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ABSTRACT

This research was conducted with the aim of knowing the effect of employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya. This research uses descriptive research with a quantitative approach. The data collection technique was carried out using a questionnaire media with the Likert method. The population in this study were 80 permanent employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya. The sampling technique used is using a saturated sample (total sampling). The total sampling obtained is as many as 80 employees from PT. Dino Jaya Karya. The t test shows that the employee engagement variable (X1) has a positive and significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y) with a value of 0.000, the perceived organizational support variable (X2) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y) with a value of 0.000, and the motivation variable (X3 has a positive and significant effect on employee performance variable (y) with a value of 0.004. In the F test results employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation have a simultaneous effect on employee performance as indicated by a significance value of 0.000.
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INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement as an employee’s appreciation of goals and concentration of energy, which appears in the form of initiative, adaptability, effort, and persistence that leads to organizational goals. (Pringgabayu & Keizer, 2017)

(Dewi Cahyani Pangestuti, 2019; Nurhidayah et al., 2019) provides a definition of perceived organizational support reflecting the quality of employee relationships with the organization by measuring the extent to which employees believe that their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being.

(Erwin Budi Setyawan, 2020) defines motivation as a mental condition that encourages one’s soul to achieve maximum performance. Motivation strings attitudes
and values that influence individuals to achieve specific things according to individual goals.

Performance comes from English, namely "job performance or actual performance" which means work performance or actual achievement achieved by someone. Or the quality and quantity of work that an employee wants to achieve in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. (Valka et al., 2018)

The formulation of the problem in this research are:

1. Does employee engagement affect the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
2. Does the perception of organizational support affect the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
3. Does motivation affect the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
4. Does employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation jointly affect the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?

Based on the above statement, the hypothesis in this study is as follows:

H1: Employee engagement has a significant positive effect on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya

H2: Perception of organizational support has a significant positive effect on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya

H3: Motivation has a significant positive effect on the performance of PT. PT. Dino Jaya Karya

H4: Employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation together affect the performance of PT. Dino Jaya Karya

The objectives of this research are:

1. Knowing whether there is an effect of employee engagement on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
2. Knowing whether there is a perceived influence of organizational support on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
3. Knowing whether there is an influence of motivation on the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?
4. Knowing whether employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation together affect the performance of employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya?

Employee Engagement

The use of employee engagement or what is often called employee engagement was popularized by Khan. Khan was the first to issue a theory of the link between work and engagement. (Saputri & Prabowo, 2015)

(Handoyo & Setiawan, 2017) suggests how to see the effect of employee engagement on employee performance based on 7 factors as follows: work environment,
leadership, team and peer relations, training and career development, compensation, organizational policies.

**Organizational Support Perception**

(Putra et al., 2019) defines the perception of organizational support as a form of support provided by the work environment to an employee. Furthermore, the perception of organizational support is an emotional form from employees to their organization with a social emotional needs approach to assess the organization’s readiness to reward efforts so that employees will form a commitment within the organization.

(Karimah & Misra, 2020) revealed that perceived organizational support can be measured through 4 indicators as follows: rewards, superior support, working conditions, welfare.

**Motivation**

(Bawono et al., 2019) argue that the term motive is the same as the words motive, motive, encouragement, reason and driving force. Motive is the driving force that drives humans to act or a force within humans that causes humans to act.

Increasing motivation through psychological empowerment there are 4 main dimensions that shape it according to (Rahmasari, 2011), namely: Meaning, Perceived impact, Competence. Self-determination is a person's feelings regarding choices in monitoring or regulating actions.

**Employee performance**

Performance comes from English, namely "job performance or actual performance" which means work performance or actual achievement achieved by someone. Or the quality and quantity of work that an employee wants to achieve in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. (Valka et al., 2018)

Stating (Handoyo & Setiawan, 2017) employee performance has 5 indicators, namely: work quantity, work quality, punctuality, attendance. The ability to cooperate, socialize and build relationships in cooperation to complete work.

**Framework**

![Framework Diagram](image)

**RESEARCH METHODS**
Nature of Research

The method used in this research is quantitative research which is classified as non-experimental, namely research that does not involve manipulation of variables or research subjects. (Maulana & Verawati, 2014)

Population and Sample

Population

According to (Lubis & Wulandari, 2018) the population is the entire research subject. The population in this study were 80 employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya.

Sample

According to Muliawan, (2017) the sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population. The sample in this study were 80 employees at PT. Dino Jaya Karya.

Sources and Data Collection Techniques

Data source

In this study the authors used the primary data collection method obtained from employees of PT. Dino Jaya Karya through a questionnaire.

Data collection technique

Avianto et al., (2019) By distributing questionnaires to see the reactions of respondents, this study uses a Likert Scale.

Place and Time of Data Collection

Data Collection Place

Data collection was carried out at PT. Dino Jaya Karya Jl. Drs. H. Anang Hasyim, Forestry Complex, Air Hitam, Kec. Samarinda Ulu, Samarinda City, East Kalimantan 75243.

Data Collection Time

Data collection was carried out on September 1, 2021 at 08.00 – 17.00 WITA.

Data analysis method

The data analysis method used in this study is as follows.

Validity test

Validity test is used to determine whether a questionnaire is valid or not. (Chrisdiana & Rahardjo, 2017)

Reliability Test

Reliability is a measure of the stability and consistency of respondents' answers to problems related to each question item. If Cronbach Alpha > 0.60 then the statement is said to be reliable. (Muliawan, 2017)

Classic assumption test

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity means that there is a perfect or definite relationship where some or several variables explain the regression line. (Solichin, 2018a)

Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation. (Solichin, 2018a)

Normality test
Through the normality test, it can be seen that P_Plot shows the data has a normal distribution and spreads along a diagonal line. It can be concluded that all regression models used in this study are feasible because they meet the assumption of normality. (S, 2018)

Data Analysis Techniques
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis
This analysis is used to determine whether there is an influence and relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. (Solichin, 2018a)
Test Statistics t
The t-test was conducted to partially test the first, second, and third hypotheses on employee performance. (Solichin, 2018a).

F Statistic Test
The F test is used to show whether all independent variables have a joint influence on the independent variables. The probability value is less than 0.05 then the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable. (S, 2018)
Coefficient of Determination Analysis (R^2)
The coefficient of determination basically measures how far the ability of the regression equation model to explain the dependent variable or is used to determine the contribution of the independent variable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Data Analysis Results
Validity Test Results
Validity test is used to determine whether a questionnaire is valid or not. A questionnaire is said to be valid if the questions on the questionnaire are able to reveal something that will be measured by the questionnaire. (Chrisdiana & Rahardjo, 2017)

Table 1. Validity Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Questions/Indicators</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (R Count)</th>
<th>Validity Standard (R Table)</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement (X1)</td>
<td>X1.1</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.2</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.3</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.4</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.5</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.6</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1.7</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support Perception (X2)</td>
<td>X2.1</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2.2</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2.3</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2.4</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (X3)</td>
<td>X3.1</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3.2</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 2, from the results of observations in rTable of a sample of 80, it is obtained by 0.220. Based on the results of the validity tests carried out, all the *employee engagement* variables, perceived organizational support, motivation, and employee performance all have a arithmetic value > rTable of 0.220. Therefore, it can be concluded that all items are valid.

Reliability Test Results

Reliability is a measure of the stability and consistency of respondents' answers to problems related to each question item. If Cronbach Alpha > 0.60 then the statement is said to be reliable. (Muliawan, 2017)

**Table 2. Reliability Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Engagement (X1)</th>
<th>Perception of Organizational Support (X2)</th>
<th>Motivation (X3)</th>
<th>Performance (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 2, the Cronbach’s Alpha value of all research variables shows that it is greater than 0.60. Respondents' answers to the research variables are reliable, so that the question items are reliable and can be used in research.

Normality

The normality test aims to test whether the data used are normally distributed regression data or not. (Solichin, 2018b)
Figure 1 Normality Test Results

Based on Figure 1, the probability-plot shows that the data spreads around the diagram and follows a regression model so that it can be concluded that the data in these variables are normally distributed. (Sustainable, 2018)

In addition to using the Normal Probably Plot (NPP) method, it can be seen by means of the Columograph-Smirnov analysis method. The standardized residual value is normally distributed if sig > than 0.05.

Table 3 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Residual</th>
<th>Normal Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal mean</td>
<td>.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.91155601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistics</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Primary data, processed in 2021 using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 3, it can be seen that the Asymp value. Sig of 0.200 > from 0.05 so it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 2 Normality Histogram Graph

Based on Figure 4.2, it can be seen that the line forms a bell/mountain curve and the value of Std. Dev. = 0.981 > 0.80, so it can be said that the regression model meets the elements.

Multicollinearity

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether in the regression model there is a correlation between independent variables. In this study, multicollinearity can be seen from the tolerance value and Variant Inflation Factor (VIF). (Sustainable, 2018)
Based on table 4, it can be seen that all independent variables, namely Employee Engagement (X1), Perceived Organizational Support (X2), and Motivation (X3) used in this study have a tolerance value > 0.10 and a VIF value < 0.10. It means that the independent variables in this study were not found to have multicollinearity so that the independent variables could be used for research.

**Heteroscedasticity**

Heteroscedasticity test is used to determine whether there is an inequality in the value of the residual deviation due to the size of the value of one of the independent variables. The test was carried out using the scatterplot test.

Judging from Figure 4.3 the scatterplot above does not find a clear pattern and the points spread above and below or around the number 0 on the Y axis. So there is no heteroscedasticity in the regression model, so the regression model is feasible to use in research. (Wahyuningtyas & Eka Askafi, 2018)

**Multiple Regression Analysis**
Multiple regression analysis aims to determine the effect of the independent variable (independent) on the dependent variable (dependent). (Lawasi & Triatmanto, 2017)

Table 5 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B (Unstandardized Coefficients)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Constant)</td>
<td>9.132</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>4.202</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support Perception</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>2.319</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

From these data, it can be seen that the Employee Engagement coefficient value is 0.322 which means that if the Employee Engagement variable increases, then the employee's performance increases. The coefficient of perceived organizational support is 0.178 which means that if the perceived organizational support variable increases, then employee performance increases. Furthermore, the value of the motivation coefficient is 0.228, meaning that if the motivation variable increases, then the employee's performance increases.

Hypothesis testing

The partial hypothesis testing in this study uses the t test, and the simultaneous hypothesis testing in this study uses the f statistic test. (Agustyna & Partono Prasitio, 2020)

Table 6. Results of t-test (partial) Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B (Unstandardized Coefficients)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Constant)</td>
<td>11.385</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>5.523</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>4.937</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 6, the results of the t-test (partial) show that the significance value of the influence of Employee Engagement (X1) on employee performance (Y)
is 0.000 <0.05 and the t-count value is 4.937 > the t-table value is 1.992. There is a significant effect of Employee Engagement on employee performance.

**Table 7. Results of t-test (Partial) Perception of Organizational Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>15.096</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>9.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support Perception</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance
Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 7, the results of the t-test (partial) show that the significance value of the perceived influence of Organizational Support (X2) on employee performance (Y) is 0.000 <0.05 and the t-count value is 3.931 > the t-table value is 1.992. There is a significant effect of perceived organizational support on employee performance.

**Table 8. Results of t-test (partial) Motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>17.485</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>12.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance
Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 8, the results of the t-test (partial) show that the significance value of the influence of motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) is 0.004 <0.05 and the t-count value is 2.973 > the t-table value is 1.992. There is a significant effect of motivation on employee performance.

**F Uji test**
The F test is used to see whether all the independent variables have an effect simultaneously or simultaneously on the dependent variable. The probability value is less than 0.05 then the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable. (Yuswardi, 2019)

**Table 9. F Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>125,330</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41,777</td>
<td>10,999</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>288,670</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Perception of Organizational Support, Employee Engagement

Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 9 above, it can be seen that hypothesis testing can be seen that the significance value for the variable employee engagement (X1), perceived organizational support (X2), and motivation (X3) is 0.000 < 0.05 and \( f \text{count} 10.999 > f \text{table} 3.12 \). Coefficient of Determination Analysis (R\(^2\))

Determination is denoted by \( r^2 \). This value indicates the proportion of the overall variation in the value of the dependent variable that can be explained or caused by a linear relationship with the value of the variable. (Hartanto et al., 2018)

**Table 10. Coefficient of Determination Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>1.94892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Perception of Organizational Support, Employee Engagement

Source: The author's processing results using IBM SPSS 25

Based on table 10, the coefficient of determination R Square (R2) is 0.303 or 30.3%. This means that the percentage of employee engagement variables, perceived organizational support, and motivation on employee performance is 30.3% and the remaining 60.7% is influenced by other factors.

**Discussion**

The Effect of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance

The results of the hypothesis test state that the employee engagement variable has a significant positive effect on employee performance, as evidenced by the results of the t-test with a tcount value of 4.937 > a t-table value of 1.992 and a significance value of 0.000 <0.05.

The Influence of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Performance

The results of the hypothesis test state that the perceived organizational support variable has a significant positive effect on employee performance, as evidenced by the results of the t-test with a t-value of 3.931 > t-table value of 1.992 and a significance value of 0.000 <0.05.

The Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

The results of the hypothesis test state that the motivation variable has a significant positive effect on employee performance. It is evident from the results of the t-test with a t-value of 2.973 > a t-table value of 1.992 and a significance value of 0.004 <0.05.

The Influence of Employee Engagement, Perceived Organizational Support, and Partial Motivation on Employee Performance
The results of the hypothesis test state that the variables of employee engagement, perceived organizational support, and motivation have a simultaneous effect on employee performance. It is evident from the results of the simultaneous F test with a value of fcount 10.999 > f table 3.12 and a significance value of 0.000 <0.05.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of the discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded as follows:

1. *Employee Engagement* has a significant positive effect on employee performance.
2. Perception of Organizational Support has a significant positive effect on employee performance.
3. Motivation has a significant effect on employee performance.
4. *Employee engagement*, perceived organizational support, and motivation have a simultaneous effect on employee performance.

Suggestion

*Employee Engagement* is perceived very well by employees, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents answered agree. This can be an illustration for the organization that it is proven in this study that involving employees can affect employee performance. Companies can use *Employee Engagement* to improve employee performance to be more active.

The perception of organizational support is felt quite well by employees, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents answered agree about the perception of organizational support, this can be a picture for the organization that is proven by the perception of organizational support can affect employee performance. Companies can use perceived organizational support to measure the level of employee performance and increase organizational support so that employee performance increases.

Motivation is perceived as quite good by employees, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents answered agree, this can be an illustration for organizations that employees still tend to not feel high enough motivation from the organization, because in this study it was proven that motivation can affect employee performance. Companies can use motivation to improve employee performance.
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