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Abstract:
Biology teacher needs to have procedural justice in delivering learning material related to school leadership and personality. That is why the objective of this research is to analyze the relationship between school leadership, personality, and procedural justice of Biology teachers. A survey used by selecting 85 Biology teachers at Karawang regency by using Simple Random Sampling (SRS). There were three instruments developed to measure school leadership (45 items) with reliability of 0.805, personality (32 items) with reliability 0.819, and procedural justice (27 items) with reliability 0.642. Data were analyzed by regression-correlation analysis. The result showed that school leadership and personality have a positive and significant correlation with procedural justice. These findings mean when procedural justice would be improved, factors such as school leadership and personality could be taken into account.

Keywords: Procedural Justice; School Leadership; Personality; Regression; Correlation; Survey.

Cite This Article: Satri Dwi Kurnia Nasution, I Made Putrawan, and Diana Vivanti S. (2019). “BIOLOGY TEACHER PROCEDURAL JUSTICE BASED ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND PERSONALITY.” International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research, 6(7), 123-128. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3353590.

1. Introduction

Entering the era of globalization is characterized by the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), which began in 2015 ago, Indonesia is required to have readiness in the face of the MEA as one way to improve the welfare of Indonesia. This shows that, teachers have a very important role in developing and forming reliable and professional human resources who are able to compete even with developed countries. According to Rosyada, teachers are required to have loyalty in their profession, therefore, teachers must work wholeheartedly so that the expected goals can be achieved [1]. Based on the explanation above, efforts to improve teacher quality are a challenge for teachers, school management, and the government.

The teacher is the key in the education system and the teacher is the central point in the renewal and improvement of the quality of education. This is in line with Barber's statement which states, "the quality of the education system will not be possible beyond the quality of the teacher and the quality of the school system depends on the quality of the teacher" [2].
As explained in UU pasal 35 (1), that the teacher's workload includes the main activities, namely planning, implementing, evaluating results, guiding and training students. Teachers are not only required to carry out their main tasks as educators, but teachers are also required to be able to be individuals who can be fair to students. Such behavior for organizations can be regarded as procedural justice.

This behavior directs the teacher to do the same procedure used to make decisions. Fair treatment can reduce stress levels and can improve performance and satisfaction at work. Teachers with good procedural justice can be seen when being fair to students in each lesson and have a strong drive to work in a school [3].

Teachers are not only required to carry out tasks with professionals, but good attitudes and behaviors are needed to support the learning process. Teachers need to have an attitude of friendliness, sincerity and stable emotions in dealing with students so that students can be more like the teacher and have enthusiasm in each learning process [4].

Personality not only affects procedural justice, but also influences the achievement of work outcomes which in turn will have implications for school change and achievement of student learning outcomes. School change can be improved through interaction with other organizational factors. Factors suspected of being able to potentially improve teacher procedural justice are school leadership and personality [5].

The principal has an important task in encouraging the teacher to carry out the learning process that can foster student creativity, problem solving abilities, and foster students' critical power. School leadership is considered more appropriate to be applied in schools because it is in line with the school's main mission of providing the best service for students through learning activities [6].

School leadership places the teacher as the main component that needs to be given full attention and developed [7]. As a leadership concept that focuses on learning activities and teacher behavior in serving principals students focus on improving the quality of education. In addition, the principal also seeks to influence the personality of the teacher, so that the teacher can carry out his duties with enthusiasm and mobilize all his abilities. The role of the principal as a leader (leader), lacks the appropriate portion [8].

In line with the above opinion, Enueme in his journal explained that, sometimes the principal seemed busy with all the daily responsibilities in managing and running the school, they did not seem to have enough time to practice leadership in school as expected. That shows all the work that the principal must do, only 10% is allocated to learning leadership [9].

According to Hoy and Miskel, there are important and ethical practical reasons to ensure that justice is the standard operational procedure of schools and other organizations [10]. Hoy &Miskel in his book explains the reasons why one high school is so productive and the teacher is eager to work. Hoy explained that, principals were open and friendly and treated teachers fairly and treated them as colleagues, while at the same time asking them to implement high
performance standards. The teachers respond to the leadership of the principal by following the example.

Based on what has been described above, leadership affects many things of organization management such as stress, trust, justice, job satisfaction, and finally affects job performances. Therefore, the productivity of teacher is strongly affected by personality traits such as SE and this trait directly affects procedural justice.

In conclusion, the purpose of writing this study is to find out (1) does school leadership relate with procedural justice?; (2) does personality relate with procedural justice?; (3) does school leadership and personality altogether relate with procedural justice?

2. Materials and Methods

This research is quantitative research that uses survey method with correlation technique. This study involved 90 Biology teachers of Senior High School in West Java as respondents with a composition of 20 Biology teachers as respondents for instrument testing and 85 Biology teachers selected in research samples using Simple Random Sampling (SRS). There were three instruments used to measure school leadership, personality, and procedural justice whose validity has been measured using Pearson Product Moment and reliability using Cronbach Alpha, calculated by Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 23.

Instrument to measure school leadership consisted of 50 items statement were measured by scale 5-4-3-2-1, from those what is always done until it has never been done, with reliability 0.805. Instrument to measure personality consisted of 35 items statement were measured by scale 5-4-3-2-1, from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with reliability 0.819. Instrument to measure procedural justice consisted of 35 items statement were measured by scale 5-4-3-2-1, from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with reliability 0.642. Data analyzed by regression and correlation analysis.

3. Results and Discussions

The data which used in this research was the result of the instrument filling data that had been filled by 85 Biology teachers of Public Senior High School in West Java. Data which presented included minimum scores, maximum scores, average, mode, median, standard deviation, and variance from school leadership (X1), personality (X2), and procedural justice (Y). Procedural justice variable data obtained based on the charging instrument consisting of 32 items. Data on procedural justice had an empirical score range between 87 and 139, range of scores, average score, median, mode, standard deviation, variance. School leadership data obtained based on the charging instrument consisting of 45 items. School leadership data had a range of empirical scores between 188 and 124, range of scores of 64, an average score of 154.96, median 156, mode 158, standard deviation 14.33, variance 205.44. The personality data obtained based on the charging instrument consisting of 45 items. Self-efficacy data had a range of empirical scores between 98 and 157, range of scores of 59, an average score of 123.18, median 121, mode 127, standard deviation 14.85, variance 220.59.
Table 1: ANAVA Table for Regression Model of $\hat{Y} = 11,648 + 0,676 X_1$

| Model           | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | $t_{hitung}$ | $t_{table}$ | Correlations |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
|                 | B                            | Std. Error                 | Beta         |             |              |
| (Constant)      | 11,648                       | 10,377                     | 1,122        | 1,98        | .744         |
| School Leadership | 0,676                       | 0,067                      | .744         | 10,137      | .744         |

Table 2: ANAVA Table for Regression Model of $\hat{Y} = 49,475 + 0,543 X_2$

| Model           | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | $t_{hitung}$ | $t_{table}$ | Correlations |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
|                 | B                            | Std. Error                 | Beta         |             |              |
| (Constant)      | 49,475                       | 9,376                      | 5,277        | 1,98        | .619         |
| Kepribadian     | 543,543                      | 0,076                      | .619         | 7,189       | .619         |

Table 3: ANAVA Table for Regression Model of $\hat{Y} = 52.612+ 0.057X_1 + 0.380X_2$

| Model           | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | $t_{hitung}$ | $t_{table}$ | Correlations |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
|                 | B                            | Std. Error                 | Beta         |             |              |
| (Constant)      | 10,924                       | 10,315                     | 1,059        |             |              |
| School Leadership | 570,570                      | 0,98                       | .627         | 5,840       | .744         |
| Personality     | 139,139                      | 0,094                      | .159         | 1,478       | .619         |

Table 4: Correlation Coefficient School Leadership and Personality with Procedural Justice

| $R_{y12}$ | DF | $F_{hitung}$ | $F_{table}$ | 0.05 | 0.01 |
|-----------|----|--------------|-------------|------|------|
| 0.565     | 82 | 53,206       | 3,10        | 4.87 |

The prerequisite test of the analysis carried out on the research is the normality test and homogeneity test. Based on the normality test it can be concluded that the data are normally distributed with a significant level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and homogeneous based on the group score variable at a significant level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Furthermore, hypothesis testing is done by regression method which is obtained by significance test and linearity test using $F$ test and ANOVA. Based on the results of the significance test and linearity, the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 11,648 + 0,676 X_1$, $\hat{Y} = 49,475 + 0,543 X_2$, and $\hat{Y} = 10,924 + 0,570 X_1 + 0,139 X_2$ significant and linear.

The coefficient of determination is $(ry1)^2 = (0.744)^2 = 0.553$ which means that 55.3 variations in school leadership contribute to the variation of procedural justice through a regression model $\hat{Y} = 11.664 + 0.676 X_1$ at $\alpha = 0.05$ so it can be concluded that school leadership can both influence teacher procedural justice.
The coefficient of determination is \( r^2 = (0.619)^2 = 0.383 \) which means 38.3 personality variations contribute to the variation of procedural justice through the regression model \( \hat{Y} = 49.475 + 0.543 X_2 \) at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) so it can be concluded that good personality can affect teacher procedural justice.

The coefficient of determination \( R^2 = (0.565)^2 = 0.319 \) which indicates that 31.9% of the variations that occur in procedural justice are determined jointly by variations in school leadership and personality through multiple linear regression models \( \hat{Y} = 10,924 + 0.570 X_1 + 0.139 X_2 \) and not through another regression.

Based on the results of calculations and testing of hypotheses it is known that the first test results are positive and significant relationships between school leadership and procedural justice, so the better the school leadership the better the procedural justice. the relationship between school leadership and teacher procedural justice is shown in the organizational behavior model by Colquitt et al. (2019) which shows that school leadership styles in group mechanisms can influence individual mechanisms, one of which is procedural justice, so that it also affects individual behavior such as personality [5]. The mechanism that occurs in groups is strongly influenced by group leadership because the leader directs activities in the group to reach the goal.

The research conducted by Ling et al. (2015) that schools are run under the leadership of the principal, so the direction of school development is determined by the leadership of the school principal and the situation between teaching staff who work [11]. Thus, the principal has a very important role in determining the achievement of the school through the vision and mission and plans and policies so that the personality and procedural justice of the teacher increases.

Research conducted by Paulina Tri Indah. (2018) shows the results "positive influential personality can significantly influence procedural justice. From this explanation, it can be explained that personality greatly influences procedural justice, because personality reflects the attitude of awareness that is owned by each person in accepting decisions fairly, and is able to carry out work with full responsibility, thorough, tenacious and persistent.

The results of testing the second hypothesis concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between personality and procedural justice. the higher the personality of a teacher, the better procedural justice. This result is supported by the research of Hoxha&Hyseni-Duraku which states that there is a relationship between teacher leadership and teacher progress [12].

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the explanation above, the conclusion of this study is that two independent variables are related to procedural justice. Procedural justice has a positive and significant relationship with school leadership with teacher personality. To improve procedural justice, school leadership and personality need to be considered. A better school leadership style and high personality will make teacher procedural justice even better.
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