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ABSTRACT

Focusing on employee performance is still necessitated concerning to perceived organizational support, quality of work life and employee engagement. The management of human resources is now needed as an organization's strategy to deal with competition challenges. The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of perceived organizational support, quality of work-life and employee engagement on employee performance in units that gained the best value in terms of monitoring the integrity and tidiness of documents in one public institution. The approach used in this study is a quantitative approach. Data collection techniques were carried out by survey method through questionnaires to a total sampling of 104 employees where the number of questionnaires returned was 100 questionnaires. Data analysis techniques in this study used descriptive and inferential analysis using SMARTPLS3. The results of this study reveal that in the unit the influence of perceived organizational support and employee engagement did not significantly correlate with employee performance but correlated significantly with employee engagement. Furthermore, the findings present that employee engagement has a direct effect on employee performance. While organizational support and quality of work life have relationship to employee performance mediated by employee engagement.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the management of human resources in an organization is very important because of the good management of human resources as an effort to produce sustainable competitive advantages to achieve the goals of an organization (Robbins, 1996). According to Robbins (2008), the reason organizations must implement more competitive human resource management is divided into 3, namely organizational excellence can be produced by superior human resource management. Secondly, the management of human resources in viewing workers as an asset and working capital is not a cost that must be minimized, it requires the organization to establish good communication between partners. Third, in achieving superior human resource management, organizations must pay attention to the treatment of employees because it will have an impact on employee performance and organizational performance.

Employee performance can be increased by enhancing the quality and quantity of one’s work. One of the efforts of an organization in increasing employee performance and enhancing the quality of its output is by engaging or participating employees in meeting the needs through the implementation of Quality of Worklife (QWL) (Siagian, 2009). QWL can make employees feel more comfortable and safe while working and become more productive, and at the end, it will affect employees performance (Horst et al, 2014). Besides QWL, employee performance can also be influenced by employee engagement because employees who have strong attachments to their institutions can have maximum performance for the company (Robinson quoted from Litile 2006: 113). Employee engagement can make organization success through optimal employee performance (Roy, 2010: 171). Other variable that affect employee performance is perceived organizational support (POS). Susskind et al. (2000) stated that organizational support can be used to increase employee motivation so that it can positively influence employee performance. Therefore, this study is interested in examining how QWL, employee engagement and POS can affect employee performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According Robbins (2008), performance is the amount of energy and effort made by an employee for the institution where he works. Performance can also be used as a measuring tool for an organization to find out the extent to which an employee tries to carry out work activities well in achieving organizational goals (Harsuko: 2011). Performance can be measured based on two aspects (Aguinis, 2009), namely Task Performance and Contextual Performance. Task performance is a work activity in changing input into output. Activity task performance based on the expertise and abilities of an individual in a group so that the organization runs effectively and efficiently. Meanwhile contextual performance is a performance that is assessed based on the behavior of employees in the organization. This data is seen based on employee personality such as strong enthusiasm in carrying out activities, helping each other, following the prevailing rules, and reflecting positive attitudes that support high integrity in the company.

As mentioned before, performance measurement is influenced by many factors such as QWL, employee engagement and POS. POS is the perception of an employee on how much the organization values the performance that has been given by employees to the organization and cares for welfare the employee. In addition, POS can also be seen as a company commitment to its employees, if the company can appreciate the performance given by its employees then the employee will pay attention to the organizational commitment given (Eisenberger, 1986). By examining the POS variable on employee performance as the dependent variable in this study, the researcher can find out whether there is an alignment between the best assessment of the unit and the actual conditions.
Eisenberger (1986) divides three general forms in an effort to improve POS in organizations. The first is justice, which is procedural justice about how to distribute human resources in an organization. Procedural justice is the impact of policies made by the organization as examples of promotions or salary increases for employees. Second is support. Bosses, superiors are considered as media organizations. Then the perception of an employee towards his organization is seen from how the boss treats his employees so that if the boss can treat his employees loyally this can trigger reciprocity between subordinates and superiors for positive things for the organization. The last is rewards from the organization and working conditions. Rewards from the organization to workers such as bonuses or other compensation that can be received by workers after carrying out work activities outside of their responsibilities. Furthermore, working conditions are supportive. In this case the working conditions are good enough in the room and the atmosphere that makes the workers comfortable in working. POS measurement in this study, the authors use 16 indicators in perceived organizational support (Eisenberger, 2011).

The second factor is QWL. According to Newstrom & Davis (2002) Quality of work life (QWL) is defined as a work environment condition for an employee. In addition, quality of work life (QWL) is a step in the management of human resources by increasing self-confidence for everyone so that they can provide optimal performance and feel comfortable and proud to be part of the organization. (Flippo, 2005). Success in implementing quality of work life in an organization can be seen based on the following indicators (Thahir, 2001): employee participation in work can provide satisfaction, satisfaction from employees can increase the desire of employees to be able to participate more actively with the company, satisfaction and high desire to participate make high attendance from employees because of the feeling of being part of the organization, can create the desire to work more than the responsibilities given without prior guidance, high participation in the work makes employees feel loss if they are not present, always motivated in giving suggestions for the progress of the organization.

In addition, the factors driving the success of quality of work life applied by the company according to Walton (1975), the following factors are quality of work life, namely adequate and fair rewards, safe and healthy work environment conditions (Save and healthy environment), opportunity to use and develop capabilities (development of human capacities), opportunities to develop and security in future work (Growth and security), social integration in the work environment (Social integration), compliance with various formal and normative provisions (Constitutionalism) , the balance between work life and personal life, the social relevance of employee life (Social relevancy).

The third factor is employee engagement. Engagement is a feeling that an individual feel bound to commitment and wants to do the best he can to what has become his commitment (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement is an attachment between the organization and employees where both need each other (Henryhand, 2009). Employee engagement can also be interpreted as a matter of positive encouragement with characteristics namely vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2002). Vigor is a desire in a person's attitude not to despair and persist in achieving his goals. Dedication is a feeling of being valued, inspiring, enthusiastic and challenging then absorption which is an attitude of full focus on the task assigned.
3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. Research Model and Hypothesis

Khaliq and Abbas (2014) in his research entitled Relationship of Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement which was with a locus on the banking sector in Pakistan. Respondents in this study were level officers in the banking sector. The results of his research stated that there was a relationship between Perceived Organizational Support towards Employee Engagement. Perceived Organizational Support in its influence with Employee Engagement also affects the level of depletion of employee turnover. Based on this result, the first hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1: Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement

Another research conducted by Alqarni (2016) found the results that there was a significant Quality of Worklife effect on Employee Engagement. Based on this result, the second hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H2: Quality of Worklife has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement

The results of research conducted by Dajani (2015) revealed that there was a significant relationship between Employee Engagement and Job Performance. Based on this result, the third hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H3: Employee Engagement has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance

The results of the study by Mohamed and Ali (2015) showed that some POS indicators such as Organizational Justice and Job Condition have a significant correlation with Employee Performance, with the exception of the Organizational Rewards indicator in this study does not show a significant correlation between Organizational Reward and Employee Performance. Based on this result, the fourth hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H4: Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

Results of research by Hosmani and Shambhushankar (2014) with the title of his research, namely Study on Impact of Quality of Work Life on Job Performance among Employees of Secunderabad Division of South Central Railway in 2014 revealed that there was a very significant correlation between Quality of Worklife and Employee Performance which also affected Organizational Performance. Based on this result, the fifth hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H5: Quality of Worklife has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance

Based on above hypothesis, the research model is drawn up as showed in figure 1.

![Figure 1 Research Model: Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Engagement](http://www.iaeme.com/IJM/index.asp)
3.2. Types of Research and Data Collection Techniques

This type of research uses quantitative methods with a SEM-PLS approach. The researcher used the SEM-PLS approach in this study because through the SEM-PLS approach this study can examine the relationship of variables in a multivariate manner and in a small sample. Data collection techniques are carried out through primary and secondary data collection. The primary data collection was carried out by distributing questionnaires to 104 respondents and 29 employees who were made into the recondition for the questionnaire pre-test. The number of questionnaires returned to the author was 100 questionnaires. The measurement scale used in this study is by using a Likert scale where the respondent answers a statement through 5 choices: strongly agree, agree, doubt, disagree and strongly disagree. The population in this study were 104 employees and the sampling used was total sampling where all members of the population were used as research samples.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Results

4.1.1. Respondent Profile

Based on the data obtained by the authors about cross-tabulation of the data of the unit respondents that were made as loci after the distribution of 104 employees with the number of questionnaires returned to the researcher as many as 100 questionnaires. The criteria set by the researcher on the respondents' identities in this study were gender consisting of men and women, education consisting of high school, D3, S1 and S2, ages consisting of 21-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years old, 51-60 years and worked for 1-5 years, 6-10 years and 10 years. The results obtained show that respondents with male gender in the unit have the most educational background at the undergraduate level, amounting to 30 employees, then the educational background that is most widely owned by male employees in this unit after the undergraduate level is at the postgraduate level of 16 employees. Male employees who work in these units occupy the most JFT positions or certain functional positions as many as 20 employees then as many as 18 staff as executive staff. Male employees have the most tenure of more than 10 years, namely a number of 24 and a work period of 5 to 10 years, as many as 23 employees.

4.2. SEM-PLS Data Analysis

The model in this study consists of four variables: perceived organizational support, quality of work-life, employee engagement and employee performance. Before doing the analysis the researcher evaluates the validity and reliability of a construct contained in the evaluation of the measurement model in advance so that before further analysis of the existing variables and indicators are valid and reliable for further analysis. Previously, there were several invalid constructs because the construct values were less than 0.5 ie POS2, POS10, QWL17, QWL19, QWL20, QWL22, QWL23, QWL24, QWL28, EE32 and EP42. Therefore, the construct is omitted so that the variables can be further analyzed. Following is the construct model after having removed a number of variables.

4.2.1. Outer Model Analysis

Convergent validity and discriminant validity are used to determine the value of the validity and reliability of a construct. Value in convergent validity construct can be known through loading factor. Value standards in convergent validity in research instruments can be fulfilled if the loading factor from the results of testing the convergent validity of an instrument is at least 0.5. Following the results of testing the convergent validity in this study after omitting some invalid constructs.
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Table 1 Validity and Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After testing the convergent validity, then discriminant validity was tested to find out the indicators of the POS, QWL, EE and EP variables resulting in a greater loading factor than the cross correlation. This value becomes material to determine the ability of the indicators in the research instrument to be able to measure other latent variables. In the discriminant table below, the researcher has removed the constructs in the previous convergent validity table which are declared invalid. This is done by researchers so that data can be further analyzed.

The calculation of AVE, Composite Reliability and Cronbach Alpha is as an ingredient to find out whether the indicator in the instrument can be reliable so that it can measure other latent variables. Based on the above table it can be seen that the AVE value in each research variable has a value greater than 0.5 where it identifies that all indicators can be expressed reliably to measure other latent variables.

4.2.2. Inner Model Analysis (Structural Model Testing)

In the inner model test, three approaches are carried out namely $R^2$, $Q^2$ and Goodness of Fit (GoF).

Table 2 Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above it can be seen that the $R^2$ value of employee engagement is 0.345. This shows that the value of the influence of perceived organizational support and quality of work-life variables on employee engagement is 0.345. These results can show perceived organizational support and quality of work-life construct variables of 34.5% while the remaining 65.5% is explained by other variables outside of this study.

Based on the table above it can be seen that the value of $R^2$ employee performance is 0.680. This shows that the value of the influence of perceived organizational variables support and quality of work-life on employee performance is 0.680. Based on these results it can be explained that perceived organizational support variables and quality of work-life are 68% while the remaining 32% is explained by other variables outside this research.

Goodness of Fit (GoF) value is said to be small if it has a value of 0.1. GoF is said to be medium if it has a value of 0.25 and has a large value if the value reaches 0.38. Based on the results obtained from previous calculations it can be concluded that the GoF value = 0.518 is included in the criteria for large values. Based on the results of the analysis of $R^2$, $Q^2$ and GoF that have been done previously, the model formed is robust, so hypothesis testing can be done.
4.3. Hypothesis Testing

The Path Coefficient Testing Results shows in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous</th>
<th>Endogenous</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>11.018</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work-life</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work-life</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1: Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement**

In the table above it can be seen that the effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Engagement has a path coefficient of 0.276 which means a strong coefficient. Then the T-Statistics value is 2.049 which means that the value is greater than the minimum value of the T-Table which is 1.96 and P-Values = 0.041 that value is less than 0.05 or 5%. Based on the results of the hypothesis test on SmartPLS3, it can be seen that Ho is rejected and that alternative science is accepted so that it can be concluded that Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant influence on Employee Engagement.

**H2: Quality of Worklife has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement**

In the table above it can be seen that the influence of Quality of Worklife on Employee Engagement has a path coefficient of 0.345 which means a strong coefficient. Then the T-Statistics value is 2.748 which means that the value is greater than the minimum value of the T-Table which is 1.96 and P-Values = 0.006 that value is less than 0.05 or 5%. Based on the results of hypothesis testing on SmartPLS3, it can be seen that Ho is rejected and that alternative hypotheses are accepted so that Quality of Worklife can be concluded to have a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement.

**H3: Employee Engagement has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance**

In the table above it can be seen that the effect of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance has a path coefficient of 0.801 which means strong coefficient. Then the T-statistic value is 11.018 which means that the value is greater than the minimum value of the T-table which is 1.96 and P-Values = 0.0000 the value is less than 0.05 or 5%. Based on the results of the hypothesis testing on SmartPLS3 it can be seen that Ho is rejected and that the alternative hypothesis is accepted so that it can be concluded that Employee Engagement has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

**H4: Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance**

Based on the results of calculations in the hypothesis test table above, it can be seen that the effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Performance has a path coefficient of -0.084 which means negative / low coefficient. The T-statistic value is 0.850 which means that the value is smaller than the minimum value of the T-table which is 1.96 and P-Values = 0.396 that value is more than 0.05 or 5%. Based on the results of the hypothesis test on SmartPLS3 it can be seen that Ho is accepted and that the alternative
hypothesis is rejected so that it can be concluded that Perceived Organizational Support does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance

**H5: Quality of Worklife has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.**

Based on the results of calculations in the hypothesis test table above, it can be seen that the influence of Quality of Worklife on Employee Performance has a path coefficient of 0.118 which means high coefficient. The T-Statistics value is 1.199 which means that the value is smaller than the minimum value of the T-Table which is 1.96 and P-Values = 0.231 that value is more than 0.05 or 5%. Based on the results of the hypothesis testing on SmartPLS3 it can be seen that Ho is accepted and that alternative hypotheses are rejected so that it can be concluded that Quality of Worklife does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

### 4.3. Indirect Effect Test

There are four stages in the indirect test, namely as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Indirect Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS-&gt;EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL-&gt;EP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above it can be seen that there is an indirect influence from the variable Perceived Organizational Support to Employee Performance and Quality if worklife on Employee Performance.

**H1: Perceived Organizational Support has a positive / significant effect on Employee Performance.**

**H2: Quality of worklife has a positive / significant effect on Employee Performance.**

The results in the form of data from the previous table can be seen that there are indirect effects of variables which in the hypothesis test have no relationship. The effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Performance has a path coefficient of 0.221 (and the T-statistic value is 2.041 or greater than the T-table = 1.96 and P values = 0.042 (0.000 <0.05). H0) that alternative hypothesis (the researcher hypothesis is accepted) so that explains that Perceived Organizational Support has a positive / significant effect on Employee Performance, through mediation by the Employee Engagement variable.

Based on the results, the indirect effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Performance has a path coefficient of 0.277 (and the T-statistic value = 2.658 or greater than T-table = 1.96 and P values = 0.008 (0.000 <0.05). These results describe (reject H0) or that alternative hypothesis (the research hypothesis is accepted) so that explains that Quality of work-life has a positive / significant effect on Employee Performance. Through mediation by the Employee Engagement variable.

### 4.4. Discussion

Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Perceived Organizational Support level can affect the attitude of Employee Engagement in this unit. This is consistent with previous research conducted by Abdul Khalilq, et al, entitled Relationship of Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement. The results of this study are in line with previous studies.
Quality of Work-life has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Quality of Work-life level can affect the attitude of Employee Engagement in this unit. The results of this study are consistent with the previous research with the title of Quality of Work-life research as a predictor of Work Teaching Faculty at King Abdulate which was examined by Ali, where the results of the previous research showed a relationship between QWL and EE so that the results of the previous research were in line with this research.

Employee Engagement has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. It can be interpreted that rising and falling levels of Employee Engagement can affect the attitude of Employee Performance. These results are in line with the results of previous studies with the title of the research on the Impact of Employee Engagement on Job Performance and Organizational Commitment in the Egyptian Banking Sector. Previously researched by Ahmed. Outputs in previous studies showed a relationship between EE and EP. This is consistent with the results in this study where employee engagement has an influence on employee performance.

Perceived Organizational Support does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. This can mean that the rise and fall of the Perceived Organizational Support level cannot affect the attitude of Employee Performance. This is not in line with previous research entitled Perceived Organizational Support, Work Motivation and Organizational Commitment as determinants of job performance conducted by Sa'diya Ahmed in his research where the results in this study show that POS has a stronger influence than other variables on employee performance. The inconsistency between the results of this study and prior research can be caused by different loci and research samples.

Quality of Work-life does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Quality of Work-life level cannot affect the attitude of Employee Performance. This is not in line with previous research with the title of study on impact of quality of work on job performance among employees of the secondary division of the south-central railway conducted by Hosmani and Shambhushankar (2014). The inequality between the results of this study and prior research can be caused by different loci and research samples.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of, it can be concluded that Perceived Organizational Support has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Perceived Organizational Support level can influence Employee Engagement attitudes. Quality of Work-life also has a positive and significant effect on Employee Engagement. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Quality of Work-life level can affect Employee Engagement attitudes. Meanwhile Employee Engagement has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. It can be interpreted that rising and falling levels of Employee Engagement can affect the attitude of Employee Performance. On the other side, Perceived Organizational Support does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Perceived Organizational Support level cannot affect the attitude of Employee Performance. Quality of Work-life also does not have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. It can be interpreted that the rise and fall of the Quality of Work-life level cannot affect the attitude of Employee Performance.

Based on the analysis the degree of perceived organizational support or perception of organizational support are quite good, but it does not affect employee’s performance directly at the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Trade. Meanwhile it has more influence on
employee engagement. Therefore, in encouraging the implementation of POS so that it can affect the employee’s performance, institution should empower the role of leadership. Leader should create conducive environment to employee in order to leverage employee engagement and retain employee performance.

Furthermore, although this research makes a significant contribution by revealing the empirical evidence of the effect Perceived Organizational Support, Quality of Work-life and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance in Public Agencies, this study has some limitations. This study only focusses in one unit in the institution and only use three variables of organizational behavior to examine the factors that driven employee performance. Further investigations are needed to fully understand the complexity of this phenomenon.
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