International Journal of Religion
2024
Volume: 5| Number 11 | pp. 2930 – 2939
ISSN: 2633-352X (Print) | ISSN: 2633-3538 (Online)
ijor.co.uk
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61707/sgmzy704

Police Personnel Performance: Intrinsic Motivation, Organizational Commitment and Psychological Empowerment in Indonesia

Edison[1], Samdin[2], Fajar Saranani[3], Endro Sukotjo[4], Laode Asfahyaddin[5] and Wahyuniati Hamid[6]

Abstract

The background of this research is to motivate police personnel who have not yet worked optimally. The purpose of this research is to test and analyze the influences of motivation on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), the influences of human resource information system on OCB, and the influences of various knowledge on OCB. This is explanatory research with a quantitative approach, using primary and secondary data in which the data collection method involves questionnaires and documents. The approach to understanding the personnel's empowerment as motivational construct states that strength in the motivational construct refers to the need for self-determination and a person's belief in his or her abilities. The data from questionnaires was structured in a structured manner to capture accurate data in the form of direct responses from respondents. The results show that respondents felt neutral with fairly value in liking their working activities, did not feel both their organizational life and personal life quite meaningful. Psychological empowerment could become a solution to the high level of working regulations that required personnel to provide creativity and to work together to make their organization effective. Many respondents who felt neutral thought that the work they did was not meaningful enough for the life of the organization. There should exist better organizational support to improve the performance, better intrinsic motivation to improve the performance, better organizational commitment to improve the performance, but better psychological empowerment is not able to improve the performance. It is concluded that there is a lack of organizational support from the institution for the personnel's psychological empowerment.

Keywords: *Police Personnel, Intrinsic Motivation, Organizational Commitment and Psychological Empowerment.*

INTRODUCTION

Since the role of Indonesian Police personnel is not easy, that is, they are responsible for the civil security and able to solve people's problems; they must also be smart in their working unit administration. These dual roles are considered significant to provide civil service. An important factor in the success of organizational performance (OP) is the presence of employees who are capable and skilled and have enthusiasm with high level of work, so that satisfactory work results can be expected (Wahyudi & Akdon, 2005).

Good performance should be optimal to meet organizational standards and to support the achievement of organizational goals; all this cannot be separated from the role of organizational management in efforts to improve employee's performance. There are several factors influencing employee's performance, including work motivation, information systems, and knowledge sharing. Other factors that influence performance include ability and motivation factors, effectiveness and efficiency, authority, discipline, initiative, knowledge sharing, OCB, organizational climate, and work environment (Mangkunegara, 2000). According to Hasibuan (2006) motivation is the driving force that creates enthusiasm for a person's work, so that he is willing to work together, effectively and integrated with all efforts to achieve organizational goals.

The motivation of Konawe police personnel (KPP) in Southeast Sulawesi has not been optimal seen from the assessment results of the performance management system since no personnel achieved maximum

[1] Halu Oleo University. E-mail: edhy2106@gmail.com
[2] Halu Oleo University.
[3] Halu Oleo University
[4] Halu Oleo University
[5] Halu Oleo University
[6] Halu Oleo University

performance. Hence, all the factors must be improved, considering that all of these variables are interrelated, and they can help all elements in an organization to achieve optimal work performance.

This research is quantitative, focusing on psychological empowerment (PE), namely four cognitions of employees' orientation to certain components, namely meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact since these four components can help them feel more like they can take control within an organization. The PE theory emerged as a result of the development of the concept of empowerment. The empowerment itself was initially only understood using a management approach. As a result, empowerment is only interpreted as a concept that is considered the same as the concept of delegation process and sharing power with subordinates (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). According to Lee & Koh (2001), the PE factors are considered individual and organizational.

METHODS

Research Design

As a quantitative research, data was taken from primary and secondary sources. The primary data was obtained directly from respondents' answers from questionnaires (Supriyanto & Machfudz, 2010) and the secondary one was found indirectly through intermediary media (Supriyanto & Machfudz, 2010). The secondary data in this research is in the form of a general description of the research location. There were 374 KPP and all of them became samples. The samples were selected on the basis of Slovin formula. According to Nalendra *et al.* (2021), the Slovin formula is the one to calculate the minimum sample size if the behavior of a population is not yet known with certainty. By this formula the samples were determined by the error rate value, in which the greater the error rate was found, the smaller the number of samples were taken. Below is the Slovin formula:

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

Legend:

n: Sample size

N: Population size

e: Percentage of allowance for inaccuracy due to sampling error that is still tolerable or desirable, for example 5%, 10%.

In this case, the researcher set the *e* value at 5%, so, based on the Slovin formula, the sample size calculation is as follows:

$$n = \frac{374}{1 + 374(0.05^2)}$$

$n = 193{,}28$ and integrated up to 193 respondents.

By this formula, the number of samples determined was 193 respondents who were considered representative for the data to reflect the population situation and random sampling was applied during the research. Two data collection methods were involved, namely questionnaires and documentation. The first method refers to a structured questionnaires to collect data, so that accurate data is obtained in the form of direct responses from respondents. The purpose of making a questionnaire is to obtain statement responses from each research variable. In the second method the data taken was related to a general description of the research location.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis techniques were carried out by analyzing the data into categories, describing them into units, synthesizing them, arranging them into patterns, choosing what were important for study, and drawing conclusions (Sugiyono, 2017).

Validity and Reliability Tests

Validity Test

In this research, the validity test was applied by construct validity test to measure how well the results were obtained to match the theory underlying the test design. It was said to be valid if it is significant (α) < 5% or < 0.05 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2017). The question indicators would be declared valid from the IBM SPSS Statistics output display on the correlation table by looking at the sig. (2-tailed). Instrument validity testing was processed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 program.

Reliability Test

In research, data quality testing that is often carried out is a reliability test for internal consistency reliability, where this concept emphasizes the consistency of the question items in an instrument. The question indicator is said to be reliable if the Cronbach alpha value is > 0.6 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2017). Reliability testing was processed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 program.

Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the independent and dependent variables which were then classified into the total number of respondents' scores. From the total score of respondents' answers, assessment criteria for each statement item was then prepared. To describe the data for each variable was done by compiling a frequency distribution table to find out whether the level of score obtained for the research variables fall into the categories: very low, low, medium, high, and very high. To determine the average score, the number of questionnaire answers was divided by the number of statements and multiplied by the number of respondents. Consider the following formula:

$$Average\ score = \frac{\sum answers\ from\ questionares}{\sum statement\ X \sum respondents}$$

Legend:

Σ questionnaire answers: the number of respondents who answered was multiplied by each score for the alternative answer.

Σ statements: number of statements for each item.

Σ respondents: the total number of respondents.

The average score was based on the average score of each statement item in the questionnaires. Meanwhile, the average indicator score referred to the average of a number of average items, and the average score of a variable was meant the average of a number of average indicators. The average score was categorized as very low or very bad, low or bad, fair or medium, high or good, and very high or very good. The categorization scale range technique was based on a minimum of one and a maximum of 5, so the average answer score was calculated using the following formula:

$$RS = \frac{max - min}{k}$$

Legend:

RS = scale range

max = maximum score

min = minimum score

k = number of categories

So, the steps and process are:

$$RS = \frac{5-1}{5} = 0{,}8$$

The categories of respondents' answers can be explained as follows:

Respondents' Answer Categories

Range	Category
1,00 – 1,80	very low or very poor
1,81 – 2,60	low or bad
2,61 – 3,40	fair or moderate
3,41 – 4,20	high or good
4,21 – 5,00	very high or very good

The *very low* or *very bad* category means that the value of a statement item in the questionnaire is considered *very low* or v*ery bad* by the respondents. The *low* or *bad* category indicates that the value of a statement item in the questionnaire is considered *low* or *bad* by the respondents.

In case of the *sufficient* or *medium* category, it points to the value of a statement item in the questionnaire which is considered sufficient or moderate by the respondents. The category of *high* or *good* refers to the value of a statement item in the questionnaire which is considered high or good by the respondents. About the *very high* or *very good* category, this means that the value of a statement item in the questionnaire is considered very high or very good by the respondents. In this research, descriptive statistical analysis involves the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 program.

Inferential Statistics Analysis

The data analysis technique uses structural equation modeling (SEM), carried out to thoroughly explain the relationship between the variables in the research. The SEM is used not to design a theory, but rather to examine and justify a model. Two reasons underlying the use of SEM are that it has the ability to estimate relationships between variables that are multiple relationships. This relationship is formed in a structural model (the relationship between dependent and independent constructs) and SEM is able to describe the pattern of relationships between latent constructs and manifest variables or indicator variables.

To use SEM requires assumptions underlying its use and these assumptions include number of samples and data normality. Models that use very large samples above 2500 samples are recommended to use the asymptotically distribution free (ADF) estimation technique (Haryono, 2016). If there is a CR value that is greater than the critical value then the data distribution is not univariate normal. Meanwhile, in multivariate terms, it can be seen in the last line of CR with the same conditions (Ferdinand, 2014). Regarding *test for outliers*, if outliers occur, whether univariate outliers or multivariate outliers, then the data can be removed from the analysis. Univariate outlier evaluation was carried out by looking at the threshold value of the z-score which was in the range 3-4 (Hair et al., 2014). Evaluation of the multivariate outlier values is presented through the AMOS output, namely mahalanobis distance. Criteria that can be used for the p level should be < 0.001. This distance is evaluated using χ^2 at degrees of freedom (df) equal to the number of variables used in the study.

About multicollinearity and singularity, this test is used to find out whether there is a correlation between independent variables. In case of data interval, the use of ordinal or nominal data reduces the coefficient of the correlation matrix used in SEM. In general, an SEM model can be divided into two main parts, namely measurement model, and structural model. According to Hair et al. (2014), there are seven steps that must be taken when using SEM, namely development of a theoretical model, development of a flow diagram, convert the flowchart into an equation (the equation obtained from the converted flowchart), selecting the input matrix and estimating the SEM model, possible identification problems, evaluation of goodness of fit criteria, and interpretation and modification of the model.

DISCUSSION

Better Organizational Support for Performance Improvement

The results of the descriptive analysis on the organizational support (OS) variable show that the mean answer score is 3.46 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OS. The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is feelings of caring (FoC) with an average value of 3.56 (high category). Meanwhile, the OS indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was willingness to listen with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high. Then, the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The performance indicator (PI) assessed with the highest level of agreement is social network (SN) with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the PI assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated their performance as high.

From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better OS can improve the performance of the KPP. This is in accordance with the results of previous research by Saltson & Nsiah (2015), Tamimi *et al.* (2023), Khiong & Utomo (2023), Sukma *et al.* (2023), and Sutianingsih & Handayani (2021) who concluded that the OS has a positive and significant effect on performance. The success of an organization is greatly influenced by the performance of its employees. Every organization or company will always try to improve employee's performance (EP), with the hope that the company's goals will be achieved. Increasing the EP will bring progress for the company to be able to survive in an unstable competitive business environment. Therefore, efforts to improve the EP are a challenge (Damayanti et al., 2018).

Good performance or employee's work performance can be a special privilege for a company. The term EP is defined as achievements or work results (output) both quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his work duties in accordance with the responsibilities given. In general, performance is evaluated based on work quality, work quantity, and timeliness. The dimensions of the EP can give rise to a company's competitiveness with its competitors. Companies with good EP can easily achieve their desired goals, which also makes them superior to competitors. Employees can become a company's advantage because they have competitive and comparative characteristics, which tend to be difficult for competitors to imitate, so that high EP is thought to be used as company ammunition (Sari & Susilo, 2018).

It is important for organizations to know the factors that can influence employee performance, some of which are perceptions of organizational support or perceived organizational support (POS). Eisenberger et al. (1986) explained that the POS is an employee's perception of the organization regarding the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their welfare. Organizations generally provide positive forms of support that are beneficial to employees. The support provided is able to raise the EP of the organization. Employees with a high level of POS provide maximum performance.

Perception of OS refers to EP of the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. If employees perceive that the OS they receive is high, then they would integrate membership as members of the organization into their self-identity and then develop more positive relationships and perceptions of the organization (Susmiati & Sudarma, 2015).

Better Intrinsic Motivation for Performance Improvement

The results of the descriptive analysis on the intrinsic motivation (IM) variable show that the mean answer score is 3.50 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high IM. The IM indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is advancement (development) with an average value of 3.58 (high category). Meanwhile, the IM indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was *work-it-self* with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the IM as high. Then the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The PI assessed with

the highest level of agreement is social network with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the PI assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category).

The IM is a person's desire to do something without the need for external stimulation and is motivated by positive thinking which is caused by encouragement factors that originate from within oneself without being influenced by other people because of the desire to achieve certain goals (Wahyuni et al., 2022). There are three IM indicators, namely, achievement, reward, and responsibility. Employees who have intrinsic work values want the challenging achievements, the opportunity to make a contribution to their work and the company, and the opportunity to reach their full potential at work. This suggests that employees with strong intrinsic work values is usually be intrinsically motivated at work. Thus, on average, the KPP rated their performance as high.

Better Organizational Commitment for Performance Improvement

The results of the descriptive analysis on the organizational commitment (OC) variable show a mean answer score of 3.62 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OC. The OC indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is affective commitment (AC) with an average value of 3.72 (very high category). Meanwhile, the OC indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is normative commitment with an average value of 3.48 (high category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated OC as high. Then the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The PI assessed with the highest level of agreement is social network with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the PI assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP who were respondents to this research rated their performance as high. From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better OC can improve the performance of the KPP. The OC is needed as an indicator of EP and employees with high commitment can be expected to show optimal performance.

Better Psychological Empowerment for Performance Improvement

The results of the descriptive analysis on the psychological empowerment (PE) variable show that the mean answer score is 3.47 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high PE. The PE indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement shows with an average value of 3.66 (high category). Meanwhile, the competency indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is competence with an average value of 3.23 (medium category). Thus, the average of the KPP who were respondents to this research rated PE as high. Then the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The PI assessed with the highest level of agreement is social network with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the PI assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP who were respondents to this research rated their performance as high.

The results of the hypothesis test prove that better PE can improve the performance of the KPP cannot be accepted (rejected). This means that better PE is not able to improve the performance of the KPP. This is not in accordance with the results of previous research by Hasbi *et al.* (2023), Cudjoe et al. (2023), and Ibrahim et al. (2023) who concluded that PE has a positive and significant relationship with performance. The inability of PE to improve the performance of the KPP can be seen from each indicator of PE, namely, meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact.

Better Organizational Support to Increase Intrinsic Motivation

The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the mean answer score is 3.46 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OS. The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is feelings of caring with an average value of 3.56 (high category). Meanwhile, the OS indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was willingness to listen with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high. Then the results of the descriptive analysis

on the intrinsic motivation (IM) variable show a mean answer score of 3.50 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high IM. The IM indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is advancement (development) with an average value of 3.58 (high category). Meanwhile, the IM indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was Work it Self with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the IM as high.

The results of hypothesis testing show that better OS can increase the intrinsic motivation of the KPP. This is in accordance with the results of previous research by Alam *et al.* (2023), Mohamad *et al.* (2021), Ayu & Ghazali (2023), Wulandari *et al.* (2023), Sartori *et al.* (2023), and Tamimi *et al.* (2023) who concluded that the OS has a positive and significant effect on IM.

Better Organizational Support to Increase Organizational Commitment

The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the mean answer score is 3.46 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OS. The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is feelings of caring with an average value of 3.56 (high category). Meanwhile, the OS indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was willingness to listen with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high and then, the results of the descriptive analysis on the OC variable show a mean answer score of 3.62 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OC. The OC indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is the AC with an average value of 3.72 (very high category). Meanwhile, the OC indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is normative commitment with an average value of 3.48 (high category). Thus, on average, the KPP who were respondents to this research rated the OC as high.

From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better OS can increase the OC of KPP. This is in accordance with the results of previous research by Gundüz (2014) and Asih et al. (2023) who concluded that the OS has a significant effect on OC.

Better Organizational Support to Increase Psychological Empowerment

The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the KPP agree that they have high OS. The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement was feelings of caring. On average, the KPP rated the OS as high and then, the results of the descriptive analysis on the PE variable show a mean answer score of 3.47 which is in the range 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high PE. Thus, on average the KPP who were respondents to this research rated the PE as high.

The negative influence of the relationship between OS and PE can be explained that organization generally provides positive forms of support that are beneficial to KKP. The support provided is able to raise their perceptions of the organization. The KPP who feel that they have the support from the organization, then receive awards for their achievements, and empowered abilities and optimal training would be able to do their work well and optimally; thus, KPP would feel satisfaction at work so that the KPP can achieve its goals more easily (Kim *et al.*, 2009).

The results of hypothesis testing regarding the relationship between OS and PE actually have a significant effect because they have a P-value of 0.000. However, the path coefficient is negative, namely -0.312. This means that better OS is not able to increase, or even reduce, the PE of KPP. These results are not in accordance with the results of previous research by Maan *et al.* (2020), Hasbi *et al.* (2023), and Phonteuka & Harmen (2023) in which all state that OS has a positive effect on PE.

Better Intrinsic Motivation to Mediate the Effect of OS on Performance

The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the mean answer score is 3.46 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that KPP agree that they have high OS. The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is feelings of caring with an average value of 3.56 (high category). Meanwhile, the OS indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was willingness to listen with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high, then, the results of the descriptive analysis

on the intrinsic motivation (IM) variable show that the mean answer score is 3.50 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high IM. The IM indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is advancement (development) with an average value of 3.58 (high category). Meanwhile, the IM indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was work-it-self with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the IM as high. Furthermore, the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The performance indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is the SN with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the PI assessed with the lowest level of agreement is the independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP in this research rated their performance as high.

From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better IM can play a role in mediating the influence of OS on the performance of the KPP. Furthermore, to see whether the role of mediation is full or partial mediation or no mediation in this research can be explained using the criteria of Hair *et al.* (2014), namely:

If *a* and *b* are significant, but *c* is not, then *Z* is declared as perfect/full mediation.

If *a*, *b*, and *c* are significant but the direct coefficient value $c < b$, then *Z* is declared as partial mediation.

If *a*, *b*, and *c* are significant but the coefficient value $c = b$, then *Z* is declared as no mediation.

If *a* or *b* or both are not significant then *Z* is declared as no mediation.

From the results of this research, it appears from the path coefficients value that effect of *a* (the influence of the OS path → IM) is significant (P-Values = 0.000). Then, effect of *b* (the influence of the IM → performance path) is significant (P-Values = 0.000). Likewise, the effect of *c* (direct influence of the OS → performance path) is significant (P-Values = 0.001). Meanwhile, the direct coefficient value $c < b$ (0.101 < 0.271). Thus, it can be said that better IM is able to play a role in partial mediation of the influence of OS on the performance of the KPP. From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better IM can play a role in mediating the influence of OS on the performance of the KPP.

Better Organizational Commitment To Mediate The Effect Of OS On Performance

The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the average value of the KPP rated the OS as high. Meanwhile, the OS Indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is normative commitment with an average value of 3.48 (high category). The results of the descriptive analysis on the OS variable show that the mean answer score is 3.46 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high OS.

The OS indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is feelings of caring with an average value of 3.56 (high category). Meanwhile, the OS Indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement was willingness to listen with an average value of 3.36 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high, then, the results of the descriptive analysis on the OC variable show a mean answer score of 3.62 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that KPP agree that they have high OC. Thus, on average, the KPP rated the OS as high. Furthermore, the results of the descriptive analysis on the performance variable show that the mean answer score is 3.53 which is in the range of 3.4 - 4.2, meaning that the KPP agree that they have high performance. The performance indicator assessed with the highest level of agreement is social network with an average value of 3.74 (very high category). Meanwhile, the performance indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated their performance as high.

Psychological Empowerment to Mediate the Effect of OS on Performance

The performance indicator assessed with the lowest level of agreement is independence with an average value of 3.40 (medium category). Thus, on average, the KPP rated their performance as high. From the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that better PE is not able to play a role in mediating the influence of OS on the performance of the KPP.

From the results of this research, it appears from the path coefficients value that the effect of *a* (the influence of the OS path → PE) is significant (P-Values = 0.000). Then, the effect of *b* (the influence of the PE → performance path) is not significant (P-Values = 0.138). Then, the effect of *c* (direct influence of the OS path → performance) is significant (P-Values = 0.001). Based on the opinion of Hair *et al.* (2014) above, if the effect of *a* or *b* or both is not significant then *Z* is declared no mediation. From the explanation above, it is known that the effect of *b* is not significant. From the results of this research, better PE is not able to play a role in mediating the influence of the OS on the performance of the KPP.

FINDINGS

In this research, it was found that the PE did not have a significant effect on performance and also did not play a mediating role in the influence of the OS on performance. It is known from the previous analysis that psychological empowerment is not significant on performance due to several reasons, including in terms of meaning, it is known that there are still many KPP who feel neutral (fairly) in liking their work activities. There are still many KPP who feel that the work they do is not or is meaningful enough for the life of the organization. There are still many KPP who feel that the work they do is not meaningful or meaningful enough for their personal lives. In terms of competence, there are still many KPP who feel that they have not mastered the skills required for work or are sufficient.

Through the PE, the KPP tend to be able to increase personal control and to motivate themselves to involve in work, resulting in positive managerial and organizational outcomes (Ariani *et al.*, 2016; Goksoy, 2017). They will see more of their abilities and will be able to influence work and organizations in more meaningful ways. They also try to do their work more optimally, act more independently, and have higher commitment, thus, encouraging them to behave proactively at work (Ramdhan, 2015). The PE in an organization is a solution to the high level of work regulations that require employees to provide creativity and be able to work together so that the organization is effective (Nursyamsi, 2013; Spreitzer, 1995).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussions carried out previously, this research reached three conclusions, namely, better OS, intrinsic motivation, and organizational commitment can improve the KPP's performance respectively. Better organizational support can reduce the KPP's psychological empowerment and this, of course, should become serious attention from the Konawe Police institution, with the reason why the organizational support, in this case, actually reduces the KPP's psychological empowerment; hence, there is a lack of organizational support from the KPP for the psychological empowerment of its personnel. The research has limitations that future researchers can re-examine with different research locations as comparative materials, or further research can add independent variables, because, in this research, only one independent variable, namely organizational support is discussed.

REFERENCES

Afandi, P. (2018). Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia: Teori Konsep dan Indikator. Pekanbaru: Zanafa Publishing.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Baumgartner, H. (1994) The Evaluation of Structural Equation Models and Hypothesis Testing. In: R.P. Bagozzi (ed.). Principles of Marketing Research, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1(10), 386-422. https://doi.org/10.1177/009207038801600107

Cacioppe, R. L. (1998). "Leaders Developing Leaders: An Effective Way to Enhance Leadership Development Programs". Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 19 (4): 194-198. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437739810217179

Damayanti, R., Hanafi A., & Cahyadi A. (2018). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Karyawan Non Medis RS Islam Siti Khadijah Palembang). Jembatan: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, 15 (2): 75-86. http://repository.unsri.ac.id/id/eprint/6113

Eder, P., & Eisenberger, R. (2008). Perceived Organizational Support: Reducing the Negative Influence of Coworker Withdrawal Behavior. Journal of Management, 34 (1): 55-68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307309259

Ferdinand, A. (2014.) Metode Penelitian Manajemen: Pedoman Penelitian untuk Skripsi, Tesis dan Disertai Ilmu Manajemen. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26 (4): 331-362. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). Multivariate Data Analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Ibrahim, N., Ismail A., Mat N., & Erhan T. (2023). Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Employees' Creativity with Psychological Empowerment as Mediator. The South East Asian Journal of Management, 17 (2): 1-25. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375114132_Relationship_Between_Transformational_Leadership_and_Employees%27_Creativity_with_Psychological_Empowerment_as_Mediator

George, J. M., & Jones G. R. (2012). Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Gordillo-Rodriguez, M. T., Pineda, A., & Gómez, J. D. F. (2023). Brand Community and Symbolic Interactionism: A Literature Review. Review of Communication Research, Vol.11, pp.1-32.

Kadarisman, M. (2013). Manajemen Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia. Depok: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Lee, M., Koh, J. (2001). Is Empowerment Really a New Concept? The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12 (4): 684-695. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/713769649?needAccess=true

Maan, A. T., Abid, G., Butt, T. H., Ashfaq, F., Ahmed, S. (2020). Perceived Organizational Support and Job Satisfaction: A Moderated Mediation Model of Proactive Personality and Psychological Empowerment. Future Business Journal, 6 (1): 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00027-8

Naderi, N., & Hoveida, R. (2013). The Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Human Resources Empowerment (HRE) Case Study: University of Isfahan (Iran). International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 3 (2): 69. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v3i2.3991.

Paillé, P., Bourdeau, L., & Galois, I. (2010). Support, Trust, Satisfaction, Intent to Leave and Citizenship at Organizational Level. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 18 (1): 41-58. https://doi.org/10.1108/19348831011033203

Ramdhan, D. (2015). Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Pemberdayaan Psikologis terhadap Komitmen Organisasi dan Implikasinya Kinerja Pegawai. Jurnal Kontingensi, 3 (2): 117-128. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367608854_Kepemimpinan_Transformasional_dan_Pemberdayaan_Psikologis_terhadap_Komitmen_Organisasi_dan_implikasinya_Kinerja_Pegawai

Saifullah, M. A., Tarigan, M., & Nurendah, G. (2019). Bagaimana Kepribadian dan Pemberdayaan Psikologis Meningkatkan Perilaku Proaktif Karyawan Start-Up? Jurnal Psikologi Insight, 3 (1): 46-62. https://doi.org/10.17509/insight.v3i1.22251

Tamimi, M., Tamam, M. B., & Sopiah. (2023). The Effect of Organizational Support on Employee Performance: A Systematic Literature Review. Asian Journal of Economics and Business Management, 2 (2): 250-256. https://doi.org/10.53402/ajebm.v2i2.337

Uno, H. B. (2016). Teori Motivasi dan Pengukurannya. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Wahyuni, D. T., Tadung, E., & Fadli, A. M. D. (2022). Motivasi Intrinsik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Bagian Organisasi dan Kepegawaian Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Konawe. Journal of Government Science (GovSci): Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 3 (1): 63-73. https://doi.org/10.54144/govsci.v3i1.26

Yani, I. M., Supartha, W. G., & Subudi, M. (2016). Pengaruh Pemberdayaan Psikologis dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Komitmen Organisasional Guru di SMKN 1 Mas Ubud. E-Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 5 (12): 4177-4208. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/pengaruh-pemberdayaan-dan-kepuasan-kerja-terhadap-n-Yani-Supartha/d8733a48798fac71b907ea3e05d0e4823b00ced0

Zaman, R. A., & Zulganef. (2023). Effect of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance (Case Study at Islamic Bank of BJB Jakarta). International Journal of Global Operations Research, 4 (1): 1-12. https://doi.org/10.47194/ijgor.v4i1.196