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ABSTRACT

The study aimed to find the direct influence and indirect influence the behavior of the task (X 1) and behavioral relationships (X 2), and the commitment (Z) on performance (Y). The population in this study are all employees of cooperatives in district Jember Patrang at 58 employees. This population also acts as a research method a sample or population (census). The method used is the type of survey methods research explanation. Data analysis techniques were used to examine the influence of independent variables and dependent variables against is the technique of analysis use path analysis. Path analysis results obtained show that the direct influence of behavioral tasks (X 1) against commitments (Z) has a value of 0.378. Direct influence behavior relationships (X 2) against commitments (Z) has a value of 0.394. Direct influence the behavior of the task (X 1) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.279. Direct influence behavior relationships (X 2) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.215. Influence of direct commitment (Z) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.394. While not directly influence the behavior of the task (X 1) against performance (Y) through (Z) is the commitment of 0.149. Relationship behavior (X 2) against performance (Y) through (Z) is the commitment of 0.085. This means the task behavior (X 1), behavioral relationships (X 2) and commitments (Z) effect significantly to performance (Y), with each there are elevated levels of task behavior (X 1), behavioral relationships (X 2) and commitments (Z) then it will affect performance.
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Introduction

Business environment lately is undergoing very rapid changes. Companies cannot easily predict what will happen in tomorrow because of everything into a versatile undetermined. In a business environment that is increasingly complex and ever-changing as currently required leadership capable of anticipating the future, which is more relevant to a complex situation like this now. With a leadership that can anticipate the problems that will be encountered in the future then the leader will be able to manage human resources in human resources are potentially high.

Situational leadership based on the relationship between the levels of guidance and direction (task behavior)
given the leader and the levels of support socioemotional (behavior relationships) provided a leader in performance, function or purpose (Hersey dan Blanchard, 1995:81). Task behavior is the leader of the organizing effort levels and sets the role group members (followers) describes the activity of each Member as well as when, where, and how to solve them (Hersey dan Blanchard, 1995:185). While the behavior of the relationship is the leader of the effort levels build the personal relationships among themselves and with other members of their group with wide-open channels of communication, provides support socioemotional, psychological, and ease behavior. A good leader must be able to assess the level of maturity of its employees first before setting the behavior where appropriate to apply to employees (Hersey dan Blanchard, 1995:185).

Commitment is the driving factor for employees to work more diligently in order to increase employee performance. Commitment arising on every employee aware of the responsibilities that have been given to him to run with the company as well as possible. With a leader like that then the employees will have a high commitment to the company by working more productive again so that the performance of employees will also increase.

Based on the description in the article is the problem formulation: (a) whether a task has any effect on the commitment of the employees. (b) Whether the behavior relationship has an impact on employee commitment. (c) whether a task has any effect on the performance of employees. (d) Whether the behavior relationship has an impact on employee performance. (e) whether commitments have an impact on the performance of employees. So the goals to be achieved in this article are as follows: (a) To observe and analyze the behavior of the task has an impact on employee commitment. (b) to observe and analyze the behavior relationship has an impact on employee commitment. (c) to observe and analyze the behavior of the task has an impact on employee performance. (d) to observe and analyze the behavior relationship has an impact on employee performance. (e) to know and analyze the commitments have an impact on the performance of employees.

Research Methods
The Draft or Design Research
The design of the research used in this research is explanatory research.

Types and Sources of Data
The data used in this research is the primary data obtained from interviews and the dissemination of the questionnaire related to the variables examined. Secondary data in this study include obtained indirectly through book readings related to the variables examined, the data obtained from the internet, and journals that exist.

Populations and Samples
Population data collected in the study are all the accounts officer amounted to 58 people. According to Arikunto (2006:131) when the subject of the population less than 100 better taken all, whereas when the subject of more than 100 then taken a 10% to 15% of the population. Therefore this research using the method of the study population (census).

Methods of Data Analysis
Analytical tools used in this study is the analysis of Path Analysis.

Research Results
Test Validity and Rehabilitate

Testing the validity of the shows the extent to which the measure can be used to measure what is supposed to be measured Sugiyono (2007). Whether or not a valid instrument can be seen from the product moment correlation (r-female) > 0.3 Sugiyono (2012). Test Validity can be seen in Table 1.1

Table 1.1 Test Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Corelation of Item</th>
<th>$R_{hit}$</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the behavior of the task (X₁)</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>0,570</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0,800</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>0,770</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>0,715</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>0,693</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral relationships (X₂)</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>0,638</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0,640</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>0,508</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>0,649</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>0,642</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment (Z)</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>0,733</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0,731</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>0,805</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>0,709</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>0,690</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance (Y)</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>0,608</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0,658</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>0,705</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>0,674</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>0,618</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

Based on Table 1.1 above, it can be noted that the research instruments used have score product moment more than 0.3 with a significance level less than 5 percent so that all the grain in the instrument is said to be valid.

Reliability testing aims to know the reliability of the measuring instrument or the measurement tool used to measure consistent if the same object more than twice. The instrument reliability is an

Table 1.2 Test Reliability
The behavior of the task
behavioral relationships
the behavior of the task
behavioral relationships
commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value α</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>Reliabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>Reliabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>Reliabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>Reliabel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

**Methods of Data Analysis**

Path Analysis was done by using multiple linear regression analysis. Based on Table 1.2, can note that Alpha Cronbach of the whole instrument is approaches and use the help of SPSS 14 greater than 0.2. This shows that the for windows. Path coefficient test results measurements can provide consistent (Path's) direct influence is presented in results when carried out measurement table 1.3 again against the same subject.

Table 1.3 Line direct influence Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Independent</th>
<th>Variable Dependent</th>
<th>Coefficient Standardize</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the behavior of the task</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Signification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral relationships</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Signification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the behavior of the task</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>Signification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral relationships</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>Not Signification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Signification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

Table 1.3 shows that most influential relationships dominant behavior towards commitments with direct influence 0.394 coefficient line or line of conduct towards relationships commitment is the most powerful line, in addition, there is also the most powerful line with the same value, namely a commitment to performance with direct line 0.394 coefficient. Then followed by the path of the behavior of the task heading commitments with direct line coefficient in 0.378, behavioral tasks towards a review with direct path coefficient 0.279, behavioral relationships towards performance with the direct path coefficient of 0.215. Based on the test results and the significance of paths coefficients, then the shape of the diagram of the path line test results are presented in Figure 1.1 below:
4.3.7

Calculation Line

This section describes the calculation of comparison of direct influence the behavior of the task (X 1) and behavioral relationships (X 2) against performance (Y) and influence the behavior of the task (X 1) and behavioral relationships (X 2) against performance (Y) through the intervening variables commitment (Z). Based on Figure 1.1 about Trimming based on path analysis model Theory is obtained: a. the influence Directly (Direct Effect or DE):

1. Variable assignment behavior Influence (X 1) against commitments (Z)
   \[ DE_{x_1} = X_{→Z} \]
   \[ DE_{x_1} = 0,378 \]

2. Behavioral variables Influence the relationships (X 2) against commitments (Z)
   \[ DE_{x_2} = X_{→Z} \]
   \[ DE_{x_2} = 0,394 \]

3. Variable assignment behavior Influence (X 1) against performance (Y)
   \[ DE_{yx_1} = X_{→Y} \]
   \[ DE_{yx_1} = 0,279 \]

4. Influence of the variable (Z) commitments on performance (Y)
   \[ DE_{yz} = Z_{→Y} \]
   \[ DE_{yz} = 0,394 \]

b. Influence Indirectly (Indirect Effect or IE):

Influence of indirect testing is done by looking at the results of the testing line where, if all of the lines that traversed a significant direct influence then not too significant, and if there is at least one line that is not significant then no direct influence is said to be not significant.

1. Variable assignment behavior Influence (X 1) on performance (Y) commitments (Z)
   \[ IE_{yx_1} = X_{→Y} \]
   \[ IE_{yx_1} = (0,378) (0,394) \]
   \[ = 0,149 \]

2. Behavioral variables Influence the relationships (X 2) against performance (Y) through a commitment (Z)
   \[ IE_{yx_2} = X_{→Y} \]
   \[ IE_{yx_2} = (0,215) (0,394) \]
   \[ = 0,085 \]

Table 1.4 Coefficient of indirect Influence Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Independent</th>
<th>Variable Intervening</th>
<th>Variable Dependent Performance</th>
<th>Coefficient Standardization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>behavior of the task</td>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>0,149</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional</td>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>0,085</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

Based on the results of testing on the table like a line coefficient of 1.3 and 1.4 table, then the model can be in the form of the equation system (simultaneous equations). Path analysis in the form of the equation is presented as follows:

\[ Z = 0,378X_1 + 0,394X_2 \]
\[ Y = 0,279X_1 + 0,215X_2 + 0,394Z \]
A Classic Assumption Test

a. Test Multikolinieritas

Multikolinieritas is a testing of the related assumption that free variables in a model are not mutually correlated with each other. To find out the symptoms of the presence of a linear regression model in multikolinieritas compounds can be made by looking at VIF, multikolinieritas is considered to occur when the VIF > 5. Multikolinieritas test results for the first line is presented in table 1.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

Table 1.6 Test Multikolinieritas For Second Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

From 1.5 to 1.6 table this indicates that the regression model for the first and second line has a value of VIF < 5. Then it can be inferred that the regression model for line 1 and line two multikolinieritas symptoms did not occur.

b. Test Heteroskedasticity

This assumption is aimed to find out whether a regression model error buffer that has the same variant or not (Gujaratı 1999). Good regression models are not happening heteroskedasticity, Glejser test done by done by way of absolute regression free variables with residual. If the test value is known partially shows numbers greater than 5%, then it is not happening heteroskedasticity. Conversely, if the number is less than 5% then occurs heteroskedasticity.

Table 1.7 Test Heteroskedastisitas For the First Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The significance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>Sig &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

Table 1.7 Test Heteroskedastisitas For Second Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The significance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>Sig &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Data Processed

From result table 1.7 to 1.8 for regression models of that first and second line has a value greater than 0.05 significance. Then it can be inferred that the regression model for line 1 and line two Heteroskedastisitas symptoms did not occur.

c. Test for Normality

Test of normality was done for the purpose of testing whether in a regression model, the dependent and independent variables or both have a normal distribution or not. To know the shape of the distribution of the data can use the graphs Plot the PP. On the graphs Plot, a PP Gaussian data will be detected by looking at the spread of data (point) on the diagonal axis of the chart. The basic decision making (Santoso, 2001:214) : 1) When data is spread around the diagonal line and follow the direction of a diagonal line, then the regression models meet the assumption of Normality. 2) When data is spread far from the diagonal line and did not follow the direction of a diagonal line, then the regression model does not satisfy the assumption of Normality.
Testing normality based on Figure 1.2 to 1.3 knowable images on the first and second lines of the data spread around the diagonal line and follow the direction of the diagonal lines, so that the regression models satisfy the assumption of normality.

d. Autocorrelation Test

Autocorrelation test aimed at testing whether in a linear regression model of multiple there is the correlation between the error of a bully in the period t of a bully with an error in the period t-1. Guide to find out whether or not the autocorrelation occurred are as follows: (Santoso, 2001:215).

a. If the coefficient under DW-2 means there is positive autocorrelation
   b. If DW coefficient between-2 to + 2 means there is no autocorrelation
   c. If the coefficient DW above + 2 means there is a negative autocorrelation.

According to the table, Durbin-Watson can note that on the first line has a coefficient of Durbin-Watson (DW) of 1.278 while on the second line has a coefficient of Durbin-Watson (DW) amounting to 1.293. Through these data it can be concluded that in the first and second lines have a coefficient of DW in between-2 to + 2, which means there is no autocorrelation. So in the regression models meet the assumptions of autocorrelation.

Discussion

From the research that has been conducted against the respondents amounted to 58 employees at the cooperative in Kec. Patrang Jember then obtained data on the respondent’s employees. Based on the results of testing hypotheses and path analysis showed that the direct line, the hypothesis put forward there are accepted and some rejected. While not directly on the hypothesis proposed is acceptable. Path analysis results obtained show that the direct influence of behavioral tasks (X 1) against commitments (Z) has a value of 0.378. Direct influence behavior relationships (X 2) against commitments (Z) has a value of 0.394. Direct influence the behavior of the task (X 1) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.279. Direct influence behavior relationships (X 2) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.215. Influence of direct commitment (Z) against performance (Y) has a value of 0.394. While not directly influence the behavior of the task (X 1) against performance (Y) through (Z) is the commitment of 0.149. Relationship behavior (X 2) against performance (Y) through (Z) is the commitment of 0.085. This means the task
behavior (X 1), behavioral relationships (X 2) and commitments (Z) effect significantly to performance (Y), with each there are elevated levels of task behavior (X 1), behavioral relationships (X 2) and commitments (Z) then it will affect performance.

**The Influence Of Task Behavior (X1) Against Commitments (Z)**

In the first hypothesis explained that there are influences between task behavior (X 1) against commitments (Z). After doing the testing and analysis, then drawn the conclusion that the task behavior (X 1) effect significantly and positively toward commitment (Z) on cooperatives in Kec. Patrang Jember. This can occur because the employee can explain to leaders about what to do, how to do it, when this is done, for what, how much it will cost, from where, and with whom to do it. Leaders who have given strong direction (task behavior) to its employees would make the employee can have a high commitment to the company.

Moreover, this condition can be seen from the indicator on task behavior can already be applied in cooperatives in Kec. Patrang Jember as share duties in accordance with the position so that they can be responsible for tasks with which they can, giving direction to employees before carrying out his duties in order to minimize the error rate performed by the employee, give the deadline for implementing the tasks so that employees can be disciplined and better appreciate the time, coordinate the work situation as comfortable as possible so that employees working at home, and control the execution of the duties so as not to out of the rules has been established the company.

Based on the test results obtained by the direct line that behavior affects task commitment, in addition to the test result line, it is known that indirect influence behavior affects task performance commitments. This can be interpreted that if leaders implement task behavior to employees will be able to affect the commitment and performance of employees. Evidenced by the number of respondents who expressed consent to the statement above, that is, as much as 29 respondents to the first item, 29 respondents to the second item, third item for respondent 23, 35 respondents to the fourth item, and 33 respondents for the fifth item.

**The influence of Behavioural relationships (X 2) against Commitments (Z)**

Basic of the second hypothesis there is influence between behavioral relationships (X 2) against commitments (Z). From the test results and analysis of the data obtained by that behavior affects relationships commitment on cooperatives in Kec. Patrang Jember. This happens because employees felt that its leaders had enough implement two-way communication towards their employees, namely by providing support, in the spirit of the work. Although there are a few items that still felt less like haven't been able to listen to the aspirations of their employees well. An employee who feels that he deemed necessary to help reach and success of the company will have its loyal attitude/high commitment to the company that working with a more enterprising because a high organizational commitment will tend to provide positive effects on performance of employees.

**The influence of Task Behavior (X 1) against performance (Y)**

On the third hypothesis mentioned that there is the influence on the behavior of the task against performance on cooperatives in Kec. Patrang Jember. Testing and analysis of the results obtained that the third hypothesis is accepted. This is because the item stating that the leader provides support to employees at the time of executing the work could affect morale
in employees to work so that the performance of employees on the rise, leaders communicate with subordinates at the time of carrying out the task can affect performance because employees feel closer to the leader and get to know its leaders well, leaders listen to the aspirations of the employees can affect performance because of the employees will feel valued and considered by its leader that he will be more excitement in the work so that its performance can be increased, the leaders interact with employees so that the power relations between the leaders with their employees not too far so employees can better get to know the leaders closer, so employees can continue to increase performance because it feels is matched by its leaders, and the leaders help employees when is facing a problem and provide the best solution to resolve the issue, so that employees will feel indebted because its leaders so care about their employees and they will try their best in working with so that performance is improved. The fifth indicator is shown to affect the performance of the employees.

On the research in addition to finding the existence of a direct influence on the behavior of the task against performance, also finds influence indirectly the task behavior on performance commitments. By providing behavioral tasks to employees in accordance with the maturity of each employee so employees will be required by the company to increase the success of the company. So the commitment of employees will be increased and the performance will also increase.

The influence of Behavioural relationships (X 2) against performance (Y)

On the fourth hypothesis explained that there is no relationship between behavior influence on performance. Based on testing and data analysis then is drawn the conclusion that the relationship of behavior has no effect on performance. This condition because employees felt that its leader is less oriented towards two directions (relationship behavior) in the lead of their employees. They just got a one-way communication from their leader that is only given the task and then carried out in the absence of socioemotional and psychological support from its leaders. While on a two-way communication it is necessary for the granting of support, encouragement, strike-struck psychologically, and facilitate employee behavior is given by its leaders. In this regard, leaders are actively listening and support the efforts of employees in the performance of their work. With the use of two-way communication (mutual) between the leadership with their employees in the decision-making process (determining program) and its implementation is expected to improve the performance of employees.

Based on the test results obtained by direct line relationship behavior that has no effect on performance. But from the results of testing the line influence indirectly aware that influential relationship behavior on performance commitments. Based on the results of testing that the influential relationship behavior on performance commitments, this can be taken to mean that the absence of commitment behavior relationship will have no effect on the performance of employees.

The Influence Of Commitment (Z) Against Performance (Y)

On the fifth hypothesis, there is the commitment to influence performance. Based on the test results and analysis of the data it can be stated that the fifth hypothesis is accepted. In the results of this research, it can be concluded that the difference in age difference also gives employees how to respond to the policies and regulations that set out the company. Most employees agree that the difference
in age distinction anyway on how to respond to the policy and regulations due to the young age of employees who are likely to violate the regulations set out because they have not been able to understand and they feel the legislation can restrict their ability in the work. The longer the employee work shows a high commitment on companies, employees agree with that's because employees working longer will have the sense of love to the company because they've been able to adjust to the company they work for. Placement of employees at a particular position can affect the results because if the Office is not in accordance with the background knowledge and skills of the employees they will not possess the spirit in work so that its performance will also decrease. How leaders lead their employees greatly affect performance because when employees get leaders who can adjust the level of maturity of its employees in applying the behavior then the employees will work in the spirit so that it can improve performance. The high organizational commitment will likely provide positive effects on the performance of employees. In addition, organizational commitment can be a psychological tool in running the Organization for the achievement of the expected target.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Conclusion

Based on the results of research on cooperatives in Kec. Patrang Jember and the results of data analysis on the influence of X and Y, then Z against the conclusion that:

1. Task Behavior (X 1) significantly and positively effect directly against the commitment of the (Z).
2. Behavioral relationships (X 2) significantly and positively effect directly against the commitment of the (Z).
3. Behavioral tasks (X 1) significantly positive and direct effect on performance (Y).
4. Behavior relationships (X 2) have no significant direct and positive influence on performance (Y). Commitment (Z) is significantly positive and direct effect on performance (Y).

Suggestions

Based on the discussion and the conclusions that have been put forth, then suggestions that need to be delivered are:

1. Cooperative Leader in muzzle velocity. Patrang Jember has led his employees well but would be even better if it can raise it. Given the tasks that run the engineer and Assistant Engineer, then a leader in applying his behavior should be adjusted to the level of maturity of its employees. For low levels of a single employee, you should implement the behavior of leaders tasks to employees, by explaining to employees about what to do, how to do it, when this is done, for what, how much does it cost, from where, and with whom to do it. As for employees who have a high level of maturity then it should apply the leader behavior relationship to employees with a two-way relationship that is by way of providing support, creating a reciprocal communication back, listening to the aspirations, given the opportunity to socialize with the colleague and help the problems being faced by the employees. But should the application of the behavior of the task given to the employee more than the behavior of the relationship.
2. To further enhance the commitment of the employees so that its performance can be
increased, the company should be paying attention to the issue of granting compensation to its employees such as salaries, benefits, and bonuses. If an employee is already felt fulfilled by the comfortable company then they will always improve performance and once on the company without feeling concerned for their welfare as a form of reciprocity for the company.

3. To academics and researchers next candidate expected to be able to expand his studies in the field of path analysis considering this important analysis tools to measure a theory as a basis of reference in order to develop insight as well as concept development the theory of situational leadership style in relation to the commitment and the performance of the employee, be able to examine other factors that have not been examined in this study are related to the situational leadership styles, employee commitment and performance as well as make questionnaire for leaders to be able to equate the results of a questionnaire distributed to employees.
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