International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Society
e-ISSN: 2682-8138 | Vol. 1, No. 3, 23-35, 2019
http://myjms.moe.gov.my/index.php/ijares

THE INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL CLIMATE, TEACHERS' COMMITMENT, TEACHERS' MOTIVATION ON TEACHERS' WORK PERFORMANCE THROUGH TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION

Evonne Lai Eng Fei[1], Crispina Gregory K Han[2*]

[1] Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
[2] Unit for Rural Education Research, Faculty of Psychology and Education, Kota Kinabalu, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author: crispina@ums.edu.my

Accepted: 1 February 2020 | Published: 15 February 2020

Abstract: *The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of school climate, teachers' commitment, teachers' motivation on teachers' work performance through teachers' job satisfaction as a mediator. The sample used in this study consisted of 2738 responses from Sarawak secondary school teachers collected through a structured questionnaire. The study used Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis technique using the Smart-PLS 3.2.7 software. Findings confirmed that school climate, teachers' commitment, teachers' motivation, and teachers' job satisfaction were the key constructs for increasing teachers' work performance among secondary school teachers in Sarawak. Furthermore, the importance-performance matrix analysis (IPMA) has shown that teachers' job satisfaction was the most important factor. The study results also stated that teachers' job satisfaction mediates the relationship between school climate and teachers' work performance; teachers' commitment and teachers' work performance; and teachers' motivation and teachers' work performance.*

Keywords: School Climate, Teachers' Commitment, Teachers' Motivation, Teachers' Work Performance, Teachers' Job Satisfaction

1. Introduction

The excellence of a school has to do with teacher satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a tool for measuring the success of an organization. If an organization can provide satisfaction to its employees, it will not only enhance the image of an organization but also enhance the motivation and productivity of all its employees (Sarimah & Faridatul 2010). Teachers are satisfied when their needs are met and employers are satisfied when their employees reach a high level of productivity (Jaafar, 2007). To influence teachers to achieve their school goals teachers must lead the school by using various styles of leadership.

2. Literature Review

Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) assumed that job demand and job resources will lead to two types of psychological processes, namely, deterioration in health and triggering motivation (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). However, researchers focus only on job resources. School climate, teachers' commitment, and teachers' motivation in this study are linked as job resources that play an intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. As such, these

roles can provide employees with job satisfaction to provide full engagement to the organization, leading to improved job performance (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007).

School climate is a social and cultural environment that influences people's behavior (Howard, 1974 in Norhannan, 2016). It is considered to be an internal factor of the school including social relationships between teachers and students, students with students, principals and teachers, co-curricular work and other forms of human relationships (Hussein Mahmood, 1997 in Norhannan, 2016).
H1: School climate is significantly related to teachers' work performance.

Lim and Nizam (2014) in their study defined work commitment as an individual trait that reflects loyalty or obedience and a desire to become an organization member and willing to contribute energy to organizations and professionals. However, Firestone & Rosenblum (1988) noted that teachers' commitment is especially important to increasing motivation to address the changing demands of high expectations in the teaching profession.
H2: Teachers' commitment is significantly related to teachers' work performance.

Previous research by Aacha (2010) concluded that motivation still contributes to the level of performance of school teachers and this indicates that there is a significant relationship between both motivational and intrinsic performance among teachers in Kimaanya Kyabakuzadivision, Uganda.
H3: Teachers' motivation is significantly related to teachers' work performance.

A positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational performance have been found (Chan et al., 2000; Chandrasekar, 2011; Ellinger et al., 2002). The higher the motivation and the positive attitude towards work, the more likely the person is to perform higher, on the contrary (Stirs and Porter, 1991).
H4: Teachers' job satisfaction is significantly related to teachers' work performance.

A meta-analysis studies were conducted by Ilies et al. (2009) on the influence of personality on organizational behavior shows that job satisfaction is a mediator that links personality to organizational behavior and clearly show that job satisfaction is a good intermediary variable that influences organizational practice behavior among employees.
H5: Teachers' job satisfaction mediates the relationship between school climate and teachers' work performance.

The findings of the meta-analysis study were conducted by Hoffman, Blair, Meriac and Woehr (2007) task performance, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are related to one another. Shokrkon and Naami (2009) examined the relationship among job satisfaction and job performance. The result showed that job satisfaction positively affected job performance.
H6: Teachers' job satisfaction mediates the relationship between teachers' commitment and teachers' work performance.

In a study of the relationship between employee motivation, job satisfaction and organizational performance in a palm oil project located in Kalangala district, Uganda, the results show that there is a positive relationship between Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction as well as a positive relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance. Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction positively affect Organizational Performance.

H7: Teachers' job satisfaction mediates the relationship between teachers' commitment and teachers' work performance.

3. Research Design and Methodology

This study used quantitative research and the data was collected by distributing 5000 questionnaires to secondary school teachers in Sarawak but only 2738 teachers returned and answered the questionnaires. Simple random sampling (ratio) was used. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Rutgers Secondary (OCDQ-RS) is used to measure the high school climate (Hoy et al., 1991), Organizational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure teachers' commitment (Mowday et al., 1979), Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers (WTMST) to measure the motivation of teachers towards specific task assignments in subjects (Deci EL, Ryan RM, 1985), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) questionnaire was used to measure the job satisfaction of teachers (Weiss et. al., 1967) and Teachers' Job Performance Self-Rating Questionnaire (TJPSQ) instrument to measure teacher work performance (Amin, Shah and Atta, 2013; Khairi, Norhisham and Asbi, 2016) with five-point Likert scale for all instruments. All the instruments was adapted. The Work Task Motivation Scale for Teachers (WTMST) and Teachers' Job Performance Self-Rating Questionnaire (TJPSQ) were translated from English to Malay and then translate back again by four experts. Face validity and content validity were conducted by five experts at the same time.

4. Reflective Measurement Model Evaluation

Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency was determined from composite reliability (CR) and construct reliability (Cronbach's alpha). Table 1 shows the Cronbach's alpha and alpha values for this study. All Alpha Cronbach and CR values exceed 0.800. This shows that the build reliability and the composite reliability are met.

Table 1: Composite Reliability Value for Assessment of Internal Consistency of Constructs

	Alfa Cronbach	Composite Reliability (CR)
Affective	0.878	0.912
Ongoing	0.773	0.853
Discipline	0.795	0.880
Extrinsic	0.876	0.907
Interpersonal Relationship	0.819	0.881
School Climate	0.926	0.936
Teachers' interaction	0.931	0.944
Intrinsic	0.914	0.931
Teaching Skills	0.805	0.885
Management Skills	0.752	0.855
Principal leadership	0.872	0.903
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	0.944	0.951
Teachers' Commitment	0.922	0.934
Teachers' Motivation	0.900	0.918
Normative	0.808	0.886
Professional Development	0.825	0.885

Teaching Task	0.894	0.934
Administrative Task	0.926	0.948
Teachers' Work Performance	0.938	0.945
Additional Task	0.904	0.933

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is a positive relationship between items measuring the same construct. To determine the validity of this indicator reliability or outer loading and average extracted variance (AVE) are taken into account. The outer loading value must be greater than 0.708 and the AVE value must be equal to or greater than 0.5. Analysis of the measurement model to obtain the value of outer loading and AVE was performed.

To obtain a minimum AVE value of 0.5, the outer loading value for each item less than 0.708 was discarded one by one by repeated PLS algorithm processing. The AVE values obtained from the PLS-SEM measurement model analysis are reported as shown in Table 2. From Table 2, it is found that the AVE value for all constructs exceeds the minimum requirement of 0.50. Thus, it can be said that items measuring these constructs have satisfactory convergent validity.

Table 2: Outer loading value by PLS algorithm process to obtain minimum value of AVE = 0.5

Item	Loading							
	Algoritma proses first time	Algoritma process 2nd time (Item deletion-IS6, KG3,KG8, KG15,TPT6, KKG2,PKG16, PKG18)	Algoritma process 3rd time (Item deletion-TPG5, KKG1, KKG11, PKG14)	Algoritma process 4th time (Item deletion-TPG3)	Algoritma process 5th time (Item deletion-TS6)	Algoritma process 6th time (Item deletion-TS5)	Algotima process 7th time (Item deletion-TPT5)	Algoritma process 8th time (Item deletion-TPG2)
IS1	0.769	0.767	0.768	0.768	0.768	0.768	0.768	0.768
IS2	0.752	0.775	0.775	0.775	0.775	0.775	0.775	0.775
IS3	0.703	0.703	0.705	0.705	0.705	0.705	0.705	0.705
IS4	0.752	0.747	0.748	0.748	0.748	0.748	0.748	0.748
IS5	0.796	0.799	0.799	0.799	0.799	0.799	0.799	0.799
IS6	0.562							
IS7	0.687	0.687						
IS8	0.773	0.792	0.791	0.791	0.791	0.791	0.791	0.791
IS9	0.783	0.803	0.802	0.802	0.802	0.802	0.802	0.802
IS10	0.789	0.789	0.795	0.795	0.795	0.795	0.795	0.795
IS11	0.897	0.897	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898
IS12	0.897	0.897	0.899	0.899	0.899	0.899	0.899	0.899
IS13	0.833	0.833	0.844	0.844	0.844	0.844	0.844	0.844
IS14	0.887	0.887	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889
IS15	0.872	0.872	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878
KG1	0.838	0.862	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874
KG2	0.860	0.880	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892
KG3	0.505							

KG4	0.873	0.891	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.892
KG5	0.675	0.680						
KG6	0.796	0.794	0.793	0.793	0.793	0.793	0.793	0.793
KG7	0.788	0.786	0.785	0.785	0.785	0.785	0.785	0.785
KG8	0.517							
KG9	0.828	0.855	0.856	0.856	0.856	0.856	0.856	0.856
KG10	0.784	0.782	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.801
KG11	0.867	0.866	9.865	0.865	0.865	0.865	0.865	0.865
KG12	0.731	0.733	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.734
KG13	0.789	0.828	0.829	0.829	0.829	0.829	0.829	0.829
KG14	0.725	0.727	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728
KG15	0.554							
KG16	0.663	0.663	0.664	0.664	0.664	0.664	0.664	0.664
TS1	0.845	0.846	0.846	0.847	0.861	0.882	0.882	0.882
TS2	0.861	0.861	0.861	0.861	0.867	0.872	0.872	0.872
TS3	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.875	0.884	0.893	0.893	0.893
TS4	0.856	0.857	0.857	0.858	0.872	0.876	0.876	0.877
TS5	0.847	0.847	0.846	0.846	0.842			
TS6	0.798	0.797	0.796	0.795				
TPG1	0.880	0.880	0.897	0.904	0.903	0.903	0.903	0.911
TPG2	0.840	0.840	0.856	0.868	0.868	0.868	0.868	
TPG3	0.770	0.770	0.742					
TPG4	0.885	0.885	0.899	0.904	0.904	0.904	0.904	0.918
TPG5	0.753	0.753						
TPG6	0.838	0.838	0.855	0.870	0.870	0.870	0.870	0.896
TPT1	0.858	0.879	0.880	0.880	0.880	0.880	0.898	0.898
TPT2	0.853	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.881	0.880
TPT3	0.907	0.915	0.915	0.915	0.915	0.915	0.917	0.917
TPT4	0.910	0.922	0.922	0.922	0.922	0.922	0.925	0.925
TPT5	0.880	0.866	0.866	0.865	0.865	0.864		
TPT6	0.737							
KKG1	0.606	0.566						
KKG2	0.585							
KKG3	0.720	0.708	0.680	0.680	0.680	0.680	0.680	0.680
KKG4	0.714	0.720	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728	0.728
KKG5	0.795	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800
KKG6	0.735	0.749	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764
KKG7	0.869	0.883	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889	0.889
KKG8	0.606	0.610	0.610	0.610	0.610	0.610	0.610	0.610
KKG9	0.863	0.878	0.884	0.884	0.884	0.884	0.884	0.884
KKG10	0.779	0.778	0.778	0.778	0.778	0.778	0.778	0.778
KKG11	0.575							
KKG12	0.733	0.746	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762
KKG13	0.834	0.835	0.835	0.835	0.835	0.835	0.680	0.835
KKG14	0.853	0.856						
KKG15	0.832	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.856	0.837	0.837
KKG16	0.776	0.784	0.784	0.784	0.784	0.784	0.784	0.784
KKG17	0.815	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816
PKG1	0.828	0.841	0.841	0.841	0.841	0.841	0.841	0.841
PKG2	0.763	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762	0.762
PKG3	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.840

PKG4	0.810	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.834
PKG5	0.769	0.770	0.770	0.770	0.770	0.770	0.770	0.770
PKG6	0.866	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867
PKG7	0.838	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.837	0.837
PKG8	0.837	0.838	0.838	0.838	0.838	0.838	0.838	0.838
PKG9	0.768	0.776	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.867	0.759
PKG10	0.862	0.862	0.862	0.862	0.862	0.862	0.862	0.862
PKG11	0.833	0.851	0.851	0.851	0.851	0.851	0.851	0.851
PKG12	0.772	0.792	0.853	0.853	0.853	0.853	0.853	0.853
PKG13	0.754	0.751	0.752	0.752	0.752	0.752	0.752	0.752
PKG14	0.608	0.624						
PKG15	0.736	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.734	0.770	0.734
PKG16	0.569							
PKG17	0.726	0.757	0.827	0.827	0.827	0.827	0.827	0.827
PKG18	0.507							
PKG19	0.873	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.874
PKG20	0.866	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867	0.867

Table 3: AVE value to determine convergent validity

Construct	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Affective	0.749
Ongoing	0.551
Discipline	0.709
Extrinsic	0.621
Interpersonal Relationship	0.651
School Climate	0.507
Teachers' Interaction	0.717
Intrinsic	0.628
Teaching Skills	0.719
Management Skills	0.663
Principals Leadership	0.609
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	0.583
Teachers' Commitment	0.538
Teachers' Motivation	0.511
Normative	0.723
Professional Development	0.659
Teaching task	0.825
Administrative task	0.820
Teachers' Work Performance	0.507
Additional Task	0.776

Discriminant Validity

The results validity analysis of the model are shown in the table where the loading and cross loading of each item are displayed after the removal of 6 items namely IS10, KKG3, KKG8, PKG13, PKG2 and PKG15 as they are not in the correct sub-construction. Item IS10 (0.848)

is an item that measures the teacher interaction sub-constructs. It is found that the loading value of these items is higher than the loading value of other construction related items such as KKG3 (0.878) and KKG8 (0.841) are actually items for the Intrinsic sub-constructors, PKG13 (0.816) and PKG2 (0.892) is an item of sub-construction professional development. PKG15 (0.835) is an item of professional development sub-construction. The sub-constructs of professional development remain only two items, but will be retained because they are highly correlated (r> .70) and have no correlation with other variables (Worthington, R.L. & Whittaker, T. A., 2006).

The next step in assessing discriminant validity is through the Fornell-Larcker criterion. Table 3 shows the final results of the Fornell-Larcker criterion evaluation. The AVE power source values for each construct are located at the top and the right in each column and column respectively. The values below represent the correlation values between those constructs and those of other constructs. It was found that AVE values of school climate (0.507), teacher commitment (0.538), teacher motivation (0.511), teacher job satisfaction (0.583), and teacher work performance (0.507) were higher than the correlation values in columns and columns the construction. Thus the discriminant validity requirements have been met. This means that the constructs are different from one another.

Table 3: Cross Loading for item

Item	Principals Leadership	Teachers' Interaction	Affective	Ongoing	Normative	Additional Task	Teaching task	Administrative task	Extrinsic	Intrinsic	Teaching Skills	Management Skills	Discipline	Interpersonal Relationship	Professional Development
IS1	**0.766**	0.425	0.424	0.369	0.338	0.214	0.149	0.178	0.433	0.403	0.271	0.415	0.255	0.284	0.253
IS2	**0.778**	0.356	0.300	0.280	0.251	0.118	0.149	0.095	0.293	0.269	0.243	0.345	0.231	0.260	0.223
IS4	**0.745**	0.436	0.415	0.357	0.307	0.194	0.140	0.175	0.431	0.399	0.247	0.431	0.253	0.279	0.254
IS5	**0.797**	0.420	0.404	0.365	0.329	0.186	0.144	0.139	0.422	0.395	0.264	0.431	0.265	0.294	0.259
IS8	**0.793**	0.447	0.337	0.299	0.260	0.155	0.163	0.112	0.343	0.316	0.263	0.425	0.254	0.297	0.266
IS9	**0.804**	0.421	0.326	0.304	0.258	0.157	0.161	0.124	0.329	0.314	0.281	0.425	0.262	0.291	0.255
IS3	0.481	**0.706**	0.459	0.335	0.314	0.156	0.229	0.115	0.453	0.420	0.342	0.518	0.366	0.421	0.361
IS11	0.459	**0.905**	0.501	0.384	0.352	0.212	0.229	0.138	0.557	0.470	0.330	0.610	0.368	0.454	0.353
IS12	0.465	**0.909**	0.502	0.389	0.362	0.223	0.221	0.163	0.558	0.463	0.323	0.610	0.349	0.452	0.350
IS13	0.475	**0.843**	0.532	0.441	0.392	0.213	0.230	0.168	0.545	0.481	0.322	0.604	0.336	0.420	0.344
IS14	0.441	**0.900**	0.512	0.397	0.374	0.203	0.221	0.149	0.545	0.472	0.339	0.588	0.363	0.468	0.348
IS15	0.452	**0.886**	0.516	0.397	0.378	0.196	0.211	0.139	0.570	0.495	0.341	0.611	0.373	0.475	0.351
KG1	0.418	0.514	**0.874**	0.576	0.554	0.254	0.292	0.188	0.570	0.605	0.434	0.522	0.465	0.475	0.490
KG2	0.395	0.481	**0.893**	0.627	0.608	0.223	0.327	0.177	0.543	0.603	0.504	0.513	0.533	0.513	0.532
KG4	0.436	0.575	**0.892**	0.624	0.592	0.254	0.296	0.210	0.589	0.608	0.451	0.567	0.476	0.516	0.484
KG10	0.383	0.456	**0.800**	0.676	0.734	0.241	0.245	0.163	0.526	0.542	0.374	0.469	0.397	0.435	0.428
KG6	0.357	0.411	0.679	**0.826**	0.633	0.212	0.241	0.175	0.488	0.524	0.378	0.430	0.380	0.390	0.424
KG7	0.358	0.433	0.715	**0.830**	0.702	0.254	0.267	0.224	0.524	0.550	0.376	0.464	0.406	0.409	0.423
KG12	0.278	0.236	0.378	**0.716**	0.565	0.128	0.102	0.104	0.293	0.289	0.173	0.268	0.187	0.208	0.194
KG14	0.298	0.279	0.383	**0.701**	0.505	0.197	0.139	0.160	0.329	0.324	0.184	0.313	0.183	0.245	0.202
KG9	0.289	0.313	0.571	0.659	**0.856**	0.194	0.176	0.174	0.408	0.420	0.289	0.341	0.319	0.323	0.297
KG11	0.367	0.442	0.744	0.686	**0.867**	0.238	0.277	0.182	0.537	0.567	0.421	0.476	0.440	0.445	0.478
KG13	0.286	0.307	0.507	0.662	**0.827**	0.196	0.157	0.155	0.392	0.410	0.246	0.330	0.261	0.274	0.295
TS1	0.200	0.215	0.257	0.243	0.224	**0.882**	0.243	0.530	0.287	0.257	0.113	0.226	0.129	0.158	0.115
TS2	0.206	0.205	0.269	0.228	0.217	**0.872**	0.342	0.512	0.289	0.289	0.176	0.246	0.198	0.219	0.174
TS3	0.203	0.211	0.240	0.233	0.230	**0.893**	0.284	0.540	0.278	0.253	0.122	0.222	0.140	0.170	0.122
TS4	0.164	0.193	0.224	0.217	0.201	**0.877**	0.267	0.563	0.253	0.224	0.125	0.212	0.143	0.178	0.130
TPG1	0.191	0.252	0.340	0.246	0.236	0.307	**0.911**	0.263	0.300	0.339	0.322	0.268	0.347	0.298	0.573
TPG4	0.184	0.233	0.302	0.229	0.223	0.281	**0.918**	0.252	0.293	0.328	0.315	0.266	0.340	0.302	0.562
TPG6	0.153	0.222	0.273	0.219	0.205	0.290	**0.896**	0.313	0.271	0.299	0.275	0.229	0.293	0.239	0.460
TPT1	0.169	0.158	0.187	0.206	0.196	0.566	0.254	**0.898**	0.236	0.208	0.073	0.157	0.082	0.113	0.080
TPT2	0.143	0.157	0.189	0.178	0.166	0.500	0.293	**0.880**	0.265	0.245	0.127	0.192	0.132	0.153	0.145
TPT3	0.172	0.149	0.199	0.207	0.184	0.568	0.302	**0.917**	0.272	0.240	0.111	0.173	0.127	0.145	0.123
TPT4	0.152	0.149	0.196	0.206	0.180	0.569	0.254	**0.925**	0.258	0.236	0.091	0.177	0.110	0.132	0.112
KKG4	0.530	0.465	0.499	0.461	0.430	0.329	0.173	0.310	**0.737**	0.614	0.306	0.485	0.337	0.387	0.295
KKG6	0.365	0.429	0.480	0.451	0.428	0.242	0.220	0.249	**0.782**	0.652	0.369	0.485	0.377	0.425	0.369
KKG7	0.381	0.608	0.579	0.456	0.455	0.254	0.304	0.217	**0.889**	0.748	0.470	0.572	0.512	0.591	0.497
KKG9	0.382	0.602	0.571	0.454	0.452	0.250	0.316	0.199	**0.885**	0.746	0.476	0.560	0.513	0.587	0.504
KKG12	0.326	0.434	0.492	0.410	0.395	0.219	0.263	0.205	**0.777**	0.724	0.445	0.460	0.453	0.470	0.427
KKG10	0.361	0.469	0.534	0.437	0.413	0.274	0.253	0.229	0.722	**0.784**	0.409	0.495	0.417	0.459	0.431
KKG5	0.387	0.447	0.628	0.542	0.549	0.282	0.293	0.239	0.758	**0.803**	0.450	0.516	0.478	0.484	0.480

KKG13	0.356	0.458	0.522	0.426	0.428	0.221	0.308	0.208	0.725	**0.847**	0.512	0.519	0.540	0.549	0.476
KKG14	0.372	0.470	0.585	0.485	0.457	0.231	0.293	0.208	0.735	**0.867**	0.488	0.518	0.500	0.536	0.494
KKG15	0.347	0.460	0.591	0.494	0.483	0.269	0.271	0.225	0.703	**0.848**	0.434	0.526	0.468	0.498	0.463
KKG16	0.426	0.435	0.526	0.468	0.431	0.246	0.244	0.226	0.675	**0.802**	0.387	0.486	0.418	0.448	0.377
KKG17	0.352	0.437	0.546	0.409	0.412	0.199	0.359	0.175	0.676	**0.821**	0.553	0.495	0.585	0.565	0.545
PKG3	0.297	0.355	0.440	0.334	0.339	0.153	0.289	0.118	0.454	0.491	**0.839**	0.468	0.662	0.592	0.499
PKG6	0.278	0.333	0.462	0.315	0.333	0.113	0.312	0.069	0.445	0.498	**0.867**	0.470	0.751	0.688	0.549
PKG7	0.278	0.293	0.391	0.312	0.295	0.122	0.247	0.096	0.399	0.451	**0.838**	0.447	0.623	0.592	0.442
PKG9	0.334	0.413	0.469	0.382	0.356	0.211	0.255	0.149	0.505	0.544	0.588	**0.766**	0.630	0.722	0.445
PKG12	0.547	0.718	0.539	0.447	0.413	0.234	0.225	0.190	0.557	0.505	0.363	**0.848**	0.378	0.435	0.369
PKG17	0.432	0.583	0.441	0.359	0.332	0.172	0.181	0.127	0.457	0.408	0.300	**0.822**	0.323	0.377	0.310
PKG1	0.292	0.369	0.475	0.368	0.360	0.175	0.339	0.111	0.484	0.525	0.683	0.498	**0.840**	0.635	0.535
PKG4	0.250	0.295	0.410	0.276	0.305	0.111	0.275	0.095	0.415	0.465	0.670	0.444	**0.835**	0.629	0.456
PKG11	0.279	0.386	0.479	0.346	0.357	0.150	0.292	0.109	0.467	0.521	0.677	0.521	**0.851**	0.730	0.491
PKG5	0.305	0.314	0.429	0.315	0.332	0.154	0.251	0.128	0.449	0.494	0.661	0.474	0.683	**0.785**	0.453
PKG8	0.309	0.528	0.502	0.377	0.363	0.179	0.269	0.115	0.552	0.526	0.609	0.599	0.645	**0.872**	0.473
PKG10	0.316	0.482	0.499	0.379	0.361	0.191	0.263	0.140	0.550	0.553	0.616	0.628	0.690	**0.892**	0.473
PKG19	0.312	0.396	0.548	0.414	0.418	0.155	0.554	0.126	0.502	0.548	0.561	0.459	0.563	0.521	**0.959**
PKG20	0.307	0.385	0.524	0.397	0.398	0.140	0.567	0.117	0.493	0.543	0.566	0.455	0.563	0.530	**0.959**

Discriminant validity was determined using Fornell Locker criterion values and HTMT ratios. Table 4 shows the study results for Fornell Locker and shows that the double correlation values (top and right values) are always greater than the bottom and left values for each construct. This shows the validity of the discrimination received.

Table 4: Discriminant Validity with Fornell-Larcker Criterion

	School Climate	**Teachers' Job Satisfaction**	**Teachers' commitment**	**Teachers' Motivation**	**Teachers' Work Performance**
School Climate	0.721				
Teachers Job Satisfaction	0.626	0.792			
Teachers' Commitment	0.585	0.677	0.734		
Teachers' Motivation	0.293	0.386	0.340	0.715	
Teachers' Work Performance	0.580	0.707	0.603	0.306	0.722

Table 5 shows the HTMT ratios for each construct. All values of the HTMT ratio showed good discriminant validity. Therefore, this confirms that the constructor has the legality of discrimination.

Table 5: Validity of Discrimination with HTMT Ratio

	School Climate	**Teachers' Job Satisfaction**	**Teachers' Commitment**	**Teachers' Motivation**	**Teachers' Work Performance**
School Climate					
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	0.668				
Teachers' Commitment	0.630	0.717			
Teachers' Motivation	0.330	0.430	0.379		
Teachers' Work Performance	0.644	0.759	0.648	0.362	

5. Structure Model Evaluation

The structural model evaluation is based on the accepted structural model. In assessing this structural model, the determination of the hydraulic issues is determined by determining the

VIF value. In addition, the accuracy and relevance of the forecasting model relationships are done by determining R^2 values and effect sizes, f^2 for prediction accuracy and Q^2 value estimation and effect sizes, q^2 for forecasting relevance.

The issue of collinearity is determined by measuring the value of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). Each indicator should have a VIF value of less than five (VIF <5). If there are indicators that have more than five VIFs, they should be dropped, merged into a single index or formed a higher-level construct to solve the collinearity problem. Table 6 shows that all VIF values are less than 5. This indicates that there are no structural issues in this structural model.

Table 6: Collinearity Assessment Result

	School Climate	Teachers' Job Satisfaction	Teachers' Commitment	Teachers' Motivation	Teachers' Work Performance
School Climate					
Teachers' Job Satisfaction					1.000
Teachers' Commitment		1.595			1.000
Teachers' Motivation		1.148	0.379		

Table 7: Research Findings $H_0$1 – $H_0$7

Hypothesis	Relationships	Path coefficient, β	t-value	p-value	Findings
H1	School Climate – Teachers' Work Performance	0.181	7.981	0.000	Supported
H2	Teachers' Commitment – Teachers' Work Performance	0.178	7.208	0.000	Supported
H3	Teachers' Motivation – Teachers' Work Performance	0.016	0.964	0.168	Not Supported
H4	Teachers' Job Satisfaction – Teachers' Work Performance	0.466	16.673	0.000	Supported
H5	School Climate –Teachers' Job Satisfaction – Teachers' Work Performance	0.153	11.309	0.000	Supported
H6	Teachers' Commitment – Teachers' Job Satisfaction – Teachers' Work Performance	0.204	12.533	0.000	Supported
H7	Teachers' Motivation – Teachers' Job Satisfaction – Teachers' Work Performance	0.066	7.473	0.000	Supported

Table 7 showed the results of the relationships and indirect effect between the construct all are significant except H3. This result had proven that teachers' job satisfaction was a catalyst for teachers' motivation and teachers' work performance. This showed that the relationship between teachers' motivation and teachers' work performance was due to teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 3: Importance-Performance Matrix Analysis (IPMA) decision on teachers' work performance

Construct	Importance	Performance
School Climate	0.290	71.538
Teachers' Commitment	0.292	70.943
Teachers' Motivation	0.063	67.882
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	0.377	71.902

Table 3 showed that teachers' commitment was the second most important factor in constructing teachers' job satisfaction, followed by school climate while teachers' motivation was at the lowest importance level.

6. Discussions

The findings of the study found that there is a significant relationship between both school climate and teachers' work performance. This finding implies that if teacher leadership and teacher interaction among teachers is high, it will increase the teacher's performance. The role of an administrator is as important as the motivator of an organization in achieving its goals.

The findings of the study also have shown that there is a significant positive direct relationship between the three factors of teachers' commitment and teachers' work performance. This finding implies that if affective commitment, ongoing commitment and normative commitment are high, then teacher performance is also high. Members with high affective commitment will not leave the organization because of them (Beck & Wilson, 2000). Ongoing commitment refers to awareness of the impact of leaving an organization and the benefits that come from staying in an organization. These employees remain in the organization because they need to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1997). This aspect of normative commitment reflects a sense of obligation to continue working.

The results also have shown that there is no significant direct relationship between the three factors of teachers' motivation and teachers' work performance. Teaching tasks are an important aspect of teachers' work practices. Öztürk (2011) states that the role of teachers has changed as a result of globalization, advanced technology, and educational change. Side-by-side work is also an important aspect of teacher performance. This is supported by the study of Brante (2009) and Öztürk (2011) who also agree that increasing the number of side jobs over the years affects the teachers' work performance. Administrative tasks also have impact on the teacher performance.

The results also showed that there is a significant direct relationship between the three factors of teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' work performance. This finding implies that if the job satisfaction of the teacher in terms of extrinsic and intrinsic factors is high, then the teacher's work performance is also high. The findings of both of the above factors support the two-factor theory. According to Herzberg (1959), there are two types of factors that motivate one to strive for satisfaction and to avoid dissatisfaction.

Findings show that teacher job satisfaction mediated the relationship between school climate and teachers' work performance, teachers' commitment and teachers' work performance, and teachers' motivation and teachers' work performance. Among the theories and models tested are Locke and Latham's Theory of Purpose (Locke & Latham, 2006), Theory of Behaviorism by Skinner (Skinner, 1977), The Two Factors Theory by Herzberg (1959), Theory of

Expectation by Dr. Martin Fishbein (1970), Source-Based Theory by Henri (2006), Continuous Improvement Model by Kaye and Dyason (1994), Steers' Commitment Model by Steers (1977), McClelland's Needs Model by McClelland (1958), Lawler's Model by Lawler (1971), The Effective Organization Model by Mott (1972) and the Job Demand-Resources Model have been used to support teachers' job satisfaction factors that influence teachers' work performance. The importance-performance matrix analysis (IPMA) has shown that teachers' job satisfaction was the most important factor.

7. Conclusion

The value of R^2 on teachers' job satisfaction is 0.558 at the 95% confidence level. This means that school climate, teachers' commitment, teachers' motivation and teachers' job satisfaction all change in a systematic manner by sharing 55.8% of the change. Hence, it shows that there is a correlation between teacher change patterns of 55.8% explained by changes in school climate, teachers' commitment and teachers' motivation, while 44.2% change is explained by other factors. The f^2 values for teacher performance were most likely to be teacher motivation (0.000), followed by teachers' commitment (0.035), followed by school climate (0.041) and finally teachers' job satisfaction (0.213). This indicates that teachers' motivation is a substantive effect on teachers' work performance compared to teachers' commitment, school climate and teachers' job satisfaction. The findings show that the Q^2 values for teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' work performance were 0.326 and 0.265, respectively. All values are greater than 0.15 but less than 0.35. Therefore, the model has relevant predictions at the intermediate level. Implications of the findings indicate that education needs to be given priority as a major challenge in the education sector. This is because they are an important asset in determining student success in school.

References

Amin M, Shah R U, Ayaz M and Atta M A 2013 Gom. Univ. J. Res 29 100-4

Bakker, A. and Demerouti, E. (2007), "The Job Demands- Resources model: state of the art", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 309-328.

Beck, K and Wilson, C. (2000). Development of Affective Organizational Commitment: A Cross Sequential Examinations of Change with Tenure. Journal of Vocational Behaviour. 56(1), 114-136.

Brante, G. (2009). "Multitasking and Synchronous Work: Complexities in Teacher Work." Teaching and Teacher Education 25, no 3: 430–36

Chan, K. C., Gee, M. V., & Steiner, T. L. (2000). Employee happiness and corporate financial performance. Financial Practice and Education, 10, 47–52.

Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organizations. International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business System, 1(1), 1-20

Ellinger, A. D., Ellinger, A. E., Yang, B., & Howton, S. W. (2002). The relationship between the learning organization concept and firm's financial performance: An empirical assessment. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 13, 5–22.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A primer in partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM). London: SAGE Publications Inc.

Henri, J. F. (2006), 'Management control systems and strategy: A resource-based perspective', Accounting, Organizations and Society, 31, pp. 529-558.

Herzberg, F. (1957). The Motivation to work, 2nd Edition, John Wiley.

Hoffman, B.J., Blair, C.A., Meriac, J.P & Woehr, D.J. (2007). Expanding the criterion

domain? A qualitative review of the OCB literature. Journal of Applied psychology, 92 (2), 555-566.

Hornby. (2006). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Oxford University Press.

Howard, E. R. (1974). School climate improvement. Education Digest, 39(8), 333-336.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). Open school/healthy schools: measuring organizational climate. London, UK: Sage

Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: the mediating role of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(4), 945-959.

Jaafar Muhamad. 2007. Kelakuan Organisasi. Petaling Jaya: Leeds Publication.

Kaye, M.M. & Dyason, M.D. (1994). Continuous quality improvement - Pathway to excellence. Pemas International Conference.

Khairi Saleh Shakuna, Norhisham Mohamad & Asbi B. Ali (2016). The Effect of School Administration and Educational Supervision on Teachers teaching performance: Training Programs as a Mediator Variable. Asian Social Science; Vol. 12, No. 10; 2016. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/viewFile/62350/33891

Lawler, E. E. (1971). Pay and organizational effectiveness: a psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lim Mui Ken & Mohamad Nizam Nazarudin. (2014) Kepimpinan Pengajaran Guru Besar Dan Hubungannya Dengan Komitmen Dan Kepuasan Kerja Guru SJKC Di Daerah Sandakan, Sabah. International Conference on Education 2014 (ICEdu14) Proceedings Vol. 1 (Part 1), 79-101.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15(5), 265-268

McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). Commitment in the workplace, theory research and application.
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mott P E (1972), The Characteristics of Effective Organizations, Harper and Row: New York.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., and Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

Mustafa, M., & Othman, N. (2010). The effect of work motivation on teacher's work performance in pekan baru senior high schools, Riau Province, Indonesia. SOSIOHUMANIKA, 3(2), 259-272.

Öztürk, İ. H. (2011). Curriculum reform and teacher autonomy in Turkey: The case of the history teaching. International Journal of Instruction, 4 (2), 113-128.

Ringle, Christian M., Wende, Sven, & Becker, Jan-Michael. (2015). SmartPLS 3. Bönningstedt: SmartPLS. Retrieved from http://www.smartpls.com

Russell, M. (2017). The Relationships among Autonomy, Job Satisfaction and Motivation. Thesis. University Of North Georgia.

Sarimah Ismail & Faridatul Akmar Talip. 2010. Kepuasan Bekerja Staf Akademik Jabatan Pendidikan Teknikal dan Kejuruteraan. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai. 1-7. (Unpublished).

Shokrkon, H. & Naami, A. (2009). The Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job Performance in Ahvaz Factory Workers. Journal of Education & Psychology, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 39-52.

Stirs , Porter, (1991). Motivation and work behavior,p.257

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship

with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293–315. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248

Skinner, B. F. (1977). Why I am not a cognitive psychologist. Behaviorism, 5(2), 1-10.

Steers, R.M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative
Science Quarterly, 1977, 22, 46-56.

Weiss, D. J. , Dawis, R. V. England, G. W. and Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Vol. 22, Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. International Journal of Stress Management, 14, 121–141.

Zablon, M. O, Odongo, B. & Raburu, P. (2016). Motivational Factors Influencing Teachers Job Performance in Pre-School Centers in Kenya. InternationalJournal of Innovative Research and Development, Vol 5 Issue 5, PP 121-132