

# The Role of Organizational Commitment in Mediating the Influence of Workload, Work Environment, and Organizational Support on Performance Wakatobi Regency Hospital Employee

Karsinah Sidi<sup>1</sup>, Andi Jam'an<sup>2</sup>, Ismail Rasulong<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Program Studi Magister Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

Email: [karsinahsidi4@gmail.com](mailto:karsinahsidi4@gmail.com)

---

## ***Abstract***

### **Keywords:**

*Organizational Commitment, Workload, Work Environment, Organizational Support, Employee Performance.*

*This study aims to analyze the influence of workload, work environment, and organizational support on employee performance at Wakatobi Regency Hospital with organizational commitment as a mediating variable. This study uses a quantitative approach by distributing questionnaires to 188 employees at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital. Data analysis used the Structural Equation Modeling method based on Partial Least Square (PLS-SEM) through the SmartPLS application to test the direct and indirect influence between variables. The results of the study show that workload does not have a significant effect on employee performance, but it has a significant effect on organizational commitment. The work environment has a significant effect on employee performance, but it does not have a significant effect on organizational commitment. Organizational support does not have a significant effect on employee performance, but it has a significant effect on organizational commitment. Furthermore, organizational commitment has been proven to have a significant effect on employee performance. The results of the mediation test showed that organizational commitment was able to mediate the influence of workload and organizational support on employee performance, but did not mediate the influence of the work environment on employee performance.*

*The findings of this study confirm that organizational commitment has an important role in improving employee performance. Therefore, the management of the Wakatobi Regency Hospital needs to pay attention to the management of the workload proportionally and increase organizational support to strengthen employee commitment so that it can encourage optimal performance improvement.*

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Hospitals are agencies engaged in public health services with the support of quality resources. Among these various resources, human resources play a very important role. Hospitals as one of the public service agencies, play an important role in ensuring the quality of public health (Adelia et al. 2025). Health is the main capital that a person really needs in order to be able to carry out his activities in accordance with his duties and responsibilities so that health is a very meaningful investment for a person (Cahyani & Prianthara, 2022).

Research on factors that affect employee performance has been conducted, especially in the field of human resource management and health services. Research by Cahyani and Prianthara (2022), found that the work environment, occupational safety and health, and organizational commitment had a positive effect on the performance of nurses at Siloam Bali Hospital, with organizational commitment as a mediating variable. However, research by Indriastuti and Awatara (2024), at Karanganyar Hospital, shows that workload does not have a significant effect on

employee commitment or performance, while competence and work involvement have a significant effect on both. Meanwhile, based on the results of Sabferrial's research Fernando Imam et al. (2024), it emphasizes the importance of employee empowerment to commitment and performance, while organizational learning has no direct effect on performance. Research by Rezeki et al. (2023), found that workload and work environment have a positive effect on nurses' performance both directly and through work stress as a mediating variable. The results of research by Nduru and Pohan (2024) also show that organizational commitment, work stress, and compensation have a significant effect on nurse retention at Sinar Husni Medan Hospital.

Based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the number of health workers in Indonesia in the last year was recorded at 1,499,959 people. This number shows that the health sector has an important role in supporting the improvement of the quality of public services, especially in the provision of optimal health services for the community. The high number of health workers does not fully guarantee maximum performance if it is not balanced with supporting factors such as a proportionate workload, conducive work environment, and adequate organizational support.

Based on data from the Wakatobi Regency Hospital in 2024, the number of outpatient visits was recorded at 9,277 patients with the number of outpatients as many as 6,017 people and the number of inpatients as many as 3,260 people (Wakatobi Regency Hospital, 2024). Meanwhile, the number of health workers at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital is 369 people (Wakatobi Regency Hospital, 2024). According to the Regulation of the Minister of Health of the Republic of Indonesia Number 56 of 2014 concerning Hospital Classification and Licensing, the ratio of health workers to patients should be adjusted to the workload and type of service. For outpatient services, one general practitioner should ideally serve 25–30 patients per day, while the ideal ratio of nurses is 1 nurse to 5–10 patients, depending on the complexity of the service (Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Based on this standard, the number of health workers at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital is not proportional to the number of patient visits, indicating a high workload for health workers in maintaining the quality of health services.

Based on the evolving service conditions, there are several patients who complain that the services at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital are considered less effective and tend to be slow. This is in line with the statement of Ilmiati Daud as the Deputy Regent of Wakatobi for the 2016-2025 period, who stated that the quality of health services at the hospital is not proportional to the amount of budget that has been disbursed by the Wakatobi Regional Government (Pemda). He emphasized that it was not only he who felt, but the public could also witness firsthand how bad the service at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital was (Aprianus, 2024). This condition shows that the performance of Wakatobi Regency Hospital employees still faces various obstacles, which can be influenced by internal and external factors, including workload, work environment, and organizational support.

Based on the description above, the research problem to solve the problem "What is the role of organizational commitment in mediating the influence of workload, work environment, and organizational support on the performance of employees of Wakatobi Regency Hospital".

## **METHODS**

This study uses a quantitative approach because this approach is appropriate to test hypotheses and analyze the cause-and-effect relationship between research variables through numerical data. According to Imam Machali (2021), the quantitative approach focuses on

objectively measuring variables and using statistical analysis to prove research theories or hypotheses.

The population in this study is all employees working at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital with a total of 353 employees. Based on the results of the calculation using the Slovin formula, it is known that the number of samples to be used in this study is 188 respondents.

The data collection methods used in this study are (Observation), Survey Distribution, and Documentation. The data analysis technique in this study uses the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach with the help of the SmartPLS application to test directly or indirectly between variables.

|                                |   |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      |             |
|--------------------------------|---|----|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|-------------|
| BK4.1                          | 1 | .5 | 3  | 1.6 | 8  | 4.3  | 126 | 67.0 | 50 | 26.6 | 4.18        |
| BK4.2                          | 1 | .5 | 9  | 4.8 | 29 | 15.4 | 117 | 62.2 | 32 | 17.0 | 3.90        |
| BK4.3                          | - | -  | 10 | 5.3 | 33 | 17.6 | 122 | 64.9 | 23 | 12.2 | 3.84        |
| <b>BK.4</b>                    |   |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | <b>3.97</b> |
| <b>Mean Workload Variables</b> |   |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | <b>3.98</b> |

The PLS-SEM analysis stage is carried out through two main stages, namely Measurement Model Testing (Outer Model), this stage focuses on evaluating validity and reliability, the testing research instruments that will be carried out include reliability tests, convergent validity tests, and discriminant validity tests. This stage of Structural Model testing (Inner Model) tests the relationship between variables, tests carried out include R-square test, Path Significance test (Path Coefficients) and hypothesis test.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Research Results

#### 1. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The findings of the descriptive analysis for each variable are as follows:

##### 1. Workload (X1)

Respondents' perceptions of workload can be seen in the following table:

| Indicator   | Respondent Answer Score |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | Red         |
|-------------|-------------------------|----|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|-------------|
|             | STS                     |    | TS |     | KS |      | S   |      | SS |      |             |
|             | f                       | %  | F  | %   | f  | %    | F   | %    | f  | %    |             |
| BK1.1       | -                       | -  | 8  | 4.3 | 20 | 10.6 | 136 | 72.3 | 24 | 12.8 | 3.94        |
| BK1.2       | -                       | -  | 8  | 4.3 | 20 | 10.6 | 133 | 70.7 | 27 | 14.4 | 3.95        |
| BK1.3       | -                       | -  | 6  | 3.2 | 15 | 8.0  | 136 | 72.3 | 31 | 16.5 | 4.02        |
| <b>BK.1</b> |                         |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | <b>3.97</b> |
| BK2.1       | 1                       | .5 | 3  | 1.6 | 8  | 4.3  | 123 | 65.4 | 53 | 28.2 | 4.19        |
| BK2.2       | 1                       | .5 | 3  | 1.6 | 8  | 4.3  | 123 | 65.4 | 53 | 28.2 | 4.19        |
| BK2.3       | 1                       | .5 | 11 | 5.9 | 38 | 20.2 | 115 | 61.2 | 23 | 12.2 | 3.79        |
| <b>BK.2</b> |                         |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | <b>4.05</b> |
| BK3.1       | 1                       | .5 | 3  | 1.6 | 8  | 4.3  | 126 | 67.0 | 50 | 26.6 | 4.18        |
| BK3.2       | -                       | -  | 9  | 4.8 | 32 | 17.0 | 119 | 63.3 | 28 | 14.9 | 3.88        |
| BK3.3       | 1                       | .5 | 10 | 5.3 | 35 | 18.6 | 122 | 64.9 | 20 | 10.6 | 3.80        |
| <b>BK.3</b> |                         |    |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | <b>3.95</b> |

Based on Table 4.2, the workload variable is in the high category with an average value of 3.98. The dominant indicator is found in the working conditions, especially items BK2.1 and BK2.2 with a mean value of 4.19. Meanwhile, the lowest indicator was found at BK2.3 with a mean value of 3.79 related to additional work outside working hours

### 2. Work Environment (X2)

The variables of the work environment are measured on a Likert scale consisting of three indicators, namely work atmosphere, relationships with colleagues, and the availability of work facilities or equipment. Respondents' perceptions of the work environment can be seen in the following table:

| Indicator                              | Respondent Answer Score |     |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | Red  |
|--|-------------------------|-----|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|------|
|  | STS                     |     | TS |     | KS |      | S   |      | SS |      |      |
|  | F                       | %   | f  | %   | f  | %    | F   | %    | f  | %    |      |
| LK1.1                                  | 1                       | .5  | 2  | 1.1 | 8  | 4.3  | 137 | 72.9 | 40 | 21.3 | 4.13 |
| LK1.2                                  | 1                       | .5  | 4  | 2.1 | 11 | 5.9  | 146 | 77.7 | 26 | 13.8 | 4.02 |
| LK1.3                                  | 1                       | .5  | 1  | .5  | 6  | 3.2  | 125 | 66.5 | 55 | 29.3 | 4.23 |
| LK.1                                   |                         |     |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.12 |
| LK2.1                                  | 2                       | 1.1 | 1  | .5  | -  | -    | 121 | 64.4 | 64 | 34.0 | 4.30 |
| LK2.2                                  | -                       | -   | 1  | .5  | 1  | .5   | 121 | 64.4 | 65 | 34.6 | 4.33 |
| LK2.3                                  | -                       | -   | 1  | .5  | -  | -    | 132 | 70.2 | 55 | 29.3 | 4.28 |
| LK.2                                   |                         |     |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.30 |
| LK3.1                                  | 5                       | 2.7 | 4  | 2.1 | 26 | 13.8 | 94  | 50.0 | 59 | 31.4 | 4.05 |
| LK3.2                                  | 5                       | 2.7 | 8  | 4.3 | 30 | 16.0 | 101 | 53.7 | 44 | 23.4 | 3.91 |
| LK3.3                                  | 1                       | .5  | 1  | .5  | 5  | 2.7  | 5   | 2.7  | 80 | 42.6 | 4.37 |
| LK.3                                   |                         |     |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.11 |
| <b>Mean Work Environment Variables</b> |                         |     |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.17 |

Based on Table 4.3, the work environment variable is in the very high category with an average value of 4.17. The dominant indicator is found in the relationship with colleagues, especially the LK2.2 item with a mean value of 4.33. Meanwhile, the lowest indicator is found in LK3.2 with a mean value of 3.91 related to the completeness and function of work equipment.

### 3. Organizational support (X3)

The variables of organizational support are measured on a likert scale consisting of three indicators, namely sense of fairness, appreciation from the organization and work conditions, and supervisor support. Respondents' perceptions of organizational support can be seen in the following table:

Based on Table 4.4, the organizational support variable is in the very high category with an average value of 4.04. The dominant indicator is the sense of justice and support of superiors, especially items DO1.1 and DO3.1 with a mean value of 4.12. Meanwhile, the lowest indicator was found in DO2.1 with a mean value of 3.87, which is related to organizational awards and working conditions

#### 4. Organizational Commitment (M)

The variables of organizational commitment are measured on a likert scale which consists of four indicators, namely willingness, unifying activities, understanding organizational needs, and having organizational needs. Respondents' perceptions of organizational commitment can be seen in the following table:

|  | Respondent Answer Score |     |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | Red  |
|--|-------------------------|-----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|----|------|------|
|  | STS                     |     | TS |     | KS |     | S   |      | SS |      |      |
|  | f                       | %   | f  | %   | f  | %   | F   | %    | f  | %    |      |
| DO 1.1                                       | -                       | -   | 4  | 2.1 | 11 | 5.9 | 132 | 70.2 | 41 | 21.8 | 4.12 |
| DO1.2  | -                       | -   | 4  | 2.1 | 14 | 7.4 | 143 | 76.1 | 27 | 14.4 | 4.03 |
| DO1.3  | -                       | -   | 5  | 2.7 | 13 | 6.9 | 140 | 74.5 | 30 | 16.0 | 4.04 |
| DO.1   |                         |     |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.06 |
| DO2.1  | 2                       | 1.1 | 10 | 5.3 | 17 | 9.0 | 141 | 75.0 | 18 | 9.6  | 3.87 |
| DO2.2  | 1                       | .5  | 6  | 3.2 | 10 | 5.3 | 149 | 79.3 | 22 | 11.7 | 3.98 |
| DO2.3  | 1                       | .5  | 9  | 4.8 | 11 | 5.9 | 129 | 68.6 | 38 | 20.2 | 4.03 |
| DO.2   |                         |     |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 3.96 |
| DO3.1  | -                       | -   | 3  | 1.6 | 12 | 6.4 | 132 | 70.2 | 41 | 21.8 | 4.12 |
| DO3.2  | -                       | -   | 3  | 1.6 | 8  | 4.3 | 143 | 76.1 | 34 | 18.1 | 4.11 |
| DO3.3  | -                       | -   | 5  | 2.7 | 16 | 8.5 | 128 | 68.1 | 39 | 20.7 | 4.07 |
| DO.3   |                         |     |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.1  |
| <b>Mean Organizational Support Variables</b> |                         |     |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.04 |

| Indicator | Respondent Answer Score |   |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | Red  |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|----|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|------|
|           | STS                     |   | TS |     | KS |      | S   |      | SS |      |      |
|           | f                       | % | f  | %   | F  | %    | F   | %    | f  | %    |      |
| KO1.1     | -                       | - | 4  | 2.1 | 22 | 11.7 | 100 | 53.2 | 62 | 33.0 | 4.17 |
| KO1.2     | -                       | - | 3  | 1.6 | 21 | 11.2 | 105 | 55.9 | 59 | 31.4 | 4.17 |
| KO1.3     | -                       | - | 3  | 1.6 | 18 | 9.6  | 108 | 57.4 | 59 | 31.4 | 4.19 |
| KO.1      |                         |   |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.17 |
| KO2.1     | -                       | - | 8  | 4.3 | 11 | 5.9  | 107 | 56.9 | 62 | 33.0 | 4.19 |
| KO2.2     | -                       | - | 7  | 3.7 | 10 | 5.3  | 114 | 60.6 | 57 | 30.3 | 4.18 |
| KO2.3     | -                       | - | 2  | 1.1 | 23 | 12.2 | 105 | 55.9 | 58 | 30.9 | 4.16 |
| KO.2      |                         |   |    |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.17 |
| KO3.1     | -                       | - | 2  | 1.1 | 19 | 10.1 | 149 | 79.3 | 18 | 9.6  | 3.97 |
| KO3.2     | -                       | - | 2  | 1.1 | 15 | 8.0  | 156 | 83.0 | 15 | 8.0  | 3.98 |

|  |   |    |   |     |    |      |     |      |    |      |      |
|--|---|----|---|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|------|
| KO3.3  | - | -  | 3 | 1.6 | 12 | 6.4  | 157 | 83.5 | 16 | 8.5  | 3.99 |
| KO.3   |   |    |   |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 3.98 |
| KO4.1  | 1 | .5 | 3 | 1.6 | 21 | 11.2 | 142 | 75.5 | 21 | 11.2 | 3.95 |
| KO4.2  | 1 | .5 | 2 | 1.1 | 10 | 5.3  | 137 | 72.9 | 38 | 20.2 | 4.11 |
| KO4.3  | 1 | .5 | 3 | 1.6 | 9  | 4.8  | 150 | 79.8 | 25 | 13.3 | 4.04 |
| KO.4   |   |    |   |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.03 |
| <b>Mean Variables of Organizational Commitment</b> |   |    |   |     |    |      |     |      |    |      | 4.08 |

Based on Table 4.5, the organizational commitment variable as a mediation variable is in the very high category with an average value of 4.08. The dominant indicator is found in items KO1.3 and KO2.1 with a mean value of 4.19, meanwhile, the lowest indicator is found in KO4.1 with a mean value of 3.95, related to the perception that organizational success is part of personal success

#### 5. Employee Performance (Y)

Employee performance variables are measured on a likert scale consisting of four indicators, namely work quality, work quantity, punctuality, and cooperative ability. Respondents' perceptions of employee performance can be seen in the following table:

| Indicator                                  | Respondent Answer Score |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | Red  |
|--|-------------------------|---|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|----|------|------|
|  | STS                     |   | TS |     | KS |     | S   |      | SS |      |      |
|  | f                       | % | f  | %   | f  | %   | F   | %    | f  | %    |      |
| KP1.1                                      | -                       | - | 3  | 1.6 | -  | -   | 143 | 76.1 | 42 | 22.3 | 4.19 |
| KP1.2                                      | -                       | - | 1  | .5  | 1  | .5  | 132 | 70.2 | 54 | 28.7 | 4.27 |
| KP1.3                                      | -                       | - | 2  | 1.1 | 1  | .5  | 146 | 77.7 | 39 | 20.7 | 4.18 |
| KP.1                                       |                         |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.21 |
| KP2.1                                      | -                       | - | 1  | .5  | 2  | 1.1 | 140 | 74.5 | 45 | 23.9 | 4.22 |
| KP2.2                                      | -                       | - | 3  | 1.6 | 2  | 1.1 | 143 | 76.1 | 40 | 21.3 | 4.17 |
| KP2.3                                      | -                       | - | 3  | 1.6 | 6  | 3.2 | 141 | 75.0 | 38 | 20.2 | 4.14 |
| KP.2                                       |                         |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.17 |
| KP3.1                                      | -                       | - | 2  | 1.1 | 8  | 4.3 | 144 | 76.6 | 34 | 18.1 | 4.12 |
| KP3.2                                      | -                       | - | 1  | .5  | 9  | 4.8 | 143 | 76.1 | 35 | 18.6 | 4.13 |
| KP3.3                                      | -                       | - | 1  | .5  | 4  | 2.1 | 147 | 78.2 | 36 | 19.1 | 4.16 |
| KP.3                                       |                         |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.13 |
| KP4.1                                      | -                       | - | -  | -   | 1  | .5  | 138 | 73.4 | 49 | 26.1 | 4.26 |
| KP4.2                                      | -                       | - | 1  | .5  | 5  | 2.7 | 142 | 75.5 | 40 | 21.3 | 4.18 |
| KP4.3                                      | -                       | - | -  | -   | 3  | 1.6 | 144 | 76.6 | 41 | 21.8 | 4.20 |
| KP.4                                       |                         |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.21 |
| <b>Mean Employee Performance Variables</b> |                         |   |    |     |    |     |     |      |    |      | 4.18 |

Based on Table 4.6, the employee performance variable is in the very high category with an overall average score of 4.18. The most dominant indicator in forming this variable is work quality (KP1.2) with a mean value of 4.27, which is related to the accuracy and neatness of employees in carrying out work. Meanwhile, the indicator that contributed the lowest was

punctuality (KP3.1) with a mean value of 4.12, which is related to the completion of work according to the set schedule.

## 2. Model Analysis

The description of the data of this study describes instruments on five variables, namely workload (X1), work environment (X2), organizational support (X3), organizational commitment (M), and employee performance (Y) from 188 respondents. The data quality test was carried out using convergent validity through the SmartPLS application by looking at the outer loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values. The indicator is declared valid if it has an outer loading  $\geq 0.70$  and  $AVE \geq 0.50$ . The test results show that all indicators meet the criteria so that the instrument is declared valid and suitable for further analysis

### 1. Evaluation Test of Measurement Model (Outer Model)

#### 1) Reliability Test

Measure the internal consistency of the research instrument. According to Hair et al., (2011), Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha can be accepted and declared valid if the value of each variable meets the requirements, namely the value of  $> 0.70$ .

|                           | <b>Cronbach's alpha</b> | <b>Composite reliability (rho_a)</b> | <b>Composite reliability (rho_c)</b> | <b>Average variance extracted (AVE)</b> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Workload                  | 0.946                   | 0.948                                | 0.953                                | 0.627                                   |
| Organizational Support    | 0.921                   | 0.925                                | 0.935                                | 0.614                                   |
| Employee Performance      | 0.944                   | 0.946                                | 0.951                                | 0.619                                   |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.929                   | 0.931                                | 0.939                                | 0.561                                   |
| Work Environment          | 0.911                   | 0.914                                | 0.927                                | 0.586                                   |

Table 4.7 shows the results of the reliability test to assess the internal consistency of the research instruments using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. The Workload variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.946 and a Composite Reliability of 0.953, with an AVE of 0.627 indicating that the workload variable has an acceptable level of reliability and has met the requirements of convergent validity. The variables of work environment, organizational support, organizational commitment and employee performance showed acceptable reliability and met the requirements of convergent validity with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.911, 0.921, 0.929, 0.944 and Composite Reliability of 0.927, 0.935, 0.939, 0.951 and AVE 0.586, 0.614, 0.561, 0.619, respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that all five variables are declared reliable and have met the requirements of good convergent validity.

#### 2) Convergent Validity Test

Measures the extent to which each indicator correlates with the construct it is supposed to measure. This validity is assessed from the recommended Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value above 0.50. The results showed that each indicator had met the criteria for convergent validity because it had an outer loading value above 0.70, so it was declared valid and could be continued to the next stage.

### 3) Discriminant Validity Test

Discriminant validity determines whether a test designed to measure a particular construct does not correlate with a test that measures a different construct. According to Fornell and Larcker's criteria, discriminant validity is established if the square root of AVE for a given construct > a correlation value with another construct. A measurement model is considered effective if the latent construct has an AVE value of > 0.5, and vice versa

The square root value of AVE variable Workload is 0.659, Organizational Support 0.782, Employee Performance 0.783, Organizational Commitment 0.735, and Work Environment 0.729. The highest correlation was found in the workload and working environment of 0.751, but it was still lower than the square root value of AVE of each construct.

## 2. Structural Model Testing (Inner Model)

1) Used to measure how much an independent variable can explain the variation in the dependent variable. The R-square value indicates the level of the model's ability to explain the relationship between variables, where the higher the R-square value, the stronger the contribution of independent variables in influencing the dependent variables.

Table 4. 10 R-square test

|                           | <b>R-square</b> | <b>R-square adjusted</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Employee Performance      | 0.434           | 0.422                    |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.643           | 0.637                    |

Source: Primary Data 2026

The employee performance variable had an R-square value of 0.434 and an adjusted R-square of 0.422, which shows that 43.4% of the variation in employee performance can be explained by variables in the research model, while 56.6% is influenced by other factors outside the model. Meanwhile, the organizational commitment variable has an R-square value of 0.643 and an R-square adjusted of 0.637, which means that 64.3% of organizational commitment variations can be explained by the variables that affect them.

2) The path significance test is used to test the significance of the direct relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. This test will also be used to prove the mediating role of organizational commitment.

Figure 4.1 shows the Graphical Output results of the SmartPLS analysis that illustrate the relationships between variables in the research model.

Table 4. 11

### Research Model Results

|  | Original sample (O) | Sample mean (M) | Standard deviation (STDEV) | T statistics ( O/STDEV ) | P Values |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Workload -> Employee Performance               | -0.003              | 0.003           | 0.093                      | 0.028                    | 0.977    |
| Workload -> Organizational Commitment          | 0.385               | 0.383           | 0.076                      | 5.037                    | 0.000    |
| Organizational Support -> Employee Performance | -0.130              | -0.124          | 0.147                      | 0.881                    | 0.378    |

|   |       |       |       |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Organizational Support -> Organizational Commitment                         | 0.457 | 0.457 | 0.083 | 5.477 | 0.000 |
| Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance                           | 0.421 | 0.415 | 0.125 | 3.359 | 0.001 |
| Work Environment -> Employee Performance                                    | 0.407 | 0.409 | 0.122 | 3.344 | 0.001 |
| Work Environment -> Organizational Commitment                               | 0.150 | 0.112 | 0.104 | 1.011 | 0.312 |
| Work Environment -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance       | 0.044 | 0.046 | 0.047 | 0.945 | 0.345 |
| Workload -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance               | 0.162 | 0.156 | 0.051 | 3.200 | 0.001 |
| Organizational Support -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance | 0.193 | 0.193 | 0.075 | 2.561 | 0.010 |

Source: Primary Data 2026

Table 4.11 shows the results of the path coefficient test between the research variables. Workload had no significant effect on employee performance ( $O = -0.003$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.977$ ), workload had a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment ( $O = 0.385$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ), Organizational support also did not have a significant effect on employee performance ( $O = -0.130$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.378$ ), but had a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment ( $O = 0.457$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ).

Organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $O = 0.421$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.001$ ), In addition, the work environment also has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $O = 0.407$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.001$ ), while the effect on organizational commitment is not significant ( $O = 0.150$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.312$ ).

### 3. Hypothesis Testing

Compare the  $p\text{-value}$  of the bootstrapping results with a predetermined significance level (e.g. 0.05) to determine whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected.

Table 4. 12 Hypothesis Testing

| HIP | Hypothesis Statement                          | Original Sample (O) | Sample red (M) | Standard deviation (STDEV ) | T statistics ( O/STDEV ) | P Values | Ket.                     |
|-----|---|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| H1  | Workload -> Employee Performance              | -0.003              | 0.003          | 0.093                       | 0.028                    | 0.977    | Rejected (Insignificant) |
| H2  | Workload -> Commitment Organizational         | 0.385               | 0.383          | 0.076                       | 5.037                    | 0.000    | Accepted (Significant)   |
| H3  | Work Environment - Performance > Employees    | 0.407               | 0.409          | 0.122                       | 3.344                    | 0.001    | Accepted (Significant)   |
| H4  | Work Environment -> Commitment Organizational | 0.150               | 0.112          | 0.104                       | 1.011                    | 0.312    | Rejected (Insignificant) |

|    |   |        |        |       |       |       |  |
|----|---|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| H5 | Support Employee Performance > Organization                   | -0.130 | -0.124 | 0.147 | 0.881 | 0.378 | Rejected (Insignificant)                       |
| H6 | Organizational Support -> Commitment Organizational           | 0.457  | 0.457  | 0.083 | 5.477 | 0.000 | Accepted (Significant)                         |
| H7 | Organizational Commitment -> Performance Employees            | 0.421  | 0.415  | 0.125 | 3.359 | 0.001 | Accepted (Significant)                         |
| H8 | Workload -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance | 0.162  | 0.156  | 0.051 | 3.200 | 0.001 | Accepted (Significant, Mediation Plays a Role) |

The results of the hypothesis test showed that workload did not have a significant effect on employee performance ( $O = -0.003$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.977$ ), but had a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment ( $O = 0.385$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ).

The work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $O = 0.407$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.001$ ), but did not have a significant effect on organizational commitment ( $O = 0.150$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.312$ ).

Organizational support also did not have a significant effect on employee performance ( $O = -0.130$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.378$ ), but had a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment ( $O = 0.457$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ). Furthermore, organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $O = 0.421$ ;  $p\text{-value} = 0.001$ ).

Overall, the results show that work environment, organizational support, and organizational commitment affect employee performance, with organizational commitment acting as a mediator in several relationships.

|     |   |       |       |       |       |       |  |
|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| H9  | Work Environment -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance       | 0.044 | 0.046 | 0.047 | 0.945 | 0.345 | Rejected (Insignificant, Mediation Doesn't Matter) |
| H10 | Organizational Support -> Organizational Commitment -> Employee Performance | 0.193 | 0.193 | 0.075 | 2.561 | 0.010 | Accepted (Significant, Mediation Plays a Role)     |

## DISCUSSION

This discussion is focused on the decisions resulting from hypothesis testing, as an effort to answer the formulation of research problems. The results of the analysis from the hypothesis test are as follows:

1. The Influence of Workload on Employee Performance

The results showed that workload did not have a significant effect on employee performance with Original Sample values = -0.003, T-statistics = 0.028, and P-value = 0.977. This shows that the workload owned by employees does not directly affect the level of employee performance at the Wakatobi Regency Hospital.

2. The Effect of Workload on Organizational Commitment

The results of the analysis showed that workload had a significant effect on organizational commitment with Original Sample (O) values = 0.385, T-statistics = 5,037, and P-value = 0.000.

3. The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance

The results of the study showed that the work environment had a significant effect on employee performance with the Original Sample (O) value = 0.407, T-statistics = 3.344, and P-value = 0.001.

4. The Influence of the Work Environment on Organizational Commitment

The results showed that the work environment did not have a significant effect on organizational commitment: Original Sample (O) = 0.150, T-statistics = 1.011, and P-value = 0.312.

5. The Effect of Organizational Support on Employee Performance

The results showed that organizational support did not have a significant effect on employee performance with an Original Sample (O) value = -0.130, T-statistics = 0.881 and a P-value of 0.378.

6. The Effect of Organizational Support on Organizational Commitment

The results showed that organizational support had a significant effect on organizational commitment with the value of Original Sample (O) = 0.457, T-statistics = 5.477, and P value = 0.000. This shows that the higher the support that the organization provides to employees, the stronger the employee's commitment to the organization.

7. The Effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance

The results of the analysis showed that organizational commitment had a significant effect on employee performance with an Original Sample (O) value = 0.421, T-statistics = 3.359, and P-value = 0.001. This means that the higher the employee's commitment to the organization, the more employee performance will increase.

8. The Influence of Workload on Employee Performance through Organizational Commitment

The results of the study show that workload has a significant effect on employee performance through organizational commitment with an Original Sample (O) value = 0.162, T-statistics = 3,200, and P-value = 0.001.

9. The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance through Organizational Commitment

The results of the study showed that organizational commitment did not mediate the influence of the work environment on employee performance Original Sample (O) = 0.044, T-statistics = 0.945, and P-value = 0.345. These results show that although the work environment has a direct effect on performance, it does not through increased organizational commitment.

10. The Influence of Organizational Support on Employee Performance through Organizational Commitment

The results of the study show that organizational support has a significant effect on employee performance through organizational commitment with an Original Sample (O) value = 0.193, T-statistics = 2.561, and a P-value of 0.010. These findings suggest that organizational commitment

plays a mediating variable in the relationship between organizational support and employee performance.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research on the role of organizational commitment in mediating the influence of workload, work environment, and organizational support on the performance of employees of Wakatobi Regency Hospital, it can be concluded as follows:

1. The workload does not have a significant effect on employee performance. This shows that the high or low workload received by employees does not directly affect employee performance.
2. Workload has a significant effect on organizational commitment. Workload that is in accordance with employee capabilities can increase employee attachment and responsibility to the organization.
3. The work environment has a significant effect on employee performance. A conducive work environment is able to support the implementation of work more effectively so as to improve employee performance.
4. The work environment has no significant effect on organizational commitment. The condition of the work environment has not completely become a factor that determines the level of employee commitment to the organization.
5. Organizational support has no significant effect on employee performance. The organizational support provided has not been directly able to improve employee performance without other supporting factors.
6. Organizational support has a significant effect on organizational commitment. Organizational attention and support have been proven to be able to increase employee loyalty and attachment to the organization.
7. Organizational commitment has a significant effect on employee performance. Employees who have high commitment show more optimal responsibility and performance in carrying out their duties.
8. Workload has a significant effect on employee performance through organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is able to mediate the relationship between workload and employee performance.
9. Organizational commitment does not mediate the influence of the work environment on employee performance. This shows that improving the work environment does not necessarily improve performance through organizational commitment.
10. Organizational support has a significant effect on employee performance through organizational commitment. Organizational commitment plays a role as a mediating variable that strengthens the influence of organizational support on improving employee performance

## 11. REFERENCES

- Adelia, D., Narpati, B., & Widjanarko, W. (2025). *The influence of work environment, work discipline, and workload on employee performance at the Bekasi Regency Regional General Hospital*. Scientific Journal of Economics and Management, 3(8), 402–413. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jiem.v3i8.6141>.

- Ahmad, A. (2021). *Human resource planning*. Makassar: Nas Media Pustaka.
- Amir, A., Akhmad, A., & Romadhoni, B. (2025). *Research Methods*. Agma.
- Anwar, M. L. K., & Raharja, E. (2023). *The influence of workload and perceived organizational support on employee performance with collective organizational engagement as a mediating variable (A study on the Department of Community and Village Empowerment in Demak)*. *Return: Journal of Management and Business*, 2(3), 45–56.
- Aprianus, F. (2024). News Notes of UJDIH BPK Representative of Southeast Sulawesi Province. Agency Checker Finance Republic Indonesia <https://sultra.bpk.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/8.-25.-Ilmiati-Daud-Soroti-Buruknya-Pelayanan-di-RSUD-Wakatobi.pdf>. Budiasa, I. G. (2021). *The influence of the work environment on employee performance in service sector organizations*. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 10(2), 87–96.
- Central Statistics Agency. (2023). *Number of health workers by province*. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/statisticstable/3/YVdwSFJHRjRVVkjQWIRWRU9EQkhNVFY0UjB4VVVVUMDkjMw==/amount-health-power-according-to-provinsi--2023.html>.
- Central Statistics Agency of Wakatobi Regency. (2024). Number of outpatient visits by poly at Wakatobi Hospital. according to the poly at the Wakatobi Hospital. <https://wakatobikab.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/MjkyIzI=/number-of-visits-patient-care-walking-according-to-poli-in-rsud-wakatobi.html>.
- Cahyani, N. P. P. A., & Prianthara, I. B. T. (2022). *The influence of the work environment, occupational health safety, organizational commitment to the performance of nurses at Siloam Bali Hospital*. *Journal of Health Management Hospital Foundation*. Dr. Soetomo, 8(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.29241/jmk.v8i2.984>.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512.
- Diana, S., & Frianto, A. (2021). The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance. *Journal of Management Science*, 9(3), 1205–1213.
- Elburdah, N. (2021). *Human resource management as part of organizational management*. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 12(3), 145–153.
- Firnanda, D. Y., & Wijayati, D. T. (2021). The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support, Self Efficacy and Work Environment on Employee Engagement of PT. Pesona Arnos Beton. *Journal of Management Science*, 9(3), 1076–1091. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v9n3.p1076-1091>.
- Gilang Gumilar, D. (2022). *The Effect of Work Stress and Workload on Employee Performance of PT. Phintraco Sekuritas*.
- Hadith, H. (2022). Impact of Growth Plans and Quality Costs on Performance Companies. *Attestation: Scientific Journal of Accounting*, 5(1), 353–371.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202>.
- Hasmi, H., Hardiyansyah, & Fitriya. (2023). The Effect of Perception of Organizational Support, Training, Self-Concept and Communication on the Work Effectiveness of Muara

- Enim Regency Regional Secretariat Employees. *Journal of Business, Management and Economics*, 4(3), 223–235.
- Hasmin. (2021). *Human resource management: Concepts and its application in modern organizations*. *Journal of Management and Business Sciences*, 8(2), 112–123.
- Hngoi, C. L., Abdullah, N. A., Wan Sulaiman, W. S., & Zaiedy Nor, N. I. (2023). *Relationship between job involvement, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment with job insecurity: A systematic literature review*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1066734. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1066734>.
- Hudayah, Echdar, S., & Maryadi. (2022). *Analysis of the Influence of the Work Environment, Individual Characteristics and Organizational Culture on the Performance of ASN of the Parepare City Youth, Sports and Tourism Office*.
- Imam, S. F., Riyanto, S., Santoso, S., & Ramli, Y. (2024). *Organizational performance improvement strategies through organizational learning and employee empowerment: Organizational commitment as mediation*. *ADPEBI International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(1), 62–76.
- Indriastuti, I., & Watts, I. G. P. D. (2024). *The role of competence, work involvement and workload in improving employee performance through commitment at the Karanganyar Regency Regional General Hospital*. *Manage: Journal of Business and Management*, 10(1), 131–150.
- Indriyati, R. (2022). *The Influence of Motivation, Communication, and Work Environment on the Performance of Employees of the Public Housing, Residential Areas, Spatial Planning and Land Office of Tegal Regency*. Pancasakti University of Tegal City.
- Iskamto, D. (2023). *Organizational commitment and its impact on performance*. Pekanbaru: CV Literasi Nusantara Abadi.
- Joni, J., & Hikmah, H. (2022). The Influence of Leadership, Work Environment and Communication on Employee Performance. *Value: Journal of Management and Accounting*, 17(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.32534/jv.v17i1.2520>.
- Juru, P., & Wellem, I. (2022). *The Effect Of Workload On Employee Performance With Job Stress As Intervening Variable In The Land Agency Office Of Sikka Regency*. *International Conference on Business & Social Sciences (ICOBUSS)*, 2, 623–633.
- Jusdiana Ahmad, A., & Mustari, N. (2022). *The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance at the Bulukumba Regency Education and Culture Office*.
- Kaswan. (2015). *Human Resource Development*. Alfabet. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Ministerial Regulation Health of the Republic of Indonesia Number 56 of 2014 concerning Hospital Classification and Licensing*. Jakarta: Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Charism. Beautiful, June Trisnowati, Ambyah Atas Aji. 2022. "The Effect of Compensation, Career Development, and Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance of Bank Mandiri Kcp Karanganyar." *Journal of Research and Scientific Studies*, Vol.20 No.2 April 2022 Pg.119-126.
- Kuncoro, M. (2021). *Research methods for business & economics: How to research and write a thesis* (Edition 5). Yogyakarta: BPF E.
- Latif, N., Ismail, A., Nurmega, N., & Irwan, A. (2022). The Influence of the Work Environment on the Performance of Employees of PT. Hadji Kalla Toyota Maros Branch. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 5(1), 585–591.

- Luthfi Umamul Husna, & Bangun Putra Prasetya. (2024). The Influence of Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance of PT. Mitra Sakti Boshe VVIP Club Yogyakarta. *Journal of Star Management*, 2(2), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jubima.v2i2.3039>.
- Machali, I. (2021). *Quantitative research methodology: Theory and practice in social and educational research*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Magdalena, N., Pratama, R., & Lestari, D. (2023). *Human resource management in increasing organizational effectiveness*. *Journal of Management and Business*, 12(1), 45–56.
- Mahawati, E., Nurcahyani, D., & Pratiwi, A. (2021). *Workload analysis of employee performance from a human resource management perspective*. *Journal of Management Science*, 9(2), 134–142.
- Mohammed Mezban, Dr. R. (2023). The Role of Strategic Leadership in Enhancing Organizational Commitment: An Analytical Study in the Iraqi Ministry of Health. *International Journal of Business Transformation* 13(01), 61–80. <https://doi.org/10.37648/ijtbm.v13i01.007>.
- Narpati, B., Lubis, I., Meutia Indriana, K., & Ningrum Prawesti, E. (2021). Employee Work Productivity Affected by Work From Home (WFH) and the Work Environment During the Pandemic. *JIMF (Scientific Journal of Forkamma Management)*, 4(2), 121–133.
- Nduru, I. K., & Pohan, Y. A. (2024). *The effect of organizational commitment, work stress, and compensation on nurse retention at Sinar Husni General Hospital Medan*. *Journal of Science*, 5(2), 1584–1599.
- Ni, Y., Wen, Y., Xu, Y., He, L., & You, G. (2023). *The relationship between work practice environment and work engagement among nurses: The multiple mediation of basic psychological needs and organizational commitment A cross-sectional survey*. *BMC Nursing*, 22.
- Nurhalizah, S., Kholijah, G., & Gusmanely, Z. (2024). Structural Equation Modeling Partial Least Square Analysis on Employee Performance of PT. Jambi Regional Development Bank. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Statistics*, 6(2), 125. <https://doi.org/10.13057/ijas.v6i2.78921>.
- Paparang, F. M., Mandey, S. L., & Tawas, H. N. (2021). *Employee performance analysis based on quality, quantity, timeliness, and cooperation ability in public organizations*. *EMBA Journal: Journal of Research in Economics, Management, Business and Accounting*, 9(3), 1201–1212.
- Prasetyaningtyas, S. W., Darmawan, A., Puhirta, B. P., & Kusmanto, D. A. (2022). *Impact Of Workload And Responsibility Load On Work Stress And Job Performance On Construction Projects During The Pandemic*. *JAM Journal of Applied Management*, 20(1), 136–145.
- Radjab, E., & Jam'an, A. (2017). *Business research methodology*. Makassar: Library and Publishing Institute of the University of Muhammadiyah Makassar.
- Rezeki, D. S., Pasaribu, S. E., & Bahri, S. (2023). *The role of work stress mediation on the influence of workload and work environment on nurse performance in the treatment room of Covid-19 patients at Dr. Pirngadi Medan Hospital*. *Journal of Sharia Economics & Economics*, 6(1), 328–339. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v6i1.920>.
- Rohman, A. (2021). *Analysis of workload and its effect on employee performance*. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 55–64.

- Rosinta, Mappatempo, A., & Andayaningsih, S. (2024). *The effect of education level on employee performance at the South Sulawesi Provincial Education and Trade Office*. *Journal of Business Economics and Management Accounting (JEBISMA)*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Rumawas, W., Mandey, S. L., & Lengkong, V. P. K. (2021). *Analysis of workload and its impact on employee performance in public sector organizations*. *EMBA Journal: Journal of Economics, Management, Business and Accounting Research*, 9(1), 100–110.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2021). *Research methodology: A practical guide for novice researchers*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Soeprijadi, Fenny and Niko Sudibjo. 2021. Perception of Teacher Performance, Reviewed from the Perception of Organizational Support, Person-Organization Fit, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Education*. Vol. 22, No. 1, 2021.
- Suhardi. (2023). *Research methodology: Concepts and applications in scientific research*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Sukmawati, S., Rasulong, I., & Rizal, S. (2024). *The Influence of Information Technology-Based Work Discipline on Improving Employee Performance at the South Sulawesi Provincial KPU Office*. *Indonesian Journal of Management Studies (IJMS)*, 2(3), 23–30. <https://dmi-journals.org/ijms/index>.
- Supriadi, D., Satria, A., & Priyati, R. Y. (2021). Employee engagement: determinants and their impact on the performance of employees of the Directorate General of Treasury during the covid-19 pandemic. *Indonesian Treasury Review Journal of State Finance and Public Policy*, 6(4), 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v6i4.428>.
- Sugiyono. 2016. *Administrative Research Method Equipped with R&D Method*. Twenty-third Print. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods*.
- Sutrisno, E. R., Lengkong, V. P. ., & Nelwan, O. S. (2022). *Implementation of the Work From Home System for State Civil Apparatus* (B. Tewal (ed.)). Uwais is inspired by Indonesia.
- Syarifudin, A., Sudarmadji, & Suherman. (2022). The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Performance through Organizational Citizenship Behavior at the KPP of Listed Companies. 2(4), 48–59.
- Untari, N. M. R., Sujana, I. W., & Novarini, N. N. A. (2021). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence, Extrinsic Motivation, and Organizational Support on Employee Performance at Perumda Tirta Amertha Buana, Tabanan Regency. *Journal of Gold*, 2(3), 1–9. <https://e-journal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/emas/articel/view/1812/1468>.
- Wang, X., Li, C., Chen, Y., Zheng, C., Zhang, F., Huang, Y., & Birch, S. (2022). *Relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout and job performance of healthcare professionals in a district-level health care system of Shenzhen, China*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 953865.
- Wicaksono, A. (2022). *Research methodology: Concepts, theories, and applications*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Widyawaty, N., Supriyantoro, & Hasyim. (2022). The influence of organizational climate and workload on the organizational commitment of nurses with work motivation as an intervening variable. *Journal of Health Sciences*, 3(4), 587–600.