JRSSEM 2022, Vol. 01, No. 12, 2076 – 2091
E-ISSN: 2807 - 6311, P-ISSN: 2807 - 6494

EFFECT OF COMPENSATION, WORKLOAD, LEADERSHIP ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND IMPLICATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Agustina Anisa[1*]
Yuliantini Tine[2]
[1,2]Mercu Buana University, Jakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: anissa.agusstina@gmail.com[1], tine.yuliantini@mercubuana.ac.id[2]
*Correspondence: anissa.agusstina@gmail.com

Submitted: 27 June 2022, Revised: 05 July 2022, Accepted: 15 July 2022

Abstract. Discussing the practice of human resource management, one of the things that makes the determining factor for the company's success is performance. The same is true for the services business sector of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya, to become a company that has a good reputation when providing services, performance is also considered important. This study aims to analyze the effect of Compensation, Workload, Leadership on Employee Performance and Implications on Organizational Performance Case study PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This research methodology uses a quantitative approach method using Smart PLS 3.3.9 to analyze several theoretical concepts to 88 respondents of company employees. Based on the results of the analysis in this study, the results obtained are that: 1) There is a positive and significant effect of compensation on employee performance; 2) There is a significant and significant effect of Workload on Employee Performance; 3) There is a positive and significant influence of leadership on employee performance; 4) There is a positive and significant effect of Compensation on Organizational Performance; 5) There is a significant and influential workload on Organizational Performance; 6) There is a positive and significant influence of Leadership on Organizational Performance; 7) There is a positive and significant effect of Employee Performance on Organizational Performance; 8) There is a positive and significant effect of Compensation on Organizational Performance through Employee Performance; 9) There is a significant and significant influence on Organizational Performance Workload through Employee Performance; 10) There is a positive and significant influence of Leadership on Organizational Performance through Employee Performance.

Keyword: compensation; workload; leadership; employee performance; organizational performance.

INTRODUCTION

Human resource management is an important component in the company's strategic planning process. The competition of this century makes every country realize that human resources are things that need to be maintained for the sustainability of a nation and state. Practically, human resource management consists of recruitment and selection, training and development, compensation and performance appraisal (Siyambalapitiya et al., 2018); (Fayazi et al., 2019).

In a situation of increasingly high competition, companies need to carefully evaluate and improve their performance so that the company can survive and develop (Linde et al., 2020). The same is true for the services business sector of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya, to become a company that has a good reputation when providing services, performance is also considered important by PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya.

The scope of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya is in the field of supplying passenger food and onboard services. The goal of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya is to become a leading technology-based service company in Indonesia. When Indonesia implemented the sea toll program, the fleet of PT Pelayaran Nasional Indonesia in 2015 was 31 ships, in 2016 it became 80 ships, in 2017 it became 83 ships, and became 86 ships in 2018 (Hameed & Hamad, 2022). This also has a positive impact on PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya where organizational performance is increasing and developing. However, this is in contrast to the conditions for the last three years where the organizational performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya has decreased.

The organizational performance target is 100% but in the realization of the KPI in 2018 it does not reach the target weight set, which is 97.72%. Then the realization of the KPI in 2019 did not reach the set target weight, which was 96.17%. In the realization of the KPI in 2020, it did not reach the specified weight, which was 84.96%.

Talking about organizational performance, there are important things to consider because the achievement of organizational performance comes from employee performance activities within the organization. At PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya, the performance of employees is difficult to project because the performance evaluated is only up to the divisional unit (Poulsen & Ipsen, 2017); (Agwu, 2012). However, it can be said that the division's performance is a reflection of the employee's performance, because the division's performance targets are the result of cooperation between employees in the business unit.

From 2018 to 2020, the division's performance has a fluctuating status. In 2018, the Commercial and Maintenance and IT divisions whose achievements did not reach the target weight score. Then in the realization of 2019 the Human Resources division did not reach the target weight score set (Agwu, 2012). In the realization of 2020, it did not reach the weight score set for the Maintenance and IT and Human Resources divisions (Rai et al., 2021).

In addition to the above information, the authors conducted a pre-survey to determine the perceptions of employees regarding the factors that affect the

performance.

From the results of the pre-survey, it is known that the percentage of each variable is as follows, on compensation it has a result of 35% stating it is in line with expectations and 65% stating it is not as expected. The workload has a result of 34% stating that they do not have a workload and 65% who state that they have a workload when faced with urgent work. In leadership, 27% stated that leadership was optimal and 72% stated that it was not optimal. In work discipline, 80% stated that they had complied with work discipline regulations and 20% were not disciplined. In the work environment, 66% stated that the company provides comfort in working and 34% stated that it was not comfortable. On motivation, 92% have high motivation to work in the company and 7% have no motivation to work.

Based on this phenomenon, it can be concluded that the most influencing factors on performance are compensation, workload, and leadership. This is also reflected in the results of employee engagement in 2021 regarding compensation, workload, and leadership where the results have decreased from the previous year (McKenzie & Sansone, 2019). Where compensation which is included in the perception of working welfare has an average result of 8.28 exceeding the target number but decreasing compared to 2020 (Nursaid et al., 2020). In the average workload of 7.54, it decreased compared to 2020. In leadership, which is included in the survey indicators, including the perception of relationships with superiors, the perception of relationships with subordinates, superiors appreciate that it has decreased in 2021.

Based on the data and phenomena contained in the background of the problem, the authors are interested in conducting a study entitled "*The Effect of Compensation, Workload, Leadership on Employee Performance and Implications on Organizational Performance at PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya*".

METHODS

This research method uses a survey method with a quantitative approach. This research is included in the form of causal or causal relationship research which is to test whether one variable causes another variable to change or not. The population in this study were employees of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya with a total of 114 employees. The sampling technique used is *simple random sampling*, where each element in the population has the same meaning and opportunity to be selected as the subject (Lo et al., 2020).

The author measures the sample size to be studied using the Slovin formula, where this formula is able to measure the sample size to be studied. The sample size to be studied is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{N.e^2 + 1}$$

Description:

n = Number of samples

N = Total population

e = error margin of 5%

From the above formula the following figures are obtained:

$$n = \frac{114}{114.0.05^2 + 1}$$

$$= \frac{114}{0.285 + 1}$$

$= 88$

So, the sample in this study was 88 employees of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya.

Results of Data Analysis

Respondent

Description is the author's way of describing the characteristics of the research sample in detail. The characteristics of the respondents in this study were analysis based on gender, age, education, and length of service of each employee.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Gender	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	52	59.10%
	Female	36	40.90%
	Total	**88**	**100%**
Age	18-25 years	22	25%
	26-30 years	36	40.90%
	31-40 years	24	27.28 %
	> 40 years	6	6.82%
	Total	88	100%
education	/equivalent	7	7.96%
	Diploma	6	6.81%
	S1	67	76.14%
	Masters degree	8	9.09%
	Total	88	100%
Work duration	1-3 years	23	26.14%
	4-6 years	58	65.91%
	> 7 years	7	7.95%
	Total	88	100%

Source: Data Processing by the Author (2022)

Test Results Measurement Model (Outer Model)

Convergent Validity Testing in this study used a loading factor value above 0.7. Convergent validity test in principle states that the instrument used as a measure of a construct should be highly correlated (Durdyev et al., 2018).

Table 2. Value of Loading Factor

Variables	Indicator	Loading Factor	Description
Compensation (X1)	X1.1.	0.870	Valid
	X1.2.	0.874	Valid
	X1.3.	0.835	Valid
	X1.4.	0.865	Valid
Workload (X3)	X2.1.	0.778	Valid
	X2.2.	0.807	Valid
	X2.3.	0.747	Valid
	X2.4.	0.758	Valid
	X2.5.	0.809	Valid
	X2.6.	0.833	Valid
	X2.7.	0.796	Valid
	X2.8.	0.761	Valid
Leadership (X3)	X3.1.	0.764	Valid
	X3.2.	0.748	Valid
	X3.3.	0.819	Valid
	X3.4.	0.774	Valid
	X3.5.	0.728	Valid
	X3.6.	0.805	Valid
	X3.7.	0.751	Valid
	X3.8.	0.771	Valid
	X3.9.	0.805	Valid
	X3.10.	0.788	Valid
	X3.11.	0.784	Valid
	X3.12.	0.796	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)	Y.1.	0.783	Valid
	Y.2.	Y.3	Valid
	.	0.823	Valid
	Y.4.	0.834	Valid
	Y.5.	0.821	Valid
	Y.6.	0.813	Valid
	Y.7.	Y.8	Valid
	.	0.821	Valid
Organizational Performance	Z.1.	0.840	Valid
	Z.2.	Z.3	Valid
	.	0.836	Valid

Variables	Indicator	Loading Factor	Description
(Z)	Z.4.	0.851	Valid
	Z.5.	0.850	Valid

Source: Results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022

It can be concluded that all indicators are valid or have met convergent validity.

Discriminant Validity Testing

Discriminant Validity

Testing is carried out to check the cross loading value of each indicator provided that the value of the variable indicator is greater than the other variables. If there is a variable value that does not meet the requirements, then the indicator is not continued for the analysis process.

Table 3. Results of the Descriminant Validity Test

Indikator	Kompensasi (X1)	Beban Kerja (X2)	Kepemimpinan (X3)	Kinerja Karyawan (Y)	Kinerja Organisasi (Z)	Keterangan
X1.1.	0.870	0.313	0.574	0.523	0.763	Valid
X1.2.	0.874	0.403	0.463	0.502	0.754	Valid
X1.3.	0.835	0.305	0.430	0.467	0.683	Valid
X1.4.	0.865	0.346	0.396	0.438	0.643	Valid
X2.1.	0.190	0.778	0.359	0.360	0.397	Valid
X2.2.	0.297	0.807	0.613	0.482	0.496	Valid
X2.3.	0.282	0.747	0.204	0.242	0.302	Valid
X2.4.	0.218	0.758	0.374	0.323	0.344	Valid
X2.5.	0.496	0.809	0.492	0.477	0.549	Valid
X2.6.	0.346	0.833	0.373	0.344	0.427	Valid
X2.7.	0.194	0.796	0.272	0.330	0.323	Valid
X2.8.	0.450	0.761	0.452	0.512	0.586	Valid
X3.1.	0.379	0.410	0.764	0.463	0.584	Valid
X3.2.	0.429	0.263	0.748	0.339	0.522	Valid
X3.3.	0.417	0.364	0.819	0.400	0.565	Valid
X3.4.	0.431	0.347	0.774	0.477	0.552	Valid
X3.5.	0.451	0.362	0.728	0.560	0.580	Valid
X3.6.	0.608	0.387	0.805	0.727	0.730	Valid
X3.7.	0.436	0.331	0.751	0.542	0.600	Valid
X3.8.	0.373	0.473	0.771	0.487	0.590	Valid
X3.9.	0.485	0.371	0.805	0.564	0.637	Valid
X3.10.	0.421	0.477	0.788	0.512	0.584	Valid
X3.11.	0.325	0.429	0.784	0.436	0.605	Valid
X3.12.	0.301	0.505	0.796	0.467	0.559	Valid

Y.1.	0.428	0.512	0.534	0.783	0.571	Valid
Y.2.	0.482	0.453	0.647	0.838	0.662	Valid
Y.3.	0.412	0.382	0.476	0.823	0.562	Valid
Y.4.	0.453	0.326	0.544	0.834	0.599	Valid
Y.5.	0.479	0.395	0.531	0.821	0.609	Valid
Y.6.	0.488	0.430	0.473	0.813	0.589	Valid
Y.7.	0.460	0.372	0.485	0.803	0.590	Valid
Y.8.	0.467	0.362	0.505	0.821	0.583	Valid
Z.1.	0.765	0.465	0.576	0.609	0.840	Valid
Z.2.	0.686	0.425	0.662	0.638	0.849	Valid
Z.3.	0.715	0.431	0.602	0.569	0.836	Valid
Z.4.	0.624	0.465	0.709	0.644	0.851	Valid
Z.5.	0.704	0.541	0.674	0.620	0.850	Valid

Source: The results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022

Test discriminant validity show that all indicators used in *valid* have a *cross loading* of the construct that is greater than the *cross loading* of other constructs. Furthermore, for *discriminant validity* is done by looking at the *Average variance extracted* (AVE) value. Evaluation of *discriminant validity* can be seen from the value of *Average Variance Extracted* (AVE) > 0.50 (Sari et al., 2019).

Table 4. AVE Value

Variable	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Compensation	0.742
Workload	0.619
Leadership	0.606
Employee Performance	0.668
Organizational Performance	0.714

Source: The results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022

AVE Value for all research variables and research dimensions has a value above 0.5 so The AVE value for discriminant validity testing has met the requirements for further testing. Therefore. The Discriminant Validity test has been met as well as the Convergent Validity test so that it can be concluded that the research model is valid.

The construct reliability test

Declared reliable if the Composite Reliability value > 0.7 and Cronbach Alpha > 0.60 (Fayazi et al., 2019).

Table 5. Value of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Realibility	Description
Compensation	0.884	0.920	Reliable
Workload	0.912	0.928	Reliable
Leadership	0.941	0.948	Reliable
Employee Performance	0.929	0.941	Reliable
Organizational Performance	0.900	0.926	Reliable

Source: The results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022.

Based on table 5 obtained the value of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha is more than 0.70 and the Composite Reability value is more than 0.60. It can be concluded that all variables in this study were declared reliable.

Structural Model Testing (Inner Model)

Structural Model Testing (Inner Model) is a step in the analysis in evaluating the path coefficient value, evaluating the R^2.

Evaluating the Value of the Path Coefficient

The path coefficient is a way of evaluating to see the strength of the relationship between constructs/variables.

Table 6. Path Coefficient Test Results

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistic (O/STDEV)	P Values
Compensation→Employee Performance	0.270	0.276	0.100	2.706	0.007
Organizational→Performance Compensation	0.510	0.515	0.060	8.439	0.000
Compensation→Employee Performance	0.182	0.183	0.084	2.161	0.031
Organizational→Performance Compensation	0.092	0.091	0.039	2.351	0.019
Compensation→Employee Performance	0.403	0.404	0.101	4.006	0.000
Organizational→Performance	0.313	0.311	0.066	4.745	0.000

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistic (O/STDEV)	P Values
Compensation					
Organizational→Performance Compensation	0.196	0.191	0.051	3.860	0.000

Source: Results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022

It can be concluded that the largest path coefficient value is indicated by the direct influence of Compensation on Organizational Performance with a T-statistic value of 8,439. Then followed by the variable Leadership on Organizational Performance of 4,745 then Leadership on Employee Performance of 4,006. For other variables have a not big enough influence on Employee Performance and Organizational Performance.

Coefficient of Determination Test/ R-Square (R2)

The value of R-Square ($R2^{0}$to 1, with higher levels indicating more predictive accuracy. The criteria for limiting the value of $R2^{weak}$ are in three classifications, namely the value of $R2^{=}$ 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25, which can be considered substantial, moderate (Fayazi et al., 2019). The results of PLS Bootstrapping R-Square and R-Square Adjusted values are as follows:

Table 7. R-Square value (R2)

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Employee Performance (Y)	0.501	0.483
Organizational Performance (Z)	0.854	0.847

Source: Processing results data using SmartPLS. 2022.

Valuation value of R-square, namely Employee Performance variable of 0.501 and Organizational Performance of 0.854 where the R2 value^{indicates} that the level of determination of exogenous variables (Compensation, Workload, and Leadership) to endogenous (Employee Performance) is moderate. And the level of determination of exogenous variables (Compensation, Workload, and Leadership) to endogenous (Organizational Performance) is high.

Goodness of Fit Index (GoF)

Goodness of Fit Index (GoF) is to validate the combined performance of the measurement model (outer model) and structural model (inner model) which can be obtained through the following calculations:

$$GoF\ Index = \sqrt{AVExR^2}$$
$$= \sqrt{0.659\ x\ 0.678}$$
$$= 0.669$$

GoF values have three categories. ie small GoF = 0.1. Moderate GoF = 0.25 and large GoF = 0.36 (Haryono. 2017). The results of the calculation of the Goodness of Fit Index (GoF) show a value of 0.669. It can be concluded that the overall performance of the measurement model (outer model) and structural model (inner model) is good because the Goodness of Fit Index (GoF) value is > 0.36.

Testing Predictive Relevance (Q^2)

Predictive relevance (Q^2) is a way of validating the model. The results of the calculation of Q2 are as follows:

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R1^2)(1 - R2^2)$$
$$= 1 - (0.749)(0.271)$$
$$= 0.797$$

Calculation of predictive relevance (Q^2) obtained a value of 0.797. In this research model, the dependent latent variable has a predictive relevance value (Q^2) > 0. So that the independent latent variable as the explanatory variable is able to predict the dependent variable, namely employee performance. In other words, it proves that this model is considered to have good predictive relevance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis test results for the independent variable Compensation (X1). Workload (X2). Leadership (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) and the influence of the independent variable Compensation (X1). Workload (X2). Leadership (X3) on employee performance (Y) with a mediating effect on employee performance (Y) can be seen in table 5.

Hypothesis 1 – Compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The path coefficient is 0.270 and Tcount (2.706) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.007. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Compensation (X1) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Table 8. Path Coefficient, t-Statistics, and P-Values Values

Hipotesis	Variabel	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistic (O/STDEV)	T Tabel	P Values	Keterangan
Partial Effect of Independent Variables on Dependent Variables								
H1	Compensation→Employee Performance	0.270	0.276	0.100	2.706	1.663	0.007	Diterima
H2	Compensation→Employee Performance	0.182	0.183	0.084	2.161	1.663	0.031	Diterima
H3	Compensation→Employee Performance	0.403	0.404	0.101	4.006	1.663	0.000	Diterima
H4	Organizational→Performance Compensation	0.510	0.515	0.060	8.439	1.663	0.000	Diterima
H5	Workload→Organizational Performance	0.092	0.091	0.039	2.351	1.663	0.019	Diterima
H6	Leadership→Organizational Performance	0.242	0.311	0.066	4.745	1.663	0.000	Diterima
H7	Employee Performance→Organizational Performance	0.913	0.991	0.051	3.860	1.663	0.000	Diterima
Indirect Effect of Independent Variables on Dependent Variables								
H8	Organizational→ Performance Compensation through Employee Performance	0.053	0.053	0.024	2.196	1.663	0.029	Diterima
H9	Workload→Organizational Performance through Employee Performance	0.036	0.034	0.018	1.975	1.663	0.049	Diterima
H10	Leadership→Organizational Performance through Employee Performance	0.079	0.078	0.030	2.677	1.663	0.008	Diterima

Source: The results of data processing using SmartPLS, 2022

Hypothesis 2 – Workload has an effect and is significant on employee performance. The path coefficient is 0.182 and Tcount (2.161) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.031. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Workload

(X2) has a significant and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Hypothesis 3 – Leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The path coefficient is 0.403 and Tcount (4.006) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.000. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Leadership (X3) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Hypothesis 4 – Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance. The path coefficient is 0.510 and Tcount (8.439) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.000. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Compensation (X1) has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance (Z).

Hypothesis 5 – Workload has an effect and is significant on Organizational Performance. The path coefficient is 0.092 and Tcount (2.351) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.019. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Workload (X2) has a significant and significant effect on Organizational Performance (Z).

Hypothesis 6–Leadership has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance. The path coefficient is 0.242 and Tcount (4.745) > Ttable (1.663) with a P-value of 0.000. Thus H1 is accepted (P value < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Leadership (X3) has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance (Z).

Hypothesis 7 – Employee Performance has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance. The path coefficient is 0.913 and T Count (3,860) > T Table (1,663) with a PV value of 0.000. Thus H1 is accepted (PValue < 0.05) and H0 is rejected. Employee Performance (Y) has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance (Z).

Hypothesis 8 – Compensation has a positive effect on Organizational Performance through Employee Performance. The P-value of the indirect effect of compensation on organizational performance mediated by employee performance is 0.053 with a TStatistic of 2.196. Thus H8 is accepted because the P value < 0.05 and TStatistic > 1.663.

Hypothesis 9 – Workload affects Organizational Performance through Employee Performance. The P-value of the indirect effect of Workload on Organizational Performance mediated by Employee Performance is 0.036 with a TStatistic of 1.975. Thus H9 is accepted because the P value < 0.05 and TStatistic > 1.663.

Hypothesis 10–Leadership has a positive effect on Organizational Performance through Employee Performance. The P-value of the indirect influence of Leadership on Organizational Performance mediated by Employee Performance is 0.079 with a TStatistic of 2.677. Thus H10 is accepted because the P value < 0.05 and TStatistic > 1.663.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the research results that have been described previously, the following conclusions can be drawn: 1) Compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the compensation given by the company to employees is very

influential on employee performance. The highest dimension that reflects compensation is Financial Compensation with direct financial indicators, while the highest dimension that reflects employee performance is Contextual Performance with interpersonal indicators. Thus, employees will give their best performance to the company through Contextual Performance where employees have the ability to work interpersonally such as starting new tasks when old tasks are completed and seeking the latest knowledge. 2) Workload has a significant and significant effect on employee performance at PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the condition of the company, especially in terms of the workload given by the company to employees, greatly influences employee performance. The highest dimension that reflects Workload is the Mental Load dimension with alertness indicators, while the highest dimension that reflects Employee Performance is Task Performance with work quality indicators. Employees need socialization in setting work points according to the ability and capacity of employees to avoid being alert to work mistakes. Thus, employees will give their best performance in quality work to solve a problem. 3) Leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the condition of the company, especially in terms of leadership applied to employees, greatly influences employee performance. The highest dimension that reflects the leadership dimension is participatory leadership with indicators of deliberation decision making, while the highest dimension reflects the dimensions of Employee Performance, namely *Contextual Performance* with interpersonal indicators. Employees need participation from a leader, especially when making decisions through joint deliberation. Thus, employees will give their best performance to the company through *Contextual Performance* where employees have the ability to work interpersonally. 4) Compensation has a positive and significant effect on the Organizational Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the compensation given by the company to employees is very influential on organizational performance. The highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Compensation is *Financial Compensation* with indicators of indirect compensation, while the highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Organizational Performance is *Financial Performance* with indicators of economic value added and income growth. This is to achieve the company's performance goals, especially in terms of economic value added and income growth, so employees need to increase employee welfare in terms of compensation indirect, such as protection which includes insurance, severance pay, children's schooling and pensions. Thus, organizational performance will be achieved through *Financial Performance*, namely economic value added and revenue growth. 5) Workload has an effect and is significant on the Organizational Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the condition of the company, especially in terms of the workload given by the company to employees, greatly influences

organizational performance. The highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Workload is Time Load with indicators of doing two or more jobs at the same time, while the highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Organizational Performance is Non- *Financial Performance* with indicators of organizational commitment. Employees need socialization in determining that the workload can be divided equally by all employees, especially when doing two or more jobs at the same time. Thus organizational performance will be achieved through organizational commitment. 6) Leadership has a positive and significant effect on the Organizational Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the condition of the company, especially in terms of leadership applied to employees, greatly influences organizational performance. The highest dimension that reflects the dimension of Leadership is participatory leadership with indicators of deliberation decision making, while the highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Organizational Performance is Non- *Financial Performance* with indicators of employee satisfaction. Employees need participation from a leader, especially when making decisions through joint deliberation. Thus this will increase employee satisfaction while working in the company and the achievement of organizational performance goals. 7) Employee performance has a positive and significant impact on the Organizational Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. This shows that the condition of the employee's performance is very influential on organizational performance. The highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Employee Performance is *Task Performance* with indicators of planning and managing work, while the highest dimension that reflects the dimensions of Performance The organization is Non- *Financial Performance* with employee satisfaction indicators. In improving organizational performance, especially on employee satisfaction, it is necessary to disseminate information to employees in planning and managing work. 8) Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Performance through the Employee Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. Through employee performance, the achievement of organizational performance related to *financial performance* and *non-financial performance* can be achieved and is reflected in individuals or employees of a company. Hypothesis testing *direct* and *indirect effect* it can be seen that the value of the effect of Compensation on Organizational Performance directly *directly* has a positive value but lower than the way through the intermediary of the Employee Performance variable. This means that the more companies pay attention to and consider compensation that is proportional to the effort of employee performance when completing organizational tasks in accordance with the capabilities of the employee, the organizational performance in terms of economic value added and revenue growth, profit margins, efficiency of internal business processes, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment can be increased. 9) Workload has an effect and significant on

Organizational Performance through Employee Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. Hypothesis testing *direct* and *indirect effect* it can be seen that the value of the influence of Workload on Organizational Performance directly *directly* has a lower value than the way through the intermediary of the Employee Performance variable. Therefore, companies need to pay attention to the workload mechanism of each employee's performance when they are doing physical activities such as employees, high concentration at work, feeling indecisive when doing assigned tasks, always being alert when working to avoid mistakes, accuracy in providing services, working quickly to solve problems. complete work, do two or more jobs at the same time. 10) Leadership has an effect and significant on Organizational Performance through Employee Performance of PT Pelita Indonesia Djaya. Hypothesis testing *direct* and *indirect effect* it can be seen that the value of the influence of Leadership on Organizational Performance directly *directly* of lower value than by means of intermediary Employee Performance variables. This needs to be taken into consideration by companies to support organizational performance improvement, namely the need to involve leadership in acting in leading to direct, guide, organize, and facilitate group or organizational activities and relationships.

REFERENCES

Agwu, M. O. (2012). Impact of employees safety culture on organisational performance in shell bonny terminal integrated project (BTIP). *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *1*(5), 70–82.

Durdyev, S., Ismail, S., Ihtiyar, A., Bakar, N. F. S. A., & Darko, A. (2018). A partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) of barriers to sustainable construction in Malaysia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *2*(4), 564–572. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.304

Fayazi, F., Araban, M., Haghighi Zadeh, M. H., & Mohamadian, H. (2019). Development and psychometric evaluation of a colorectal cancer screening scale based on preventive health model: Application of Smart-PLS software. *Payesh (Health Monitor)*, *8*(3), 251–259. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.02.011

Hameed, V. M., & Hamad, F. J. (2022). Implementation of novel triangular fins at a helical coil heat exchanger. *Chemical Engineering and Processing-Process Intensification*, *2*(4), 1087–1095. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cep.2021.108745

Linde, L., Sjödin, D., Parida, V., & Gebauer, H. (2020). Evaluation of digital business model opportunities: a framework for avoiding digitalization traps. *Research-Technology Management*, *6*(4), 43–53. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2021.1842664

Lo, F.-Y., Rey-Martí, A., & Botella-Carrubi, D. (2020). Research methods in business: Quantitative and qualitative comparative analysis. In *Journal of Business Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 221–224). Elsevier. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.003

McKenzie, D., & Sansone, D. (2019). Predicting entrepreneurial success is hard: Evidence from a business plan competition in Nigeria. *Journal of Development Economics*, *4*(2), 102369. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.07.002

Nursaid, N., Qomariah, N., Sanosra, A., Satoto, E. B., & Utomo, A. W. (2020). Improvement of Job Satisfaction Based on Work Motivation, Work Environment, Competence and Compensation for Hospital Employees. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review*, *7*(2), 210–225. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.2020.V7.461

Poulsen, S., & Ipsen, C. (2017). In times of change: How distance managers can ensure employees' wellbeing and organizational performance. *Safety Science*, *10*(2), 37–45. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2017.05.002

Rai, N. G. M., Silmina, N., Fitrananda, H., Hanoum, S., Sinansari, P., & Noor, B. A. (2021). The Effect of work Conflict and Job Stress on The Human Resources Performance (Case Study: Maintenance & Engineer Division at PT. Paiton Operation & Maintenance Indonesia). *3rd International Conference on Business and Management of Technology (ICONBMT 2021)*, 305–309. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.211226.042

Sari, I. P., Febtriko, A., Rahayuningsih, T., & Putra, A. A. (2019). Integrasi pendekatan analytic network process dan structural equation modeling untuk pengukuran bullying di tempat kerja berbasis gender menggunakan sistem pakar. *Rabit: Jurnal Teknologi Dan Sistem Informasi Univrab*, *4*(2), 109–119. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36341/rabit.v4i2.742

Siyambalapitiya, J., Zhang, X., & Liu, X. (2018). Green human resource management: A proposed model in the context of Sri Lanka's tourism industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *2*(2), 542–555. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.07.305