

## THE INFLUENCE OF WORKLOAD AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE WITH COLLECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ENGAGEMENT AS A MEDIATING VARIABLE (A STUDY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND VILLAGE EMPOWERMENT IN DEMAK)

Muhammad Labib Khoirul Anwar<sup>1\*</sup>, Edy Raharja<sup>2</sup>

Faculty of Economics and Business Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia<sup>1,2</sup>  
labibkhorul@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, edy.soerjo2707@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Human Resources is the most decisive factor in every organization because in addition to human resources as one of the elements of the nation's competitive strength it is also the main determinant, therefore human resources must have high competence and performance for the progress of the organization. The purpose of this study is to compare or find out in research as follows: The Effect of Workload and Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Performance With Collective Organizational Engagement as a Mediation Variable does it result in maximum employee performance, high morale from employees but also higher workload then performance will decrease and if the value of the workload is low then the employee's performance increases. The method used in this research is quantitative, namely using a representative sample to answer each statement submitted and using a questionnaire to collect research data. The research sample consisted of 134 Demak Dinpermades employees with a minimum working period of one year. The research analysis tool uses AMOS 24.00 software with the SEM method. The results of this study state that there is no significant relationship between workload and employee performance. The results of this study state that there is a positive relationship between perceptions of organizational support on employee performance. This is supported by a positive estimation parameter data value of 0.973 and also a probability value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results of this study state that there is a positive relationship between workload and collective organizational involvement. The results of this study state that there is no significant influence between perceptions of organizational support on employee performance through collective organizational involvement. This is supported by the value of t count data of 1.282 and t table of 1.978.

**Keywords:** *Workload; Perceived Organizational Support; Employee Performance; Collective Organizational Engagement; Dinpermades Demak Employee*

### INTRODUCTION

Human Resources is the most decisive factor in any organization because in addition to human resources as one element of the strength of the nation's competitiveness is also the main determinant, (Crouch & Ritchie, 1999) therefore human resources must have high competence and performance for the progress of the organization, for this reason, careful planning is needed so that the company's activities can run in an integrated and directed manner in realizing the desired goals, One way is by improving the performance of human resources.

Based on producing maximum employee performance, it takes a high mental or high morale from employees but also the higher the workload, the performance will decrease and if the workload value is low, employee performance increases (Konstantinou et al., 2018). Perceived organizational support (POS) is the degree to which employees believe their contributions and well-being are valued by the organization (Robbins & Judge, 2008). According to (Baliartati, 2017) Perceived organizational support (POS) and values adopted are important factors for changing employee behavior, one of which is POS is the perception of an employee regarding the extent to which the organization assesses employee contributions and cares about employee welfare (Noor, 2021).

In addition to the background described above, some studies provide inconsistent results below, so the intervening variable is proposed, namely Collective Organizational Engagement. Based on the research gap, the results of the study are different, besides that the researcher also analyzes from a sample company data that there is still a mismatch between theory and fact,

therefore this study will reanalyze employee performance. In addition, the importance of employee performance to the progress of the company because it can improve the company's economy by increasing and empowering human resources in employee performance makes this research important to be researched. The gap phenomenon in this study is a decrease in employee performance which indicates a high workload, impacting on low HR performance. This requires an objective attitude from management in implementing organizational strategies such as involving employees in determining work goals, specifying how to achieve those goals and setting targets in this engagement will build high HR performance for the organization.

### **The Effect of Workload on Employee Performance.**

According to Lisnayetti and Hasanbasari (2009) in (Rolos et al., 2018) there is a relationship between Workload and Employee Performance, high workload will cause a lack of performance where it can be explained that the higher the workload received by an employee will affect the performance of the employee, as well as the definition of workload that workload is defined as a responsibility or task given by employees that must be completed according to the specified time in order to achieve it. The purpose of the organization or company, therefore workload is very important for a company with effective workload the company can find out to what extent its employees can be given the maximum workload and the extent of its influence on the performance of the company itself.

H1 : Workload has a positive effect on Employee Performance

### **The effect of perceived organization support on employee performance.**

According to Rhoades & Eisenberger in Artiko et al (2015), Perceived Organizational Support is the perception of organizational support, referring to the perception of employees about the extent to which the organization through their contributions and care about their welfare is very influential in employee performance in the company.

According to Sinambela, et al (2012) suggest that employee performance is defined as the ability of employees to do certain skills, employee performance is very necessary because with this performance it will be known how far the ability of employees to carry out the tasks imposed on them, in this case the support of an organization has a positive effect on achieving an organizational goal (Sinambela, 2012).

H2 : POS Has a Positive Effect on Employee Performance

### **How Workload Affects Collective Organizational Engagement**

According to (Sumarni, 2010), workload is a set or number of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or office holder within a certain period of time. Collective Organizational Engagement arises as a positive response from employees to good support from the organization. Due to workplace engagement, employees perform better and organizational efficiency is improved. So that the workload can affect the collective perception of organizational members in the division and demands of work. Employee engagement refers to individual engagement towards work whereas organizational engagement argues about individual motivation towards organizational goals (Ali Malik et al., 2020).

H3: Workload Positively Affects Collective Organizational Engagement

### **The effect of perceived organizational support on collective organizational engagement**

According to Rhoades & Eisenberger in Artiko et al (2015), Perceived Organizational Support is the perception of organizational support, referring to the perception of employees about the extent to which the organization through their contributions and care about their welfare is very influential in employee performance in the company. Organizations generally provide employees with positive forms of support such as recognition, respect, fair treatment, salary, promotion, voting rights, access to information, and other support that can improve job performance and well-being (Ariarni & Afrianty, 2017).

H4 : Perceived Organizational Support Positively Affects Collective Organizational Engagement

### The Effect of Collective Organizational Engagement on Employee Performance

Collective Organizational Engagement is a firm-level construct and indicator of the overall motivational environment within the company, and thus has a more descriptive focus (Barrick et al., 2015; Rich et al., 2010). Sirmon et al. (Sirmon et al., 2007) argue that with the strategy of top managers in their actions to encourage collective organizational involvement, which, in turn, creates increased value for the company indicated by improved company performance. Engagement can be thought of as an organization-level construct that is influenced by motivation-focused organizational practices that represent enterprise-level resources.

H5: Collective Organizational Engagement Positively Affects Employee Performance

### RESEARCH METHOD

The type of research used in this study is quantitative, Primary data in this study is obtained by researchers as original data collected according to the purpose of the study by conducting surveys or observations Dinpermades, Demak (Klein & Kozlowski, 2000). The population in this study was all employees working at Dinpermades where there were 134 respondents. The total sample used was the total of Dinpermades employees totaling 134 respondents. The variables in this study are workload ( $X_1$ ), perceived organizational support ( $X_2$ ), employee performance ( $Y$ ), collective organizational engagement ( $Z$ ).

Testing the validity and reliability of the research questionnaire before the overall dissemination will be tested, 30 samples will be tested using SPSS. A data variable can be declared valid if the value of the loading factor  $\geq 0.50$ , while a variable will be declared reliable if the value of construct reliability ( $cr$ )  $> 0.70$  (Ghozali, 2017). After sample testing, invalid or reliable question items will be eliminated immediately. According to (Malhotra Naresh & Dash, 2016), to measure questions using the Likert scale from 1 to 5 is as follows:

Strongly disagree	= score 1
Disagree	= score 2
Neutral	= score 3
Agree	= score 4
Strongly agree	= score 5

### Data Collection Methods

Data collection in this study will later be disseminated using questionnaires or questionnaires to Dinpermades employees totaling 134 respondents. The process of distributing questionnaires is carried out by sharing google form links to people through social media. The data analysis used in this study is SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) using IBM SPSS Amos software. The purpose of data analysis is to process data into information to analyze how the influence of Workload and Percieved Organizational Support on Employee Performance with Collective Organizational Engagement as a mediation variable.

**Table 1 Goodness of Fit Index**

Goodness of Fit Index	Cut – off Value
$X^2$ - Chi Square	$< df, \alpha = 0,05$
Significance Probability	$\geq 0,05$
RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$
GFI	$\geq 0,09$
AGFI	$\geq 0,09$
TLI	$\geq 0,95$
CMN/DF	$\leq 2,00$
CFI	$\geq 0,95$

### Measurement

To conduct this study, we conducted quantitative data processing with the help of Sofwahare AMOS 24.00 to test the influence of each research variable used in this study, test research hypotheses, theoretical implications, managerial implications and research conclusions. The subjects / respondents of this study are Dinpermades, Demak. From the results of the distribution of questionnaires carried out, as many as 134 respondents. The census method is used in the determination of s

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Descriptive Analysis of Research

This study used Structural Equation Model (SEM) data analysis operated with Amos software version 24. The results of the Structural Equation Model (SEM) testing will be described as follows :

#### Normality Test

Table 2 Data Normality Test

Variable	Min	Max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Z1.1	2	4	-0.243	-1.147	-0.641	-1.515
Z1.2	1	4	-0.452	-2.134	-0.132	-0.312
Z1.3	1	4	-0.437	-2.066	-0.068	-0.161
Z1.4	1	4	-0.667	-3.152	0.871	2.059
Y1.5	2	4	-0.454	-2.145	-0.706	-1.667
Y1.4	2	4	-0.407	-1.925	-0.667	-1.577
Y1.3	2	4	-0.142	-0.673	-0.605	-1.431
Y1.2	2	4	-0.555	-2.621	-0.654	-1.545
Y1.1	2	4	-0.725	-3.425	-0.488	-1.153
X2.1	2	4	-0.317	-1.498	-0.657	-1.552
X2.2	2	4	-1.189	-5.619	0.398	0.941
X2.3	2	4	-0.738	-3.486	-0.441	-1.043
X2.4	2	4	-0.903	-4.267	-0.217	-0.512
X2.5	2	4	-0.547	-2.587	-0.695	-1.642
X1.1	2	4	0.065	0.307	-0.68	-1.606
X1.2	2	4	-0.274	-1.296	-0.637	-1.505
X1.3	1	4	-0.554	-2.617	0.624	1.474
X1.4	2	4	-0.441	-2.086	-0.731	-1.727
X1.5	2	4	-0.217	-1.025	-0.632	-1.494
<b>Multivariate</b>					28.491	5.838

Source : Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the critical ratio (c.r) value indicator in skewness and kurtosis is not greater than 2.58, so it can be concluded that the variable indicators of research data are univariately normal. While the multivariate normality test in this study was 5.838 greater than 2.58 so it was assumed to be abnormal.

#### Uji Outlier

The multivariate outlier test was performed by looking at the value of mahalanobis distance squared with p levels < 0.001. The variable indicators in this study amounted to 19 items, based on the calculation of the CHIINV formula in the excel program by entering the probability and number of variable indicators obtained a value of 43,820. So that the data will be declared an outlier if the expensive value of distance squared is above 43,820.

**Table 3 Outlier Normality Testing**

<b>Observation number</b>	<b>Mahalanobis d-squared</b>	<b>p1</b>	<b>p2</b>
Responden 117	35.781	0.011	0.78
Responden 60	35.395	0.013	0.501
Responden 63	35.229	0.013	0.257
Responden 62	34.753	0.015	0.142
Responden 7	34.337	0.017	0.076
Responden 89	34.298	0.017	0.027
Responden 73	32.47	0.028	0.079
Responden 77	31.854	0.032	0.071
Responden 59	30.706	0.043	0.131
Responden 58	30.589	0.045	0.079

Source : Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that there is no data with a value above 43,820. So it can be concluded that the 134 data have no outliers.

### **Test Validity and Reliability**

The results of validity and reliability tests on each variable can be known in the table below:

**Table 4 Validity and Reliability Test Results**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Factor Loading</b>	<b>Construct Reliability</b>
<b>Workload</b>	X1.1	0.544	0.739
	X1.2	0.635	
	X1.3	0.548	
	X1.4	0.685	
	X1.5	0.591	
<b>Percieved Organization Support</b>	X2.1	0.583	0.814
	X2.2	0.703	
	X2.3	0.782	
	X2.4	0.654	
	X2.5	0.691	
<b>Employee Performance</b>	Y1.1	0.806	0.813
	Y1.2	0.708	
	Y1.3	0.659	
	Y1.4	0.615	
	Y1.5	0.619	
<b>Collective Organizational Engagement</b>	Z1.1	0.691	0.791
	Z1.2	0.711	
	Z1.3	0.704	
	Z1.4	0.683	

Source : Processed Primary Data (2023)

Data variable indicators can be declared valid if the value of the loading factor is  $\geq 0.50$ , while a variable will be declared reliable if the value of construct reliability (cr)  $> 0.70$  (Ghozali, 2017). Based on the data above, it can be concluded that the data is valid and reliable.

### Structural Model Analysis

In the analysis of the measurement model, it is carried out with a goodness test of fit indices. The criteria are chi-square, GFI, AGFI, TLI, RMSEA, and NFI (Jung et al., 2015; Schreiber, 2017). The first test analysis can be said that the analyzed model is not good. This is because almost all indicators used have not met the criteria for cut of value values, namely GFI, AGFI, TLI, NFI has a limit of  $> 0.90$  while for RMSEA with a limit of  $< 0.08$  and chi-square with a limit of  $\geq 0.05$ . To find out the results of the chi-square, it is done by looking at the df 134 table with a significance level of 0.05, the result is 1.974. In measurement models that are not good, it is necessary to modify indices in amos software by connecting errors that have the largest value of the correlation value between errors and the results can be seen in the following table .

**Table 5 Goodness Of Fit Indices Test with Modification**

<b>Goodness of Fit Indices</b>	<b>Cut of Value</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Information</b>
Chi-square	$< 162,015$	132.776	Good
GFI	$> 0,90$	0.914	Good
AGFI	$> 0,90$	0.901	Good
TLI	$> 0,90$	0.980	Good
RMSEA	$< 0,08$	0.028	Good
NFI	$> 0,90$	0.921	Good

Source : Primary Data processed (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the results of the goodness of fit indices test with chi-square, GFI, AGFI, TLI, RMSEA, and NFI criteria can be said to be good because, it has met the predetermined limit criteria

### Hypothesis Testing

This stage has the aim of seeing the variables studied whether there is a significant influence. Based on analysis data using amos version 24, the results of the hypothesis test are known which is a test of the relationship between the following research variables.

**Table 6**  
**Test the Hypothesis**

No	Hypothesis	Estimation	S.E.	p	Border	Information
1	There is a positive influence of workload on employee performance	0.112	0.177	0.526	0,05	Not Accepted
2	There is a positive influence of percieved organization support on employee performance	0.973	0.211	0.000	0,05	Accepted
3	There is a positive influence of workload on collective organizational engagement	0.926	0.218	0.000	0,05	Accepted
4	There is a positive influence of percieved organization support on collective organizational engagement	0.163	0.246	0.508	0,05	Not Accepted
5	There is a positive influence of collective organizational engagement on employee performance	0.403	0.13	0.002	0,05	Accepted

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

**Table 7 Test Hypotheses with Mediation**

No	Hipotesis	T Count	T Table	Information
1	There is a positive influence of workload on employee performance through collective organizational engagement	1.544	1.978	Not Accepted
2	There is a positive influence of percieved organization support on employee performance through collective organizational engagement	1.282	1.978	Not Accepted

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

#### **The Effect of Workload Variables on Employee Performance**

From the results of this research states that there is no significant relationship between workload and employee performance. This is supported by the value of the positive estimation parameter data of 0.112 which is smaller and also the probability value of 0.526 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### **The Effect of Percieved Organization Support Variables on Employee Performance**

The results of this study state that there is a positive relationship between percieved organization support on employee performance. This is supported by the value of the positive estimation parameter data of 0.973 and also the probability value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### **The effect of workload variables on collective organizational engagement**

From the results of this study states that there is a positive relationship between workload and collective organizational engagement. This is supported by the value of the positive estimation parameter data of 0.926 and also the probability value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). This shows

that if the workload received by employees increases or decreases, it will affect collective organizational engagement.

### **Effect of Percieved Organization Support Variables on Collective Organizational Engagement**

The results of this study stated that there was no significant relationship between percieved organization support on collective organizational engagement. This is supported by the value of positive estimation parameter data of 0.163 and also the probability value of 0.508 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### **The Effect of Collective Organizational Engagement Variables on Employee Performance**

From the results of this research states that there is a positive relationship between collective organizational engagement on employee performance. This is supported by the value of the positive estimation parameter data of 0.403 and also the probability value of 0.002 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### **The influence of workload variables on employee performance through collective organizational engagement**

The results of this research stated that there was no significant influence on the relationship of workload to employee performance through collective organizational engagement. This is supported by the value of the data t count is 1.544 and t table is 1.978. This explains that the size of the workload received by employees will not affect the performance of these employees or through collective organizational engagement.

### **The influence of percieved organization support variables on employee performance through collective organizational engagement**

The results of this research stated that there was no significant influence on the relationship of percieved organization support on employee performance through collective organizational engagement. This is supported by the value of the data t count is 1.282 and t table is 1.978. This explains that the size of percieved organization support provided to influence employee performance through collective organizational engagement will not be effective.

## **CONCLUSION**

The research indicate that workload has an insignificant effect on employee performance, while perceived organizational support has a significant positive impact on employee performance. Workload does significantly affect collective organizational engagement, but perceived organizational support does not show a significant effect on collective organizational engagement. Collective organizational engagement, however, has a significant positive influence on employee performance. Additionally, the study suggests that workload does not affect employee performance through collective organizational engagement, and perceived organizational support does not influence employee performance through collective organizational engagement effectively. Therefore, it is essential for organizations to focus on providing positive support and fostering collective engagement to enhance employee performance effectively..

## **REFERENCES**

- Ali Malik, H., Haider, G., Bhatti, A., Kamal, A. Z., & Khan, S. (2020). HRM Practices and Organizational Resources as Predictors of Collective Organizational Engagement: Mediating Role of Team Work Engagement. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 23(5). [Google Scholar](#)
- Ariarni, N., & Afrianty, T. W. (2017). Pengaruh Perceived Organizational Support terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Employee Engagement sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 50(4). [Google Scholar](#)



- Baliartati, B. O. (2017). Pengaruh organizational support terhadap job satisfaction tenaga edukatif tetap fakultas ekonomi dan bisnis universitas trisakti. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Pemasaran Jasa*, 9(1), 35–52. [Google Scholar](#)
- Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective Organizational Engagement: Linking Motivational Antecedents, Strategic Implementation, and Firm Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 111–135. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0227> [Google Scholar](#)
- Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, Competitiveness, and Societal Prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 137–152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(97\)00196-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(97)00196-3) [Google Scholar](#)
- Ghozali, I. (2017). Model persamaan struktural konsep dan aplikasi dengan program AMOS 24. *Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro*. [Google Scholar](#)
- Jung, S. Y., Lee, S. J., Kim, S. H., & Jung, K. M. (2015). A Predictive Model of Health Outcomes for Young People with Type 2 Diabetes. *Asian Nursing Research*, 9(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2014.11.002> [Google Scholar](#)
- Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From Micro to Meso: Critical Steps in Conceptualizing and Conducting Multilevel Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(3), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810033001> [Google Scholar](#)
- Konstantinou, A.-K., Bonotis, K., Sokratous, M., Siokas, V., & Dardiotis, E. (2018). Burnout Evaluation and Potential Predictors in a Greek Cohort of Mental Health Nurses. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 32(3), 449–456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2018.01.002> [Google Scholar](#)
- Malhotra Naresh, K., & Dash, S. (2016). *Marketing Research, an Applied Orientation, (7th ed)*. Pearson India Education Services. [Google Scholar](#)
- Noor, T. M. (2021). Collective Organizational Engagement & Work Engagement as Anchor Strategies to Sustain Green Organizational Performance A Case Study on Indonesian Organizational Services. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, 9(1), 78. <https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v9i1.1814> [Google Scholar](#)
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988> [Google Scholar](#)
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Perilaku organisasi edisi ke-12. *Jakarta: Salemba Empat, 11*. [Google Scholar](#)
- Rolos, J. K. R., Sambul, S. A. P., & Rumawas, W. (2018). Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Asuransi Jiwasraya Cabang Manado Kota. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 6(004), 19–27. [Google Scholar](#)
- Schreiber, J. B. (2017). Update to core reporting practices in structural equation modeling. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 13(3), 634–643. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2016.06.006> [Google Scholar](#)

The Influence Of Workload And Perceived Organizational Support On Employee Performance With Collective Organizational Engagement As A Mediating Variable (A Study On The Department Of Community And Village Empowerment In Demak)

Sinambela, L. P. (2012). Kinerja pegawai teori pengukuran dan implikasi. *Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 1*. [Google Scholar](#)

Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2007). Managing firm resources in dynamic environments to create value: Looking inside the black box. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(1), 273–292. [Google Scholar](#)

Sumarni, M. (2010). Pengaruh Organizational Commitment Dan Professional Commitment Terhadap Organization Citizenship Behavior. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan, 4*(2), 1–25. [Google Scholar](#)