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INTRODUCTION

Organizational performance areas can be measured from other things such as strategic planning, operations, and finance, legal and organizational development. Developing an institution or organization is a must to survive in the world's competitive climate. Kaplan and Norton (1992) organizational performance should be measured not only in terms of financial concepts but also from non-financial terms. Performance can be calculated from productivity, quality, consistency, and so on. On the other hand, organizational performance measures results, behavior and normative levels, education, and the resulting concepts, including management development (Richard, 2010).

Several factors that need to be considered in organizational performance are increased knowledge management, self-efficacy, and improving organizational citizenship behavior. An enterprise knowledge management system is an enterprise-wide endeavor to collect, store, distribute, and apply digital content and knowledge. The implementation of knowledge management or knowledge management will positively influence its business processes, either directly or indirectly. Some of the benefits of knowledge management or knowledge management for companies include: Saving time and costs. With a well-structured source of knowledge, the company will be easy to use this knowledge for other contexts, so that the company will be able to save time and costs, increase knowledge assets. The source of experience will make it easy for every employee to use it to utilize knowledge in the company environment will increase. In the end, creativity and innovation will be pushed more widely, and each employee can improve their competence and adaptability. Companies will be able to quickly adapt to changes in the business environment that occur and increase productivity. The existing knowledge can be reused for the process or product to be developed so that the company's productivity will increase.

Abstract: This research aims to know influence knowledge management to performance organization, to understand self-efficacy to performance organization, to know citizenship behavior organization to performance organization, to learn influence knowledge management to citizenship behavior organization, to know influence self-efficacy to citizenship behavior organization, to know influence knowledge management to performance organization through citizenship behavior organization, and to know influence self-efficacy to performance organization through citizenship behavior organization. This research is applied in PT. Puri Dibya Property used 127 employees of this firm. Analysis of data used path analysis. Based on data analysis confirmed that knowledge management influences organizational performance. The value of the loading factor is 0.415. Self-efficacy affects performance organization. Organizational citizenship behavior significantly influence knowledge management and self-efficacy on performance organization. According to self-efficacy on performance organization, the value of the loading factor is 0.556. Another hand, the influence of self-efficacy on performance organization through citizenship behavior is 0.539 x 0.839 = 0.452. This indirect effect is more than the direct effect, and another hand, this indirect effect can significantly influence knowledge management to performance at 0.452-0.15 = 3.7%. In this case, citizenship behavior is an intervening variable. The value of the loading factor of influenced knowledge management to performance organization directly is 0.415. The other hand influences knowledge management to performance organization through citizenship behavior is 0.539 x 0.839 = 0.452. This indirect effect is more than the direct effect, and another hand, this indirect effect can significantly influence knowledge management to performance at 0.452-0.15 = 3.7%. In this case, citizenship behavior is an intervening variable.
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Another factor that has an impact on organizational performance is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the ability to perform tasks or actions needed to achieve absolute results. Meanwhile, Baron and Byrne (2003) define self-efficacy as an evaluation of someone's ability to perform a task, achieve goals, and overcome obstacles. Bandura and Woods (2006) explain that self-efficacy refers to the belief in an individual's ability to drive the motivation, cognitive skills, and actions needed to meet the situation's demands.

In general, self-efficacy is related to self-esteem or self-esteem because both are aspects of assessment related to one's success or failure as a human being. However, both also have differences, namely self-efficacy does not have a self-esteem component such as self-esteem. Self-esteem may be a trait to give life to; self-efficacy is always situation-specific, preceding immediate action. For example, a person may have high general self-efficacy; he may consider himself capable in many situations. However, he has low self-esteem because he believes that he does not have an underlying value in the thing he is good at.

Bandura (2006) states that self-efficacy results from a cognitive process in the form of decisions, beliefs, or awards about how individuals estimate their ability to carry out specific tasks or actions needed to achieve the desired results. According to him, self-efficacy is not related to the skills possessed but is related to individual beliefs about what can be done with the skills they have regardless of the size.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Knowledge Management**

According to Tripathi and Reddy (2008: 2), management is the art of getting things done through other people. This understanding is a concern for essential differences between a manager and other members of an organization. According to Hasibuan (2012: 124), management is the science and art of regulating the process of utilizing human resources and other resources effectively and efficiently to achieve specific goals. So it can be concluded that management is a science and art regarding managing resources to achieve efficient effectiveness.

Knowledge management is often viewed as a multidimensional and multidisciplinary concept. There are many definitions of knowledge management in the literature, so comparisons should be made to determine each author's focus. As stated by Beccera-Fernandez (2004: 113), knowledge management can be defined as "doing what is needed to get the maximum of knowledge resources." Knowledge management is also defined as the process required to create, capture, codify, and disseminate knowledge to organizations to achieve competitive advantage. Every individual is a source of organizational learning.

Meanwhile, Hwang et al. (2008: 98) states that knowledge management is a process to optimize intellectual property, which can be seen from employees' performance in an organization for the organization's benefits. The existence of knowledge management in an organization cannot be seen directly by the results. This is due to several things related to intellectual property, such as human capital, social capital, and corporate capital (Hwang et al., 2008: 67).

As stated by Nonaka & Takeuchi. (1995: 97) "Knowledge management is the process that through organizations deals with generates a wealth of knowledge and their intellectual capital." At the same time, other definitions state that knowledge management is a process or activity by creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and using knowledge, wherever it exists, to improve learning and performance in organizations (Scarborough, S, 2008).

Furthermore, knowledge management is the formalization of and access to experience, knowledge, and expertise that creates new capabilities that enable superior performance, encourage innovation, and increase customer value (Khan, 2012: 23). Knowledge management is a process that helps organizations to find, select, organize, disseminate, and transfer important information and expertise needed for activities (Zaied, 2012). Knowledge management is the management of company knowledge and intellectual assets that can increase the range of organizational performance characteristics and added value by enabling a company to act smarter (Wiig, 1993 in Khan, 2012: 33).

**Self Efficacy**

Bandura (2000) defines self-efficacy, namely his ability to perform tasks or actions needed to achieve specific results. Meanwhile, Baron and Byrne (2003) define self-efficacy as an evaluation of someone's ability or competence to perform a task, achieve goals, and overcome obstacles. Bandura and Woods explain that self-efficacy refers to the belief in an individual's ability to drive the motivation, cognitive abilities, and actions needed to meet the situation's demands.

Self-esteem may be a trait to give life to; self-efficacy is always situation-specific, preceding immediate action. For example, a person may have high general self-efficacy; he may consider himself capable in many situations. However, he has low self-esteem because he believes that he does not have an underlying value in the thing he is good at.

Bandura (2006) states that self-efficacy results from a cognitive process in the form of decisions, beliefs, or awards about how individuals estimate their ability to carry out specific tasks or actions needed to achieve the desired results. According to him, self-efficacy is not related to the skills he has but is related to individual beliefs about what can be done with whatever skills he has.
Self-efficacy emphasizes the components of self-confidence that a person has in facing future situations that are vague, unpredictable, and often full of stress. Although self-efficacy has a significant causal effect on our actions, self-efficacy combines with the environment, previous behavior, and other personal variables, especially expectations of the outcome to produce behavior. Self-efficacy will affect several aspects of one's cognition and behavior.

In everyday life, self-efficacy leads us to set challenging goals and to survive difficulties. More than a hundred studies show that self-efficacy predicts worker productivity. When problems arise, a strong sense of self-efficacy encourages workers to remain calm and seek solutions rather than contemplate their inadequacies. Effort and persistence lead to achievement.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that self-efficacy, in general, is a person's belief in his ability to cope with the various situations that arise in his life. Self-efficacy is not related to the skills he has and how many aspects of cognition and behavior. Therefore, one individual's action will be different from another individual.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is not part of the duties that have been formally required for an employee but, as a whole, encourages the effective functioning of the organization (Robbins, 2008). In terms of organizational effectiveness, the individuals in a team need to have supportive behavior. These behaviors are not only in-role behaviors but are expected to generate extra-role actions from these individuals to be more solid and can work optimally for the organization. In addition to the above definition, Organ (in Podsakoff, 2000) also provides five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB):

- Altruism: behavior that influences helping colleagues on duty.
- Conscientiousness: behavior that is part of employees who carry out tasks that exceed the minimum requirements.
- Sportsmanship: feelings from employees to refrain from complaints about things that are not liked.
- Courtesy: behavior that individuals become part of to replace others in the organization about their work changes.
- Civic virtue: behavior belonging to individuals indicating that they participate in the company.

Organizational Behavior (OB) or our bias is also called Organizational Behavior is a science that studies human behavior in an organization and how that behavior impacts the organization. One of the actions that have an impact is Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).

**Organizational Performance**

The definition of organizational performance refers to employees' ability to carry out all the tasks that are their responsibility. These tasks are usually based on indicators of success that have been implemented. As a result, it will be known that an employee enters a certain level of work. The status can be various terms. Performance can be categorized as over target, on target, or under the mark. Departing from the things referred to as a whole for the work of an employee. The definition of organizational performance is a description of the level of achievement of implementing an activity program or policy in realizing the goals, objectives, vision, and mission of the organization as outlined in the strategic planning of an organization (Moheriono, 2009: 60).

Mangkuprawira (2011: 218-219) says that performance is a matter, or the overall success rate of a person during a specific period in carrying out a task compared to various possibilities, such as work standards, targets, or targets or criteria that have been determined in advance and have been agreed together. According to Wibowo (2016: 19), performance is a management style in managing performance-oriented resources that carries out an open and sustainable communication process by creating a shared vision and strategic and integrated approach as a driving force to achieve organizational goals. According to Rivai and Sagala (2009: 548) suggest that: "Performance is a function of motivation and ability to complete a task, or a person's work should have a certain degree of willingness and level of knowledge. According to Richard et al. (2010), organizational performance is what is produced by an organization, which includes results, namely financial performance such as profit as measured by return on assets, return on investment, and so on, market performance such as an expansion of market share, and sales. Also, the shareowner’s return is the return of the shareowner and the economic increase of the shareowner.

**Research Method**

**Time and Location of Research**

The research will be conducted in January-March 2020 by taking the location at PT. Puri Dibya Property.

**Research Design**

This study uses an explanatory analysis approach. This means that every variable presented in the hypothesis will be observed by testing the independent variable's causal relationship to the dependent variable. The relationship between variables can be described in the form of a path analysis diagram as follows: The conceptual research framework can be explained as follows.
Population and sample
The population in this research is employees who work at PT. Puri Dibya Property. While the sample used includes 127 employees who work in the office. This sampling uses the saturated sample method because it uses all employees.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Analysis of the effect of independent (exogenous) on dependent (endogenous)
Overall, this analysis involves all the variables analyzed, namely knowledge management (X1), self-efficacy (X2), organizational citizenship behavior (X3) and organizational Performance (Y). This analysis uses path analysis obtained from the standardized coefficient in the equation can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. The standardized coefficient value of the effect of X1 and X2 on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge_Management</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>7.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self_Efficacy</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>9.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standardized coefficient value of the influence of X1 and X2 on X3 can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. The standardized coefficient value of the effect of X1 and X2 on X3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge_Management</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>6.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self_Efficacy</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>22,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standardized coefficient value of the effect of X3 on Y can be seen in the following table.

Table 3. The standardized coefficient value of the effect of X3 on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship_Behavior</td>
<td>9,677</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>5,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational_Performance

Figure 1. Concept Model Research
**DISCUSSION**

**Path Analysis 1**

The analysis of this path is knowledge management (X1) on organizational Performance (Y). The loading factor value is 0.415. This value has a t value equal to 6.839 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05, so it can be said that knowledge management has a significant effect on organizational performance.

**Path Analysis 2**

The analysis of this path is self-efficacy (X2) on organizational Performance (Y). The loading factor value is 0.556. This value has a t value equal to 9.160 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05, so it can be said that self-efficacy significantly affects organizational performance.

**Path Analysis 3**

The analysis in this path is the effect of organizational citizenship behavior (X3) on organizational Performance (Y). The loading factor value is 0.830. This value has a t-value equal to 17.238 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05, so it can be said that organizational citizenship behavior has a significant effect on organizational performance.

**Path Analysis 4**

The analysis in this pathway is the effect of knowledge management on organizational citizenship behavior (X3). The loading factor value is 0.539. This value has a t-value equal to 22.188 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05, so it can be said that knowledge management has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

**Path Analysis 5**

The analysis in this pathway is the effect of self-efficacy on organizational citizenship behavior (X3). The loading factor value is 0.719. This value has a t value equal to 29.558 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05, so it can be said that self-efficacy significantly affects organizational citizenship behavior.

**Path Analysis 6**

The analysis in this pathway is knowledge management on organizational Performance (Y) through organizational citizenship behavior (X3). The loading factor value of knowledge management’s direct effect on organizational performance is 0.415 while the effect of knowledge management on organizational performance through organizational citizenship behavior is 0.539 x 0.839 = 0.452. This indirect effect is greater than the direct effect; or in other words, organizational citizenship behavior can increase the influence of knowledge management on organizational performance by 0.452-0.15 = 3.7%. In this case, it can be said that organizational citizenship behavior is an intervening variable.

**Path Analysis 7**

This pathway's analysis is the effect of self-efficacy on organizational Performance (Y) through organizational citizenship behavior (X3). The loading factor value of the direct effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance is 0.556, while the effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance through organizational citizenship behavior is 0.719 x 0.839 = 0.603. This indirect effect is greater than the direct effect, or in other words, organizational citizenship behavior can increase the effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance by 0.603-0.556 = 0.047 or 4.7%. In this case, it can be said that organizational citizenship behavior is an intervening variable.

**CONCLUSION**

Knowledge management has a significant effect on organizational performance. The loading factor value is 0.415. This value has a t-value equal to 6.839 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05. Self-efficacy has a significant effect on organizational performance. The loading factor value is 0.556. This value has a t-value equal to 9.160 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05. Organizational citizenship behavior has a significant effect on organizational performance. The t value is equal to 17.238 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05. Knowledge management has a significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior. The loading factor value is 0.539.
This value has a t value equal to 22.188 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05. Self-efficacy has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. The loading factor value is 0.719. This value has a t value equal to 29.558 with a significance of 0.00 or less than 0.05.

The loading factor value of the direct effect of knowledge management on organizational performance is 0.415, while the effect of knowledge management on organizational performance through organizational citizenship behavior is 0.539 x 0.839 = 0.452. This indirect effect is greater than the direct effect; or in other words, organizational citizenship behavior can increase the influence of knowledge management on organizational performance by 0.452-0.15 = 3.7%. In this case, it can be said that organizational citizenship behavior is an intervening variable.

The loading factor value of the direct effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance is 0.556, while the effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance through organizational citizenship behavior is 0.719 x 0.839 = 0.603. This indirect effect is greater than the direct effect, or in other words, organizational citizenship behavior can increase the effect of self-efficacy on organizational performance by 0.603-0.556 = 0.047 or 4.7%. In this case, it can be said that organizational citizenship behavior is an intervening variable.

Suggestions

Knowledge management needs to be considered in improving organizational performance. This can be done by increasing knowledge management indicators, namely people, convergence, and processes. People who need to be considered are employees' ability, employee knowledge, and employee adaptation to technological developments. The knowledge that needs to be considered in the development of knowledge management is how to operate programs, applications, or new things related to technology. In contrast, the processes that need to be considered are the processes of increasing knowledge, information processes, and setting operational standards for companies.

Self-efficacy also needs to be considered with the dimensions of level, sizes of strength, and generalization dimensions. The level dimension is related to the difficulty of the employee's task. The second dimension is associated with the employee's confidence in his abilities. The third dimension is associated with the general knowledge of the job to be carried out.

Another thing that needs to be considered in improving organizational performance is increasing organizational citizenship behavior in the organization. Actions such as helping colleagues carry out their activities need to be considered even though this is not the responsibility of the employee being asked for help.
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