Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi **ISSN 3025-1664**

Vol. 4 No. 01, 2026, 246-268 Ogzrespublish.com

The Influence of Workload and Agile Leadership on Performance Through Job Satisfaction as a Mediator of Personnel in the Assessment and Development Bureau of the Indonesian National Police Education and Training Institute

(*Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Kepemimpinan Agile terhadap Kinerja Melalui Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Mediator Personel di Biro Penilaian dan Pengembangan Lembaga Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Kepolisian Nasional Indonesia*)

Ayu Monaputri[1], Puji Wahono[2], Christian Wiradendi Wolor[3]

Universitas Negeri Jakarta[123]

ayumonaputri8@gmail.com[1], wahono@unj.ac.id[2], christianwiradendi@unj.ac.id[3]

Article Revision History:
Received on 24 January 2026
1st Revision on 30 January 2026
Accepted on 31 January 2026

Doi :
https://doi.org/10.61597/jbe-ogzrp.v4i1.192

Abstract:

Objective : This study examines the effects of workload and agile leadership on employee performance, with job satisfaction as a mediating variable.

Methodology : Using a quantitative survey approach, data were collected from 106 respondents and analyzed through Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM).

Research results : The results indicate that workload and agile leadership have positive and significant effects on employee performance. Agile leadership also shows the strongest positive influence on job satisfaction, which in turn significantly enhances performance. Mediation analysis reveals that job satisfaction partially mediates the relationships between workload and performance as well as between agile leadership and performance. These findings highlight the importance of effective workload management and agile leadership in fostering job satisfaction and sustaining improved employee performance.

Keyword: Workload, Agile Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance, Human Resource Management

1. Introduction

Changes in the working environment of law enforcement officers (complexity of duties, demands for digitalization, and the need for rapid response to security disturbances) require improvements in the performance of the Indonesian National Police (Polri) education and training organizations. The performance of development and assessment units (such as the Assessment and Development Bureau of the Education and Training Institution) is crucial because they play a role in preparing adaptive and professional human resources to face the dynamics of threats and the transformation of Polri's duties (Polri 2024).

According to data from the National Police Education and Training Institute's Assessment and Development Bureau, obstacles to achieving performance targets include a lack of IT-skilled personnel in the National Police Education Unit and the need to improve administrative skills (Education and Training Information Systems) within the Education Unit. Limited IT personnel can slow down system maintenance, delay technical problem resolution, and suboptimal information system utilization. Consequently, performance targets related to the utilization of technology-based facilities and infrastructure are not fully achieved.

Work pressure often leads to substandard work quality. In terms of accuracy and speed, employee work quality is lacking, and results do not meet expectations. Stress is a significant performance inhibitor in the workplace, particularly in companies. Various studies have shown that work stress is directly related to employee performance. Studies have shown that excessive workload and conflict at work can cause stress, negatively impacting employee performance. These findings are crucial for company management, which must evaluate how to manage stress and conflict in the workplace to maintain optimal employee performance (Murtasiyah 2024). The relationship between workload and performance can be proven by research by Yosiana (2020). The results showed that when a small number of employees handle a high workload, this only results in a heavy workload and ultimately increases work stress levels. Having support from the work environment not only helps human resources manage stress but also provides them with the opportunity to improve

their performance. According to Schultz & Schultz (R. J. Johari 2019), workload is related to the ability to carry out work tasks and can cause psychological stress on subordinates. Individual responses to workload vary, with some coping positively, while others show signs of frustration. As employees move up the career ladder, workload also increases, and this impacts employee performance.

Similarly, research by (Paramitadewi 2017) showed that employee performance is negatively related to workload. This means that when the workload borne by employees decreases, their performance tends to increase.

The research gap in empirical research findings is explained by the following explanation. Several previous studies have examined the negative impact of workload on performance, such as (Manikotomo 2017), (Siswanto 2019) research, which showed different results, stating that workload was positively related to employee performance. Furthermore, (R. J. Johari 2019) research showed different results, stating that workload was not related to employee performance.

This study presents novelty by integrating the concept of agile leadership as an adaptive and responsive leadership approach to dynamic change, and workload as a significant factor influencing personnel performance. In this study, job satisfaction is used as a mediating variable to explore how these two main variables interact in influencing personnel performance at the Assessment and Development Bureau of the Indonesian National Police Education and Training Institute. The uniqueness of this study lies in the application of a mediation model that provides new insights into the mechanism of the relationship between adaptive leadership, workload, and performance, while enriching the literature in the field of human resource management in police institutions that have complex and dynamic task characteristics. These findings are expected to provide theoretical and practical contributions to improving organizational performance through optimizing leadership and workload management that support personnel job satisfaction.

2. Literarature Review

2.1. Grand Theory

According to (David David, and David 2023), the Resource-Based View (RBV) approach to competitive advantage states that internal resources are more important for a company than external factors in achieving and maintaining competitive advantage. According to (Lubis 2024), the Resource-Based View (RBV) relies on the ownership of certain critical resources, particularly those with qualities such as value and resistance to duplication. If a company effectively optimizes these resources, benefits can be achieved. The Resource-Based View (RBV) perspective theory is used to evaluate and interpret resources within an organization with the aim of understanding how the organization achieves sustainable competitive advantage (Chigara 2021).

2.2. Perfomance

Performance refers to the work achievements or work results (output) achieved by employees in terms of quality and quantity in carrying out their work responsibilities in accordance with the responsibilities given. (Sari and Susilo 2018). According to Oppler and Sager in (Gong, Chen, and Wang 2019), they define performance as "actions related to employee goals." In other words, whether employee behavior meets organizational goals and whether they can achieve the results expected by the organization. According to (Damayanti, Hanafi, and Cahyadi 2018) Additional performance reflects the extent to which employees meet job requirements. Employee performance is a personal matter, because each employee has a different level of ability in working. Management can measure the performance of each employee based on the performance of each employee.

2.3. Workload

According to Tarwaka's definition (Fauzi and Akbar 2020), workload can be understood as the gap between a worker's abilities or skills and the demands of the job that must be performed. Since human work involves both mental and physical

aspects, and individuals have different levels of stress tolerance, an excessively high workload can lead to excessive energy consumption and stress, whereas an excessively low workload may result in boredom or underutilization. (Rolos 2018) defines workload as a series of tasks or activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or a branch manager within a certain period of time. When a worker's skills exceed job demands, boredom may occur. Conversely, when a worker's skills are lower than job demands, greater fatigue is likely to arise. Workload can be categorized into three conditions: standard workload, excessive workload (overload), and insufficient workload (underload).Furthermore, (J. Johari 2018) states that workload refers to all activities related to the amount of time an employee spends, either directly or indirectly, in carrying out tasks, responsibilities, and professional work-related interests.

2.4. Agile Leadership

Agile leadership plays a central role in flexible organizations. Essentially, adaptive leadership not only concerns the personal development of leaders but also focuses on the development of the organization as a whole. There are six key elements of organizational growth that leaders need to address, namely: fostering creativity within teams, inspiring teams to tackle significant problems, creating a human-centered work environment, enhancing individual morale so that it aligns with the organizational vision, directing the organization to behave ethically, and guiding the organization toward achieving optimal performance (Adhikersa et al. 2022). According to (Sakitri 2021), agile leaders function as role models for team members, helping them clearly understand the agility values that need to be adopted. In shaping an agile culture, leadership should be driven by creativity and innovation, emphasize the importance of adaptive and responsive performance, and focus on teamwork and autonomous empowerment. In addition, leaders must consistently support learning processes and overall organizational development in order to respond to uncertainty in an agile and resilient manner.The same opinion and can also be strengthened by (Greineder and Leicht 2020) Agile leadership can be explained as various aspects, including but not limited to views and attitudes that follow the principles of agile

leadership, the role and traits of adaptable leaders, fast-paced team leadership, and leadership processes and practices. Agile leadership encompasses various elements, including mindsets, leadership styles, practical methods, and characteristics and qualifications of leaders, which are designed to support rapid responses to changes in the organizational environment. This is especially appropriate for situations where the organizational structure tends to be flat or without many hierarchical levels.

2.5. Job Satisfaction

According to (Al-Kilani 2017), an individual's satisfaction with their job can be assessed through their feelings toward their work, which is referred to as job satisfaction. Individuals who perceive their jobs as valuable and challenging tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction than those who dislike their work. Similarly (Gul 2018), define job satisfaction as "a pleasurable emotional state resulting from an individual's appraisal of how well the experienced work environment fulfills their needs, values, and expectations." Furthermore, (Eliyana, 2019), suggests that job satisfaction represents a general attitude that emerges when employees perceive their performance as adequate, accompanied by rewards and achievements. Theoretically, job satisfaction is closely associated with job performance. In line with this view, (Ramli 2018), argues that job satisfaction can be considered a predictor of performance, as it demonstrates a moderate correlation with employee performance.

3. Methods

The research design employed in this study is a quantitative causal survey method. The variables examined consist of three independent variables, namely workload, agile leadership, and job satisfaction, while employee performance is treated as the dependent variable. The objects of this study include workload, agile leadership, job stress, and performance. The subjects of the study are personnel of the Jianbang Bureau, Lemdiklat Polri. The population of this study comprises all members of the Jianbang Bureau, Lemdiklat Polri, totaling 106 personnel. The sampling technique

used is saturated sampling, in which all members of the population are included as research respondents (Echdar 2017). Saturated sampling is applied when the population size is relatively small. Accordingly, the sample of this study consists of 106 members of the Jianbang Bureau, Lemdiklat Polri. Data were collected using a questionnaire survey method. The data analysis technique employed in this study is Partial Least Squares (PLS) using SmartPLS 3.

3.1. Instrument Development

Operational definitions of variables are formulated to ensure that the research is more easily understood and to avoid misinterpretation or ambiguity in defining the studied variables. They also serve as a conceptual framework for describing the research problems to be examined.

According to (Sugiyono and Noeraini 2019), a research variable is anything in any form determined by the researcher to be studied in order to obtain information about it, which subsequently becomes the basis for drawing conclusions.

3.2. Instrument Development

Operational variables are created to make research easier to understand and to avoid misunderstandings or errors in interpreting the variables being studied. They also serve as a framework for describing the problem to be addressed.

According to (Sugiyono and Noeraini 2019), a research variable is anything in any form determined by the researcher to be studied to obtain information about it and then draw conclusions.

3.2.1. Member Performance

1) Operational Definition

   Performance is the work attitude of a police officer in carrying out his/her duties in line with the goals that the organization wishes to achieve.

Table 1 Instrument Research Performance

No.	Dimension	Indicator	Item Statement	Source
1	Work Results	Accuracy of work	1,2	(Wijaya, Widayati, and Rahmayanti 2018)
		Effectiveness of work	3,4	
2	Work Behavior	Friendliness towards coworkers	5,6	(Susiarty, Suparman, and Suryatni 2019)
		Seriousness of work	7,8	
		Teamwork	9,10	
3	Work Results	Knowledge	11,12	(Setiawati 2021)
		Skills	13,14	
		Accuracy of work	15,16	
		Effectiveness of work	17,18	

3.2.2. Workload

1) Operational Definition

Workload is the application of the difference between the capacity or ability of a member and the demands of the work that must be faced.

Table 2 Instrument Research Workload

No.	Dimension	Indicator	Item Statement	Source
1	*Load Time*	The level of pressure felt due to work deadlines.	1,2	Edi Siregar (2021)
		The frequency of tasks that must be completed within a short time.	3,4	
		The match between available time and the volume of work.	5,6	
2	*Mental Effect Load*	The level of concentration required to complete tasks.	7,8	(Nurhasanah, Jufrizen, and Tupti 2022)
		The complexity of thinking or analysis at work.	9,10	
3	*Psychological stress load*	The level of anxiety or tension when facing work tasks.	11,12	(Tentama, Rahmawati, and Muhopilah 2019)
		The extent of responsibility.	13,14	
		The impact of work on mood and psychological well-being.	15,16	

3.2.3. Agile leadership

1) Operational Definition

Agile leadership is a police leader who has fast, active involvement in various different situations, is able to adapt flexibly in facing new experiences and environmental changes.

Table 3 Instrument Research Agile Leadership

No.	Dimension	Indicator	Item Statement	Source
1	*Mindset/Attitude*	Openness to change and innovation in work.	1,2	(Greineder and Leicht 2020)
		A positive attitude toward challenges and failure (resilience).	3,4	
2	*Leadership role*	The ability to provide clear direction and vision to the team.	5,6	(Greineder and Leicht 2020)
		The ability to inspire, motivate, and lead by example.	7,8	
3	*Visionary*	The effectiveness of the performance evaluation and monitoring system.	9,10	(Setiawati 2021)
		Management's ability to adapt to changes in the organizational environment.	11,12	
4	*Enggagment*	The level of collaboration and cooperation among team members.	13,14	(Setiawan Wibowo et al. 2023)
		The regularity of coordination and communication among team members in achieving targets.	15,16	

3.2.4. Job satisfaction

1) Operational Definition

Job satisfaction is a member's positive feelings regarding the work performed, as a result of evaluating the work itself.

Table 4 Instrument Research Job Satisfaction

No.	Dimension	Indicator	Item Statement	Source
1	The job itself	The work performed is in accordance with your abilities and expertise.	1,2	(Ratnasari, Sutjahjo, and Adam 2020)
2	Supervisor qualities	The supervisor provides clear guidance and direction.	3,4	
		The supervisor supports career development and competency improvement.	5,6	
3	Relationships with coworkers	Coworkers help each other complete tasks.	7,8	(Nurhasanah, Jufrizen, and Tupti 2022)
		Coworkers are easy to communicate and collaborate with.	9,10	
4	Promotion opportunities	The workplace promotion system is fair and transparent.	11,12	(Nurhasanah, Jufrizen, and Tupti 2022)
		There are opportunities for career development in this organization.	13,14	
5	Salary	The salary received is sufficient to cover living expenses.	15,16	

4. Result

4.1. Descriptive Statistic

The respondents in this study consisted of both males and females, with males accounting for 51% and females for 55% of the sample. This distribution indicates a slightly higher proportion of female respondents, although the difference between the two groups was relatively small. Based on the descriptive analysis of age characteristics, the total sample comprised 106 respondents. The largest proportion was represented by individuals aged 21–30 years, totaling 40 respondents (37.7%), followed by those aged 31–40 years, with 35 respondents (33.0%).

4.2. Outer Model Result

4.2.1. Convergent Validity

1. Workload Variables

The Workload Indicator consists of six statements with 106 respondents, and each statement must have a value greater than 0.07 to meet the convergent validity requirements. Convergent validity results were obtained from the SmartPLS 4.0 external loading table (Hair et al. 2023).

Table 5 Workload Load Factor Test Results

Indikator Variabel	Outer loadings	Description
BK1 <- Workload	0,824	Valid
BK2 <- Workload	0,705	Valid
BK3 <- Workload	0,794	Valid
BK4 <- Workload	0,832	Valid
BK5 <- Workload	0,758	Valid
BK6 <- Workload	0,780	Valid
BK7 <- Workload	0,770	Valid
BK8 <- Workload	0,769	Valid
BK9 <- Workload	0,766	Valid
BK10 <- Workload	0,813	Valid
BK11 <- Workload	0,806	Valid
BK12 <- Workload	0,814	Valid
BK13 <- Workload	0,766	Valid
BK14 <- Workload	0,728	Valid
BK15 <- Workload	0,793	Valid
BK16 <- Workload	0,801	Valid

Source: Data processing results using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

Based on Table 1 sixteen statement items from the Workload variable are considered valid or meet convergent validity requirements.

2. Agile Leadership Variables

The Agile Leadership indicator consists of six statements with 106 respondents. To meet the Convergent Validity requirement, each Agile Leadership statement must have a value >0.7. The Convergent Validity results are taken from the outer loading table in SmartPLS 4 (Hair et al. 2023).

Table 6 Agile Leadership Load Factor Test Results

Indikator	Outer loadings	Description
AL1 <- Agile Leadership	0,757	Valid
AL2 <- Agile Leadership	0,822	Valid
AL3 <- Agile Leadership	0,741	Valid
AL4 <- Agile Leadership	0,763	Valid
AL5 <- Agile Leadership	0,842	Valid
AL6 <- Agile Leadership	0,817	Valid
AL7 <- Agile Leadership	0,776	Valid
AL8 <- Agile Leadership	0,825	Valid
AL9 <- Agile Leadership	0,796	Valid
AL10 <- Agile Leadership	0,792	Valid
AL11 <- Agile Leadership	0,803	Valid
AL12 <- Agile Leadership	0,819	Valid
AL13 <- Agile Leadership	0,762	Valid
AL14 <- Agile Leadership	0,827	Valid
AL15 <- Agile Leadership	0,833	Valid
AL16 <- Agile Leadership	0,754	Valid

Source: Data processing results using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

Based on Table 2, sixteen statement items from the Agile Leadership variable are considered valid or meet convergent validity requirements.

3. Performance Variables

The Performance Indicators consist of sixteen statements with 106 respondents. To meet the Convergent Validity requirement, each Performance statement must have a value >0.7 (Hair et al. 2023). Convergent validity results are taken from the outer loading table in SmartPLS 4.0.

Table 7 Performance Load Factor Test Results

Indikator Variabel	Outer loadings	Description
Y1 <- Performance	0,787	Valid
Y2 <- Performance	0,830	Valid
Y3 <- Performance	0,871	Valid
Y4 <- Performance	0,877	Valid
Y5 <- Performance	0,777	Valid
Y6 <- Performance	0,823	Valid
Y7 <- Performance	0,778	Valid
Y8 <- Performance	0,889	Valid
Y9 <- Performance	0,790	Valid
Y10 <- Performance	0,871	Valid

Indikator Variabel	Outer loadings	Description
Y11 <- Performance	0,875	Valid
Y12 <- Performance	0,879	Valid
Y13 <- Performance	0,868	Valid
Y14 <- Performance	0,777	Valid
Y15 <- Performance	0,861	Valid
Y16 <- Performance	0,805	Valid
Y17 <- Performance	0.800	Valid
Y18 <- Performance	0.827	Valid

Source: Data processing results using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

Based on Table 3, eighteen statement items from the Performance variable can be considered valid or meet the requirements for convergent validity.

4. Job Satisfaction Variable

The Job Satisfaction indicator consists of 16 statements with 106 respondents. To meet Convergent Validity requirements, each Job Satisfaction statement must have a value >0.7 (Hair et al. 2023). Convergent validity results are taken from the outer loading table in SmartPLS 3.0.

Table 8 Job Satisfaction Load Factor Test Results

Indikator Variabel	Outer loadings	Description
KK1 <- Job Satisfaction	0,769	Valid
KK2 <- Job Satisfaction	0,810	Valid
KK3 <- Job Satisfaction	0,781	Valid
KK4 <- Job Satisfaction	0,837	Valid
KK5 <- Job Satisfaction	0,828	Valid
KK6 <- Job Satisfaction	0,779	Valid
KK7 <- Job Satisfaction	0,726	Valid
KK8 <- Job Satisfaction	0,855	Valid
KK9 <- Job Satisfaction	0,806	Valid
KK10 <- Job Satisfaction	0,830	Valid
KK11 <- Job Satisfaction	0,807	Valid
KK12 <- Job Satisfaction	0,727	Valid
KK13 <- Job Satisfaction	0,801	Valid
KK14 <- Job Satisfaction	0,798	Valid
KK15 <- Job Satisfaction	0,790	Valid
KK16 <- Job Satisfaction	0,791	Valid

Source: Results of data processing using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

Berdasarkan tabel 4 sixteen statement items from the Job Satisfaction variable are considered valid or meet the requirements for convergent validity.

4.2.2. Construct Validity Testing Stage

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is extracted to evaluate the convergent validity of the latent variables. Consequently, a latent variable can be said to have convergent validity if the AVE value is 0.50 (Hair et al. 2023):

Table 9 Latent Variable AVE Results

Variabel	Average variance extracted (AVE)	Description
Agile Leadership	0,634	Valid
Workload	0,613	Valid
Job Satisfaction	0,635	Valid
Performance	0,699	Valid

Sumber : Hasil pengolahan data menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

All latent variables or constructs in the study meet the requirements for convergent variables, as shown in table 4.12. The variables Workload (X1), Agile Leadership (X2), Job satisfaction (Y1), and Performance (Y2) have a total AVE value greater than 0.5.

4.2.3. Construct Reliability Testing Stage

The confidence level of the component indicators used to test the indicators based on the variables is known as composite reliability. A variable is considered reliable if it has a composite reliability value of 0.7 (Hair et al. 2023). For each variable used in this study, the following Composite Reliability output values are:

Table 10 Composite Reliability Results

Variables	Cronbach's alpha	Description
Agile Leadership	0,961	Reliabel
Workload	0,958	Reliabel
Job Satisfaction	0,961	Reliabel
Performance	0,971	Reliabel

Sumber : Hasil pengolahan data menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

From Table 6, it can be seen that all four variables in the study have a high level of reliability, as shown by the combined reliability values of the four variables in Table 4.15. These results indicate that each variable meets the combined reliability value.

4.2.4. Common Method Bias Test with Harman's Single-Factor Test

Common method bias (CMB) testing was conducted using Harman's single-factor test through exploratory factor analysis (EFA) without rotation, incorporating all study indicators into a single extraction procedure. This approach was used to assess whether a single common factor dominated the variance, potentially indicating method bias due to a single questionnaire-based measurement (Podsakoff et al. 2024).

Table 11 Common Method Bias dengan Harman's Single-Factor Test

Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
30.671	46.471	46.471

Sumber : Hasil pengolahan data menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

Based on the test results, the first factor produced a variance percentage of 46.471% (cumulative 46.471%). Referring to commonly used criteria, the indication of CMB is considered problematic if one factor explains >50% of the variance or when one factor strongly dominates the factor structure. Therefore, because 46.471% <50%, it can be concluded that CMB is not indicated as a serious problem in this research data, so that the results of the hypothesis testing can be continued with a better level of reliability.

4.3. Inner Model Analysis

The inner model or structural model is tested to determine how variables and their significance values relate to each other. Understanding how variables correlate is important. Then, you can formulate a hypothesis for the research problem of how workload, Agile Leadership, and Job Satisfaction influence repurchase. The bootstrap resampling method was used to test the hypothesis. SmartPLS obtained a significance value of 0.05 for the p-value (Hair et al. 2023).

4.3.1. PLS Model Determination Coefficient

The R-Square term for the endogenous latent construct is 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25, indicating a strong, moderate, and weak pattern (Hair et al. 2023). The PLS R-Square represents the number of design options explained by the model.

Table 12 Koefisien Determinasi

Variables	R-square	R-square adjusted
Job Satisfaction	0,590	0,582
Performance	0,896	0,893

Sumber : Hasil pengolahan data menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

The Job Satisfaction variable has an R-Square value of 0.590, while the Performance variable, respectively, has an R-Square value of 0.896. These figures indicate that the Workload and Agile Leadership variables contribute 59% to the Job Satisfaction variable. In addition, only the Job Satisfaction variable can explain the Performance variable by 89.6%, while other variables outside the model can explain the remainder.

4.3.2. Model Fit Test

To determine model fit, use the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR) measurement. An SRMR value of less than 0.08 indicates good model fit. (Hair et al. 2023). The results of the SRMR measurement are as follows:

Tabel 13 Model Fit Measurement Results

Model	Saturated model	Estimated model
SRMR	0,074	0,074

Source: Data processing results using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

The SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual) value is 0.074, which means the result is less than 0.08, indicating a good model fit.

4.4. Hypothesis Testing

4.4.1. Direct Effect

A direct effect is a significant relationship between the variables studied. Its significance can be determined from the p-value generated by SmartPLS software. If the p-value is <0.05, it is considered significant, and Table 4.20 shows whether the relationship between the study variables is significant:

Table 13 Path Coefficient Results

Hipotesis	Original sample	T statistics	P values	Description
Workload -> Performance	0,498	9,391	0,000	H1 Accepted
Agile Leadership -> Performance	0,440	9,395	0,000	H2 Accepted
Job Satisfaction -> Performance	0,261	4,897	0,000	H3 Accepted
Workload -> Job Satisfaction	0,439	6,942	0,000	H4 Accepted
Agile Leadership -> Job Satisfaction	0,542	9,489	0,000	H5 Accepted

Source: Results of data processing using SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

1. **H1: There is a positive effect of Workload on Performance.**

   Table 9 shows the coefficient value of Workload is 0.498, indicating that perceived Performance will increase if perceived Workload increases. This result aligns with the hypothesis that Workload has a positive impact on Performance. If the P-value is 0.000 equals 0.05 (alpha 5%), H1 is accepted. Workload has a positive impact on Performance at the 95% confidence level.

2. **H2: There is a positive effect of Agile Leadership on Performance.**

   Table 9 shows the coefficient value of Agile Leadership is 0.440, indicating that perceived Performance will increase if perceived Agile Leadership increases. This result aligns with the hypothesis that agile leadership improves Performance. Because the P-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05 (alpha 5%), H2 is accepted. Agile Leadership has a positive impact on Performance at the 95% confidence level.

3. **H3: There is a positive effect of Job Satisfaction on Performance.**

   Table 9 shows the coefficient value for Job Satisfaction is 0.261, indicating that Performance will increase if the perception of Job Satisfaction increases. This result aligns with the proposed hypothesis that Job Satisfaction influences Performance. Since the P-value of 0.000 is equal to 0.05 (alpha 5%), H3 is accepted. With a 95% confidence level, Job Satisfaction influences Performance.

4. **H4: There is a positive effect of Workload on Job Satisfaction.**

   Table 9 shows the coefficient value for Workload is 0.439, indicating that if the perception of Workload increases, the perception of Job Satisfaction will increase. This result supports the hypothesis that Workload has a positive effect on Job Satisfaction. Since the P-value is 0.000 and below 0.05 (alpha 5%), H4 is accepted. With a 95% confidence level, Workload has a positive impact on Job Satisfaction.

5. **H5: There is a positive effect of Agile Leadership on Job Satisfaction.**

   Table shows the coefficient value for Agile Leadership is 0.542. Perception of job satisfaction will increase if the perception of Agile Leadership increases. This result is in line with the proposed hypothesis that Agile Leadership influences job satisfaction. The p-value of 0.020 is equal to 0.05 (alpha 5%), so H5 is accepted. Agile Leadership has a positive impact on job satisfaction with a 95% confidence level.

4.4.2. Indirect Effect

Table 14 Indirect Influence Results

Hypothesis	Original sample	T statistics	P values	Description
Workload -> Performance	0,115	3,820	0,000	H6 Diterima
Agile Leadership -> Performance	0,142	4,264	0,000	H7 Diterima

Sumber : Hasil pengolahan data menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0, 2025

H6: There is a positive effect of workload on performance through the mediation of job satisfaction.

The test results show that the coefficient of the indirect effect of workload on performance through job satisfaction is 0.115, meaning that increased perceptions of workload will lead to increased job satisfaction. The test results show a p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05 (alpha 5%), so H6 is accepted. Workload has a positive impact on performance through job satisfaction, with a 95% confidence level.

H7: There is a suspected effect of agile leadership on performance through the mediation of job satisfaction.

The test results show that the coefficient of the indirect effect of agile leadership on performance through job satisfaction is 0.142, meaning that increased perceptions of job satisfaction will lead to increased perceptions of performance. The test results show a p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05 (alpha 5%), so H7 is accepted. Agile leadership has a positive impact on performance through job satisfaction, with a 95% confidence level.

5. Conclusion

The findings indicate that workload and agile leadership both have positive and significant direct effects on employee performance, suggesting that proportionally managed workloads and adaptive, collaborative leadership enhance employees' effectiveness in carrying out their duties. Job satisfaction was also found to positively and significantly influence performance, reflecting the role of motivation, commitment, and positive work attitudes in driving higher performance outcomes. Furthermore, workload and agile leadership each exerted a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, highlighting the importance of fair task distribution and supportive, participative leadership in fostering favorable employee perceptions. Importantly, job satisfaction was shown to mediate the relationships between workload and performance as well as between agile leadership and performance, indicating that both factors improve performance not only directly but also indirectly by enhancing employees' job satisfaction.

6. Bibliography

Adhikersa, Ridhwan, Wahyudi Kumorotomo, Achmad Djunaedi, and Agus Heruanto Hadna. "Impact of Agile Organization and Leadership on Employee Experience: Case Study UPTD (Technical Implementing Service Unit) Digital Service Center, Geospatial Data and Information of West Java Provincial Government (Jabar

Digital Service)." *Populasi* 30 (2) (2022): 103–125.

Al-Kilani, Mohammad Hani. "The Influence of Organizational Justice on Intention to Leave: Examining the Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction." *Journal of Management and Strategy* 8 (1) (2017):1-18.

Chigara, Hadjira.. "Resource Based View and Competitiveness:An Empirical Study of the Algerian SME." *International Journal of Economic Performance* 4 (2) (2021): 432–443.

Damayanti, Riski, Agustina Hanafi, and Afriyadi Cahyadi. "Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Karyawan Non Medis RS Islam Siti Khadijah Palembang). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis Dan Terapan Tahun*, 15 (2) (2018): 75–86.

David, Fred R., Forest R. David, and Meredith E. David. "Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases. *Pearson Education Limited*. (2023).

Echdar, S. "Metode Penelitian Manajemen Dan Bisnis". I. Bogor: *Ghalia Indonesia*. (2017).

Eliyana, Anis, Syamsul Ma'arif, and Muzakki. "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Effect in the Transformational Leadership towards Employee Performance." *European Research on Management and Business Economics* 25 (3) (2019): 144–50.

Fauzi, M. Iwan, and Muhammad Akbar. "Pengaruh Kompetensi, Disiplin Kerja, Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Penyidik Direktorat Reserse Kriminal Umum Kepolisian Daerah Kalimantan Selatan." *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Manajemen* 4 (1) (2020): 173–208.

Gong, Zhun, Yuqi Chen, and Yayu Wang. "The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Job Burnout and Job Performance: Mediating Effect of Psychological Capital." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. (2019).

Greineder, Michael, and Niklas Leicht. "Agile Leadership - A Comparison of Agile Leadership Styles." *Enabling Technology For A Sustainable Society*, (2020) 278–90.

Gul, Habib, Muhammad Usman, Yuxin Liu, Zahid Rehman, and Khalil Jebran. "Does the Effect of Power Distance Moderate the Relation between Person

Environment Fi t and Job Satisfaction Leading to Job Performance ? Evidence from Afghanistan and Pakistan." *Future Business Journal* 4 (1) (2018): 68–83.

Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt. "Review of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R: A Workbook. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal". Vol. 30. (2023).

Johari, Johanim, Fee Yean Tan, and Zati Iwani Tjik Zulkarnain. "Autonomy, Workload, Work-Life Balance and Job Performance among Teachers." *International Journal of Educational Management* 32 (1) (2018): 107–20.

Johari, Razana Juhaida, Nordayana Sri Ridzoan, and Arumega Zarefar. "The Influence of Work Overload, Time Pressure and Social Influence Pressure on Auditors' Job Performance." *International Journal of Financial Research* 10 (3) (2019): 88–106.

Lubis, Nurul Wardani. "Resource Based View (RBV) in Improving Company Strategic Capacity." *Research Horizon* 2 (6) (2022): 587–96.

Manikotomo, Bondan. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja Yang Berlebihan Dan Keterlibatan Personel Terhadap Kinerja Personel Polres Kudus." *Indonesian Journal of Police Studies* 1(1) (2017):83–144.

Murtasiyah, Murtasiyah. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja Stress Kerja Dan Konflik Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada PDAM Tirta Manuntung Kota Balikpapan)." *Jurnal Geoekonomi* 15 (1) (2024): 251–260.

Nurhasanah, Nurhasanah, Jufrizen Jufrizen, and Zulaspan Tupti. "Pengaruh Etika Kerja, Budaya Organisasi Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening." *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah)* 5 (1) (2022): 245–261.

Paramitadewi, Kadek Ferrania. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Sekretariat Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Tabanan." *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana* 6 (6) (2017): 255108.

Podsakoff, Philip M, Nathan P Podsakoff, Larry J Williams, Chengquan Huang, and Junhui Yang. "Common Method Bias : It ' s Bad , It ' s Complex , It ' s Widespread , and It ' s Not Easy to Fix." *Annual Review OfOrganizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11 (2024): 17–61.

Polri, Renstra. "Renstra Polri". (2024).

Ramli, Abdul Haeba. "Compensation , Job Satisfaction And Employee Performance In Health Services." *Business and Entrepreneurial Review* 18 (2) (2018): 177–86.

Ratnasari, Sri Langgeng, Gandhi Sutjahjo, and Adam. "The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture and Leadership on Employee Performance." *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health* 23 (13 A). (2020).

Rolos, J., S. Sambul, and W. Rumawas. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Asuransi Jiwasraya Cabang Manado Kota." *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis* 6 (004): (2018): 19–27.

Sakitri, Galih. "Agilitas Organisasi Dan Talenta Esensial." *Forum Manajemen Prasetiya Mulya* 35 (2021):1–11.

Sari, Oxy Rindiantika, and Heru Susilo. "Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Organizational Citizenship Behavior Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Pada Karyawan PTPN X - Unit Usaha Pabrik Gula Modjopanggoong Tulungagung) Oxy." *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis* 64 (1) (2018): 28–35.

Setiawan Wibowo, Teguh, Rini Fatmawati, Sunday Ade Sitorus, and Didi Suhendi. "Employee Performance in the Vuca Era: Determinants of Agile Leadership and Job Satisfaction." *Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR) Peer Reviewed-International Journal* 7 (1) (2023): 1–10.

Setiawati, Lulu. "The Effect of Agile Leadership and Work Environment to Employees' Performance in a VUCA World (Study on Millennial Generation Employees in Jabodetabek)." *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research* 04 (11) (2021): 3123–3131.

Siregar, Edi. "The Effect of Work Placement and Workload on Employee Performance through Competency" 3 (2 March-April) (2021): 229–233.

Siswanto, Siswanto, Achmad Sani Supriyanto, Ulfatun Ni'mah, Nur Asnawi, and Ismail Suardi Wekke. "Does a Workload Influence the Performance of Bank Employees?" *Management Science Letters* 9 (5) (2019): 639–650.

Sugiyono, and Irma Ayu Noeraini. "Pengaruh Tingkat Kepercayaan, Kualitas Pelayanan, Dan Harga Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan JNE Surabaya." *Ilmu Dan*

Riset Manajemen 5 (5) (2019): 1–17.

Susiarty, Afrina, Lalu Suparman, and Mukmin Suryatni. "The Effect of Workload and Work Environment on Job Stress and Its Impact on the Performance of Nurse Inpatient Rooms At Mataram City General Hospitalk." *Scientific Research Journal* VII (VI). (2019).

Tentama, Fatwa, Pusparina Arum Rahmawati, and Pipih Muhopilah. "The Effect and Implications of Work Stress and Workload on Job Satisfaction." *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research* 8 (11) (2019): 2498–2502.

Wijaya, P. Hellen, Christina Catur Widayati, and Chichi Rahmayanti. "Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Situasional, Budaya Organisasi Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja." *Jurnal Ekonomi* 23 (3) (2018): 319.

Yosiana, Yosiana, Adya Hermawati, and Muchlis H Mas'ud. "The Analysis of Workload and Work Environment on Nurse Performance with Job Stress as Mediation Variable." *Journal of Socioeconomics and Development* 3 (1) (2020): 1-37.