

The Influence of Compensation, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction on the Performance of Gojek Driver Partners in Bekasi City: Job Insecurity as an Intervening Variable

Fauzhan Firmansyah¹, Icha Vanida Putri², Osly Usman³

^{1,2,3} Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia.
Email: fauzhan.firm@gmail.com¹, dwialamn@gmail.com², oslyusman@unj.ac.id³

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: July 03, 2025
Revised: September 20, 2026
Accepted: October 15, 2026

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.52970/grdis.v6i4.1496>

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationships of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction with the performance of Gojek partner drivers in Bekasi City, with job insecurity as an intervening variable. A quantitative survey was conducted involving 126 respondents selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. The results show negative path coefficients between compensation and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.325$), work motivation and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.278$), and job satisfaction and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.312$). Job insecurity also exhibits a negative path coefficient in relation to driver performance ($\beta = -0.371$). The reported indirect-effect coefficients are positive for compensation ($\beta = 0.121$), work motivation ($\beta = 0.103$), and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.116$), suggesting that job insecurity may provide an indirect pathway linking these factors to performance. The model explains 69.3% of the variance in job insecurity and 74.2% of the variance in performance. These findings highlight the relevance of compensation, work motivation, job satisfaction, and perceived employment security in understanding performance among digital platform workers. The statistical significance of the structural and indirect effects requires confirmation through appropriate bootstrapping results.

Keywords: Compensation, Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Job Insecurity, Driver Performance.

I. Introduction

Digital labor platforms have transformed how work is organized, how workers access income-generating opportunities, and how organizations coordinate service delivery. Platform-mediated employment offers flexibility and relatively accessible entry into the labor market, but it also creates challenges concerning income stability, working conditions, and employment protection. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2021) identifies earnings, working time, social protection, and algorithmic management as important dimensions of the platform-work experience. Vallas and Schor (2020) further explain that digital platforms can expand workers' economic opportunities while retaining substantial control over transactions and work arrangements. These developments raise an important question for human resource management: how can platform workers maintain satisfactory performance when the conditions governing their work remain uncertain?

Ride-hailing services illustrate this tension. Drivers may choose when to work, yet their opportunities and earnings can depend on customer demand, incentive arrangements, application-based evaluations, and platform policies. Wood et al. (2019) demonstrate that algorithmic control can coexist with flexibility and autonomy, while also exposing platform workers to low pay, irregular working hours, and excessive workloads. Dunn (2020) similarly argues that workers evaluate platform jobs differently according to their individual circumstances, motivations, and expectations. Accordingly, flexibility alone does not adequately explain the quality of platform work or its implications for performance. The compensation drivers receive, their motivation to continue working, their satisfaction with working conditions, and their perceptions of employment security warrant joint examination.

These issues are relevant to Gojek partner drivers in Bekasi City, an urban area within the Jakarta metropolitan region where transportation services operate amid substantial mobility and competition. Drivers must respond to customer demand, manage travel time and operating costs, and maintain service quality within an application-mediated system. From a management perspective, compensation may influence how drivers evaluate the returns from their efforts, while work motivation may shape their persistence and willingness to meet service demands. Job satisfaction may reflect whether the actual working arrangements meet their expectations. Nevertheless, the extent to which these factors relate to driver performance in Bekasi City requires empirical examination rather than assumption.

Compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction represent distinct but potentially interconnected dimensions of the work experience. Compensation concerns the financial and other rewards associated with work, whereas motivation concerns the direction and persistence of work-related effort. Job satisfaction reflects an individual's evaluation of their work and its conditions. Evidence from Gojek-driver research in Indonesia has examined relationships among these variables, including the roles of compensation and motivation in job satisfaction (Sofiyah & Yulinda, 2022). More recently, Natali et al. (2026) examined compensation and motivation in relation to job satisfaction among online Gojek drivers in Palembang. These studies provide relevant context, but they do not, by themselves, establish how the three factors jointly relate to driver performance through perceived job insecurity in Bekasi City.

Job insecurity offers a potential explanation for this relationship. It refers to perceived uncertainty concerning the continuity of employment or the preservation of valued aspects of work. For platform drivers, concerns may involve future earning opportunities, changes in incentive arrangements, access to orders, or the continuation of partner status. Sverke et al. (2019), in a meta-analysis, found that job insecurity was generally associated with poorer employee performance, although the strength of the relationships varied across performance outcomes and contextual conditions. This evidence supports examining job insecurity as a relevant psychological factor in performance research. However, findings from conventional employment settings cannot automatically be generalized to platform-based work, where access to tasks and income may be governed by digital systems rather than conventional employment arrangements.

The relationship between job satisfaction and performance also requires careful consideration. Although satisfaction is frequently expected to improve performance, the relationship is not necessarily straightforward. Bowling (2007) found that the association between job satisfaction and job performance could be substantially reduced after accounting for other individual characteristics, illustrating the importance of examining explanatory mechanisms rather than assuming a direct causal relationship. A meta-analysis by Katebi et al. (2022), however, reported a positive association between job satisfaction and job performance. Taken together, these findings suggest that the relationship warrants further examination in specific occupational settings, including platform-mediated transportation services.

Despite growing research on digital labor platforms and driver working conditions, an empirical question remains concerning the joint relationships among compensation, work motivation, job satisfaction, job insecurity, and performance within a single model. Research on algorithm-based flexibility has also examined how platform monitoring and work-family conflict relate to job insecurity among gig workers (Chen & Chen, 2026). Nevertheless, the extent to which compensation, motivation, and satisfaction are associated with driver performance through job insecurity in the specific context of Gojek partner drivers in Bekasi City

remains to be established. This study addresses that question by examining compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction as explanatory variables, job insecurity as an intervening variable, and driver performance as the outcome.

The study therefore aims to examine the relationships of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction with the performance of Gojek partner drivers in Bekasi City and to assess the intervening role of job insecurity. Its empirical contribution lies in bringing these five constructs into a single analytical framework within a specific urban platform-work context. The findings are expected to inform discussions of platform-worker management, particularly the potential relevance of transparent compensation arrangements, supportive working conditions, and reduced employment-related uncertainty. By examining these relationships together, the study seeks to provide a more context-specific understanding of the factors associated with performance among Gojek partner drivers.

II. Literature Review

2.1. Compensation and Platform-Worker Performance

Compensation represents the financial and nonfinancial returns workers receive in exchange for their contributions. In platform-mediated work, compensation encompasses not only the amount earned per task but also incentives, payment arrangements, and the predictability of income. These features are particularly relevant to ride-hailing drivers because earnings depend on completed orders, operating costs, customer demand, and platform arrangements. The International Labour Organization (2021) identifies remuneration and working conditions as important concerns in digital labor platforms, while Vallas and Schor (2020) explain that platform-mediated employment creates new opportunities alongside persistent questions about control and the distribution of economic rewards. Compensation may relate to performance by shaping workers' evaluations of whether their efforts produce adequate returns. However, the relationship depends on how rewards are structured and perceived. Kurniawan (2025), in a systematic literature review, identifies compensation as a factor associated with performance outcomes while highlighting the relevance of mediating mechanisms and organizational context. For Gojek drivers, transparent and predictable compensation may support sustained work effort, whereas uncertainty about incentives may weaken the perceived relationship between effort and reward. Nevertheless, compensation should not be assumed to produce higher performance automatically, particularly when workers face high operating costs or limited control over task allocation.

2.2. Work Motivation and Platform-Worker Performance

Work motivation concerns the processes that initiate, direct, and sustain effort toward work-related goals. It includes the reasons individuals engage in particular activities and the extent to which they persist when facing difficulties. Deci et al. (2017) explain that self-determination theory distinguishes autonomous motivation from controlled motivation and emphasizes the roles of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in supporting high-quality performance and well-being. In platform work, motivation may arise from income needs, personal autonomy, achievement, recognition, or the desire to provide reliable service. Wood et al. (2019) demonstrate that platform-based work can combine worker autonomy with algorithmic control, indicating that flexibility does not necessarily translate into complete control over working conditions. Dunn (2020) also highlights the importance of workers' motivations and the quality of gig work in understanding participation in digital labor markets. Thus, motivation among Gojek drivers should be understood in relation to both individual aspirations and the operational conditions within which work is performed. Indonesian studies provide context-specific evidence. Lebang and Paulina (2022) examined motivation, work environment, competence, and compensation in relation to job satisfaction and performance among Gojek drivers in Jakarta. Sofiyah and Yulinda (2022) investigated work-life balance, organizational commitment,

motivation, and financial compensation in the context of Gojek drivers in Medan. These studies illustrate the relevance of motivational and work-related factors in platform transportation, although their findings should be interpreted within their respective models and samples.

2.3. Job Satisfaction and Platform-Worker Performance

Job satisfaction reflects an individual's evaluation of work and its associated conditions. Relevant aspects may include remuneration, the nature of the work, interpersonal relationships, recognition, and the perceived fairness of work arrangements. In platform-based transportation, satisfaction may also depend on whether drivers consider the compensation system, application procedures, customer interactions, and operational policies acceptable. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is theoretically plausible but not necessarily uniform. Bowling (2007) found that the association between job satisfaction and job performance could be substantially reduced after controlling for individual characteristics, suggesting that other factors may explain part of the relationship. In contrast, Katebi et al. (2022) reported a positive association between job satisfaction and job performance in their meta-analysis. These findings indicate that satisfaction can be relevant to performance while cautioning against assuming a universal or exclusively causal relationship. Research on Indonesian platform drivers further demonstrates the practical relevance of satisfaction. Putra and Risma (2024) examined compensation, work environment, and motivation in relation to job satisfaction among Gojek partners in Gunung Anyar. Haqi and Swasti (2024) likewise examined compensation and work motivation in relation to job satisfaction among Gojek drivers in Surabaya. Natali et al. (2026) investigated compensation and motivation among online Gojek drivers in Palembang. Collectively, these studies provide evidence that compensation and motivational conditions are relevant to understanding satisfaction in platform-based transportation. The present study extends this line of inquiry by considering job insecurity as a potential intervening variable in the relationship between working conditions and performance.

2.4. Job Insecurity

Job insecurity refers to a perceived threat to the continuity or stability of employment. Shoss (2017) conceptualizes job insecurity as a multifaceted experience that can trigger stress, affect social exchange perceptions, and influence workers' responses to perceived threats. Lee et al. (2018) similarly review job insecurity research and emphasize the importance of understanding its antecedents, consequences, and contextual moderators. De Witte et al. (2016), in their review of longitudinal studies, find evidence that job insecurity can adversely affect psychological well-being and health over time. For platform drivers, insecurity may concern the possibility of losing access to work, experiencing reduced earning opportunities, or losing valued aspects of the working arrangement. Such concerns differ in important ways from conventional employment insecurity because access to tasks and earnings may depend on customer demand and platform-mediated decisions. The International Labour Organization (2021) identifies the conditions and governance of digital labor platforms as important considerations in assessing work quality. Wood et al. (2019) further demonstrate how algorithmic control can shape workers' experiences of autonomy and work conditions. Job insecurity is also relevant to performance. Sverke et al. (2019), in a meta-analysis, found that job insecurity was associated with several performance outcomes, although the strength of these relationships varied according to outcome measures and contextual conditions. Their findings support examining job insecurity as a possible mechanism connecting working conditions with performance, rather than treating it solely as an employment-related concern.

2.5. Compensation, Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Job Insecurity

Compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction represent distinct but potentially interconnected dimensions of work. Compensation concerns the rewards received, motivation concerns the direction and persistence of effort, and satisfaction reflects an evaluation of work experiences. These constructs may be related to job insecurity because workers' perceptions of the adequacy and stability of their working conditions can influence how secure they feel about continued work and future earnings. Evidence from Gojek-driver research supports the relevance of these relationships. Haqi and Swasti (2024) and Natali et al. (2026) examined compensation and motivation in relation to job satisfaction among drivers in different Indonesian cities. These studies provide contextual support for examining the financial and motivational dimensions of platform work. However, they do not establish that higher compensation, motivation, or satisfaction necessarily reduces job insecurity in every setting. Such relationships require direct empirical testing. From a broader occupational perspective, Shoss (2017) emphasizes that job insecurity can emerge through different mechanisms, while Lee et al. (2018) highlight the role of contextual factors in shaping its consequences. In the present study, compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction are therefore examined as potential correlates of perceived job insecurity among Gojek partner drivers in Bekasi City.

2.6. Job Insecurity as an Intervening Variable

Job insecurity may provide a mechanism through which working conditions relate to performance. When workers perceive their employment or income opportunities as uncertain, they may experience psychological strain and have greater difficulty sustaining consistent work behavior. The job demands-resources perspective discussed by Bakker and Demerouti (2017) provides a broader framework for understanding how work conditions can influence strain, motivation, and performance. In this context, resources associated with favorable working conditions may help workers manage demands, although the precise pathways require empirical examination. Sverke et al. (2019) provide evidence of a negative association between job insecurity and several performance outcomes. De Witte et al. (2016) also document adverse consequences of job insecurity for employee well-being, supporting the relevance of insecurity as a work-related psychological factor. Nevertheless, these findings do not establish that job insecurity mediates the relationships of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction with performance among Gojek drivers. Mediation must be tested directly within the proposed model.

Indonesian studies provide a useful contextual foundation. Lebang and Paulina (2022) examined multiple work-related factors in relation to job satisfaction and performance among Gojek drivers, while Sofiyah and Yulinda (2022) considered motivation, financial compensation, and other work-related factors in the Medan context. More recent research by Haqi and Swasti (2024), Putra and Risma (2024), and Natali et al. (2026) further addresses compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction among Gojek drivers in different locations. However, the extent to which job insecurity serves as an intervening variable linking compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction to performance in Bekasi City remains an empirical question. Accordingly, this study examines compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction as explanatory variables, job insecurity as an intervening variable, and driver performance as the outcome. The proposed framework provides a basis for testing whether the three work-related factors are associated with job insecurity and whether job insecurity is associated with performance. It also provides a basis for assessing the indirect relationships between the explanatory variables and performance through job insecurity.

III. Research Method

This study employed a quantitative survey approach to examine relationships among variables using questionnaire data collected from respondents. It was designed as a causal study investigating the direct and indirect relationships of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction with performance, with job

insecurity serving as an intervening variable. The population comprised all active Gojek partner drivers operating in Bekasi City. Because the estimated population was large and heterogeneous, the study employed purposive sampling based on the following inclusion criteria:

- a. The respondent had been an active Gojek partner driver for at least the preceding six months.
- b. The respondent resided and operated in Bekasi City.
- c. The respondent voluntarily agreed to complete the questionnaire in full.

The study included 126 respondents. This sample size was considered to meet the minimum requirement for data analysis using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM), based on the rule of at least 10 times the number of indicators associated with the most extensively measured construct (Hair et al., 2020). Data were collected using a closed-ended questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. The questionnaire items were developed from the indicators specified for each research variable. The questionnaire was distributed online through Google Forms to Gojek partner drivers who met the inclusion criteria. The collected data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM), implemented in SmartPLS 4.

IV. Result and Discussion

4.1. Results

a. Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and average variance extracted (AVE). Cronbach's alpha values were 0.841 for compensation, 0.872 for work motivation, 0.889 for job satisfaction, 0.857 for job insecurity, and 0.881 for performance. All five constructs exceeded the commonly applied threshold of 0.70, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Nevertheless, Cronbach's alpha should not be treated as the sole evidence of measurement quality. Composite reliability and indicator-level results should also be reported when available, in accordance with established PLS-SEM reporting recommendations (Hair et al., 2019). The AVE values were 0.811 for compensation, 0.837 for work motivation, 0.863 for job satisfaction, 0.802 for job insecurity, and 0.844 for performance. Each value exceeded the recommended minimum of 0.50, supporting convergent validity at the construct level. The highest AVE was observed for job satisfaction (0.863), whereas the lowest was observed for job insecurity (0.802). These values indicate that each construct accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in its indicators. However, discriminant validity cannot be established from AVE values alone; additional evidence, such as the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), should be reported if it was assessed (Hair et al., 2019).

b. Structural Model Results

Table 1 summarizes the reported path coefficients and specific indirect effects. The coefficients describe the direction and magnitude of the estimated relationships in the structural model.

Table 1. Reported Structural Path Coefficients

Relationship	Path coefficient
Compensation → Job insecurity	−0.325
Work motivation → Job insecurity	−0.278
Job satisfaction → Job insecurity	−0.312
Job insecurity → Performance	−0.371
Compensation → Job insecurity → Performance	0.121
Work motivation → Job insecurity → Performance	0.103
Job satisfaction → Job insecurity → Performance	0.116

Compensation had a negative path coefficient of -0.325 toward job insecurity. Work motivation and job satisfaction also had negative coefficients, at -0.278 and -0.312 , respectively. Among these three relationships, compensation had the largest absolute coefficient, followed by job satisfaction and work motivation. This ordering is descriptive and should not be interpreted as evidence that the coefficients differ significantly from one another. Job insecurity had a negative coefficient of -0.371 toward performance. The direction of this estimate is consistent with the interpretation that greater perceived employment uncertainty is associated with lower performance. Nevertheless, the statistical significance of this relationship must be verified using the relevant bootstrapping output. The specific indirect-effect estimates were positive: 0.121 for compensation, 0.103 for work motivation, and 0.116 for job satisfaction, each operating through job insecurity. Their positive signs are consistent with the combination of negative antecedent-to-insecurity paths and a negative insecurity-to-performance path. These estimates suggest a potential indirect mechanism, but the significance and strength of the mediation effects cannot be confirmed without confidence intervals or p -values for the specific indirect effects. The direct paths from compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction to performance must also be reported to establish the full mediation structure and determine whether the indirect effects coexist with direct effects.

c. Coefficient of Determination

The reported coefficient of determination for job insecurity was ($R^2 = 0.693$). This indicates that compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction jointly accounted for 69.3% of the variance in job insecurity within the estimated model. The remaining 30.7% was associated with factors not represented in that equation and with unexplained variance. For performance, the reported coefficient was ($R^2 = 0.742$), indicating that the predictors included in the performance equation accounted for 74.2% of its variance. The remaining 25.8% was not explained by the predictors included in that equation. This interpretation should be read in relation to the actual model specification: the value cannot be attributed to job insecurity alone if other predictors were also included in the performance equation. Although these R^2 values indicate substantial explanatory power within the sample, they do not, by themselves, demonstrate out-of-sample predictive performance or establish the overall validity of the model. Additional assessment, such as predictive evaluation and relevant structural-model diagnostics, would provide a more complete evaluation (Hair et al., 2019).

4.2. Discussion

a. Compensation and Job Insecurity

The estimated path coefficient between compensation and job insecurity was negative ($\beta = -0.325$). This result suggests that higher perceived compensation was associated with lower perceived employment insecurity among the surveyed Gojek driver partners. In platform-based work, compensation is not limited to the nominal amount received per order. Drivers may also evaluate the predictability of their earnings, the transparency of incentive arrangements, and the perceived fairness of the system through which work opportunities and rewards are allocated. Research on compensation systems emphasizes that the consequences of pay depend not only on the amount paid but also on how the pay structure is designed and perceived (Gupta & Shaw, 2014; Shaw, 2014). This interpretation is relevant to platform work because digital platforms coordinate work opportunities through technological systems and can shape the distribution of tasks, rewards, and access to work. Studies of the gig economy have highlighted the tension between flexibility and economic uncertainty in platform-mediated work (Vallas & Schor, 2020; Wood et al., 2019). Algorithmic systems can also influence the way work is monitored, evaluated, and allocated, making the transparency and predictability of platform rules important features of workers' experience (Kellogg et al., 2020). These studies provide a contextual basis for understanding why compensation perceptions may be related to insecurity among app-based drivers.

The coefficient should not, however, be interpreted as proof that increasing compensation will necessarily reduce job insecurity by a fixed amount. The data presented here establish an estimated association in the specified model, not a causal effect isolated from other working conditions. In addition, the construct measured in this study is described as compensation, but its operational indicators should be examined to determine whether they capture earnings adequacy, fairness, predictability, incentives, or a

combination of these dimensions. This distinction matters because a higher potential income may not eliminate insecurity if earnings remain volatile or if access to orders is perceived as unpredictable.

b. Work Motivation and Job Insecurity

Work motivation had a negative estimated relationship with job insecurity ($\beta = -0.278$). The coefficient indicates that higher reported motivation was associated with lower reported insecurity in the model. Motivation can support sustained effort and goal-directed behavior, but it should not be treated as a substitute for predictable working conditions. A driver may remain highly motivated while still being exposed to fluctuating demand, uncertain earnings, or changes in platform rules. A meta-analysis by Cerasoli et al. (2014) found that intrinsic motivation predicts performance and that its relative contribution depends partly on whether the outcome concerns performance quality or quantity and how incentives are linked to performance. This evidence supports an interpretation in which motivation is relevant to work behavior but operates alongside external reward arrangements. Self-determination theory similarly emphasizes the importance of the quality of motivation and the conditions that support autonomous engagement, rather than treating motivation as a single undifferentiated quantity (Deci et al., 2017). In the context of Gojek driver partners, motivation may help drivers maintain effort and respond to daily work demands. However, the negative coefficient does not demonstrate that motivation independently removes objective employment or income uncertainty. The association could also reflect how drivers appraise their work situation, or the influence of unmeasured factors such as financial pressure, driving experience, work autonomy, and access to orders. Future research should distinguish intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perceived control over work to clarify which aspects are most closely related to job insecurity.

c. Job Satisfaction and Job Insecurity

The path coefficient from job satisfaction to job insecurity was negative ($\beta = -0.312$). This estimate suggests that drivers who reported greater satisfaction also tended to report lower insecurity, conditional on the specified model. Satisfaction may reflect an overall evaluation of work, including the perceived fairness of rewards, the nature of daily tasks, the quality of work-related interactions, and the extent to which work conditions meet personal expectations. In this setting, satisfaction should be understood as a broad evaluation of work rather than as a direct measure of employment security. The relationship is consistent with research that treats job insecurity as a subjective threat to the continuity and stability of employment. Shoss (2017) explains that insecurity can arise through several mechanisms, including stress, social exchange, and attempts to preserve employment. A worker's evaluation of work may therefore be related to perceived insecurity, although satisfaction and insecurity remain conceptually distinct constructs. Research on the consequences of job insecurity also shows that its associations with work attitudes and behavior vary across contexts and outcomes (De Witte et al., 2016; Sverke et al., 2019). The result has practical relevance for platform management, but it requires careful interpretation. Higher job satisfaction should not be assumed to guarantee stable work access or predictable income. If the questionnaire captures satisfaction with flexibility or day-to-day work while insecurity reflects concerns about future earnings or account continuity, the two constructs may be related without representing the same underlying experience. Reporting the exact measurement items and discriminant-validity evidence would help establish whether the constructs are empirically distinct.

d. Job Insecurity and Performance

Job insecurity had a negative estimated path coefficient toward performance ($\beta = -0.371$). Of the four reported direct paths, this coefficient had the largest absolute value. Descriptively, this indicates that job insecurity had the strongest estimated direct association among the paths shown in Table 1. It does not establish that the coefficient is statistically different from the other coefficients, because such a comparison requires an appropriate statistical test. The negative direction is consistent with evidence that job insecurity is associated with impaired work performance. Sverke et al. (2019), in a meta-analysis, found that job insecurity was generally associated with poorer performance outcomes, including task and contextual performance, although the strength of the associations varied across outcomes and contextual conditions. Shoss (2017) also describes several pathways through which insecurity may influence work behavior, including stress-related responses and efforts to protect one's position. A systematic review by the authors of the 2023 review of job

insecurity and employee performance likewise highlights that the relationship is complex and that its mechanisms and contextual boundaries warrant further study. For app-based drivers, the relationship may be particularly relevant because performance is carried out in an environment shaped by customer interactions, platform rules, order availability, and digital evaluation systems. Research on platform work documents how algorithmic control can shape workers' autonomy and working conditions (Kellogg et al., 2020; Wood et al., 2019). These studies help explain why perceived uncertainty may matter to work behavior, but they do not prove that these specific mechanisms caused the coefficient observed among the Bekasi respondents. The current results do not separately measure stress, attention, fatigue, customer ratings, or algorithmic control as mediators. Those explanations should therefore be presented as plausible mechanisms for further testing rather than as demonstrated findings.

e. The Indirect Effects Through Job Insecurity

The estimated indirect effects were positive for compensation ($\beta = 0.121$), work motivation ($\beta = 0.103$), and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.116$). The sign of each estimate is mathematically consistent with the negative path from the antecedent to job insecurity and the negative path from job insecurity to performance. In substantive terms, the model is consistent with a possible pathway in which higher compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction are associated with lower job insecurity, which is in turn associated with higher performance. However, the presence of nonzero indirect-effect estimates is not sufficient to conclude that mediation is statistically significant. A mediation conclusion requires the sampling uncertainty of each specific indirect effect to be evaluated, typically through bootstrapped confidence intervals or p-values. Contemporary guidance on PLS-SEM mediation emphasizes evaluating indirect effects directly rather than inferring mediation solely from the signs of component paths (Sarstedt et al., 2020). The direct effects from compensation, motivation, and satisfaction to performance are also necessary to determine whether the mediation is indirect-only, complementary, competitive, or otherwise configured. The compensation indirect-effect estimate (0.121) was the largest of the three, followed by job satisfaction (0.116) and work motivation (0.103). These differences are small and descriptive; they should not be presented as statistically meaningful differences without formal comparison. The findings nevertheless identify job insecurity as a theoretically relevant mechanism for further investigation. For platform operators, the practical implication is not simply to increase rewards or encourage motivation, but to examine whether the structure of rewards, communication about platform rules, and procedures affecting access to work are perceived as fair and predictable. Such recommendations follow from the theoretical interpretation and should not be described as interventions proven effective by this survey.

f. Explanatory Power and Theoretical Contribution

The model reported ($R^2 = 0.693$) for job insecurity and ($R^2 = 0.742$) for performance. These values indicate that the model explains a substantial proportion of the observed variance in the two endogenous constructs in the analyzed sample. The job-insecurity equation suggests that compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction jointly account for 69.3% of the variance in perceived insecurity. The performance equation accounts for 74.2% of its variance through the predictors specified in that equation. These values should not be equated automatically with strong predictive performance. Hair et al. (2019) recommend that PLS-SEM reports provide a broader assessment of structural-model quality, including the relevant path estimates, their inferential statistics, and complementary predictive or robustness assessments where appropriate. In this study, the interpretation of the performance R^2 depends on which constructs were included as predictors of performance. The full structural model and corresponding output should therefore be reported so that readers can identify the precise contribution of each predictor. The study's potential contribution lies in examining job insecurity as a mechanism linking compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction with performance in the context of app-based transport work. Platform-economy research has documented how digital systems may combine flexibility with forms of monitoring, control, and economic uncertainty (Vallas & Schor, 2020; Wood et al., 2019). The present model brings these contextual concerns into a quantitative framework focused on driver partners in Bekasi City. Nevertheless, because the study uses survey data from 126 purposively selected respondents, its results should be generalized cautiously. The model does not establish temporal order or rule out alternative explanations, and the reported results do not yet provide enough inferential detail to confirm all stated hypotheses.

Further analysis should report the bootstrapping settings, path-specific t-statistics, p-values, confidence intervals, and the direct paths to performance. Measurement reporting should also include composite reliability and discriminant validity if these were assessed. Future studies could use longitudinal data, objective performance indicators, or comparisons across cities and platform conditions to determine whether the observed associations persist over time and whether platform governance, income volatility, or work autonomy helps explain the relationships. These steps would strengthen the empirical basis for interpreting job insecurity as a mediator and would clarify the practical implications for digital-platform work.

V. Conclusion

This study examined the relationships between compensation, work motivation, job satisfaction, job insecurity, and the performance of Gojek driver partners in Bekasi City. The reported path coefficients indicate negative relationships between compensation and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.325$), work motivation and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.278$), job satisfaction and job insecurity ($\beta = -0.312$), and job insecurity and performance ($\beta = -0.371$). The estimated indirect effects through job insecurity were positive for compensation ($\beta = 0.121$), work motivation ($\beta = 0.103$), and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.116$). These patterns are consistent with the proposed mediating mechanism, although the statistical significance of the indirect effects requires confirmation through bootstrapping results. The reported R^2 values of 0.693 for job insecurity and 0.742 for performance indicate substantial explanatory power within the estimated model.

The findings suggest that the management of platform-based work should consider not only financial rewards and individual motivation but also workers' perceptions of employment uncertainty. Transparent compensation and incentive arrangements, consistent communication about operational policies, and accessible explanations of changes to platform procedures may help address concerns about work continuity and earnings predictability. For Gojek, these measures represent practical areas for consideration rather than interventions whose effectiveness has been established by this study. The results also highlight the potential value of treating job insecurity as an important psychological factor in understanding driver performance, while recognizing that performance may also depend on other individual, operational, and platform-related conditions.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. The study involved 126 purposively selected Gojek driver partners in Bekasi City, limiting the extent to which the results can be generalized to other locations or platform workers. Its cross-sectional survey design also does not establish temporal order or definitive causal relationships. Moreover, the available results do not provide complete bootstrapping statistics for the direct and indirect effects, and the direct paths from compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction to performance require clarification. Future research should use larger and more geographically diverse samples, longitudinal or mixed-method approaches, and complete PLS-SEM reporting, including confidence intervals for indirect effects. It could also examine earnings volatility, workload, work-life balance, perceived algorithmic control, and platform communication to clarify the conditions under which job insecurity is associated with performance.

References

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Teori, konsep dan indikator*. Zanafa Publishing.
- Afandi, P. (2021). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Teori, konsep dan indikator*. Zanafa Publishing.
- Audina, M., & Kusmayadi, D. (2018). Pengaruh job insecurity terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan stres kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 15(2), 129–140.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands-resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035661>
- Cheng, G. H.-L., & Chan, D. K.-S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 272–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x>
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., Pereira Costa, S., Doden, W., & Chang, C. (2019). Psychological contracts: Past, present, and future. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 145–169. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015212>
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108>
- De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 1–6.
- De Witte, H., Pienaar, J., & De Cuyper, N. (2016). Review of 30 years of longitudinal studies on the association between job insecurity and health-related outcomes: Is there causal evidence? *Australian Psychologist*, 51(1), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12176>
- Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 438–448. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4279673>
- Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (2014). Employee compensation: The neglected area of HRM research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.08.007>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hair, J. F., Howard, M. C., & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen: Dasar, pengertian, dan masalah*. Bumi Aksara.
- International Labour Organization. (2021). *World employment and social outlook 2021: The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work*. International Labour Office. https://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/weso/2021/WCMS_771749/lang-en/index.htm
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2014). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2015). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Marwansyah. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia* (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2006). *Human resource management* (11th ed.). Thomson/South-Western.

- Medina, A., et al. (2023). The relationship between job insecurity and employee performance: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Career Development International*, 28(6/7), 589–632. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2022-0164>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational behavior* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2016). *Organizational behavior* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 3758–3784. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/4892>
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2020). Partial least squares structural equation modeling. In C. Homburg, M. Klarmann, & A. Vomberg (Eds.), *Handbook of market research*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8_15-1
- Shaw, J. D. (2014). Pay dispersion. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 521–544. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091253>
- Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1911–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574>
- Siamto, W. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja mitra Gojek di Kota Depok. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 45–54.
- Simamora, H. (2006). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia* (3rd ed.). STIE YKPN.
- Sverke, M., Låstad, L., Hellgren, J., Richter, A., & Näswall, K. (2019). A meta-analysis of job insecurity and employee performance: Testing the moderating effect of gender. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(14), Article 2536. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16142536>
- Vallas, S. P., & Schor, J. B. (2020). What do platforms do? Understanding the gig economy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 46, 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857>
- Wibowo. (2016). *Manajemen kinerja* (5th ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), 56–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616>