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The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and the performance of lecturers through workload and motivation. Education in higher education institutions requires support especially from adequate human resources so that the education process can run well, especially in the health sector. Lecturers greatly influence the quality of the lecture process and the quality of the output produced by the higher education institution. To achieve this, a lecturer is expected to have social sensitivity and academic competence in transforming existing knowledge to their students. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour on lecturer performance through workload and motivation. The results of the study using structural equation modeling (SEM) approach show that the model of lecturer performance with the SEM approach is a fit model based on GoF criteria. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) with loyalty indicators (0.854) and compliance aspects (0.823) have a significant and positive effect on workload (Y1) and work motivation (Y2). workload (Y1) with indicators Participating in Cooperation Teams in Learning Activities (Y1.8) (0.770) and Attending Departmental Meetings (Y1.10) (0.741) significant and positive influence on Motivation (Y2) and Lecturer Performance (Y3 ). Work Motivation (Y2) with indicators Having High Risk in Action (Y2.3) (0.918) and Trying to Do Something with New and Creative Ways (Y2.1) (0.849) have a significant and positive effect on Lecturer Performance (Y3) with indicators of academic qualifications and performance on teaching (Y3.1) (0.923) and Perceptions of Pedagogic, Professional, Social and Personality Competencies (Y3.2).
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Introduction

Education in higher education institutions requires support especially from adequate human resources so that the educational process can run well. Likewise, for health institutions, as higher education institutions that specifically deal with the health sector, human resources personnel will be more specialised in their fields, especially for existing lecturers. Lecturer educational background and good performance from lecturers will greatly influence the quality of the lecture process and the quality of output produced by the higher education institution. To achieve this, a lecturer is expected to have social sensitivity, academic competence, and emotional intelligence in transforming existing knowledge to their students (Muzenda, 2013).

The dynamics of life on campus not only demands the resilience of lecturers physically but also demands the resilience and readiness of lecturers both in the provision of lecture materials and in managing emotions amid the dynamics of student behaviour (Maina, 2013). This is also because the transformation of education is directed to the formation of superior personalities by focusing on the maturation process of the quality of logic, heart, character, and faith in students who will be the successors of a nation's progress (Winarti & Suharnomo, 2015).

Health institutions that are part of higher education the institutions also have the same role as high civilisations in general, namely the process of transforming scientific education from lecturers to students in accordance with the scientific fields they understand. Thus, a lecturer is required to be able to optimise their ability in managing time, energy and mind in order to achieve optimal performance. Good and optimal performance from a lecturer will affect the output or output of students who are educated and the institution where the lecturer is devoted to his knowledge, and to achieve this condition, a leader of higher education institutions is needed to actualise their leadership in the institution they lead (Mokone, 2011).

In the city of Banjarmasin, the capital of the province of South Kalimantan, there are four health institutions or institutes that are quite influential which will be used as research locations. The four health institutions or institutes are respectively: (1) the Midwifery Academy and the Sari Mulia College of Health; (2) College of Health Sciences, Asylum Asylum; (3) Nursing Academy Kesdam VI / Tanjungpura; (4) National Light Health College; (5) Pandan Harum Nursing Academy; and (6) Borneo Husada Health College.

Of the six institutions, each institution has different characteristics, such as: (1) STIKES Sari Mulia, newly established in 2009, accredited 'B', with 74 lecturers; and under the auspices of the Indah Foundation, which is managed by private management; (2) STIKES Suaka Insan, established in 2007, is accredited "B", with 31 lecturers and under the auspices of the Suaka Insan Foundation, which is managed by the Sisters of the Nuns of the Saint Paul Congregation of Chartres; (3) AKPER Kesdam VI / Tanjungpura, established in 2002, accredited "C", with 21 lecturers, and under the auspices of Wahana Bakti Karya Husada Foundation managed by Kesdam VI / Tanjungpura; (4) Cahaya Bangsa College of Health Sciences, established in 2003,
accredited 'B', with 22 lecturers, and under the auspices of the Cahaya Bangsa Foundation; (5) Pandan Harum Nursing Academy Banjarmasin, established in 2001, accredited 'C', with 21 lecturers, and under the auspices of the Abdi Foundation in South Kalimantan; and (6) Husband Borneo University of Health Sciences (STIKES), established in 2008, accredited 'C', with 17 lecturers, and under the auspices of the Borneo Husada Foundation. Some of the root causes of the general problems that surfaced in the four health institutions at the time the researcher conducted preliminary studies in the period of June 16 and 17, 2017 which affected the performance of lecturers were like the existence of sectoral ego of each Study Program, there was no assessment. clear performance, and the absence of a centre of excellence, which can be used as a reference for enhancing the professional competence and capacity of existing lecturers and institutions that protect them.

The six health tertiary education institutions characterised as health institutions, with the condition of differences in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in the four institutions. The peculiarities of each OCB from the four educational institutions are as follows:

First, for Sari Mulia STIKES, it puts more emphasis on active loyalty and participation, which in this case is reflected in the information presented by the Director of Midwifery Academy, Head of the D-IV Study Program Midwifery; Head of S-1 Nursing Study Program; and the Head of the Institute for Research and Community Service, LPPM on the initial observation on June 16, 2017. At this time, the four have the same opinion that the loyalty that the lecturers have is more because the role of the leader in the institution is democratic, whereas the Chairperson of the STIKES or leader of the institution is fatherhood that prioritises the nature of wanting to hear, exemplify, and provide solutions through discussion forums if there are things that need to be decided; however, there is still a clear performance appraisal indicator from the institution.

Second, for the STIKES Suaka Insan, it is more emphasised on compliance, which in this case is reflected in the information presented by the Deputy Chair 1 STIKES who stated that the institution under the Nun Sister Foundation prioritises personhood, compliance, and service motivation, but in taking campus decisions or policies are handed over to each deputy chairman, because the chairman has entrusted the mandate to each of those who get their duties, and with regard to the assessment of the performance of lecturers, it depends entirely on the decisions of the leadership.

Third, for AKPER Kesdam VI / Tanjungpura, it is more emphasised on organic compliance in military nuances, which in this case is reflected in the information put forward by one of the senior lecturers who stated that the AKPER institution is a military institution that promotes disciplinary values so that the instructions from the boss is a mandate that must be implemented, as well as a performance appraisal where it is still felt there are no clear benchmarks.

Fourth, for the National Light Health College, the priority is more on compliance, which in this case is reflected in the information put forward by one of the senior lecturers who stated that in
order to achieve adequate lecturer performance, we should have lecturers only able to obey what has become provisions of foundations and institutions.

Fifth, the Nursing Academy Pandan Harum Banjarmasin, prioritises participation, which in this case is reflected in the information presented by Deputy Director 1 which suggests that in order to achieve adequate lecturer performance, we should teach the lecturers to prioritise participation in campus development as shown in there is compliance in carrying out his duties as a lecturer.

Sixth, for STIKES Borneo Husada puts more emphasis on loyalty, which in this case is reflected in the information presented by the Chairperson of STIKES which suggests that with good loyalty from the lecturers it will affect the performance of lecturers in order to improve the quality of education in the institution.

With regard to the above conditions, this is also like the results of several previous studies such as those conducted by Owston, et al (2011); Mokone (2011); Maina (2013); Supriyanto (2016) who argued that most lecturers' performance was strongly influenced by workload, work environment, and rewards in the form of decent remuneration. Likewise, research conducted by Traphagan, et al (2009); Taplin, et al (2011); Muzenda (2013) pursues the leadership of higher education institutions, the duration or tenure of lecturers, and the performance of a lecturer at several universities in different places, indicating that the length of work does not necessarily guarantee that the lecturer will perform well, because the performance of the lecturer is also influenced by several factors such as one's leadership in higher education institutions, gender, age, lecturer workload, and organisational atmosphere.

Further research conducted by Van Zanten et al (2012); Hermino (2017) argues that the non-optimal workload provided by the leader of higher education institutions will affect the performance of the lecturer, but the effects of stress arising from the workload can be minimised if the agency leader can manage the effectiveness of adequate time duration in the distribution of hours of giving lecture material. This condition is also in line as stated by Soong et al (2006); Hermino & Viengdavong (2017) who argued that the cultural factors of the origin of the leader applied to higher education institutions in the region not the origin of the leader greatly influenced the performance of an educator. This is because the culture of the region of origin and the culture of the region where higher education is located influences the organisation climate both in the decision making process and in the implementation of the decision. This occurs right up to the decision making on conditions during the implementation of policies in an organisation.

Owens (1985) and Hermino (2013) state that supporting theories for performance are individual performance theory models which consist of ability and skill variables, personal and demographic backgrounds. Ability and skill variables are factors that directly influence work behaviour and individual performance. Personal and demographic background variables have
an indirect effect. Demographic variables indicate that the existence of environmental influences, one of which is work motivation in implementing lecturer performance.

The lecturer as a campus responsibility in the classroom learning process to their students is obliged to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the lecture material provided. Lecturers in the implementation of learning are required to have leadership elements, namely: (1) having a strong personality; (2) understanding the condition of colleagues, employees and students; (3) having a vision and understanding the high civil servant mission where the lecturer teaches; (4) having the ability to make decisions; and (5) communication skills (Reinhartz & Beach, 2004; Hermino, 2013).

Wilson (2010) states in path-goal theory that there is a relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour and subordinate performance and work activities. This theory explains the importance of leaders helping their members achieve goals and provide direction, or support or both that are needed to ensure that goals are achieved in accordance with organisational goals. Lecturers in achieving these goals require management functions in the form of: planning, organising, actuating and controlling. Lecturers must also ensure their role as leaders in the learning process to their students with the ability to position themselves as: educators, managers, administrators, supervisors, leaders, innovators and motivators can be carried out. Lecturers are expected to be able to manage and empower their students in improving their learning abilities. Nasir et al (2017) stated that the workload affects work morale as a desire and sincerity of someone doing their work well and disciplined to achieve maximum work performance. To get the conditions of the lecturers' performance that are adequate, a stimulus is needed that can motivate lecturers to carry out their duties well (Bryman, 2007).

Methods related to latent variables are Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) (Brown, 2006) and SEM (Mulaik, 2009; Raykov & Marcoulides, 2006; Hair et.al., 2006; Bollen, 1989). Several studies related to SEM, namely Setiadi et al. (2017), work ethic with indicators as actualisation (78.8%), calls (74.2%) and worship (72.6%) are influenced by work climate and work discipline, while work productivity seen from measurements found that those who work with academic skills and skills development (efficacy) 82.2%, which works with the principle of effectiveness of 76.5% and that works using an efficient principle 84.0% is influenced by the work climate, work discipline and work ethic. Work ethic has an indirect influence on the work climate on work productivity. Sompie et al., (2015), with the Structural Equation Modeling approach, shows that the choice of transportation modes during weekends is influenced by economic status, activity patterns and service satisfaction. Activity patterns provide the greatest influence on transportation modes. Eddi et al. (2015) explain taxpayers' satisfaction in parking business is influenced by the quality of taxpayer services, the level of satisfaction of taxpayers and the attitude of taxpayers. Local tax regulations do not affect the attitude of taxpayers in the parking business sector. The level of satisfaction of taxpayers provides the greatest indirect effect on the quality of taxpayer services to taxpayer compliance in the field of parking businesses. Rusdi, et al. (2015, 2014), state that taxpayer satisfaction in the hotel business sector
is influenced by the quality of taxpayer services, the level of satisfaction of taxpayers and the attitude of taxpayers. Local tax regulations do not affect the attitude of taxpayers in the hotel business sector. The level of satisfaction of taxpayers provides the greatest indirect effect on the quality of taxpayer services to taxpayer compliance in the field of hotel business.

This study examines indicators and variables that affect lecturer performance and their impact theoretically, which is then compiled into a theoretical model that will be proven by empirical data. This research is expected to provide information on improving the performance of lecturers in higher education institutions.

**Method**

This research is a descriptive correlation with a quantitative approach, because research data is collected in the form of numbers and intends to test certain hypotheses (Bryman, 2007). Creswell (2005) states descriptive because there are attempts to display the phenomena observed at the moment, while correlational means to analyse and explain the relationship between variables studied based on the correlation coefficient.

The design of this study uses a survey model. Survey research has characteristics, namely: a) data collected from a sample originating from a predetermined population, b) data relating to an opinion, perception and a matter at a time, collected in a relatively short time, and c) the data collected is then analysed by various methods, depending on the conclusions of the data collected.

The variables that will be tested for their relationship in this study are the performance of lecturers (Y), organisational citizenship behaviour (X1), workload (X2), emotional intelligence (X3), and work motivation (X4). These variables consist of endogenous variables (dependent variables) in this case lecturer performance (Y), while exogenous variables (independent variables) include: organisational citizenship behaviour (X1), workload (X2), emotional intelligence (X3), and work motivation (X4).

This research was conducted with the aim to obtain a clear picture of the presence or absence of the relationship between exogenous and endogenous variables, analysed by modeling structural equations. The data analysis with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is processed with the Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) software.
Population and Research Sample

Population
Creswell (2014) states that a population is all data that is of concern to researchers in a given scope and time. Sugiyono (2013) argues that a population is an area of generalisation that consists of objects / subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics applied by researchers to be studied and whose conclusions can then be drawn.

In this study the population is six health institutions in Banjarmasin with the number of permanent lecturers as many as 186 lecturers in the year 2017/2018.

Sample
Sugiyono (2013) suggests that the sample is part of the population. Furthermore, regarding the limits of sampling, if the number of subjects is less than 100 people then it is better to take all, so that the research is a total population research (Sukmadinata, 2008).

Sugiyono (2013) suggests that samples taken from the population must be truly representative. Based on the performance table of individuals with an error level of 5%, the sample with N (population), 186 lecturers found S (sample) of 127 lecturers.

The sample in this study was continued by proportional random sampling technique, the sample size was searched by using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(d^2)}$$

Remarks:
N = numbers of population
n = numbers of sample
d = desired level of trust (Sugiyono, 2013)

Based on the formula above, the sample size is determined:

$$n = \frac{186}{1 + 186(0.05^2)}$$

= 127 sample

So, the total number of samples is 127 people. In this study the sample was determined through the steps of determining the proportional random sampling technique from each member of the
sub-population based on the number of schools studied, so that the following samples were obtained:

\[
Proportional\ Sample = \frac{Population\ of\ School}{Total\ of\ Population} \times Total\ of\ Sample
\]

The data in this study uses primary data at health institutions in Banjarmasin, obtained through questionnaires to lecturers (Levy & Stanley, 1999). Then, the analysis is done by CFA and SEM methods. CFA is part of the Structural Equation Modeling method. According to Brown (2006), CFA is not a method for finding factor structures, but rather confirming the existence of a specific factor structure. One of the advantages of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis is the degree of flexibility when applied to a complex hypothesis model. The estimation method in CFA uses maximum likelihood which can determine the optimal value in the loading factor. The basic principle of CFA is to begin by confirming a number of factors (problem dimensions) for each dimension to be investigated in depth using several theoretical indicators that have strong theoretical support and to test a theory or concept of a process or phenomenon.

The measurement model of one latent variable is presented in the following figure. In the form of a matrix, it can be written as:

\[
X = \Lambda_x \xi + \delta
\]

Remarks:
- \( X \): matriks variable indicator
- \( \Lambda_x \): matriks lambda (loading factor)
- \( \xi \): matriks variabel laten
- \( \delta \): error

Suppose a latent variable can be measured by two indicators \((p = 2)\), then, the following equation will be obtained:

\[
x_1 = \lambda_1 x + \delta_1 ; \quad x_2 = \lambda_2 x + \delta_2
\]

To find out whether the indicator variables are significant in forming constructs that explain the factor dimensions (unidimensionality) t-test statistics are used (Brown, 2006). The hypothesis used is as follows:

- \( H_0 : \lambda_i = 0 \) (loading factor, not significant in measuring latent variables)
- \( H_1 : \lambda_i \neq 0 \), \( i = 1, 2, ..., p \) (loading factor, significant in measuring latent variables)

Where: \( i = 1, 2, ..., p \) is variable indicator.

Test statistics for loading factors are:
\[
T = \frac{\hat{\lambda}}{SE(\hat{\lambda})}
\]

(3)

When \( T < |t(\alpha, df)| \) then Reject H0 and estimation of causal relationship parameters (regression coefficients) is significant in measuring causal relationships so that it is said to form unidimensionality.

SEM modeling basically consists of measurement models and structural models. The research variable consists of four latent variables namely: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X), Workload (Y1), Motivation (Y2), and Lecturer Performance (Y3). Conceptual research is presented as follows.

The measurement model consists of convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is seen in the loading factor value greater than 0.5 and the Critical Ratio (CR) value is greater than T table, and the latent variable meets the unidimensional nature. While discriminant validity is seen in the correlation value between small latent variables, or covariance values between latent variables are not significant.

### Results and Discussion

A validity test was carried out using confirmatory factor analysis on each latent variable namely Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X), Workload (Y1), Motivation (Y2), and Lecturer Performance (Y3). Reliability test used composite reliability with a cut off value is a minimum of 0.7. The results of testing the complete model with the AMOS program can be seen in the following Table 2.

Table 2 shows that all indicators of each latent variable have a loading factor above 0.5 with a p-value smaller than \( \alpha = 0.05 \), then the indicator is valid and significant. Furthermore, it also gives the p-value variance error smaller than 0.05 and the C-R value above the cut-off value of 0.5 so that it can be said of all the indicators and reliable latent variables. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour’s (X) dominant form is loyalty (0.854) and compliance aspects (0.823). Workload (Y1) dominant indicator is to participate in cooperation teams in learning activities (Y1.8) (0.770) and attend department meetings (Y1.10) (0.741). Motivation (Y2) with a dominant indicator having a high risk in action (Y2.3) (0.918) and trying to do something in new and creative ways (Y2.1) (0.849). Dominant Lecturer Performance Academic qualifications and performance in teaching (Y3.1) (0.923) and Perceptions of Pedagogic, Professional, Social and Personality Competencies (Y3.2) (0.878).
The assumptions that must be met in structural modeling are normal multivariate assumptions, non singularities and no outliers. Multivariate normal test statistically can be seen from the Pearson Correlation value between \( dj \) and \( q \). If a significance level of 5 percent is used, then the Pearson Correlation value between \( dj \) and \( q \) is more than 0.5 (\( p < \alpha = 0.05 \)) or \( z \) around 0.5 is said to be multivariate normally distributed data. Pearson Correlation value between \( dj \) and \( q \) is 0.985 or \( p = 0.000 < \alpha = 0.05 \), and \( z = 59.0051 \) so that it can be said that the data has a normal multivariate distribution. Outlier test results based on Mahalanobis value which is greater than Chi-square table or \( p_1 \) value <0.001 is said to be outlier observation. In this study there were four data outliers, so outliers did not occur. Determinant of sample covariance matrix value is 0.198. This value is not equal to zero so it can be said that there is no singularity problem in the data.

Goodness of Fit Structural OCB Model Against Lecturer Performance Through Workload, and complete motivation with AMOS program can be seen in the following Table 3.

Table 3 shows that eight criteria used to assess the feasibility of a model turned out to be good and good enough. It can be said that the model can be accepted, which means there is a match between the model and the data.

From the appropriate model, each path coefficient can be interpreted. These path coefficients are hypotheses in this study, which can be presented in the following structural equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
Y_1 &= 0.625 X \\
Y_2 &= 0.443 X + 0.377 Y_1 \\
Y_3 &= 0.450 Y_1 + 0.232 Y_2
\end{align*}
\]

Where:

- \( X \) : OCB
- \( Y_1 \) : Work Load
- \( Y_2 \) : Motivation
- \( Y_3 \) : Lecture Performance

The path coefficient test in Figure 3 and the above equation in detail is presented in the following Table 3.

Based on Table 4, each research hypothesis can be interpreted as follows:

a. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) has a positive and significant effect on Workload (Y1). This can be seen from the path coefficient that has a positive sign of 0.748 with the value of C.R. amounting to 5,210 and obtained a significance probability (p) of 0.000 which is smaller than the significance level (\( \alpha \)) determined at 0.05. Thus, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) directly affects Workload (Y1) of 0.748, which means that if there is an increase in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) it will increase the Workload (Y1) by 0.748.

b. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) has a positive and significant effect on motivation (Y2). This can be seen from the path coefficient that has a positive sign of 0.311 with the
value of C.R. amounting to 2,659 and obtained a significance probability (p) of 0.008 which is smaller than the significance level (sebesar) determined at 0.05. Thus, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) directly affects Motivation (Y2) of 0.311, which means that every increase in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) will increase Motivation (Y2) by 0.311.

c. Workload (Y1) has a positive and significant effect on motivation (Y2). This can be seen from the path coefficient that has a positive sign of 0.532 with the value of C.R. amounting to 3,690 and obtained a significance probability (p) of 0.000 which is smaller than the significance level (α) which is determined by 0.05. Thus, the Workload (Y1) directly affects Motivation (Y2) of 0.532, which means that whenever there is an increase in Workload (Y1) it will increase Motivation (Y2) by 0.532.

d. Workload (Y1) has a positive and significant effect on Lecturer Performance (Y3). This can be seen from the path coefficient that has a positive sign of 0.429 with the value of C.R. amounting to 2.920 and obtained a significance probability (p) of 0.003 which is smaller than the significance level (α) which is determined by 0.05. Thus, the Workload (Y1) directly affects Lecturer Performance (Y3) of 0.429, which means that every increase in Workload (Y1) will increase Lecturer Performance (Y3) by 0.429.

e. Motivation (Y2) has a positive and significant effect on Lecturer Performance (Y3). This can be seen from the path coefficient that is positively marked by 0.289 with the value of C.R. amounting to 2,269 and obtained a significance probability (p) of 0.023 which is smaller than the significance level (α) which is determined by 0.05. Thus, Motivation (Y2) directly affects Lecturer Performance (Y3) of 0.289, which means that every increase in Motivation (Y2) will increase Lecturer Performance (Y3) by 0.289.

**OCB and Work Motivation**

One of the most important and challenging activities carried out by managers in modern business is to motivate and reward employees. Motivation can be defined as a desire or energy that affects a person to perform a particular task or action. Different researchers have expressed motivation in different ways. Based on the results of this study, job satisfaction is one of the antecedents of OCB where the emotional state of mind will affect job satisfaction by assuming that job satisfaction itself is a variable while others state different dimensions.

From the results of this study, OCB found a useful construct which showed two dimensions of OCB that found a significant relationship between motivation, work commitment and OCB, namely the existence of OCB relationships with different job attitudes, leadership, organisational justice, trust, organisational culture. Likewise, exploration through the available literature of past studies have measured the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction with only a few factors from OCB. Therefore, the results of this study can inform the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction with the five most recognised factors of OCB, namely enthusiasm, work understanding, conscience, commitment, and sportsmanship, thus the results of this study will enrich the knowledge of lecturers to develop and increase OCB among lecturers in universities.
The process that gives direction to individuals to achieve their goals is known as motivation. Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are two types of motivation in which the first is based on the inherent needs for self-determination and competence, but the second type increases by the workplace environment, namely the work environment or external rewards (Hermino, 2017). Individuals are driven by motivation that directs them to develop their work attitudes and behaviours, such as job satisfaction, OCB and others (Hermino, 2013; Hermino & Viengdavong, 2017). Based on the results of this study, OCB in a motivational perspective is very important to be grown in an organisation in a university environment and has become a challenge for lecturers to maintain the motivation of fellow lecturers in higher education institutions where lecturers teach. By continuing to pay attention to the importance of motivation in organisational life on campus and its role in work attitudes, it is another factor to examine its relationship and impact on OCB. Motivation and work attitude are important in understanding OCB (Supriyanto, 2016). In addition, the hope of future rewards motivates employees to show OCB (Hermino, 2013; Traphagan et al, 2009).

From the results of this study it can also be stated that there are three motives of the paradigm of the relationship between OCB and work motivation, namely the motive of affiliation, motive of achievement, and motive of power. The affiliation motives are a part of the achievement motive including the pretty good OCB altruistic path. However, the power of motives creates a better understanding of the side of a job that has a high level of difficulty so that a high motivation is needed to solve it. With the help of this motif, it's easy to see whether OCB can correlate with performance ratings and why. In a study conducted by Van Zanten et al (2012) it was found that a significant positive relationship existed between OCB and work motivation; where there are five characteristics of work motivation, namely: the variety of work, identity, significance, autonomy and feedback of job characteristics. Thus, aspects of social relations within the campus environment and good working relationships between lecturers underlie the relationship between the characteristics of motivational work and OCB.

**OCB and Work Load**

Workloads that can be resolved well by lecturers in universities will affect their job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is one of the attitude variables that are widely studied in the field of organisational behaviour in understanding various organisational outcomes (Hermino, 2013). Similarly, Taplin et al (2011) suggest that pleasant and positive emotional states as a result of job assessment or work experience are known as job satisfaction (JS). The importance of the relationship between JS and OCB from the results of this study identifies a significant positive relationship between OCB and JS.

The workload possessed by the lecturer is not only how to teach but also with regard to the education received by students can be well received and can also be implemented well in accordance with the understanding of the knowledge they have. The results of this study indicate that the workload of a lecturer who is well received as a responsibility for self-
development will improve good performance because this is driven by the motivation to go forward that is owned by the lecturer.

In line with the statement that the performance appraisal of the workload carried out by the lecturer indicates that an organisation or institution has utilised the human resources in the organisation well and optimally, and in carrying out the performance appraisal it must avoid the "likes" and "dislikes" from the appraiser, so that objectivity can be achieved properly.

Performance appraisal based on workload is understood as a process of measuring work performance that has been carried out, either in the form of success or failure of someone's work in carrying out their duties. Based on the results of this study, the performance appraisal also functions as a tool to evaluate work, develop and motivate the work of employees or staff in an institution that takes place in a certain period with a predetermined requirement or standard. The performance assessment referred to at least includes: (1) quality of work; (2) quantity of work; (3) supervision; (4) attendance; and (5) conservation (Hermino, 2013).

In this study the assessment of performance on the lecturer as a form of the behaviour of the activities of educators in the learning process includes: (1) success in planning learning in lectures; (2) optimal in carrying out learning activities during lectures; and (3) assessing learning outcomes of existing students and from fellow lecturers. A guide to the performance assessment of educators or lecturers explains that the performance standards for teaching staff are related to the quality of lecturers in carrying out their assigned tasks, namely: (1) working with students individually; (2) preparation and planning of learning materials; (3) utilisation of learning media; (4) involving students in various learning experiences; and (5) active leadership from a lecturer.

Assessment of lecturers' performance by considering the workload carried out by the lecturer in this study can be understood as the process of determining the level of success of the lecturer in carrying out teaching and learning tasks by using predetermined standards. Performance appraisal for lecturers can be feedback to see the abilities, strengths, weaknesses and potential possessed by the lecturer. The ability referred to is the ability of a lecturer in planning lecture programs, carrying out and leading the teaching and learning process, assessing the progress of the teaching and learning process, and fostering relationships with students and peers. Performance appraisal based on lecturer workload also gives meaning to higher education institutions in giving consideration to optimal decision making.

Conclusion

The conclusion of the data analysis and discussions are: (a) Indicators that form the latent variable Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X), workload (Y1), work motivation (Y2) and Lecturer Performance are valid and reliable indicators; (b) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) the dominant form is loyalty (0.854) and compliance aspects (0.823). Workload
(Y1) dominant indicator Participate in Cooperation Teams in Learning Activities (Y1.8) (0.770) and Attend Department Meetings (Y1.10) (0.741). Motivation (Y2) with a dominant indicator Having a High Risk in Action (Y2.3) (0.918) and Trying to Do Something in New and Creative Ways (Y2.1) (0.849). Dominant Lecturer Performance Academic qualifications and performance in teaching (Y3.1) (0.923) and Perceptions of Pedagogic, Professional, Social and Personality Competencies (Y3.2) (0.878); (c) Lecturer Performance Model with SEM approach is a model that is fit based on GoF criteria. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (X) has a significant and positive effect on workload (Y1) and work motivation (Y2), workload (Y1) has a significant and positive effect on Motivation (Y2) and Lecturer Performance (Y3), Work Motivation (Y2) has an effect significant and positive towards Lecturer Performance (Y3).
Figure 1 Measurement Model for One Latent Variable

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta_1 & \rightarrow x_1 \\
\delta_2 & \rightarrow x_2 \\
& \vdots \\
\delta_p & \rightarrow x_p \\
\lambda & \rightarrow \xi \\
\end{align*}
\]

Measurement Model:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= \lambda_1 \xi + \delta_1 \\
x_2 &= \lambda_2 \xi + \delta_2 \\
& \vdots \\
x_p &= \lambda_p \xi + \delta_p \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2. Conceptual Model of OCB on Lecturer Performance through Workload and Motivation (Modification Alma, 2009)
Figure 3. Structural OCB Model Against Lecturer Performance Through Workload, and Motivation

Table 1 List of Institutions Research Sites in Banjarmasin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Numbers Lecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STIKES Sari Mulia</td>
<td>Jln. Pramuka, No.2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STIKES Suaka Insan</td>
<td>Jln. H. Zafri Zam-Zam</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AKPER Kesdam VI</td>
<td>Jln. Mayjend Sutoyo</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STIKES Cahaya Bangsa</td>
<td>Jln. A. Yani, Km.19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AKPER Pandan Harum</td>
<td>Jln. Achmad Yani</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>STIKES Husada Borneo</td>
<td>Jln. Achmad Yani</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Convergent Validity and Indicator Reliability on OCB Latent Variables, Workload, Motivation, Lecturer Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Validity Konvergen</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Composite Reliability C-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loading Factor p-value</td>
<td>Decisio n</td>
<td>Variance Error p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisatio nal Citizenship Behaviour (X)</td>
<td>Aspect Participation (X1.1)</td>
<td>0.801 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.137 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyality (X1.2)</td>
<td>0.854 0.001 Valid</td>
<td>0.095 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspect obedience (X1.3)</td>
<td>0.823 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.138 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work (Y1)</td>
<td>Teaching Learning Process (Y1.1)</td>
<td>0.537 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.437 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice (Y1.2)</td>
<td>0.590 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.520 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic guidance (Y1.3)</td>
<td>0.629 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.422 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Seminar Guidance to Students (Y1.4)</td>
<td>0.583 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.680 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic and management of teaching and learning processes(Y1.5)</td>
<td>0.603 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.505 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and publications (Y1.6)</td>
<td>0.597 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.580 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service (Y1.7)</td>
<td>0.547 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.566 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in Cooperation Teams in Learning Activities (Y1.8)</td>
<td>0.770 0.000 Valid</td>
<td>0.269 0.000</td>
<td>Reliabl e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the extracurricular activities (student Affairs) (Y1.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending the meeting (Y1.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Business Relations in Quality of Learning (Y1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (Y2)</td>
<td>Trying to Do Something in New and Creative Ways (Y2.1)</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking for feedback about making (Y2.2)</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a High Risk in Action (Y2.3)</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take Personal Responsibility for Actions (Y2.4)</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of the Lecture (Y3)</td>
<td>Academic qualifications and performance on teaching (Y3.1)</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of Pedagogic, Professional, Social and Personality Competencies (Y3.2)</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of Research &amp; Community Service activities (Y3.3)</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability values are provided for each category.
Table 3. Results of OCB Model Testing on Lecturer Performance Through Workload, and Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cut – Off Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi – Square</td>
<td>Small expected</td>
<td>163.400</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ with df = 152 is 181.770 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Probability</td>
<td>$\geq 0.05$</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$\leq 0.08$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>$\leq 2.00$</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: data processed

Table 4 Results of OCB Model Pathway Test Coefficients on Lecturer Performance Through Workload, and Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variabel</th>
<th>Koefisien</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior (X)à Work Load (Y1)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load (Y1)à Motivation (Y2)</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load (Y1)à Lecture Performance (Y3)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (Y2)à Lecture Performance (Y3)</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: data processed
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