Abstract

For companies or organizations to come forward, it is required to have qualified employees. Qualified employees are employees whose performance can meet targets or targets set by the company. High employee performance demands are already part of every company because a successful company cannot be separated from employees who work at the company. In some conditions, employees' performance in a company is inseparable from several factors that can affect it. The purpose of this research is to analyze the influence of job involvement on work engagement; the influence of job involvement on employee performance, and the influence of work engagement on employee performance. This type of research is a descriptive study using a quantitative approach. The population in this study was the Branch Heads and Sub-Branch Managers of Bank Jatim. As many as 191 were taken using saturated sampling techniques. The number of samples was used as many as 191 Branch Heads and Sub-Branch Managers of Bank Jatim. The types of data used are quantitative data, and the data source used is the primary data. Collecting data is by distributing questionnaires. Data analysis techniques in this study used partial least square (PLS) analysis. This study proves that Job Involvement has a significant influence on Work Engagement, but Job Involvement has no significant influence on Employee Performance, while Work Engagement has a significant influence on Employee Performance.
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1. Introduction

For companies or organizations, if they want to move forward, they must have qualified employees. Employee performance demonstrates a person's ability to work. An employee is said to perform well when having the quality of work, which is useful in completing every leader's job. Employees who have good performance can also be seen from their ability to finish their tasks at predetermined time. It can achieve any target stipulated by the company, as stated [1] that employee performance results from quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his/her duties following the responsibilities given by. The demand for high employee performance is already part of every company because a successful company is not separated from the performance of employees who work at the company. In some performing conditions, employees in a company are not separated from several factors that may affect it.

An intrinsic factor in influencing employee performance is job involvement. Involvement in the work [2] is an attempt to measure the extent to which an individual considers the work essential and the performance achieved as a form of appreciation for him or her. In other words, job involvement is an employee's commitment to his/her work. Employees Involvement is defined by employees' dedication and concern for their work, a feeling that will psychologically get the employee
to complete the task, and full confidence in his ability to get the job’s complete. Furthermore, some researchers revealed that work involvement plays an essential role in determining employees’ work performance. Employee engagement has been estimated to impact the organization's actual results [3] significantly. Variable relationships of work engagement and work achievement measured positive relationships from data collected from the banking sector, and the results showed that a positive relationship between work engagement and work achievement if one thing will both increase, the other automatically increases if the employee is fully engaged achievement if one thing will both increase, the other automatically increases if the employee is fully engaged.

Achievement if one thing will both increase, the other automatically increases if the employee is fully engaged.



2.2. Work Engagement

Schaufeli and Bakker on [6] said that Work Engagement is the positive energy, compliance, effort of the center of mind that is characterized. Work Engagement is a center of motivational and positive work-related thoughts characterized by passion, dedication and absorption. Robbins and Judge [2] argue that the involvement, satisfaction, and enthusiasm of individual employees to do their jobs are a form of employee engagement. Employees who have a high level of engagement are very impartial and care about the field of work they do. Someone who has a high level of engagement will integrate with his work. Work engagement occurs when an organization member places themselves in a physical, cognitive, and emotional role during work [13].

Work Engagement can estimate employee productivity, organizational success, and financial performance [14]. Schaufeli & Bakker [6] defines employee engagement as a positive, satisfying state of mind, a viewpoint related to his work. Engagement refers to a state of earnest and consistent feeling and thought that focuses not only on specific objects, events, individuals, or behaviors.

2.3. Employee Performance

Performance is what employees do or do not do. General employee performance for most occupations includes quantity elements of results, quality of results, timeliness of results, presence, ability to work together [15]. Performance is something produced by the functions or indicators of a job or something that is the profession of nature at any given time [16].

Performance is the achievement of work or work achieved by human resources both in quality and quantity.
of unity while carrying out its work duties following the responsibilities given to it [1]. Performance is a person's achievement in quality and quantity according to the responsibilities that are carried. Also, some factors like: the level of education, initiative, work experience, and spiritual leadership of employees affect a person's performance. One's work will provide feedback for the person to always actively do his work well and hopefully produce good quality work.

Scullen [17] describes work achievements made up by four components; i) general performance, ii) employee performance, iii) technical performance, and iv) organizational performance. Rubina et al. [17] view work achievement as an outcome of three elements: skills, diligence, and the working environment state. Skills include the knowledge, capability, and competencies of employees; diligence is the level of dedication given by employees to get the job done, and the working environment conditions is the accommodation level of such conditions in facilitating employee performance. The general concern for organizations is the performance of their employees regardless of factors and circumstances. Good achievement by employee brings good to organizational performance, which is an indicator of their triumph [17].

2.4. Research Model

Hypothesis
H1: Job Involvement affects employee Work Engagement at Bank Jatim.
H2: Job Involvement affects employee performance at Bank Jatim.
H3: Work Engagement affects employee performance at Bank Jatim

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

This study used casual research as the type of research. Causal analysis is conclusive research aiming at obtaining evidence related to causal relationships [18]. The method used in this research is quantitative. According to [19], quantitative methods are scientific methods whose data are in the form of numbers or numbers that can be processed and analyzed using mathematical or statistical calculations.

3.2. Population and Sample

Population points to the whole group of people, events, or things of concern that the researcher wants to probe [20]. The populations used and researched in this study are employees with work areas in Surabaya Branch and East Java Bank Auxiliary Branch with as many as 365 people.

Table 1. Employee Population Data in Surabaya Branch and East Java Bank Auxiliary Branch

| No. | Cabang                                           | Jumlah |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Untag                 | 45     |
| 2   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Rungkut               | 38     |
| 3   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Tenggilis             | 32     |
| 4   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Rajawali              | 22     |
| 5   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Universitas Wijaya Kusuma | 12   |
| 6   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Klampis Jaya          | 35     |
| 7   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Juanda                | 13     |
| 8   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Pogot                 | 26     |
| 9   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Darmo                 | 34     |
| 10  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Tambak Rejo           | 15     |
| 11  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Wiyung                | 21     |
| 12  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Injoko                | 23     |
| 13  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu PJTKI                 | 11     |
| 14  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu PGs                    | 18     |
| 15  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Benowo                 | 20     |
|     | Jumlah                                           | 365    |

Source: Internal Company, 2020

In a quantitative approach, a sample is a group of individuals with some common characteristics identified and studied by researchers[21]. The sample withdrawal techniques in this study used Proportional Sampling. This sampling aims to represent the entire population. The Slovin formula is used to measure the total number of samples [19]:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Which:
\[ N = \] Population Numbers
\[ n = \] Number of Samples
\[ e = \] Percent inaccuracy leniency 5%
\[ n = \frac{365}{1 + (365 (0.05^2))} \]
\[ n = 190.8 \]
Based on the Slovin formula results above, we obtained a sample of 190.8, which was rounded up to 191 samples from 365. So the samples used in this study were as many as 191 employees of the Surabaya Branch and East Java Bank Auxiliary Branch. Here is a sample share for each:

Table 2. Research Samples

| No. | Cabang                              | Population | Sample |
|-----|-------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| 1   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Untag    | 45         | (45/365) x 191 = 24 |
| 2   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Rungkut  | 38         | (38/365) x 191 = 20 |
| 3   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Tenggilis| 32         | (32/365) x 191 = 17 |
| 4   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Rajawali | 22         | (22/365) x 191 = 12 |
| 5   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Universitas Wijaya Kusuma | 12 | (12/365) x 191 = 6 |
| 6   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Klampis Jaya | 35 | (35/365) x 191 = 18 |
| 7   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Juanda    | 13         | (13/365) x 191 = 7 |
| 8   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Pogot     | 26         | (26/365) x 191 = 14 |
| 9   | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Darmo     | 34         | (34/365) x 191 = 18 |
| 10  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Tambak Rejo | 15 | (15/365) x 191 = 8 |
| 11  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Wiyung    | 21         | (21/365) x 191 = 11 |
| 12  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Injoko    | 23         | (23/365) x 191 = 12 |
| 13  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu PJTKI     | 11         | (11/365) x 191 = 6 |
| 14  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu PGS       | 18         | (18/365) x 191 = 9 |
| 15  | Bank Jatim Cabang Pembantu Benowo    | 20         | (20/365) x 191 = 10 |
| Jumlah |                                    | 365       | 191    |

Source: Processed Researchers, 2020

Based on the calculation above, the sample used in this study is as many as 191 employees of Surabaya Branch and East Java Bank Auxiliary Branch.

3.3. Variable Operational Definitions

A. Exogenous Variables

Exogenous variables are often referred to as stimulus variables, predictors, and adherents. Exogenous variables are often also called free variables that influence endogenous variables [22]. The exogenous variable in this study is Job Involvement (X). Job Involvement in this study was measured through several indicators referring to Ansel [23], namely:

a). Actively participate in work
b). Putting work first
c). Important work for self-esteem

B. Intervening Variables

Intervening variables are known as mediation variables that explain the relationship between independent and dependent variables; he did not change his relationship but explained it. The intervening variable in this study is Work Engagement (Z). Work Engagement in this study was measured through several indicators referring to Schaufeli et al. [24], namely:

a). Vigor
b). Dedication
c). Absorption

C. Endogenous Variables

Endogenous variables are variables that change as the implications of changes in exogenous variables [22]. The endogenous variable in this study was Employee Performance (Y). Employee Performance in this study was measured through several indicators referring to Wirawan [16], namely:

a). Work results
b). Work behavior
c). Personal attitude

3.4. Types and Data Sources

The data sources used are primary data. According to Sekaran & Bougie, primary data are how data are collected from sources on the variable of interest for the specific purpose of the study [20]. The primary data in the study were gained through questionnaires that have been filled out by respondents containing statements according to variables that have been designed by providing alternative answers.

3.5. Data Collection Methods

This research will use various methods in collecting the data needed to conduct research, namely: library studies, field observations, and data collection through questionnaires. This study used primary method for data collection, which is carried out by disseminating questionnaires. Questionnaires are a series of previously formulated written questions in which respondents record their answers, usually in a more closely defined alternative [19]. Questionnaires are built according to the theories that have been collected and will be measured on the Likert Scale. Likert scale is defined by Cooper et al. [25] as a variation of the summed scale, which consists of statements stating an excellent or unpleasant attitude towards an object of interest or action. The Likert scale is aligned into five options, namely:

1. Strongly Disagree (STS)
2. Disagree (TS)
3. Entirely Agree (CS)
4. Agree (S)
5. Strongly Agree (SS)
### 3.6. Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis technique used in this study was Partial Least Square. According to Abdillah & Jogiyanto [26], PLS (Partial Least Square) is a variant-based structural equation analysis (SEM) that can test measurement models and test structural models simultaneously. Measurement models are used for validity and reliability tests, while structural models are used for causality tests (hypothesis testing with prediction models). Furthermore, Abdillah & Jogiyanto [26] stated the analysis of Partial Least Squares (PLS) is a multivariate statistical technique that compares between dependent and independent variables. PLS is one of sem's variant-based statistical methods designed to resolve multiple regressions when specific data problems occur. According to Ghozali [27] explained, PLS is a soft modeling analysis technique because it does not presume the data should be with a particular scale measurement, which means even small number of samples can be used (below 100 samples).

### 4. Analysis Results

#### 4.1. Outer Model

Outer Model is often also called external relation or measurement model, specifying the connection between the variables studied and the indicators.

1. **Convergent Validity**

To determine the validity of indicators, Measurement model tests through-loading factor done by looking at the validity value of convergent indicators in the Model. Each indicator in the Model must fulfill convergent validity, i.e., has a value of > 0.5. If each indicator already has a loading factor value > 0.5, the evaluation step can be continued.

Based on Table 3, all variable measurements are declared valid as the measuring instrument of the construct, and the indicator item has a convergent validity value > 0.5.

| Table 3. Convergent Validity |
|-----------------------------|
| Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values |
| X.1 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.678 | 0.674 | 0.046 | 14.845 | 0.000 |
| X.2 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.757 | 0.753 | 0.034 | 22.351 | 0.000 |
| X.3 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.775 | 0.773 | 0.029 | 26.663 | 0.000 |
| X.4 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.759 | 0.756 | 0.043 | 17.506 | 0.000 |
| X.5 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.682 | 0.685 | 0.043 | 16.028 | 0.000 |
| X.6 <- Job Involvement (X) | 0.620 | 0.623 | 0.046 | 13.524 | 0.000 |
| Y.1 <- Performance (Y) | 0.767 | 0.761 | 0.031 | 25.117 | 0.000 |
| Y.2 <- Performance (Y) | 0.727 | 0.723 | 0.037 | 19.815 | 0.000 |
| Y.3 <- Performance (Y) | 0.791 | 0.790 | 0.026 | 30.455 | 0.000 |
| Y.4 <- Performance (Y) | 0.756 | 0.756 | 0.027 | 27.802 | 0.000 |
| Y.5 <- Performance (Y) | 0.841 | 0.839 | 0.026 | 32.757 | 0.000 |
| Y.6 <- Performance (Y) | 0.503 | 0.502 | 0.067 | 7.488 | 0.000 |
| Z.1 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.790 | 0.788 | 0.027 | 29.535 | 0.000 |
| Z.2 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.774 | 0.774 | 0.031 | 25.121 | 0.000 |
| Z.3 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.813 | 0.809 | 0.034 | 24.216 | 0.000 |
| Z.4 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.702 | 0.701 | 0.042 | 16.525 | 0.000 |
| Z.5 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.749 | 0.744 | 0.045 | 16.763 | 0.000 |
| Z.6 <- Work Engagement (Z) | 0.596 | 0.595 | 0.052 | 11.388 | 0.000 |
2. **Discriminant Validity**

Table 4. Cross Loading

|          | Job Involvement (X) | Performance (Y) | Work Engagement (Z) |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| X.1      | 0.678               | 0.429           | 0.490               |
| X.2      | 0.757               | 0.496           | 0.613               |
| X.3      | 0.775               | 0.568           | 0.561               |
| X.4      | 0.759               | 0.530           | 0.539               |
| X.5      | 0.682               | 0.575           | 0.514               |
| X.6      | 0.620               | 0.519           | 0.409               |
| Y.1      | 0.476               | 0.767           | 0.478               |
| Y.2      | 0.530               | 0.727           | 0.455               |
| Y.3      | 0.640               | 0.791           | 0.675               |
| Y.4      | 0.619               | 0.756           | 0.657               |
| Y.5      | 0.538               | 0.841           | 0.560               |
| Y.6      | 0.358               | 0.503           | 0.352               |
| Z.1      | 0.562               | 0.629           | 0.790               |
| Z.2      | 0.528               | 0.572           | 0.774               |
| Z.3      | 0.563               | 0.527           | 0.813               |
| Z.4      | 0.551               | 0.430           | 0.702               |
| Z.5      | 0.511               | 0.478           | 0.749               |
| Z.6      | 0.531               | 0.604           | 0.596               |

Based on Table 4 which is obtained entirely from the construct, the formers are declared to be good discriminant because all of them have a correlation value of indicators with constructs that is greater than other constructs. Another criterion for obtaining discriminant validity is to look at the correlation value of one contract with another. The reference value of each construct is the square root of the AVE value of the construct. The construct has good convergence if the AVE value is > 0.50

Table 5. AVE

|          | AVE |
|----------|-----|
| Job Involvement (X) | 0.510 |
| Performance (Y)    | 0.546 |
| Work Engagement (Z) | 0.549 |

In Table 5, the ave value > 0.5 is obtained, and then the indicators in each construal have been converging with the other items in one measurement.

3. **Composite Reliability**

Table 6. Composite Reliability

|                            | Composite Reliability |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Job Involvement (X)         | 0.861                 |
| Performance (Y)             | 0.876                 |
| Work Engagement (Z)         | 0.878                 |

Based on Table 6, all constructs have a composite reliability value above 0.60 which means that all variables have good consistency in measuring the latent constructs measured for use in further analysis.

4.2. **Inner Model**

The inner model in this section will describe the structural model and the influence between the research variables.

1. **Inner Model Test or Structural Model Test**

   To measure the level of suitability of the model in the influence of each variable under study, it is measured from the resulting R2 value, where if R2 is 0.67 then the model is good, 0.33 then the model is "moderate", 0.19 then the model is "weak" [20]. pls output as described below:

   Table 7. R-Square Score

   |                          | R-Square | Q-Square |
   |--------------------------|----------|----------|
   | Job Involvement (X)      | 0.825    |          |
   | Employee Performance (Y) | 0.539    | 0.825    |

   The table above shows that the Job Involvement variable affecting Competitive Advantage has an R2 value of 0.621, which means the "moderate" Model. Meanwhile, the Job Involvement and Work Engagement variables that affect Employee Performance have an R2 of 0.539, indicating a "moderate" model. The Q2 value is 0.825 which is in the "strong" category. According to Ghozali [20], Q2 values can be used to measure how well models and parameter estimates generate observational values. So the predicted Q2 value performed by the Model is judged to have predictive relevance.
As Figure 2 show as the result of the value of inner weight, Job Involvement affect Work Engagement, while both Job Involvement and Work Engagement affect the Employee Performance by structural equations as follows:

\[ Z = 0.734X \]
\[ Y = 0.406X + 0.440Z \]

2. Hypothesis Testing

A. Hypothesis Test 1

The first hypothesis test was known that the statistical t value was 18,320 or > 1.96. So it can be interpreted that Job Involvement has a significant effect on Work Engagement in Bank Jatim. The direction of job involvement and work engagement relationships is positive, so the higher the job involvement, the higher the work engagement by having a considerable influence of 0.734.

B. Hypothesis Test 2

The second hypothesis test is known that the statistical t value is 4,196 or > 1.96. So it can be interpreted that Job Involvement has a significant effect on employee performance at Bank Jatim. The direction of job involvement and employee performance is buoyant, so it can be interpreted that the higher the job involvement, the higher the employee's performance by having an enormous influence of 0.406.

C. Hypothesis Test 3

The third hypothesis test is known that the statistical t value is 4,791 or > 1.96. So it can be interpreted that Work Engagement has a significant effect on employee performance at Bank Jatim. The direction of the work engagement relationship and employee performance is positive so that the higher the work engagement, the more significantly improved the employee performance by having a considerable influence of 0.440.

5. Discussion

A. The Effect of Job Involvement on Work Engagement

The results of data analysis that has been conducted above, found that Job Involvement has a significant positive impact on Work Engagement at Bank Jatim as the T-statistical value of 18,320, which is far greater than 1.96 so that it can be concluded that high Job Involvement cannot be recognized through the absence of excellent Job Involvement. Thus, the first hypothesis that reads, "Job Involvement affects Work Engagement employees at Bank Jatim," is accepted and proven genuine.

These results show that the higher the Job Involvement, the higher the Work Engagement. In other words, Job Involvement will be able to increase Work Engagement, so if Bank Jatim wants to increase Work Engagement, then it is crucial to pay attention to the extent of Job Involvement owned by Employees of East Java Bank. According to Robbins and Judge [2], it is the level at which a person identifies with a job, actively participates in it, and considers performance necessary for self-worth.

B. The Effect of Job Involvement on Employee Performance

The results of data analysis that has been conducted above, show that Job Involvement has significant positive impact on Employee Performance at Bank Jatim as the T-statistical value of 4,196, which means it is more significant than 1.96, so it can be interpreted that good Employee Performance can be recognized through the excellent Job Involvement. Thus, the second hypothesis that reads, "Job Involvement affects employees' performance at Bank Jatim," is accepted and proven to be true.

These results show that the higher the Job Involvement, the higher the Employee Performance. In other words, Job Involvement will be able to improve Employee Performance, so if Bank Jatim wants to Improve Employee Performance, then it is vital to pay attention to the extent of Job Involvement owned by Employees of East Java Bank. This is in line with Nasir et al. [4], which states that a da positive relationship between work engagement and work achievement if one thing both will increase, the other automatically increases if the employee is fully engaged and full of motivation will get positive
results. His performance will improve from time to time. These results also support Thevanes and Dirojan [5], which found a positive and significant relationship between work engagement and work achievement.

C. The Effect of Work Engagement on Employee Performance

The data analysis results have proven that Work Engagement has a significant and positive effect on employee performance at Bank Jatim as evidenced by a T-statistical value of 4.791, which means it is more significant than 1.96, so it can be explained that high employee performance can be established through the high work engagement. Thus, the eleventh hypothesis that reads, "Work Engagement affects employees' performance at Bank Jatim," is accepted and proven genuine.

This study's results are in line with the findings of research conducted by Dajani [7], which proves that employee employment attachment has a significant impact on job performance. Work Engagement is essential in an enterprise because it can positively impact the company's success in achieving its goals. These results also support Tho'in and Muliasari [9], who found that work engagement directly affects employee performance. This result is also similar with Kim et al. [10], who also found that work engagement significantly influences employee performance.

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of the analysis and testing of the hypothesis obtained, it can be concluded that:

1. Job Involvement has a significant and positive effect on Work Engagement at Bank Jatim. These results suggest that the first hypothesis was accepted and proven to be true.

2. Job Involvement has a significant and positive effect on employee performance at Bank Jatim. These results suggest that the second hypothesis is accepted and proven to be true. These results also support several previous findings such as Nasir et al. [4] and Thevanes and Dirojan [5]

3. Work Engagement has a significant and positive effect on employee performance at Bank Jatim. These results suggest that the third hypothesis is accepted and proven to be true. These results also support some previous findings, such as Dajani [7], Tho'in dan Muliasari [9], and Kim et al. [10].
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