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ABSTRACT

The company as an organization has a dependency on individuals within the company itself. Employees as individuals in the company are part of the organizational structure that has a major role in determining the achievement of company goals. In the perspective of employees, direct supervisors' attitudes and actions can increase employee engagement or even create an atmosphere where an employee becomes disengaged (feeling not part of the company/organization). In addition to marketing employees, rewards and recognition are generally used as the main motivation to improve their performance.

For this reason, the purpose of this study is to determine the role of perceived supervisor support, rewards, and recognition, employee engagement on performance mediated by job satisfaction. The study was conducted with a survey using a questionnaire where respondents used 170 marketing employees in the banking industry in Tangerang. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Model (SEM). The results showed there was a relationship between rewards and recognition of employee engagement, there was a relationship between rewards and recognition of performance, there was not a relationship between perceived supervisor support for performance. Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between employee engagement on performance.
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INTRODUCTION

The company as an organization has a dependency on individuals within the company itself. Employees as individuals in the company are part of the organizational structure that has a major role in determining the achievement of company goals. From the employee's perspective, a personal relationship with a direct superior is the key. Attitudes and actions of direct supervisors can increase employee engagement or even create an atmosphere where an employee becomes disengaged (feeling not part of a company/organization). What's more, for employees, the ability of senior leadership to receive their input, direct the company in the right direction and openly communicate the state of the organization is important in gaining engagement. Another factor that triggers engagement is when employees are treated with respect, their values are seen and the organization cares about what they feel. Employee engagement is a stable psychological state and the result of interaction between an individual and the environment in which an individual works (Thomas, 2007). Engagement occurs when a person is consciously and/or emotionally connected to another person. Engagement is not an attitude, but rather a behavior that drives the performance of an organization (Welbourne, 2007). In addition to marketing employees, rewards and recognition are generally used as the main motivation to improve their performance. The view a marketing employee generally sees how much rewards and recognition they get compared to their performance; this also makes them feel involved with a company.

Employee engagement has been claimed to be able to predict productivity improvements in employees, profitability, retain employees, customer satisfaction, and success for the organization. This is because employees who have a high degree of engagement will have a high emotional attachment to the organization. High emotional attachment affects employees in completing work (tends to have satisfactory work quality) and will have an impact on the low desire of employees to leave work or the company. When engagement is high, employees will be more satisfied with their work, the level of desire to leave work will be low and employees will be more productive (Wellins, Bernthal, and Phelps, 2014). It can be said that employees want the best relationship with their organization and they want to be provided with the best possibilities, environment, or management initiatives that will make them happier, feel valued and feel involved in the organization.
Results of research conducted by Gagnon and Michael, (2004); Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) that employees who see themselves as having a relationship with their immediate supervisor tend to have higher performance and are more satisfied with their work. Research conducted by Scott and McMullen (2010) shows that the total reward structure, programs, and policies influence employee involvement. According to Shah et al. (2010) intrinsic and extrinsic rewards can improve employee performance, other than those other results found are the moderating effects of employee recognition of performance that are considered more attractive than intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

Research conducted by Ram and Prabhakar (2011) shows that supervisor support has a strong relationship with employee engagement and is also positively related to Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and OCB. Meanwhile according to Dysvik and Kuvaas (2013) regards perceived supervisor support as an important predictor of employee performance. The results of research conducted by Puspadewi and Suharnomo (2016), the application of rewards and recognition are better and more effective ways to increase employee engagement. Aktar et al. (2012) in their research stated that there is a direct relationship between intrinsic rewards and employee performance. According to Dizgah et al. (2012), Job satisfaction has a strong relationship with innovative job performance. Besides that, Job Satisfaction also has a strong relationship with in-role performance (Nurdiansyah et al, 2020). Research conducted by Rubel and Kee (2013) states that perceived supervisor support and performance have positive and significant relationships, whereas after introducing mediators the relationship becomes insignificant. Research conducted by Khan et al. (2013) stated that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards not only increase job satisfaction but can also improve overall employee performance.

According to research conducted by Bari et al. (2013) factors that have a positive impact on employee attitudes and performance include feedback to employees, freedom, career development plans, and employee assessment, learning programs, an open and comfortable work environment, and good supervisory relationships, while other factors examined do not influence employee attitudes and performance. Other research shows that organizational engagement does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction, while job engagement has a significant effect on job satisfaction (Saragih and Maranatha, 2013). Research conducted by Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013) shows that
employee involvement with work and the organization will have a positive relationship with the level of job satisfaction. Also, research conducted by (Thakur, 2014) shows that employee involvement has a positive effect on job satisfaction. Research conducted by Hettiarchchi (2014) states that performance is influenced by the job satisfaction of the staff. This shows that when staff are satisfied, they will produce better performance.

When employees believe that their work or role is significant and by the goals and values of themselves or the organization, they can bring themselves into the work and will show their involvement Kimutai and Sakataka (2015). The same results are also shown by research conducted by Duggirala et al. (2009) that work involvement influences job satisfaction. Madan and Srivastava (2015) concluded that there was a positive relationship between employee involvement and job satisfaction. Research conducted by Burns (2016) shows that perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support make a significant contribution to work engagement. The same result is shown by Mohamed and Ali (2016) shows that the independent variable supervisor support and the dependent variable employee engagement positively correlated with each other. The same results are also shown by research conducted by Ghosh et al. (2016) which states that not only supervisory support has a relationship to work involvement but also overall support at work, including organizational support and also support from colleagues. The same research results are also shown by Mesepy (2016) shows that the variable of rewards and recognition has a strong relationship on employee involvement partially and simultaneously supported by the level of significance.

Saleh, et al. (2016) states that job satisfaction directly has a significant effect on performance. Similarly, research conducted by Ndulue and Ekechukwu (2016) states that when job satisfaction in the form of the nature of work and job security increases, it will affect employee performance in terms of high employee morale. According to the results of research conducted by Victor and Hoole (2017) the higher the organizational rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic), the more employees will be involved in their work. When employees are given higher intrinsic rewards, they tend to exert more effort, dedication, and involvement in their work. Research conducted by Vorina, Simonić, and Vlasova, (2017) show that when employee involvement increases, job satisfaction also increases. Research conducted by Ndungu (2017) that there is a significant relationship
between intrinsic rewards and performance, besides that a significant correlation is also found to exist between extrinsic rewards and employee performance. Another result is that there is a significant relationship between rewards and recognition of employee performance. A significant relationship was also found between financial rewards to employee performance. Research conducted by Abdirahman, et al. (2018) states that job satisfaction is positively related to employee performance.

Based on previous research, the purpose of the research to be achieved is to find out the influence of Perceived Supervisor Support, Rewards, and Recognition, Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, and Performance that are specifically focused on Marketing employees from the banking industry in Tangerang, Indonesia.

**Hypothesis Development**

**Relationship between Perceived Supervisor Support and Employee Engagement**

Ghosh et al. (2016) stated that workplace support (organizational support, supervisor support, and colleague support) has a significant relationship to work engagement. Burns (2016) explains that perceived organizational support makes a significant contribution to work engagement, this shows that employees who consider their organization more supportive will also prefer to be involved in their work. Ram and Prabhakar (2011) show that supervisors play a major role in ensuring fair and unbiased implementation of procedures. supervisor support who has a strong relationship with employee engagement and is also positively related to Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and OCB. perceived supervisor support also makes a significant contribution to work engagement, this shows that if employees consider their supervisors more supportive, they will be more likely to be involved in their work. Mohamed and Ali (2016) aimed at showing that the independent variable supervisor support and the dependent variable employee engagement positively and sufficiently correlated with each other.

Support from superiors in the form of direct or indirect attention, material, the active role of superiors, ideas, ideas, and solutions can make employees feel valued and supported at work (Takaya et al, 2020). Also, ideas and ideas given by employees to superiors and used as an indicator for the determination of strategy is one form of
support from superiors. Employees who are given full attention and support by their superiors will feel that they are valued, needed, and involved by superiors and their companies. Based on the literature above the hypothesis that can be submitted:

**H1:** *Perceived Supervisor Support will increase Employee Engagement.*

**Relationship of Rewards and Recognition to Employee Engagement**

Mesepy (2016) shows that the variable of rewards and recognition has a strong relationship with employee involvement partially and simultaneously supported by the level of significance. Puspadewi and Suharnomo (2016) show that the application of rewards and recognition a better and more effective at Patra Jasa Convention Hotel Semarang will increase employee engagement in the company. According to Victor and Hoole (2017) the higher the organizational rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic), the more employees will be involved in their work. When employees are given higher intrinsic rewards, they tend to exert more effort, dedication, and involvement in their work.

Kimutai and Sakataka (2015) focus on three drivers of engagement and commitment namely, direct financial benefits, indirect benefits, and non-financial benefits. The contribution of factors varies in strength and attractiveness for workers. Promotional opportunities, identified as leading direct financial drivers in employee engagement. Health benefits, work-relevant training, and free interaction with fellow workers have the strongest contribution to involvement and commitment in the Rift Valley Bottlers Company. When employees believe that their work or role is significant and by the goals and values of themselves or the organization, they can bring themselves into the work and will show involvement.

Scott and McMullen (2010) show the total structure of rewards, programs, and policies affecting employee involvement. However, most professional compensation does not need to consider how the total rewards program affects employee involvement in the design of structures, policies, and reward programs. The results of his research found that organizations that encourage managers to engage employees by making them valuable performance and engagement criteria through incentive programs show that their organizations are more effective in encouraging employee involvement and motivation, so organizations that do not do so. Other results were also found that base
salary and benefits had the weakest overall relationship with the organization's ability to drive high levels of employee involvement and motivation compared to incentives, intangible rewards, and leadership qualities on engagement.

Rewards and Recognition height is given can increase employee involvement. Employees work to earn income to fulfill their lives. A marketing employee generally gets a basic salary from the UMR in each region, but if you get more Rewards and Recognition in the Bank where they work, both in the form of material or non-material, they will involve themselves in the work and company where they work. From the literature above, the hypotheses that can be proposed are:

**H2: Rewards and Recognition high will increase Employee Engagement.**

### Relationship of Employee Engagement to Job Satisfaction

Madan and Srivastava (2015) show that there is a positive relationship between employee involvement and job satisfaction, other than those other results also state that ownership with the organization, has a significant impact on employee involvement and job satisfaction is not accepted because the results indicate there is no significant relationship between variables. Also, the results show that ownership with the organization has a negative correlation with employee involvement and job satisfaction. Vorina et al. (2017) show that if employee involvement increases, job satisfaction will also increase.

Thakur (2014) shows that employee involvement has a positive effect on job satisfaction. It can be concluded that among the previous work motivations can be increased through increased job authority and accountability. At the administrative level, rewards and sanctions are significantly related to work involvement. Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013) show that employee involvement with work and the organization will have a positive relationship with the level of job satisfaction. This implies that when individuals experience a certain level of involvement, they find their work to be more satisfying and motivating the results they see their work and workplace to provide them with a pleasant environment and they feel more satisfied with their work.

Employee Engagement high will make employees feel satisfied with the job and the company where they work. Employees who feel valued and involved by the company
they work for will be satisfied with their work and company. From the literature above, the hypotheses that can be proposed are:

**H3:** High Employee Engagement will increase Job Satisfaction.

**Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance**

Dizgah et al. (2012) Job satisfaction has a strong relationship with innovative job performance. Besides that, Job Satisfaction also has a strong relationship with in-role performance. Organizations must provide situations where employees can criticize to improve conditions without fear of negative reactions from higher superiors and if they see that positive aspects are more important than negative ones, then performance will increase and higher job satisfaction will be obtained. Ndulue and Ekechukwu (2016) state that when job satisfaction in the form of the nature of work and job security increases, it will affect employee performance in terms of high employee morale. Saleh et al. (2016) state that job satisfaction directly has a significant effect on performance.

Inuwa (2016) explained that job satisfaction has a positive and significant relationship with employee performance, this indicates that if there is an increase in job satisfaction of non-academic staff at Bauchi State University, Gadau will improve higher performance while also helping the University achieve its vision and mission targeted. Abdirahman et al. (2018) state that job satisfaction is positively related to employee performance. This explains that increasing the standard of job satisfaction of administrative staff at universities in the northern Malaysia region could also increase performance higher. Intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction is also in line with that, when administrative staff has a high level of job satisfaction, they will work even harder so that it can have a positive impact on their work performance. Also, when administrative staff gets appreciation from management, they tend to be more motivated, so they will work harder and can have a positive impact on their performance.

Employees who are satisfied with their work and company will make the best contribution to their company. When the employer gives full support, the company gives good Rewards and Recognition, then employees will feel that their needs have been met and will give their best contribution in the form of extraordinary work. From the literature above, the hypotheses that can be proposed are:
**H4:** *High work performance will improve performance.*

**Relationship of Perceived Supervisor Support to Performance**

Dysvik and Kuvaas (2013) regard perceived supervisor support as an important predictor of employee performance. In line with the research conducted by Gagnon and Michael (2004) that employees who see themselves as having a relationship with their immediate supervisor tend to have higher performance and are more satisfied with their work. Rubel and Kee (2013) state that there is a direct relationship between perceived supervisor support and performance that has a positive and significant relationship whereas, after introducing a mediator the relationship becomes insignificant. Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) state that perceived supervisor support has a significant positive relationship with the perception of subordinate organizational support, role performance, and extra-role performance.

When the boss gives attention, full support, ideas, solutions from each obstacle, as well as an active role in helping to complete the work of his subordinates, directly employees will feel always supervised, feel supported and will provide their best contribution, in this case, the achievement of their sales targets. From the literature above, the hypotheses that can be proposed are:

**H5:** *High Perceived Supervisor Support will improve Performance.*

**Relationship Rewards and Recognition on performance**

Aktar et al. (2012) in their research stated that there is a direct relationship between intrinsic rewards and employee performance, besides intrinsic rewards also have a direct relationship to employee performance. The same results were also conveyed in the research conducted by Shah et al. (2010) which states that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards can improve employee performance, other than those other results found are the moderating effects of employee recognition of performance that are considered more attractive than intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Khan et al. (2013) stated that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards not only increase job satisfaction but can also improve overall employee performance.
Ndungu (2017) stated that there was a significant relationship between intrinsic rewards and performance, besides that a significant correlation was also found to exist between extrinsic rewards and employee performance. Another result is that there is a significant relationship between rewards and recognition of employee performance. A significant relationship was also found between financial rewards to employee performance.

Implementation of Rewards and Recognition based on performance will produce employees who have high performance. When Rewards and Recognition are directly proportional to performance, employees will compete to give their best performance to obtain large Rewards and Recognition. Also, if employees get good Rewards and Recognition where they work, the possibility of employees moving to other companies with reasons of Rewards and Recognition is lower. From the literature above, the hypotheses that can be proposed are:

**H6: Rewards and Recognition High performance will improve.**

From the description above, the research model can be described as follows:

**Picture1: Research Model**

![Research Model Diagram]

**METHODS**

The population of this study was conducted on marketing employees in the banking industry in the Tangerang area. By the analysis tool that will be used, namely the structural equation model (SEM), the determination of a representative minimum sample size. In terms of SEM samples in this study, at least 5 times the number of questionnaires (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 2013) The number of questionnaire
statements in this study were 34 statements, so the number of samples taken in this study (34x5) 170 respondents. In this study the determination of the type of sample using the Purposive Sampling method, in which the surveyed respondents had criteria including government or private bank employees, aged at least 21 years and having a minimum period 1 month of work.

This study is an explanatory study between independent variables, namely Perceived Supervisor Support, Rewards and Recognition, Employee Engagement, and Job satisfaction on the dependent variable, namely Performance. To find out the significant level and the relationship between variables, the structural equation model (SEM) analysis method is used.

**Measurement**

Measurements in this study on the variables of perceived supervisor support, rewards, and recognition, employee engagement, and performance adopted from Saks (2006), while the performance variables adopted from Talukder and Jan (2017). In this study, the data obtained using a questionnaire. While the measurement scale using the Likert scale method. On the Likert scale the method used is by using four alternative answers: on a score of four ratings strongly agree (SS), a score of three ratings agrees (S), a score of two ratings disagrees (TS) and a score of one rating strongly disagrees (STS) (Sugiyono, 2014).

This study uses confirmatory factor analysis to test validity by looking at the value of the Kaiser-Msyer-Olkin measure of sampling (KMO) and measures of sampling adequacy (MSA). If the KMO value is below 0.5 then factor analysis cannot be used or accepted. Whereas the acceptable KMO value is the minimum value of 0.5 to 0.9 (Malhotra, 2010). Reliability test with Cronbach alpha value> 0.5 which means reliable (Azwar, 2012).

Confirmatory factor analysis test results show that all indicators of the perceived supervisor support variable are declared valid, for rewards and recognition variables there are 6 indicators declared valid, for employee engagement variables there are 6 indicators declared valid, for variable job satisfaction there are 3 indicators declared valid and performance there are 4 indicators that have been declared valid with KMO
and MSA values > 0.5 and 1 component matrix). Furthermore, the reliability test on all perceived supervisor support, rewards and recognition, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and performance show a Cronbach alpha value > 0.5, which means reliable (Malhotra, 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Goodness of Fit

From the analysis of the suitability test, all tests showed good compatibility including Chisquare, ECVI, AIC and CAIC, Fit Index, RMSEA, and Goodness of Fit. From the results of the above analysis, it can be concluded that the fittest for all models meets the requirements (good fit).

Hypothesis Testing

For the hypothesis testing this research produces the T-Value path diagram as follows:

Picture 2: T-Value Path Chart

Note: sp (Perceived Supervisor Support), rr (Rewards and Recognition), ee (Employee Engagement), kk (Job Satisfaction), and kin (Performance).

Based on the T-Value Path Diagram Image is a hypothesis in this study, presented
in the hypothesis testing table as follows:

**Table 1: Research Model Hypothesis Testing**

| Hypothesis | Hypothesis statement | T-Value | Information |
|------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|
| H1         | Perceived Supervisor Support affect Employee Engagement | -1.86  | Data does not support hypothesis |
| H2         | Rewards and Recognition affect Employee Engagement | 8.82   | Data supports the hypothesis |
| H3         | Employee Engagement affect Job Satisfaction | 3.43   | Data supports the hypothesis |
| H4         | Job Satisfaction affects Performance | 2.87   | Data supports the hypothesis |
| H5         | Perceived Supervisor Support affect Performance | 1.77   | Data does not support hypothesis |
| H6         | Rewards and Recognition affect Performance | 4.18   | Data supports the hypothesis |

*Source: SEM Lisrel data processing results*

**Mediation Analysis of Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction**

The findings in this study indicate that rewards and recognition have a direct effect on employee engagement with a t value of 8.82. Employee engagement has a direct effect on Job Satisfaction with a t value of 3.43. Job satisfaction has a direct effect on performance with a t value of 2.87. Rewards and recognition have a direct effect on performance with a t value of 4.18.

Perceived supervisor support has no direct effect on employee engagement and performance with t values of -0.72 and 1.77 (<1.96). It can be concluded that employee engagement and job satisfaction can mediate the relationship between rewards and recognition of performance.

**RESULT, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSION**

**DISCUSSION**

In this study some results show that perceived supervisor support does not affect employee engagement, meaning that large or small perceived supervisor support no
effect on their employee engagement. These results are not in line with the results of research conducted by Ghosh et al. (2016); Ram and Prabhakar (2011); Mohamed and Ali (2016) and Burns (2016) which states that there is an influence between perceived supervisor support on employee engagement. Generally, employees assume that the greater the perceived supervisor support will increase employee engagement for each employee. Unlike the case with marketing employees in the banking industry who assume that the size of the perceived supervisor support is not one indicator to make them engaged to the company. This can happen considering that most of the activities carried out by marketing employees in the banking industry are carried out in the field, so they assume that the perceived size of the supervisor does not affect their engagement with the company. Also, the average level of rotation and mutation of superiors in the banking industry is relatively fast, this can cause a marketing employee must always continue to adapt to his superiors. Some superiors do not appreciate their team and even always consider their team bad, some superiors are only able to give direction without any action, this can make employees feel reluctant to ask for support from superiors, so they feel that they work alone for their company.

In the test results, it was found that rewards and recognition influence employee engagement. This is in line with the results of research conducted by Mesepy (2016); Puspadewi and Suharnomo (2016); Victor and Hoole (2017) and Scott and McMullen (2010). This shows that for marketing employees in the banking industry rewards and recognition can increase the engagement of their employees. This is common considering that marketing employees work according to their targets. The greater rewards and recognition they receive from the company, they will feel involved with their company.

In the test results, it was found that employee engagement influences job satisfaction. These results are in line with research conducted by Diyanto et al. (2019); Suryanto et al. (2019); Madan and Srivastava (2015); Vorina et al. (2017); Thakur (2014) and Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013). This shows that when a company has a high level of employee engagement in its employees, then this has an impact on the job satisfaction of employees. Generally, when employees feel satisfied with their work the impact produced one of them is that employees become loyal to their company and do not have the desire to move to another company, besides that employee will also do
anything to advance the company.

In the test results, it was found that satisfaction affects performance. This is in line with the results of research conducted by Kishen et al. (2020); Takdir et al. (2020); Sidabutar et al. (2020); Dizgah et al. (2012); Ndulue and Ekechukwu (2016); Saleh et al. (2016); Inuwa (2016) and Abdirahman et al. (2018). This shows that satisfied employees will give a good performance to the company. And in this study, one of the factors that can improve performance is rewards and recognition.

Other results from this study indicate that perceived supervisor support does not affect performance. These results are in line with research conducted by Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013) This shows that the perceived supervisor support does not have a large role in the performance of marketing employees in the banking industry. The tendency of superiors to give more orders to achieve targets without giving examples also happens a lot in the field, this can also have an impact on marketing employees. Also, the frequent rotation and mutation of superiors in the banking industry affect the performance of marketing employees. There are not a few characteristics of superiors who are unable to provide solutions to every problem in the field, are less competent, do not value their team, cannot understand market conditions, and are not actively participating in achieving the targets given by the company, and can make marketing employees feel they are working alone to achieve the target given by the company.

Other results from this study indicate that rewards and recognition affect performance. In line with research conducted by Aktar et al. (2012); Shah et al. (2010); Khan et al. (2013); and dung (2017). This shows that the greater rewards and recognition provided by the company can improve the performance of marketing employees in the banking industry, but it is inseparable from the achievement of the targets given by the company. When rewards and recognition given by companies are considered good enough in this case still based on their targets, then they will be eager to achieve these targets, even exceeding the targets given to obtain rewards and recognition provided by the company.

Conclusion

The results that can be concluded from this study are first, there is first, there is a
relationship between rewards and recognition of employee engagement, secondly, there is a relationship between employee engagement on job satisfaction, thirdly there is a relationship between job satisfaction on performance. The four-employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition of job satisfaction with banking marketing employees in the Tangerang area. The fifth job satisfaction mediates the relationship between employee engagement on performance. But there is no relationship between perceived supervisor support for employee engagement and performance in banking marketing employees in the Tangerang area.

**Research Limitations**

Research limitations refer to several weaknesses in this study. Some limitations contained in this study are that this study only discusses the variables of perceived supervisor support, rewards and recognition, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and performance. Then, the area covered in this study was only examined in the Tangerang area and was limited to marketing employees in the banking industry. Furthermore, it is possible that respondents did not fill in really or only filled in based on the expected ideal conditions and not the actual conditions that were happening.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

Future research developments can add variables that can influence the performance of marketing employees in the banking industry. Other variables can be suggested that is adding organizational support variables, given that organizational support also has an important role on employee performance. Future studies can expand the scope of his research not only in Tangerang but throughout Indonesia.

**Managerial Implications**

This study aims to determine the perceived supervisor support and rewards and recognition through employee engagement and job satisfaction on performance in marketing banking employees in the Tangerang area. Marketing employees tend to have more unique characteristics compared to employees in general. Marketing employees are more likely to have fluctuating productivity and tend to feel the rewards they receive are not proportional to what they have produced (production/sales), so managerial implications are proposed that aim to improve the performance of
marketing employees.

The first indicator is salary increase, which is considered very important for marketing employees in the banking industry. Generally, a marketing employee has a non-permanent income (depending on the amount of production) or even has a basic salary that is generally the same as employees in other units. Therefore, to improve the performance of the company’s marketing employees should make regular salary increases. Besides being a strategy to improve performance, this can also be used as a strategy to retain employees as one of the company’s assets.

The second indicator is security, this is very necessary for marketing employees in banking. Generally, marketing employees have quite a lot of risks. Starting from the receipt of false data, error analysis to the occurrence of bad loans, and concerns about the failure to achieve the target that caused marketing employees in the banking system to be stopped. In this case, the company should be able to guarantee the safety of marketing employees when working either when there are lawsuits (if a particular case occurs) or guarantee their existence within the company, so they can focus on their performance in this case the achievement of the given credit targets.

The third indicator is promotion, this is very important for companies to be able to prioritize promotional opportunities for marketing employees. The production results of marketing employees have the largest contribution to company profits, but not a few companies that pay less attention to promotional opportunities for marketing employees or even promotions are given based on subjectivity (for example closeness to the boss or the deposit of certain debtors). If the company can implement objective promotional opportunities based on performance, then it is likely that what will happen is healthy competition among marketing employees to provide the best performance for the company.

The fourth indicator is freedom, this needs to be considered by companies related to freedom in working marketing employees. Generally, every employee has their way of working, this must be a concern of management to provide freedom of work for marketing employees, but still with a commitment to achieving its targets or commitment to good performance.

The fifth indicator is praise, this is a common psychological of every human being. Praise from superiors for good performance results in a positive impact on
the psychology of their employees. Praise for good performance is one part of the motivation given by the employer for their employees. As a supervisor, it is better to apply this in his work unit because rewards in the form of praise do not require a fee but can provide motivation for employees who receive the praise and the employee will be more motivated to improve their performance.

Then the last indicator is training and development, this should also be a concern for companies where employees are their biggest assets. Training and development are included in the rewards given to their employees. Companies must be able to provide training and development facilities to marketing employees, this aims to make marketing employees have the ability to adapt hard skills and soft skills to deal with changing market conditions so quickly. Besides training and development functions to improve the ability of their employees in various aspects, this is one of the company's strategies to improve the performance of employees. With marketing employees who have good skills, are expected to have good performance to achieve company goals.
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