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Abstract: This article will analyze the effect of motivation, Leadership and perceived workload with the moderation effect of leadership to the teacher’s commitment. We use Structural Equation Modeling with descriptive quantitative analyzing. Samples were taken from a private Islamic school in Tangerang Selatan Indonesia, using census method to all the 61 teachers. The instrument is questionnaire using likert scales. Based on the results, motivation, Leadership and perceived workload with the moderation effect of leadership all together effecting 47.9% of teacher’s commitment. The result suggested that it is important to improve the leaders (principles or headmasters) leadership capability in order to get high commitment teacher. Leadership holds an important key for commitment.
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INTRODUCTION

The needs of professional teachers are high, yet the turn over of this profession are also high. There are assumptions that the commitment of being a teacher is low because of the school principles/headmasters leadership are not good enough for the teachers, plus the low motivation on being a teacher and added by high perceived workload from the teachers itself. Teacher’s profession assumed to be a hard and out of date profession for the youngster. A research by Han and Yin in 2016 stated that in these several decades the interest to be a teacher is decreasing significantly compared to the needs of professional teachers. (Han and Yin, 2016) Commitment on being a teacher is one of the most important things to have as a teacher. Commitment will effect the teacher work performance. (Marlina, Aliman and Somantri, 2001).
Based on the data from Indonesian Teachers Union (Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia), Indonesia lack of 1.1 million teachers. (Ramadhani, Awaluddin and Nugraha, 2016). The problems might comes form the lack of commitment on teacher’s profession. By knowing the factors that effecting teacher’s commitment, hopefully it can be an input for government, schools, and or educational organizations to improve their teacher’s commitment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

On this research, teachers are define base on Indonesian educational ministerial regulation (PERMENDIKBUD RI) number 15 year 2018, that teachers as professional educator has a main job to educate, teaching, guiding, directing, training, evaluating students. Principal/headmaster is defined as a teacher who is given the task to lead and manage the school. Thus the leader of a teacher in school is the principal/headmaster.

Teacher is assumed as a nonprestige profession, with low career path, and less rewarding. These assumptions might have been lowering motivation of the young generations, to be a teacher. (Han and Yin.2016:2). The declining motivation can also cause someone who has a career as a teacher to have lower commitment in his profession.

Nowadays, the educational worlds, filled with government regulation with the aim of increasing the quality of national education. But sometimes the regulations forgot to see it from the teacher’s perspective, changes in regulation means changing the complexity of teacher’s work which can increase the teacher’s perceived work load. Knowing the teachers perceived workload is important to improve their capabilities. (Gu, 2014). High workload can result in stressful teachers and lowering their work performances. (Wulansari, Damanik and Prasetio, 2017). Decreasing on teachers performance, can effect the teachers commitment for their profession and organization.

Beside those factors that have been stated ahead, one of the most intriguing factors is the principles/headmaster leadership that assumed to effect teacher’s commitment. Principle has a big effect on decision making, helping or even obstructing teacher’s performance. (Sulastri, Nurkolis and Rasiman, 2017). In the matter of teachers who don’t have a good leader, what will happen? Will his/her professional commitment run out? This is one among other factors, that becoming our main focus in the research.

Education is a process, which aims to create a civilized society. Teacher is a professional who is required to have professional characters, if not then it will comes to the end of teacher. Based on those factors that has been stated above, it is important to analyze and evaluate factors that effecting teacher’s commitment, such as leadership, motivation, and perceived workload. On this research, leadership will be emphasized by adding it not only as dependant variable but also as a moderation variable. Leadership chosen as the moderating variable, because among the other tested variable, the one that gave significant impact as moderating variable is leadership (based on previous SEM analysis), and also it is the variables that can not be controlled directly by the subject because it comes from the other person side, so it is interesting to see the effect on the subject.
Motivation.
Mitchel (1997), as cited by Robbins and Judge (2009), Motivation is a process to measure intensity, direction, perseverance/persistence of someone in achieving goals. (Stephan and Timothy, 2009)

Motivation comes from complex interaction between personality and situational determinant. Motivation doesn’t always about the money, clarity of a job desk, clear job description can increase motivation. (Mainiero and Tromley, 1994)

Motivation in the book “Motivation for Achievement: Possibilities for Teaching and Learning.”, defined as: something that has 3 psychological functions to someone, which is: giving energy, activate a discipline behavior, guiding act, arranging action that will stay within itself. (Alderman, 2013).

Classic theory about motivation, was stated by Abraham Maslow on 1943, saying that all human have 5 hierarchy of needs, that will change it motivation: psychological include hunger and thirst, safety from physical harassment and emotional, social including love and acceptance, acknowledgemeny including to be love and enough, self actualization. (Maslow, 1943)

These statements about motivation from the experts can be summarized that, motivation is a complex interaction process, between personality and determination, which root from a needs, and determine perseverance, preistance, and pathway to reach a goal.

Based on an experiment from Voigt and Hirst on 2014. Employee that has high focus on job promotion has lower intention on leaving. This is one of the aspects of commitment. From here it can be assumed that motivation effecting commitment. (Voigt and Hirst, 2015)

Base on those sentences, the hypothesis is:
Hypothesis 1 (H1): Motivation effecting teacher’s commitment.

Leadership
Implementation of leadership (for teachers, the direct supervisor is the principal), has an influence in decision making, and also influences teacher performance. (Sulastri, Nurkolis and Rasiman, 2017). Teacher’s performance is also an indicator of commitment to the profession. This research will determine the influence of superior leadership on teacher commitment.

Leadership has an impact on organizational commitment and the people within it. In high-level education, effective leadership and employee commitment is needed to see its influence. Transformational leadership has a positive relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016)

Other research by Eliophotou-Menon, M. and Ioannou, A, 2016, states that the transformational leadership emphasizes a high increase in employees' commitment to the organization. Transformational leadership influences employee loyalty by promoting the achievement of goals from subordinates and encouraging them to think critically in achieving employee problem solving. (Eliophotou-Menon and Ioannou, 2016)

In school, the leader is the headmasters/principles. They need to have a capability to arrange, and manage the school needs and assets according to priority scales, include on those assets are the teachers. The quality that is needed from a leader in school is strong leadership,
good communication, making everybody feels involve and own the changes in school environment. (HMS teacher and principal development program, 2012)

From these studies it can be assumed that the leadership of leaders influences the commitment of their employees. This also includes the world of education where the principal's leadership will influence the commitment of the teachers, both the commitment to the profession and the foundation / organization where they work.

Based on the explanation above, it can be proposed as a hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Superiors leadership influences teacher commitment.

**Perceived Workload**

In PERMENDIKBUD RI no 15 2018 the workload of teachers for one week in total is 40 hours divided into 37.5 hours of work and 2.5 hours of rest. Within these working hours, counts are not only fixed teaching hours but also hours of lesson planning or mentoring; assessing the results of learning or coaching; guide and train the students; and carry out additional tasks attached to the implementation of main activities in accordance with the teacher workload.

Workload is defined as all activities that result in a person spending his time doing a job that is in accordance with his professional duties, responsibilities and interests in work, both directly and indirectly. For teachers the workload does not only exist when they are in school, but teachers also have to spend extra time after working hours, to be more effective and productive in their work as teachers. (Johari, Tan and Tjik, 2016). Teacher workloads sometimes not in accordance with what is written in government regulations. In this study, the workload to be discussed is perceived workload which is defined as a feeling that something needs effort to be expended. Individual perception, that the tasks / jobs given to them from the workplace, are above normal or stressful. (Cömert and Dönmez, 2019)

Workload was significantly related to the teacher's decision to leave his job. About 1 in 3 teachers, who consider that their workload is uncontrolled, will leave their schools by comparison only 1 in 10 teachers who leave their jobs when they feel the workload can be managed. The decision to leave work shows a low level of commitment so it needs to be examined whether the workload directly influences the commitment of the teacher or not. (Torres, 2016a)

Based on the explanation above, this study purposed a hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Workload affects teacher commitment

**Leadership as Moderating Variable**

Moderating variable is a variable that effecting the independ variable power to the depend variable, whether it is empowering or lowering the effect of independ to depend variables. (Ghozali, 2011)

In this research we used leadership as moderating variable and check the effect on the relation between motivation variable to commitment variable, and perceived workload to commitment variable.

Leadership style takes into account the needs of employees while being sensitive to the differences that exist in an organization. Thus based on these statements, leadership style is
effecting the motivation and commitment of an employee. (Eliophotou-Menon and Ioannou, 2016)

Another research stated that there were a few relationship between workloads to the leadership style, and it is also connected to the personal commitment. (Ingvarson et al., 2005) Therefore it is important to find how strong the effect of leadership to teachers workload and commitment.

Based on the explanation above, this study purposed two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Leadership affects the relation of motivation to commitment.

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Leadership affects the relation of perceived workload to commitment.

Commitment

Commitment can be divided into several forms, in this paper the commitment define as the union between professional commitment as a teacher and organizational commitment as the workplace of the teacher.

Commitment is defined as attachment, identification or loyalty (Singh and Gupta, 2015). Organizational commitment is defined as the strength of an individual towards self-identification and its hospitality to a particular organization (Singh and Gupta, 2015). Professional commitment is defined as psychological attachment and identification of a person to his profession. (Singh and Gupta, 2015)

Teacher commitment is very important because it can improve a person abilities and relationships with his profession to create a successful career. (Akbari and Malagi, 2017). The teacher's commitment also encourages him to improve his performances. Teachers with high commitment become teachers who perform better, effectively and efficiently. (Marlina, Aliman and Somantri, 2001)

RESEARCH METHODS

The method used is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using smart PLS, to measure the influence of motivation, superior Leadership and teacher workload on teacher commitment, combined by quantitative descriptive analysis to the level of each variables. The target population are the teachers who work at a well-known Islamic private school in South Tangerang. Sampling is done using census method with a total sample of permanent teachers in the school 61 people.

The instrument used was a questionnaire with a Likert scale of 1-4, neutral answer choices were eliminated to get sharper results. Questionnaire reliability was calculated using cornbach alpha with a cut-off point of 0.6. Validity is calculated by Discriminant Validity Fornell Larcker Criterion.

Instrument questions use closed sentences and open questions. Examples of questions for motivational variables: "Being among students makes me happy" and "I am interested in being a teacher because of the many holidays.", For the Leadership variable "My boss is the type of responsible leader" and "I have difficulties in discussing matters with my boss " The question for leadership points to transformational leadership characteristics either positive or negative characters , For the workload perception variable" I have no problem with my workload "and" I feel the dividing of work in school is unfair ", for the commitment variable"
I am satisfied with being a teacher "and" I still want to try other professions ". Example open-ended question "My impression of the profession that I do is ...."

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Results**

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was made to find out the items loading per variables, with the result shown in Diagram 1.

![Figure 1. Research Framework](image-url)
From these results, every item that has loading less than 0.5 was removed. Leadership then added as moderating variable for motivation and perceived workload. The result is shown in diagram 2.

**Diagram 2. SEM with leadership as moderating variable.**
Calculation for validity and reliability was used by calculate the items loading, average variance extracted, composite reliability and cronbach’s alpha. The result shown in table 1.

Table 1. Measurement Model

| Items            | Loadings | AVE   | CR    | Alpha |
|------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Commitment       |          |       |       |       |
| K4               | 0.843    | 0.700 | 0.875 | 0.786 |
| K5               | 0.855    |       |       |       |
| K8               | 0.812    |       |       |       |
| Leadership       |          |       |       |       |
| L10              | 0.759    | 0.618 | 0.906 | 0.876 |
| L2               | 0.757    |       |       |       |
| L3               | 0.827    |       |       |       |
| L5               | 0.830    |       |       |       |
| L7               | 0.811    |       |       |       |
| L8               | 0.724    |       |       |       |
| Motivation       |          |       |       |       |
| M10              | 0.856    | 0.710 | 0.880 | 0.808 |
| M3               | 0.796    |       |       |       |
| M4               | 0.873    |       |       |       |
| Moderating       | Leadership to Motivation |       |       |       |
| Perceived        | Workload  |       |       |       |
| W2               | 0.713    | 0.653 | 0.849 | 0.732 |
| W3               | 0.824    |       |       |       |
| W4               | 0.878    |       |       |       |

a. All items loading > 0.5 as indicates Indicator Reliability (Hulland.1999:198)
b. All Average Variance Extracted (AVE) > 0.5 as indicates Convergen Reliability (Fornell and Larcker.1981:48)
c. All Composite Reliability (CR) > 0.7 indicates internal consistency (Peterson and Kim.2013:197)
d. All Cronbach alpha > 0.7 indicates Indicator Reliability (Cronbach.1951:322)

Based on the calculation result, all indicator items in the variable, has fulfilled the reliability requirements. All of the loading items are higher than 0.5, convergen reliability higher than 0.5, internal consistency higher than 0.7 dan cronbach alpha reliability higher than 0.7. The result shows that all items in the instruments that were used in this research are reliable to measure all the latent variables. To find out about the appropriatness of the model, we calculate the discriminant validity by checking each item cross loading. The result is shown in Tabel 2.
Table 2. Indicator Item Cross Loading.

| Item in Indicator | Leadership | Motivation | Leadership - Perceived | Motivation | Perceived Workload | Commitment |
|------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| K4               | 0.524      | 0.344      | 0.208                  | 0.133      | -0.567            | 0.843      |
| K5               | 0.369      | 0.280      | -0.067                 | 0.403      | -0.357            | 0.855      |
| K8               | 0.469      | 0.293      | 0.118                  | 0.288      | -0.451            | 0.812      |
| L10              | 0.759      | 0.229      | 0.302                  | 0.125      | -0.524            | 0.430      |
| L2               | 0.757      | 0.139      | 0.187                  | 0.120      | -0.385            | 0.289      |
| L3               | 0.827      | 0.144      | 0.256                  | 0.193      | -0.462            | 0.469      |
| L5               | 0.830      | 0.196      | 0.322                  | 0.215      | -0.435            | 0.463      |
| L7               | 0.811      | 0.236      | 0.350                  | 0.098      | -0.488            | 0.457      |
| L8               | 0.724      | 0.285      | 0.204                  | 0.226      | -0.351            | 0.435      |
| M10              | 0.156      | -0.190     | -0.286                 | 0.856      | -0.165            | 0.338      |
| M3               | 0.191      | -0.229     | -0.244                 | 0.796      | -0.117            | 0.171      |
| M4               | 0.156      | -0.175     | -0.192                 | 0.873      | -0.178            | 0.244      |

**Mediation**

- Leadership → Motiv: 0.191, 1.000, 0.413, -0.229, -0.410, 0.368
- Perceived → Motiv: 0.201, 0.413, 1.000, 0.291, -0.209, 0.115

Based on the crossloading calculation, there aren’t any indicators that have higher correlation with others latent variables, therefore the model fit.

To calculate the validity, we use Discriminant Validity by Fornell and Larcker Criterion. The result is shown in table 3.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity (Fornell and Larcker Criterion).

| Variabel              | Leadership | Leadership to motivation | Leadership to Perceived Workload | Motivation | Perceived Workload | Commitment |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| Leadership            | 0.786      |                         |                                 |            |                   |            |
| Leadership to motivation | 0.257      |                         | 1.000                           |            |                   |            |
| Leadership to Perceived Workload | 0.350      | 0.413                   | 1.000                           |            |                   |            |
| Motivation            | 0.211      | -0.229                  | -0.291                          | 0.842      |                   |            |
Based on the discriminant validity, each latent variable shared higher scores with their own indicator block, which means, the instrument is valid.

To test the hypotheses per each latent variable, bootstrapping test was done, the results are as follow.

**Diagram 3. Bootstrapping Direct Effect Result.**
Table 4. Path Coefficients.

| Path Coefficients | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Leadership -> commitment | 0.299             | 0.347           | 0.127                     | 2.602                  | 0.010    |
| Leadership to Motivation -> commitment | 0.309             | 0.238           | 0.141                     | 2.187                  | 0.029    |
| Leadership to Perceived Workload -> commitment | -0.073            | -0.067          | 0.106                     | 0.663                  | 0.468    |
| Motivation -> commitment | 0.243             | 0.238           | 0.095                     | 2.573                  | 0.010    |
| Perceived Workload -> commitment | -0.229            | -0.251          | 0.136                     | 1.676                  | 0.094    |

Based on the bootstrapping analysis T statistics and P values for moderating variable leadership to perceived workload and commitment is not accepted. So we removed the variable, and run bootstrapping analysis for the second time. The result is shown below.

Table 5. Second Run of Path Coefficients.

| Path Coefficients | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Leadership -> commitment | 0.299             | 0.319           | 0.166                     | 2.523                  | 0.012    |
| Leadership to Motivation -> commitment | 0.290             | 0.256           | 0.138                     | 2.020                  | 0.044    |
| Motivation -> commitment | 0.272             | 0.274           | 0.095                     | 2.670                  | 0.004    |
| Perceived Workload -> commitment | -0.234            | -0.252          | 0.122                     | 1.918                  | 0.056    |

Based on the second bootstrapping analysis, with the T-statistics standard, hypothesis can be accepted if the result is more than 1.9 and P values below 0.07, the result shows that each of the hypotheses can be accepted. Leadership effects commitment. The better leadership style the higher the teacher’s commitment.

The leadership also moderates the effect of motivation to commitment. It has positive effect which means, leadership strengthen the effects of motivation to commitment and vice versa. Motivation effecting commitment positively, which means, to make teachers have high commitment, we need to motivate them, we need to make sure they have high motivation for their job. Perceived workload also effects commitment. The relation from T statistics is positive which mean the effect is positive; the higher perceived workload, the higher commitment that teachers put on that job.

Based on the result, leadership style effects teacher’s commitment directly and indirectly (as a moderation effect). This result supports the research from Yahaya and Ebrahim,
in 2016. Leadership has an impact on organizational commitment and the people within it. Transformational Leadership has a positive relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction.(Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016). It means that when the leadership style is improved, the commitment will follow. And it is also increasing the effect of motivation to commitment. The better the leadership style the more increasing the effects.

The results also show that motivation effect commitment positively, this result also support the research from Han 2015, that commitment positively predicted by goal orientation (motivation). (Han, Yin and Wang, 2016). This means when we want to increase teacher’s commitment we need to make sure to find a way to increase their motivation too. Because by increasing their motivation, their commitment will follow.

Perceived workload also effecting commitment, this research prove that perceived workload positively effecting commitment, which means that the more higher the perceived workload the commitment resulted higher also, this result differ from the research of Tores in 2016, which stated that long hours workload resulting lack of commitment.(Torres, 2016). These differences perhaps happened because the different of the samples, Our research taken sample in Islamic school which inherited the values of commitment, more workload means you need to give more commitment to finish it. And it is different then the samples taken by Tores from Carter schools in New York city.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Teacher is rarely being the first choice as a profession for young generation. Even for those who already is being a teacher, sometimes they doing it with lack of commitments. Therefore it is important to study the factors that effecting teacher’s commitment. Because teacher’s commitment important to improve their work performance, thus effecting the result of teaching to the students. akbarBase on this research, all of the latent variable which are, leadership, motivation and perceived workload are effecting commitment. Hypothesis between those variables are accepted and significant. These finding can be an input for human resource management at various schools, to get info about what are the factors that they need to be noticed and improved.

This research also proved that if we want to improve teacher’s commitment, one of the most important aspect to be look in too is the leader’s (headmaster/principle) leadership style, because leadership style effecting the teacher’s commitment significantly directly and indirectly. Choosing leaders with good leadership or improving the leader’s leadership will have great effect in the teacher’s commitment at any school, and vice versa, lacking of leadership or bad leadership style means the teacher’s commitment will be lower.

The limitations of this research are: the sample numbers which are only 61 people from Islamic based school and the data analysis is using only SEM. Therefore these limitations can be looked as a chance to be improved on future research.
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