The Importance of Work Motivation in Building Principals’ Work Performance and School Performance Quality in Senior High Schools West Sumatra

*Hibban1,* Mukhaiyar2 Rusdinal3

1,2,3 Doctoral Program of Education, Universitas Negeri Padang
*Corresponding author. Email: hibbannasution92@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This article describes the results of quantitative research on the importance of work motivation on the principals’ work performance and the school performance quality at SMA Negeri Sumatra Barat. The research applied direct survey as a research method. The data is processed using path analysis. This study consists of 3 variables, namely work motivation (X2), principals’ work performance (Y) and school performance quality (Z). The result of work motivation questionnaire (X2) shows that the maximum score achieved is 216 and the lowest score is 125 and the range is 91. The average score is 180.77, the median is 182.5, the mode is 183 and the standard deviation is 19.98. This study reveals the effect of work motivation on work performance of the principals, and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera. The value the work motivation is 33.33% with a cumulative score of 61.53%. The linearity of work motivation with the quality of school performance is the sig. 0.666 > 0.05, with a variance table value of 1.81 and a calculated variance of 0.875. This means that there is a significant linear relationship between work motivation (X2) and the quality of school performance (Z) at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The importance of work motivation to be involved in supporting the work performance of school principals and the quality of school performance is a major consideration in improving school grades. The demands of education, the business world [1,2,3], global and industrial demands [13,17], as well as problems related to low quality, relevance and educational competitiveness [7,12] are considered as benchmarks for increasing motivation for school institutions.

Motivation is a condition of encouragement for someone to do an activity consciously [11], [18] in achieving the desired goal, and [4] the provision of a driving force that creates a person's work excitement to fulfill an individual's need [15]. Schools must create motivating conditions in which a person feels free but responsible [8,16], the difficulty of creating motivating conditions becomes a problem for schools [14], due to the different needs of each individual in school [9].

needs as high order and low order [15]. Physiological, safety needs and social needs are described as low-order needs. The need for appreciation, and self-actualization as are regarded as a high order need. Thus, it can be concluded that during the period of economic prosperity, almost all workers who are employed permanently have mostly fulfilled their low order needs

1.1. Formulation of the Problem

Based on the background above, the problems of the research are formulated as follows:

1. How does work motivation affect the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?
2. How much does the implementation of work motivation influence the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?
3. To what extent does work motivation directly and indirectly affect the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?
1.2. Research Purposes

The objectives of this research are to describe:
1. the way work motivation affect the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?
2. the extent to which the implementation of work motivation influence the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?
3. the extent to which work motivation directly and indirectly affect the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance at SMA Negeri in West Sumatera?

2. METHOD

This study used a survey method with a quantitative approach. [6] The focus of research is on disclosing the causal relationship [10] between variables. The research hypothesis is used to answer the problem formulation in concept and theory. [5] The quantity and characteristics of the object / subject generalizations are determined by the researcher. The population of the research was all State Senior High Schools (SMA) scattered in 19 urban districts in West Sumatra. [12] The sample that represents the part of the population under study is measured using the following formulation:

\[ n = \frac{N \times XN}{Nd^2 + 1} \]  

(1)

Based on the results of the calculation of the formulation above, it is concluded that the sample units are as follows:

| No | City/Regency       | Number of Schools | Proportion \( \frac{x78}{139} \) | Sample Unit | %  |
|----|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----|
| 1  | Bukittinggi        | 5                 | \( \frac{5}{139} \) = 2.8       | 3           | 3  |
| 2  | Padang             | 16                | \( \frac{16}{139} \) = 8.97     | 9           | 11 |
| 3  | Padang Panjang     | 4                 | \( \frac{4}{139} \) = 2.2       | 2           | 2  |
| 4  | Pariaman           | 4                 | \( \frac{4}{139} \) = 2.2       | 2           | 2  |
| 5  | Payakumbuh         | 5                 | \( \frac{5}{139} \) = 2.8       | 3           | 3  |
| 6  | Sawahlunto         | 3                 | \( \frac{3}{139} \) = 1.6       | 2           | 2  |
| 7  | Solok              | 4                 | \( \frac{4}{139} \) = 2.2       | 2           | 2  |
| 8  | Agam               | 19                | \( \frac{19}{139} \) = 10.66    | 11          | 14 |
| 9  | Darmasraya         | 6                 | \( \frac{6}{139} \) = 3.36      | 3           | 3  |
| 10 | Solok Selatan      | 8                 | \( \frac{8}{139} \) = 4.48      | 4           | 4  |
| 11 | Padang Pariaman    | 5                 | \( \frac{5}{139} \) = 2.8       | 3           | 3  |
| 12 | Pesisir Selaan     | 13                | \( \frac{13}{139} \) = 7.29     | 7           | 9  |
| 13 | Sijunjung          | 7                 | \( \frac{7}{139} \) = 3.9       | 4           | 4  |
| 14 | Pasaman            | 3                 | \( \frac{3}{139} \) = 1.6       | 2           | 3  |
| 15 | Limah Puluh kota   | 15                | \( \frac{15}{139} \) = 8.4      | 8           | 13 |
| 16 | Kabupaten Solok    | 18                | \( \frac{18}{139} \) = 10.1     | 10          | 8  |
| Total |                  | 139               |                                 | 78          | 100|
The questionnaire is evaluated according to the measuring instrument. The work motivation questionnaire consists of 45 items, all of which are valid. [12] The reliability was measured using the Cronbach alpha value. The reliability results were analyzed using SPPS 20, the reliability value was 0.907 suggesting that the reliability was in the very high category. The trust results are measured using the sig value. 0.00 <α = 0.05, the ICC values of work motivation were 0.179 and 0.907 meaning that the validator's confidence in the instrument was at a very high value.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study were analyzed through linearity test using SPSS 20. The results of the ANOVA analysis at SPSS show that:

1. Significance and Linearity Forms of regression between work motivation (X2) and the quality of school performance (Z).

The results of the SPSS 20 analysis reveal that the sig value is 0.666> 0.05 suggesting that the hypothesis is accepted so that there is a significant linear relationship between work motivation variable and school performance quality variable. The form of regression for the work motivation variable (X2) on the quality of school performance (Z) is in the linear category.

Table 2. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Linearity Forms of Regression between work motivation (X2) and school performance (Y)

| Sources of variance | the sum of squares | Average Sum of squares | F | Sig. |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|------|
| Linearity           | 2996,540          | 109,853                | 17,942 | .000 |
| Linearity deviation| 7157,469          | 49                     | 146,071 | .875 |
| Between groups      | 4509,324          | 27                     | 167,012 | .666 |
| Total               | 14663,333         | 77                     |

In line with the above table, it is found that the value of F-table is 49.27 of 1.81. So, when it is compared to the value of F-calculated and F-table, it is figured out that 0.456 <1.9 meaning that there is a significant linear relationship between work motivation variable (X2) and quality of school performance (Z).

2. Significance and Linearity Forms of regression between principals performance (Y) and school performance quality (Z).

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be said that, with sig. 0.298> 0.05 the hypothesis is accepted and it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between principals' work performance variable and school performance quality variable. That is, the form of regression used for the principals' work performance variable (Y) on the quality of school performance (Z) is categorized as linear.

Table 3. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Linearity Forms of Regression between Principals Performance (Y) and School Performance (Z)

| ANOVA Table | the sum of squares | DF | Average Sum of squares | F     | Sig. |
|-------------|-------------------|----|------------------------|-------|------|
| Z*          | Between groups    | 2390.224 | 1 | 2696,809               | 16,250 | .000 |
| Y           | Linearity         | 6830.659 | 39 | 151,697               | 1,191  | .298 |
|             | Linearity deviation | 5442.450 | 37 | 164,566               |        |      |
|             | Total             | 14663,333 | 77 |                      |       |      |
The above Anava table displays that the value of F-table (39.37) is 1.77. So, when it is compared to the value of F-calculated and F-table, it is found that 0.922 < 1.78 meaning that there is a significant linear relationship between principals’ work performance variable (Y) and the quality of school performance (Z).

Based on the ANOVA test described above, the summary of the variance (F) test of linearity of the SPSS results is obtained as follows:

| No | variable | Nilai F_hitung | Score | conclusion |
|----|----------|----------------|-------|------------|
| 1  | Work Motivation * Quality of School Performance | .875 | F_{table} (49,27) = 1.81 | Linear |
| 2  | Principals’ Work Performance * Quality of School Performance | 1.191 | F_{table} (39,77) = 1.78 | Linear |

If the value of F-calculated is smaller than F-table at 0.05 of significance level, then the research data is stated to follow a linear regression model. Conversely, if F-calculated is greater than F-table at 0.05 of significance level, then the data do not follow a linear regression model. Based on the results of the above analysis, it is found that the value of F-calculated is smaller than F-table, suggesting that there is a significant linear relationship between work motivation and principals work performance on the quality of school performance.

Based on the analysis above, the path analysis model operation are described through regression analysis which is determined by each path coefficient as follows:

Based on t:

Stage 3 regression Beta X\textsubscript{2y} = 0.315 (t = 2.892) = \rho_{y}

8Beta stage regression Y\textsubscript{2z} = 0.231 (t = 3.857) = \rho_{y2Z}

10 Beta regression x\textsubscript{2}\Omega_{yZ} = 0.361 + 0.289 (f = 14.563) = x\textsubscript{2}\Omega_{yZ}

11 Beta regression x\textsubscript{2}\Omega_{yZ} = 0.150 + 0.224 (f = 11.649) = x\textsubscript{2}\Omega_{yZ}

By using the formula \sqrt{(1-R^2)} , the path coefficient for the residuals of each variable can be calculated as follows:

The path coefficient for residual work motivation (X2) through the principals' performance (Y) on the quality of school performance (Z).

\[ e_2 = \sqrt{(1-R^2)} \]
\[ = \sqrt{(1-0.280)} \]
\[ = \sqrt{0.720} \]
\[ = 0.848 \]

Based on the results of the analysis of hypothesis testing of each exogenous variable against endogenous variables and the path analysis model used by the researcher, the path coefficient can be presented as illustrated below:

Figure 1: Analysis model of the influence of work motivation (X2) variables on work performance of the principals (Y) and the quality of school performance (Z).

Structural Analysis One

Sub structure 1
Figure 2. Path coefficient for residual work motivation (X2) and principals’ work performance (Y)

Sub structure 1

Figure 14. Path coefficient for residual work motivation (X2) through principals work performance (Y) on quality of school performance (Z)

3. Direct Influence Model and Indirect Effect Model

The first path analysis model analyzes the direct effect of variables. Firstly, knowing the direct effect of work motivation (X2) on the principals’ work performance (Y). Secondly, the effect of work motivation (X2) on the quality of school performance (Z). Thirdly, work performance of the principals (Y) affects the quality of school performance (Z) in SMA Negeri in West Sumatra.

The indirect effect of work motivation (X2) affects the quality of school performance (Z) through school performance (Y).

Based on the recapitulation results, the direct and indirect effects are described as follows;
1) The direct effect of work motivation (X2) on the quality of school performance (Z).

\[ X_1 \text{ with respect to } Z = \rho y_2 x \rho y_2 \]

\[ = 0.315 \times 0.315 \]

\[ = 0.099 \text{ or 9.9\%} \]

Based on the above calculations, it can be concluded that there is a direct influence of the work motivation variable (X2) on the variable quality of school performance, which is 9.9%.

2) The indirect effect of work motivation (X2) on the quality of school performance (Z) through the performance of the principals (Y).

\[ Z \Omega Y = \rho yX2 x ryz \]

\[ = 0.361 \times 0.289 \]

\[ = 0.104 \text{ or 10.4\%} \]

Based on the above calculations, it can be concluded that there is a direct influence of the work motivation variable (X2) on the school performance quality variable (Z) through the principals’ work performance, which is 10.4%.

Table 5. Conclusion Analysis of Direct and Indirect Effects.

| No | information | % Direc | % Indirect | % Total |
|----|-------------|---------|------------|---------|
| 1  | Direct effect of work motivation (X2) on the quality of school performance (Z) | 19.4 | 19.4 | |
| 2  | Indirect influence between work motivation (X2) through principals’ work performance (Y) on school performance (Z) | 10.45 | 10.45 | |

4. CONCLUSION

a. The description of work motivation (X2) on the work performance of school principals and the quality of school performance in SMA Negeri West Sumatra obtained an average of 180.77, median 182.5, mode 183 and standard deviation of 3.62. Respondents' achievement regarding work motivation (X2) was 33.33%, in the class of cumulative frequency 61.53%.

b. There is an effect of compensation for the implementation of work motivation (X2) on the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance in SMA Negeri West Sumatra Province seen from the sig value. 0.666> 0.05 means, the form of regression used for the work motivation
variable (X2), on the quality of school performance (Z), is categorized as linear.
c. There is a direct and indirect effect of work motivation compensation (X2) on the performance of school principals and the quality of school performance in SMA Negeri West Sumatra Province.
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