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Abstract
This study aimed to determine the effect of self-efficacy on the performance of high school teachers and organizational commitment, determine the effect of technostress on the performance of high school teachers, determine the effect of technostress on high school teacher and organizational commitment, and to know the effect of self-efficacy and technostress on the performance of high school teachers in Purwokerto through organizational commitment. The population in this study were 400 high school teachers in Purwokerto. The sample used a proportional random sampling. A questionnaire was used as a method of data collection. The data analysis method used a search method based on the SEM-path analysis model. The results showed that self-efficacy had a significant effect on the performance of high school teachers. Self-efficacy had a significant effect on the organizational commitment of high school teachers. Technostress had a significant effect on the performance of high school teachers. Technostress had a significant effect on the organizational commitment of high school teachers. Self-efficacy and Technostress had a significant effect on the performance of high school teachers in Purwokerto through organizational commitment.
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INTRODUCTION

Organizations are keys to success in terms of human resources, and skilled human resources can be highly competitive in today’s work environment. Yuniarsih and Suwantoro (2016) stated that human resources are an important part of the organization. Irrespective of structure or mission, the organization is built on a vision for the benefit of humanity. In the execution of its functions, people control and manage it. Labor is related to human resources. It can be understood that work is a result and is represented as a means of success in one’s work. Teachers’ work is related to the teacher’s experience. This means that educators must have good skills to gain support for their work to be effective.

Performance indicates whether a goal has been reached. By providing excellent academic work, they work hard to overcome and solve the problems they face while implementing projects and activities. On the other hand, due to lack of optimism in the workplace, when teachers struggle to complete their work, it is easy to give up and it is difficult to achieve their goals. The factors affecting teacher performance include self-control of teachers’ workload and control of the ability to use technology.

Organizations expect their employees to focus on the organization and deal with issues that support work quality. In the process of education and teaching, teachers are very important and influential elements. Therefore, the performance of teachers needs to be paid attention to, especially in the performance of their duties. Teachers play an important role in improving the quality of education. Therefore, it is particularly important to pay attention to improving the performance of teachers. Therefore, schools must pay attention to the activities of teachers to make them work normally and seriously. Teachers must also participate in preparations for various plans and goal setting.

The teacher’s performance is the teacher’s activity in performing its main task (Hayes et al., 2006). Teacher tasks are related to the teacher’s main tasks. This includes planning lessons, conducting lessons, assessing learning outcomes, teaching and training students, and performing other activities that are part of the teacher’s core activities (Ikhrom, 2020). The quality of a teacher’s work can reduce the amount of stress when it comes to tasks such as the type of work of the teacher. Bandura (1977) stated that entrepreneurship involves efforts to solve problems and how to pursue them effectively, even when the situation is difficult and frustrating while doing a given task. Independence will increase a teacher’s greater desire to carry out his duties as a professional teacher.

Teachers who are confident in the implementation of projects will be effective because they can face and overcome the obstacles that hinder the project. This is consistent with a study by Cherian & Jacob (2013) the level of teacher qualification had a direct effect on teacher performance. If the teacher’s experience level is too high, the teacher’s performance will be good, but if the teacher’s ability is low, the teacher’s performance will be poor.

Self-efficacy shows that the quality of autonomy is associated with human beliefs that may carry out work (Ikhrom, 2020). People generally have less their quality, which enter their own service. People who have their own quality are always completing their work and try to win their problems. Human behavior has a major impact (Khurshid et al., 2012).

On the other hand, technological progress is rapidly evolving, and using this technology, it is possible to work more efficiently and effectively, and without the role of humans, technological advancement is meaningless. Therefore, human resources, especially educators, need to gain expertise in the field of technology to adapt and develop technology. As the role of technology continues to improve, change is inevitable. Of course, not all educators can adapt to the rapid pace of technological change and development, which can lead to problems. Technological advances can affect your ability to be productive, even if you have a problem or you do not have the ability to manage it. Teachers will find it easier to worry. Frustration caused by the influence of technology is called technostress.

Technostress is a state of unhappiness resulting from a person’s inability to adapt to changes in technology and / or a state of dependence on technology, which results in physical and mental discomfort. Technostress is the root cause of the imbalance between man and their environment (Wang and Li, 2019). Eftili, E., & Çoklar (2019), in the most civilized schools of all time, teachers face technology as a result of the use of technology and force. It also affects a high level of individual morality which represents a good order of structure. Technostress has a negative impact on productivity, which can lead to inefficiency, reduced job satisfaction and increased employee productivity (Ayyagari et al., 2011; Tarafdar et al., 2015).

It is hoped that educators will be able to
change their attitudes and practices to adapt to ongoing technological advances by continuously updating their technology and experience. This is consistent with the work done by Tagurum et al. (2017) The role of the modern educator in the field of teachers in central and northern Nigeria. Teachers perform well at lower skill levels, but teachers do not perform well at higher skill levels.

The commitment of a teacher plays a big role. A teacher who has high confidence in himself in solving workloads and has the ability to adapt to technology can be said to have a high commitment to school where a teacher identifies himself psychologically with his job, and considers his performance important to himself, in addition to the organization. Based on the theory above, it shows that by knowing the work desires of teachers, these teachers will be more motivated, more committed to schools or organizations, more productive and more satisfied with their work (Moorhead & Griffin, 2013).

Based on the phenomenon that occurred, the researchers made observations on high school teachers in Purwokerto, regarding the current teacher performance. A problem becomes the focus point for researchers regarding below-average teacher performance due to sub-optimal workload fulfillment and a lack of knowledge about the continuous use of technology. It can affect teacher performance; there are still teachers who find it difficult to do online learning, causing stress and lack of confidence in fulfilling workloads.

The level of commitment of the teacher’s organization to the school will lead to a sense of confidence and expertise in the use of science and technology in teachers if it can improve teacher performance. The phenomenon that occurs in this problem has never been discussed simultaneously by previous research because the level of teacher confidence and teacher expertise in the use of science and technology is something that has not been given much attention even though these two things are included in supporting factors for the achievement of teacher performance. This study aims to determine the effect of self-efficacy and technostress on the performance of high school teachers and organizational commitment, determine the effect of technostress towards organizational commitment of high school teacher, and to know the effect of self-efficacy and technostress on the performance of high school teachers through organizational commitment.

METHODS

This research used quantitative research. The people in this study were all high school teachers in Purwokerto with a total of 8 Senior High Schools. Sampling in this study was 400 teachers. The number of samples was determined by the Slovin method. The product used a standard purposive random sample. The data collection method used a questionnaire. Data analysis technology used SEM-based path analysis.

The R2 rating was a value of 0.67 (determined as a test). 0.33 (classified as medium) and 0.19 (classified as weak). The source used to test the projection was the value contained in the output method by value. The value of the path was indicated by the average t-value. This should be greater than 1.96 for double-sided projection and 1.64 for unidirectional projection for 5% alpha projection. The key to accepting the assumption was whether the estimated t > t-table can be seen by looking at the value p <0.05 (Abdillah et al., 2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 showed each loading factor value of the variable of self-efficacy, technostress, organizational commitment, and teacher performance obtained a loading factor value above 0.7, thus it can be said to meet the value of cross loading. The result of the outer model teacher performance was depicted in Figure 1. For proper quality testing, this can be seen from the load value. When the load value exceeded 0.7, the efficiency change was complete.

Checking the differential quality test from the cross value, if the value was greater than 0.7, then the quality with a complete change is tested. Depending on the results of the study, each hidden latent area of cross section was found in a latent missing. The cross-loading value of teacher performance variables was 0.897 for the self-efficacy variable, then 0.909 for the Technostress variable, and 0.913 for the organizational commitment variable, this means that the teacher performance variable had an effect.

Organizational commitment variable obtained a cross-loading value of 0.847 for the self-efficacy variable, and 0.840 for the technostress variable. This means that the organizational commitment variable affected self-efficacy and technostress. Self-Efficacy variable obtained a cross-loading value of 0.831 on the technostress variable. This means that the self-efficacy variable had an effect on technostress. It could be concluded that all latent variables in this study affected...
### Table 1. Cross Loading Factor

| Variable | Teacher Performance | Organizational Commitment | Self-Efficacy | Technostress |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| X1       |                     |                           | 0.791         |              |
| X2       |                     |                           | 0.878         |              |
| X3       |                     |                           | 0.778         |              |
| X4       |                     |                           | 0.826         |              |
| X5       |                     |                           |               | 0.704        |
| X6       |                     |                           |               | 0.862        |
| X7       |                     |                           |               | 0.817        |
| X8       |                     |                           |               | 0.808        |
| X9       |                     |                           |               | 0.868        |
| X10      |                     |                           |               | 0.880        |
| X11      |                     |                           |               | 0.803        |
| Y1       |                     |                           | 0.806         |              |
| Y2       |                     |                           | 0.779         |              |
| Y3       |                     |                           | 0.791         |              |
| Y4       |                     |                           | 0.791         |              |
| Y5       |                     |                           | 0.810         |              |
| Y6       |                     |                           | 0.807         |              |
| Y7       |                     |                           | 0.827         |              |
| Y8       |                     |                           | 0.794         |              |
| Z1       |                     |                           |               | 0.781        |
| Z2       |                     |                           |               | 0.843        |
| Z3       |                     |                           |               | 0.863        |
| Z4       |                     |                           |               | 0.825        |
| Z5       |                     |                           |               | 0.762        |

Source: Primary Data Processed (2020)

### Figure 1. Output Model of Research

Source: Processed Primary Data (2020)
each other because the discriminant validity value obtained was more than 0.70.

There are two options for the Smart-PLS reliability product: Factor alpha and the Cronbach compound. The value or limit that must be met in composite reliability is $>0.7$ although the value of 0.6 is still acceptable. Based on the Table 2, each latent variable got a value of 0.920, 0.874, 0.836, and 0.919 so that all variables met the test reliability with the Cronbach’s Alpha method. Each latent variable in Table 3 got a value of 0.935, 0.908, 0.890, and 0.936 so that all latent variables met the composite reliability test.

| Table 2. Reliability Test of Cronbach’s Alpha |
|----------------------------------------------|
| Cronbach’s Alpha                            |
| Teacher Performance                        | 0.920 |
| Organizational Commitment                  | 0.874 |
| Self-Efficacy                              | 0.836 |
| Technostress                               | 0.919 |
| Source: Primary Data Processed (2020)      |

| Table 3. Composite Reliability               |
|----------------------------------------------|
| Composite Reliability                       |
| Teacher Performance                         | 0.935 |
| Organizational Commitment                  | 0.908 |
| Self-Efficacy                              | 0.890 |
| Technostress                               | 0.936 |
| Source: Primary Data Processed (2020)      |

The formative indicator weight value with its construct must be significant if the value is $>0.05$. The greater the weight value, the stronger the model with the lowest score for $Y_2$, namely 0.146 and the highest for $X_2$, which was 0.359, it could be concluded that the value of significance of weight above showed that all significant values were greater than 0.05, thus all values of significance of weight were met.

The multicollinearity test showed that the VIF value of 5-10 can be said that the indicator occurred multicollinearity. With the lowest score for $X_3$, namely 1.622 and the highest for $Y_1$, namely 4.553, it could be concluded that the VIF value of each indicator was obtained, it can be seen that all variables had a VIF value $>$, thus the indicators in this study did not have multicollinearity symptoms.

To test the hypothesis, the basis used was the value contained in the coefficient output path. Step values were indicated by a calculated value of $T$ and must exceed 1.96 for two-digit projections, in terms of one-way thinking, it passed 1.64, and in experimental mode with 5% alpha. The criteria for acceptance of the hypothesis are if the t-statistic value $>t$-table or it can also be seen by looking at the p-value $<0.05$ (Abdillah et al., 2015). The results of hypothesis testing are briefly written in Table 1.

The P-value obtained for the Technostress variable on teacher performance was 0.000 $<0.05$. It could be concluded that changes in teacher skills had a significant effect. The change in technostress with respect to organizational commitment reached a P-value of 0.000 $<0.05$. Therefore, it could be concluded that organizational change had a significant effect. Changes in the group that implemented the transforming quality and technostress variables in teaching practice will obtain a P value of 0.000 $<0.05$. Therefore, it can be concluded that the transformation of the self-variable and the techno-variable variable through the transformation of the organizational system in the teacher work had a great influence.

**Effect of Self-Efficacy on Teacher Performance**

The “Important Teacher Impact Factor” P-value was 0.000 $<0.05$ (Table 1). Therefore, it could be concluded that the change in self-efficacy had a great effect on the change in “teacher’s grade” because it can be concluded that changes in teacher self-efficacy had a significant effect. Teachers with first-hand work experience report strong educational development and lack of wil-

| Table 4. t-Test                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------|
| O          | M        | STDEV | T Statistics | P Values |
| Organizational Commitment-> Teacher Performance     | 0.367    | 0.368  | 0.049        | 7.433    | 0.000 |
| Self-Efficacy -> Teacher Performance                | 0.281    | 0.282  | 0.055        | 5.160    | 0.000 |
| Self-Efficacy -> Organizational Commitment          | 0.481    | 0.470  | 0.080        | 5.997    | 0.000 |
| Technostress -> Teacher Performance                 | 0.367    | 0.364  | 0.053        | 6.900    | 0.000 |
| Technostress -> Organizational Commitment           | 0.440    | 0.456  | 0.077        | 5.703    | 0.000 |
| Source: Primary Data Processed (2020)               |
The technostress variable on teacher performance obtained a P-Value of 0.000 < 0.05 (Table 1). Thus, it can be concluded that the technostress variable on the teacher performance variable had a significant effect, so hypothesis 3 was supported. This supported previous research by Tagurum, et al (2017) which stated that technology that ran continuously caused stress to teachers in Northern Nigeria so that technostress had a significant effect on teacher performance in North-Central Nigeria.

Ennis (2005) stated that the four facets of cognitive ability include physical, emotional, behavioral, and behavioral aspects. Factors related to cognitive impairment include eye, back pain, headache, thick shoulders, high blood pressure, and chest pain. Factors affecting artists include irritability, loss of mood, high levels of anxiety if not out of control of the computer, frustration, frustration, and restlessness, which lead to computer avoidance in particular. Behavioral areas include, among other things, computer addiction, over-spending on computers, lack of sleep, lack of coordination and reluctance to work, use of computer words in non-computer conversations, smoking and drinking alcohol amongst others.

The mind-boggling state of technology-stress can be through the abundance of data to find, analyze, evaluate, and use in the context of relevant resources. Frustration can occur while working with daily work, inactivity, or when the work being done only involves daily work. Security at work is when people are afraid that computers can replace human status. Jealousy of professionals is created by technical expertise and reduced motivation due to long-term technical activities. Job's uncertainty, mostly due to the increase in time spent working on the technology.

The results of this study were in line with Wang et al. (2020) which said that lecturers in China prepared thoroughly in facing job demands with technology so that the workload became easier and could be resolved quickly and avoid techno-overload, so that technostress had a negative and significant effect on lecturers' work effectiveness in China. Oyintola et al. (2014) according to a survey of academic and non-academic staff at the University of Obafemia Wollowo in Ife, Osun, about half (53%) of respondents reported that technology had too much of an impact on productivity.
Effect of Technostress Variables on Organizational Commitment

The technostress variable on the organizational commitment variable obtained a P-Value of 0.000 <0.05 (Table 1). Thus, it can be concluded that the Variable to the Organizational Commitment Variable had a significant effect, so hypothesis 4 was supported. This supported previous research by Hassan et al. (2019) which stated that teachers had a stress level when adapting to technology so that teachers felt they could not survive with their organization or school so that technostress affected organizational commitment.

The results of this study also supported the research results by Hassan et al. (2019) which said that teachers in Selangor who attended training on technology could not be affected by the obstacles that occurred which could result in a sense of indifference to their school. Therefore, technostress had a positive impact on the performance of teachers’ unions in Selangor, Malaysia.

Effect of Organizational Commitment Variables that intervenes Self-Efficacy and Technostress Variables on Teacher Performance

The organizational commitment variable that intervenes the self-efficacy and technostress variables on Teacher Performance obtained a P-Value of 0.000 <0.05 (Table 1). This, it can be concluded that the self-efficacy and technostress variables intervened by the organizational commitment variable on the teacher performance variable had a significant effect, so hypothesis 5 was supported.

The structure of the PLS system (internal model) can be assessed by using the R2 reliability model. The value of R2 was used to measure the exchange rate regardless of the dependent exchange rate. However, the value of the path or the internal model indicated the importance of the level in the experimental design (Abdillah et al., 2015). The criterion for evaluating R2 was a value of 0.67 or higher (calculated as a name). ≥0.33 (moderated) and ≥0.19 (classified as weak) (Sarwono, et al., 2015).

Based on the Table 5, the R2 value for the latent variable Teacher Performance which was influenced by the Self-Efficacy, Technostress, and Organizational Commitment variables as an intervening variable was 0.921. Thus, it can be said that the structural model in this study was very substantial or had a significant effect. Then for the latent variable Organizational Commitment which was influenced by the Self-Efficacy and Technostress variables, the R2 value was 0.777 which means that it was substantial or had a significant effect.

| Table 5. R2 Value |
|-------------------|
|                   |
| R2 Square         | R2 Square Adjusted |
| Teacher Performance | 0.921              | 0.920              |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.777              | 0.775              |

Source: Primary Data Processed (2020)

CONCLUSION

As a result of Partial Least Square Examining the impact of team participation on the skills of secondary school teachers was a direct, user-friendly impact that had an impact on changes in the teaching profession. Change in self-efficacy had a profound effect on changes in organizational change. The technostress variables had significant effect on the teacher performance variable.

The technostress variables had significant effect on the organizational commitment variable. The effect of organizational commitment variables had significant effect that intervene self-efficacy and technostress variables on teacher performance.

The results of this study can be used by SMA in Purwokerto as a consideration for improving teacher performance so that the teaching and learning process becomes more optimal. In order to improve teacher performance, the principal needs to pay attention to teacher self-efficacy and stress levels against technology so that it can affect teacher commitment to school. The ways that can be done include always increasing the self-confidence of teachers in their abilities and following training on teacher abilities and by always practicing both individually and with teachers to adapt to technology for the teaching and learning process and attend workshops on science and technology so that the stress level of the teacher will decrease.
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