded that the regression equation organisational commitment (X3) on the task competence of the assignment (X1) is significant. Linearity test is obtained a score of $F = 0.94$ and $= 1.80$ F-table score on the error level $\alpha = 0.05$. These results indicate that the score of $F$ is smaller than the score in the $F$-table then it concluded that the regression equation for organisational commitment (X3) on the task competence of the assignment (X1) is linear.

**Linearity Regression Test Significance and Organisational Commitment (X3) on Placement (X2)**

From the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 54.15 + 0.39X_2$, scores of $F = 13.34$, while the score $F$-table = 3.96 at a rate of error $\alpha = 0.05$. Because of $F = 13.34$ is greater than $F$-table = 3.96, then conclude the regression equation organisational commitment (X3) on placement (X2) is significant. Linearity test is obtained a score of $F = 1.48$ and $= 1.73$ F-table score on the error level $\alpha = 0.05$. These results indicate that the smaller $F$-hitung score by score $F$-table, it is concluded that the regression equation for organisational commitment (X3) on placement (X2) linear (Airforce, 2012); (Airforce, 2013).

**Significance and Linearity Regression Task Competence (X1) on Placement (X2)**

From the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 107.70 + 0.45X_1$, scores and scores of $F = 7.32$ F-table = 3.96 at the error rate $\alpha = 0.05$. Because score of $F> score F$-table then concluded the placement regression equation (X2) on task competence of the assignment (X1) is significant. Linearity test is obtained a score of $F = 1.48$ and $F$-table score = 1.80 on the error level $\alpha = 0.05$. Results $F$ smaller score than score $F$-table, then concluded the placement variable regression equation (X2) on task competence variable assignment (X1) linear.
Hypothesis Test

Substructural First Model, consists of a constant, competency assignments (X1), placement (X2), and organisational commitment (X3). Path analysis results of a calculation the structural first model are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Results Path Analysis Substructural First Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardised</th>
<th>standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>43.070</td>
<td>11.620</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substructural First Models presented on the figure 1

Figure 1. Substructural Line Diagram First Model

Based on the analysis of data obtained path coefficient (py1) = 0.336, with a score of t (4.070), and the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05. This fact reveals that the scores t (4.070) greater than the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. That is the path coefficient significant py1 with a contribution of 0.336. This finding is interpreted that the task competence of the assignment (X1) has a positive effect on lecturer performance (Y).

Based on the analysis of data obtained, the path coefficient (py2) = 0.321, with a score of t (3.899), and the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05. The fact revealed that scores of t (3.899) greater by score ttable (1, 99) at α = 0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. That is the
path coefficient significant $\beta_2$ with a contribution of 0.321. These findings are interpreted that placement ($X_2$) has a positive effect on lecturer performance ($Y$) (Ministry of Research and Technology and Higher Education, 2005) (Nur'aeni, 2011).

Based on the analysis of data obtained path coefficient ($\beta_3$) = 0.318, with a score of $t$ (3.725), and the score table (1.99) at $\alpha = 0.05$. This fact reveals that the scores $t$ (3.725) are greater than the score table (1.99) at $\alpha = 0.05$, then $H_0$ is rejected and $H_a$ accepted. That is the path coefficient is significant at $\beta_3$ with a contribution of 0.318. These findings are interpreted as organisational commitment ($X_3$) has a positive effect on lecturer performance ($Y$).

**Substructural Second Model**, consists of a constant, task competence assignments ($X_1$) placement ($X_2$). Count Results Path Analysis Substructural Second are presented in Table 3, while the second substructural model line diagram presented in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients unstandardized</th>
<th>standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>50.894</td>
<td>12.506</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Substructural Line Diagram Second Model**

Based on the analysis of data obtained, the path coefficient ($P_{31}$) = 0.292, with count score (2.861) and the score table (1.99) at $\alpha = 0.05$. This fact reveals that the scores $t$ (2.861) greater by score table (1.99) at $\alpha = 0.05$, then $H_0$ is rejected and $H_a$ accepted. That is the path coefficient significant $P_{31}$ with a contribution of 0.292. This finding is interpreted that the competence of the assignment ($X_1$) positive influence on lecturer organisational commitment ($X_3$).
Based on the analysis of data obtained, the path coefficient (p32) = 0.289, with a score of t (2.825), and the price table score (1.99) at α = 0.05. This fact reveals that the scores t (2.825) is greater than the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. That is the p32 pathway significant coefficient with a contribution of 0.289. These findings are interpreted that placement (X2) has a positive influence on lecturer organisational commitment (X3).

**Substructural Third Model**, consists of a constant, variable of task competence (X1). Count Results Path Analysis Substructural Third Model are presented in Table 4 and diagram substructural lane 3 is presented in Figure 3.

**Table 4. Results Path Analysis Substructural Third Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients Unstandardised</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>107.702</td>
<td>4.757</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>2.706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Substructural Line Model Diagram**

Based on the analysis of data obtained, the path coefficient (p21) = 0.285, with a score of t (2.706) and the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05. the revealed that scores t (2.706) is greater than the score ttable (1.99) at α = 0.05, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. That is the p21 pathway significant coefficient with a contribution of 0.285. This finding is interpreted that the task competence of the assignment (X1) has a positive effect on the lecturer placement (X2). Summary path coefficient testing are presented in Table 5.
Table 5: Path Coefficient Testing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>Coefficient Lane</th>
<th>dk</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ttable</th>
<th>α = 0.05</th>
<th>α = 0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>py1</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.07 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>py2</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.90 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>py3</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.73 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P31</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.86 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P32</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.83 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P21</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.71 *</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant (t> t table)

The empirical model structural relationship between variable in figure 4 (Hanggraeni, 2014).

Figure 4. Structural Relationship Between Empirical Model Variables Based on Path Analysis Calculation Results

The results showed that: (1) Task competence positive and significant effect on the lecturer’s performance; (2) Placement positive and significant effect on the lecturer’s performance; (3) Organisational commitment positive and significant effect on the lecturer’s performance; (4) Task competence have positive and significant effect on the lecturer’s organisational commitment; (5) Placement is positive and has a significant effect on the lecturer’s organisational commitment; (6) Task competence is positive and has a significant effect on the lecturer’s placement.
Discussion

Influence Tasks Competence on Performance

The results of the analysis of the first hypothesis provide the estimated value of a positive influence task competencies on performance at 32.1%. The results of the analysis proved a significant task competence influence on performance where a score of t (4.07) is greater than the score ttable (1.99) at the significance level (α) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. That is the path coefficient significant \( p_{y1} \) with a contribution of 0.321. These findings prove that task competence on the assignment (X1) is positive and has a significant effect on the lecturer’s performance (Y).

The construct of task competence forming the most dominant influence on performance is knowledge. Airforce Command and Staff College proved that lecturers do not have the minimum academic qualifications and graduates of doctoral programs to teach postgraduate programs. This is contrary to Act No. 14 of 2005 Article 46, paragraph 2b of Teachers and Lecturers stating that the faculty have minimum academic qualification for doctoral program graduates.

Theoretically, these results correspond to Manoppo (2011), where if the employee does not have the skills and competence as required, it will affect the performance of the generated. In a manner, the empirical results of this study are relevant to the Hidayati research (2014), Kayanil et al. (2011), Paloste and Uusiautti (2011), which concluded that task competence will have a positive and significant effect on performance. Thus, theoretically and empirically, the results of this study indicate that the task competence have a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.

Influence Placement on Performance

The results of the analysis of the second hypothesis give the estimated value of a positive influence of performance on task competence at 33.6%. The results of the analysis proved a significant influence of the task competence on performance with a score of t (3.90) which is greater than the score ttable (1.99) at the significance level (α) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. That is the path coefficient significant \( p_{y2} \) with a contribution of 0.321. These findings prove that the placement (X2) has a positive and significant effect on the lecturer performance (Y).

The construct of forming placement most dominantly influences the performance of the qualification, work experience, and assignments. Assignment time, in a position for Air Force officer at least two years and a maximum of three years taking into account the needs
of the organisation and coaching career of the Airforce officer soldier. It is very influential on lecturer performance in teaching the scientific postgraduate program.

Theoretically, these results aligned with Simanjuntak (2011) stating that if staffing is not by the appropriate job position, it will affect performance. In a manner, the empirical results of this study are relevant with Tsani and Astini research (2013), Tanor (2014) and Tippe (2012) which concluded that placement has a positive and significant effect on performance. Thus, theoretically and empirically shows that placement positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.

**Influence of Organisational Commitment on Performance**

The results of the analysis of the third hypothesis have a positive effect on the performance of task competencies at 31.8%. The results of the analysis proved a significant influence of organisational commitment on performance where a score of $t$ (3.73) is greater than the score $t$ table (1.99) at the significance level ($\alpha$) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis ($Ho$) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis ($Ha$) is accepted. That is the path coefficient significant $py3$ with a contribution of 0.318. These findings demonstrate that organisational commitment ($X3$) has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance ($Y$).

The construct of organisational commitment forming the most dominant influence on performance is an attachment to the oath and pledge, attachment to unity (corps spirit), and moral and ethical obligation. Also, the Air Force officer since recruitment is not prepared specifically as a lecturer, but for manning the main instrument of the air weapons system.

The attitudes and principles of life of soldiers is laden with risks, consequences and high sacrifice be a strong commitment, because 1) Warriors should uphold the values and ethics of soldiering and put it into practice in earnest throughout his life; 2) Soldiers realise that Sapta Marga and the Soldier's Oath as a spirit of devotion and code of ethics soldiering should be carried out; 3) Soldiers no longer see risk as a burden, sacrifice personal interests for the sake of the unit, the nation, and the country. Loyalty among fellow soldiers, compactness, and the corps spirit felt very beautiful; and 4) The soldier as a life choice has given pride and joy were outstanding.

Theoretically, these results and Glinov aligned with the opinion McShane (2010) who states that loyal employees have higher work performance. Wirawan (2014) states that if the followers of the organisation's commitment are high, they will carry out their duties to the fullest and generate high performance. Empirical results of this study are relevant to Nura'eni
research (2011), Handoko (2010), Khan et. al (2010), Rusminingsih and Soliha (2014) found that organisational commitment positive and significant effect on performance. Thus, theoretically and empirically demonstrate that organisational commitment positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.

**Influence of Task Competence on Organisational Commitment**

The results of the analysis of the fourth hypothesis provide the estimated value of a positive influence on the performance of the task competence at 29.2%. The results of the analysis proved a significant influence on the performance of task competence with a score of $t$ (2.86) that is greater than the score $t$ table (1.99) at the significance level ($\alpha$) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis ($H_0$) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis ($H_a$) is accepted. That is the path coefficient significant of $P31$ with a contribution of 0.292. These findings prove that the task competence of assignment (X1) positive and significant effect on lecturer organisational commitment (X3).

The construct of task competence forming most dominant influence on organisational commitment is a behaviour, that can take decisions in difficult conditions. It proved that personal goals with the status of lecturers, Airforce officers are desire to remain a member of the Indonesian Airforce organisation. It is relevant to the corps spirit that is bound to the oath and the promise (Saptamarga and the Soldier's Oath). The behaviour the lecturer faces is difficult conditions in making decisions, should carry out multiple tasks simultaneously as a lecturer (vocational), and teaching the postgraduate program of a scientific nature.

Theoretically, these results aligned with Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson (2015) who state that cognitive abilities generally have a weak effect on affective commitment, continuous commitment, and normative commitment. That is, the desire to remain a member of the organisation is not affected much by the ability to a cognitive. In a manner, empirical results of this study are relevant to the research by Sudarya (2016), and Sujana (2012), which concluded that the competency assignments positive direct effect on commitment organisational. Thus, theoretically and empirically demonstrate that task competence is positive and significantly effects on lecturer organisational commitment.

**Effect of Placement on Organisational Commitment**

The results of the fifth hypothesis analysis provide the estimated value of a positive influence of the performance on the task competence at 28.9%. The results of the analysis of the task competence a prove significant influence on performance with a score of $t$ (2.83) is greater than the score $t$ table (1.99) at the significance level ($\alpha$) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis ($H_0$) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis ($H_a$) is accepted. That is the $P32$ pathway
significant coefficient with a contribution of 0.289. These findings prove that the placement (X2) positive and significant effect on lecturer organisational commitment (X3).

Construct forming placements' most dominant influence on organisational commitment is the accuracy requirements of the work and personality. Placement Airforce officers became a lecturer, not by the accuracy requirements of the job, lecturers does not have a requirement to teach postgraduate courses.

Theoretically, these results aligned with Nurjaman (2012) who state that lifting in positions based on loyalty and devotion. The empirical results of this study are relevant to the Pratama and Pratamaresearch (2013), and Enny (2016) who concluded that the positive and significant effects on placement and organisation to the commitment. Thus, in theoretically and empirically research shows that placement positive and significant effect on lecturer organisational commitment.

**Effect of Task Competence on Placement**

The results of the sixth hypothesis analysis, the estimated value of a positive influence on the performance of the task competence 28.5%. The results of the analysis proved to have a significant influence on the performance of task competence with a score of t (2.71) is greater than the score ttable (1.99) at the significance level (α) of 0.05, so that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. That is the p21 pathway significant coefficient with a contribution of 0.285. These findings prove that the task competence of the assignment (X1) positive and significant effect on the lecturer placement (X2).

The construct of task competence forming the most dominant influence assignment to the placement in terms of quality or competence, including knowledge, expertise, and skills. The main factor to be considered as a means of control for placement in the office of the lecturer is education and skills. However, lecturers have not a requirement to teach postgraduate courses of a scientific nature, so the effect task competence on placement.

Theoretically, these results are in line with the opinion of Amir (2015) who states for 'competence', he was appointed to the post in the company. While Army Headquarter (2006) states that competence is the capacity and characteristics of a soldier in the form of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary behaviour in the execution of their office so that the soldiers can carry out their duties professionally, effectively and efficiently. Empirical results of this study are relevant to research of Tippe (2012) and Mirayanti (2015) which concluded that the competence of positive and significant effect on placement. Thus,
theoretically and empirically demonstrate that the task competence positive and significant effect on placement.

Based on the description of the discussion, it is known that the low performance of lecturers influenced by the low task competence, improper placement, and lack of organisational commitment.

**Conclusion**

1. Task competence positive and significant effect on the lecturer performance. They contributed positively to influence task competence on performance at 32.1%.

2. Placement positive and significant impact on the lecturer performance of Seskoau. Contributed a positively influence of placement on performance at 33.6%.

3. Organisational commitment positive and significant effect on the lecturer performance. Contributed a positive influence of organisational commitment on performance 31.8%.

4. Task competence positive and significant effect on lecturer organisational commitment. They contributed positively with an influence of task competence on organisational commitment at 29.2%.

5. Placement positive and significant effect on lecturer organisational commitment. Contributed positively with an influence of placement on organisational commitment 28.9%.

6. Task competence positive and significant effect on the lecturer placement. Contributed positively with an influence of task competence on placement at 28.5%.
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