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Abstract:
This study examines the mediating role of organizational commitment on the influence of participatory leadership and competence on lecturer performance. This research consists of two independent variables, participative leadership and competence, and one mediating variable, organizational commitment, and one dependent variable, lecturer performance. This study uses a quantitative explanatory approach with a survey approach. The test was carried out at the Guna Nusantara College of Social and Political Sciences (STISIP). This study uses the Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis method using Smart PLS. The results of the study show that participatory leadership has a significant effect on lecturer performance. The higher the participative leadership, the higher the performance of the lecturers. Competence has a significant effect on lecturer performance. The higher the competency, the higher the lecturer's performance. Competence has a significant effect on organizational commitment. The higher the competence, the higher the organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has a significant effect on lecturer performance. The higher the organizational commitment, the higher the performance of lecturers. There is no indirect effect of participatory leadership on performance through organizational commitment. There is an indirect effect of competency on performance through organizational commitment.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Lecturers are a component of the education system crucial for implementing the educational process (Jabbar & Hussin, 2019; Khoa et al., 2020). The existence of lecturers is the leading actor a facilitator in organizing the teaching and learning process in tertiary institutions (Shaharudin et al., 2020; Rahman, 2020). Therefore, his presence and professionalism are very influential in realizing national education goals. Lecturers must have good quality because lecturers are one of the micro components of the education system, which is very strategic and plays many roles in the education process in Indonesia (Utama et al., 2017; Nasution & Afandi, 2022).

Lecturers have an essential role, are in a strategic position, and are responsible for national education. The lecturer position or profession requires particular skills (Mahmud & Abduh, 2022). People with expertise can only do this work to carry out activities or work as lecturers (Jufrizen et al., 2021; Aisyah et al., 2019). In order to become a lecturer, special requirements are needed, especially as a professional lecturer who must master the intricacies of education and teaching with various other knowledge that needs to be fostered and developed through a certain period of education or pre-service education.

Lecturers are people who are responsible for providing guidance or assistance to students in their physical and spiritual development so that they reach maturity, can carry out their duties as creatures of God, Khalifah on the surface of the earth, as social beings and as individuals who can stand alone (Mustofa, 2018). Thus, the lecturer is one of the people responsible for the development and education of their students. In other words, the lecturer is a human resource that significantly determines the success of an educational program.

Lecturer performance is influenced by the competence of the Lecturer (Nuriman, 2021). Lecturer competence is the ability of a lecturer to carry out his teaching profession professionally and responsibly (Purwanto & Asbari, 2020). Therefore, a lecturer must have the knowledge and skills embodied in the competencies he must have (Santoso et al., 2020; Wahyudi et al., 2020).

In addition to the Lecturer Competency, lecturers must also pay attention to the involvement of leaders in their educational activities. Leaders giving freedom to lecturers must be open, especially to subordinates, not make decisions on their own, as well as delegating to subordinates (A. Purwanto & Asbari, 2020). This attitude shows that a wise leader stimulates the creativity of lecturers to develop innovation (Myende et al., 2018; Bunjak et al., 2022).
Organizational commitment also influences lecturer performance (Mittal et al., 2022). Organizational commitment is the degree to which individuals identify themselves in an organization based on their goals and desire to maintain membership (Robbins & Judge, 2013; Chatzistamoulou & Tyllianakis, 2022); (Vanova-Gongne et al., 2022). Commitment to an organization involves three attitudes, namely: 1) self-identification of organizational goals, 2) the desire to be involved in organizational tasks, and 3) a sense of loyalty to the organization (Gibson et al., 2009). Organizational commitment reflects the psychological state that binds individuals to the organization (Cownie, 2020; Sawicki & Agnew, 2021). The psychological state can be described as the employee's relationship with the organization and related to the decision to continue or stop membership in the organization (Lambert et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021).

Participatory leadership is the same as applying delegation, making a decision together, consultative and autocratic (Astutik et al., 2021). This participatory leadership model is usually interpreted by a leader who, in the process, involves subordinates and actively participates from various parties, lecturers, students and other community members. Because of its application, participatory leadership has a high morale value, which will affect work achievement (Nurman et al., 2018; Junaedi & Waruwu, 2020). The importance of a leader will have a significant impact by adhering to several views of how good a leader's attitude is (Purwanto et al., 2022).

In participatory leadership, a leader is not only able to realize community participation but is also required to have the ability to coordinate all efforts and policies in the field of development so that the potential of related parties can be utilized so that it is hoped that it can assist the process of implementing development. Coordination is also needed in the implementation of development as an organized movement. Based on the description above, the researchers focused their study on the mediating role of organizational commitment on the influence of participatory leadership and competence on the performance of lecturers at the Guna Nusantara College of Social and Political Sciences (STISIP), Cianjur, West Java, Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODS
The research approach used in this research is quantitative research. This study aims to obtain empirical evidence and develop a theory (predictive orientation) of the mediating role of organizational commitment on the influence of participatory leadership and competency on lecturer performance. Seeing the problems and research objectives to be achieved, this research uses explanatory research with a survey approach. Exploratory research examines causality between variables that explain a particular phenomenon (Fitri & Haryanti, 2020). The main reason this researcher uses this type of explanatory research is to test the proposed hypothesis so that this research can explain the relationship and influence between the independent and dependent variables in the hypothesis.

Population refers to the entire group of people, events, or things of interest that the researcher wants to investigate (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). In this study, the sample used was lecturers at the Guna Nusantara College of Social and
Political Sciences (STISIP), Cianjur, West Java, Indonesia. In this study, researchers used a non-probability sampling technique with a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is a technique with specific considerations (Sugiyono, 2015).

The research instrument used was a questionnaire. In the measurement, each respondent was asked for his opinion regarding a question, with a rating scale from 1 to 5. Positive responses (maximum) were given the highest value (5), and negative responses (minimum) were given the lowest value (1). The scale for measuring respondents' perceptions (Likert Scale 1-5) in this study for the convenience of respondents in answering the questionnaire the rating scale is as follows: Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Undecided = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5. The questionnaire was prepared based on organizational commitment variables on the influence of participatory leadership and competence on lecturer performance.

In this study, data analysis used the Partial Least Square (PLS) approach using SmartPLS software. PLS is a component or (variance) based structural equation model (SEM). According to Ghozali (2006), PLS is an alternative approach that shifts from a covariance-based SEM approach to a variant-based one. SEM tests quality/theory based on covariance, while PLS is more of a predictive model. PLS is a powerful analytical method (Ghozali, 2006) because it is based on only a few assumptions. For example, the data must be normally distributed; the sample does not have to be significant. Besides being able to be used to confirm theories, PLS can also be used to explain whether there is a relationship between latent variables. PLS can simultaneously analyze constructs formed with reflexive and formative indicators. Covariance-based SEM cannot do this because it will be an unidentified model.

In the analysis with PLS, two things are done: Assessing the Outer Model or measurement model. There are three criteria for assessing the outer model: Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity and Composite Reliability. The convergent validity of the measurement model with reflection indicators is assessed based on the correlation between the item score/component score calculated by PLS. The individual reflection measure is considered high if it correlates more than 0.70 with the measured construct. However, according to Chin in Ghozali (2006), developing a measurement scale for a loading value of 0.5 to 0.6 is considered sufficient for the initial research stage. The Discriminant Validity of the measurement model with reflection indicators is assessed based on Cross Loading measurements with constructs. Suppose the construct's correlation with the measurement item is more significant than the other measures. In that case, this indicates that the latent construct predicts the size of their block better than the size of the other blocks. Another method for assessing Discriminant Validity is to compare each construct's Root Of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value with the correlation between the construct and the other constructs in the model.

Suppose the AVE value of each construct is greater than the correlation value between the construct and the other constructs in the model. In that case, it is said to have a good Discriminant Validity value (Fornell and Larcker in
Ghozali, 2006). It is recommended that the AVE value be more significant than 0.50. The composite reliability of the indicator block that measures a construct can be evaluated by two measures, namely the internal consistency developed by Wert et al. (in Ghozali, 2006). Assessing the inner Model or Structural Model. Testing the inner or structural model is carried out to see the relationship between constructs, significant value and R-square of the research model. The structural model was evaluated using the R-square for the dependent construct, the Stone-Geisser Q-square test for predictive relevance and the t-test and the significance of the structural path parameter coefficients. Assessing the model with PLS begins by looking at the R-square for each latent dependent variable. Changes in the R-square value can be used to assess the effect of certain independent latent variables on the latent dependent variable and whether it has a substantive effect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
1. Data Quality test results (Outer Model)

   a. Convergent Validity

   The convergent validity of the measurement model with reflexive indicators is assessed based on the correlation between the item score/component score estimated by the PLS Software. The individual reflexive measure is considered high if it correlates more than 0.70 with the measured construct. In this study, a loading factor limit of 0.70 will be used. Based on the table below, it can be seen that all outer loading results are > 0.60, so all research items are included in the criteria. External loadings result in Table 1.

   Based on the results of processing using SmartPLS can be seen in Table 4.1. The value of the outer model or the correlation between constructs and variables has met convergent validity. The estimation results for the outer loading test calculation using PLS. From the output, it can be seen that all items are valid. This is because the Factor loading values are all more than 0.6.

   b. Discriminant Validity Analysis

   After confirming that all indicators of latent variables are constructs of latent variables, the next step is to test discriminant validity. Discriminant validity also needs to be done so that the scale used does not have two constructs that measure the same thing. To find out, the correlation between constructs must be <0.90. If between constructs reaches 0.90 or more, there will be multicollinearity between constructs. The results of discriminant validity testing were obtained as Tabel 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Participatory Leadership</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Lecturer Performance</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X21</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X22</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X23</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X24</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X25</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y11</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y12</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y15</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y16</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above shows no multicollinearity between variables because each construct measures different things. This is evident from the correlation value between constructs which is less than 0.90.
c. Evaluating Reliability and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

The validity and reliability criteria can also be seen from the reliability value of a construct and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value of each construct. The construct is said to have high reliability if the value is 0.70 and the AVE is above 0.50 (Ghozali, Imam, 2011). Table 3 will present the Composite Reliability and AVE values for all variables as follows:

Table 4. Outer Model, AVE, Composite Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variabel</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory leadership</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer performance</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4, all constructs meet the criteria of being reliable. This is indicated by the composite reliability value above 0.70 and AVE above 0.50 according to the existing criteria.

2. Results of the Feasibility Testing Model (Inner Model)

Testing of the inner model or structural model is tested to see the relationship between constructs, significance value and R-square of the research model. The structural model was evaluated using the R-square for the dependent construct t-test and the significance of the structural path parameter coefficients. Assessing the model with PLS begins by looking at the R-square for each latent dependent variable. Table 5 is the result of R-square estimation using SmartPLS.

Table 5. R-Square Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer performance</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the R-square value for the lecturer performance variable obtained at 0.656; this means that the construct variability of lecturer performance can be explained by the variability of the construct of participatory leadership and competence of 65.6%, while the rest is explained by other variables outside the model studied. The greater the R-square number indicates, the greater the independent variable can explain the dependent variable so that the structural equation is better. As for the organizational commitment variable, it was obtained at 0.708; this means that the variability of the construct of organizational commitment can be explained by the variability of the construct of participatory leadership and competence of 70.8%, while the rest is explained by other variables outside the model studied. The greater the R-square number indicates, the greater the independent variable can explain the dependent variable so that the structural equation is better.

3. Hypothesis Testing

The significance of the estimated parameters provides beneficial information about the relationship between the research variables. The basis used
in testing the hypothesis is the value contained in the output result for inner weight. Table 5 provides the estimated output for testing the structural model. In SmartPLS, statistical testing of each hypothesized relationship is carried out using a simulation. In this case, the bootstrap method was carried out on the sample. Testing with bootstrap is also intended to minimize the problem of abnormal research data. The results of testing with bootstrapping from the SmartPLS analysis are as follows:

![Figure 2. Bootstrapping Results](image)

The significance level in hypothesis testing is measured using the path coefficient value parameter (Abdillah & Hartono, 2015). This test looks at the estimated path coefficient and t-statistic value with significance at $\alpha=5\%$. The hypothesis is accepted if the t-statistic value is higher than the t-table value, which is equal to 1.984 for the one-tailed hypothesis. Table 6 below is the value of the path coefficient in testing the central hypothesis of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Original Sample Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Statistik</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participatory Leadership -&gt; Lecturer Performance</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Competency -&gt; Lecturer Performance</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participatory Leadership -&gt; Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Competency -&gt; Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>6.340</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organizational Commitment -&gt; Lecturer Performance</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hypothesis 1 test: participatory leadership affects lecturer performance
   The test on participatory leadership resulted in a t-statistic value of 3.240 with a P value of 0.001 < 0.05 (sig level). The test results prove that the hypothesis proposed in this study can be accepted, namely that participative leadership influences lecturer performance.

2. Hypothesis 2 test: competency influences lecturer performance
   The competence test resulted in a t-statistic value of 2.901 with a P value of 0.004 < 0.05 (sig level). The test results prove that the hypothesis proposed in this study can be accepted: competence affects lecturer performance.

3. Hypothesis 3 test: participative leadership influences organizational commitment
   The test on participatory leadership resulted in a t-statistic value of 4.512 with a P value of 0.000 < 0.05 (sig level). The test results prove that the hypothesis proposed in this study can be accepted, namely that participatory leadership affects lecturer performance.

4. Hypothesis 4 test: competence influences organizational commitment
   The competence test resulted in a t-statistic value of 6.340 with a P value of 0.000 < 0.05 (sig level). The test results prove that the hypothesis proposed in this study can be accepted: competence affects organizational commitment.

5. Hypothesis 5 test: organizational commitment affects lecturer performance
   The innovation test resulted in a t statistic value of 2.167 with a P value of 0.031 < 0.05 (sig level). The test results prove that the hypothesis proposed in this study can be accepted: organizational commitment affects lecturer performance.

4. Mediation Test Results
   Influence analysis was carried out to analyze the strength of influence between variables, both direct, indirect and total influence. The direct effect is the coefficients of all the coefficient lines with one-pointed arrows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Original Sample</th>
<th>Sampel Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standar Deviation</th>
<th>T-Statistik</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participatory Leadership -&gt; Organizational Commitment -&gt; Lecturer Performance</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Competence -&gt; Organizational Commitment -&gt; Lecturer Performance</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7 above, the results show no indirect effect of Supply Chain Integration on performance through knowledge management P-values 0.065 > 0.05. The result is that there is an indirect effect of innovation on performance
Departing from the research results above, it can be understood that participatory leadership significantly affects lecturer performance. This means that the higher the participative leadership, the higher the performance of the lecturers. The results of this study by Nurman et al. (2018) participatory leadership is one of the leadership styles used by those who are trusted; that is, with trust and credibility, it motivates people who involve themselves in the decision-making process. Leaders have a strategic role in increasing the competence of lecturers. Participatory leadership is also influenced by gender.

Competence has a significant effect on lecturer performance. This means that the higher the competency, the higher the lecturer’s performance (Tabi’in, 2017). Organizational commitment has a significant effect on lecturer performance. This means that the higher the organizational commitment, the higher the performance of lecturers. The results of this study by Labutubun & Dewi (2022) organizational commitment can also be interpreted as a form of individual expression in self-identification, loyalty and involvement in the organization. Employees who are committed to the organization will work dedicatedly because employees think that the critical thing to achieve is the achievement of tasks within the organization.

There is no indirect effect of participatory leadership on performance through organizational commitment. There is an indirect effect of competency on performance through organizational commitment. The results of this study by Junaidi & Mildawati (2022) organizational commitment can also be interpreted as a form of individual expression in self-identification, loyalty and involvement in the organization. Employees who are committed to the organization will work dedicatedly because employees think that the critical thing to achieve is the achievement of tasks within the organization (Labetubun & Dewi, 2022).

Organizational commitment involves three attitudes, namely: 1) self-identification of organizational goals; 2) the desire to be involved in organizational tasks; 3) a sense of loyalty to the organization (Ulfa et al., 2021). Participatory leadership is proven to positively and significantly affect employee performance in achieving organizational goals. The leader gives the delegation of authority to make decisions, either through or without the leader's approval. Leaders must give confidence to their subordinates to take on their duties with a complete sense of responsibility (Purwanto et al., 2020). Participative leadership is a fundamental principle of leadership in implementing the education system. Prasetyo (2022) says that the effectiveness of implementing a participatory leadership style refers to several aspects, namely; 1) the decision-making process; 2) the process of handling organizational conflict; and 3) the communication strategy in forming a positive organizational culture.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion in this study, participatory leadership significantly affects lecturer performance. Thus, the higher the participative leadership, the higher the performance of the lecturers. Competence
has a significant effect on lecturer performance. Thus, the higher the competency, the higher the lecturer's performance. Competence has a significant effect on organizational commitment. Thus, the higher the competence, the higher the organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has a significant effect on lecturer performance. Thus, the higher the organizational commitment, the higher the performance of lecturers. There is no indirect effect of participatory leadership on performance through organizational commitment. There is an indirect effect of competency on performance through organizational commitment.

Some recommendations for future research are that the next researcher can examine the effect of participatory leadership and competence on lecturer performance through organizational commitment by relating it to other variables. Future researchers can conduct studies by adding these variables or adding samples on a large scale.
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