THE EFFECT OF TRUST AND JOB SATISFACTION ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

[1]Thurayah, [2]Sylviana Murni , [3]Suparno Eko Widodo

ABSTRACT--The objective of this research was to understand the effect of trust and job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior. It was quantitative research in twenty-two (22) Senior High Schools located in Makassar district, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia.The research used a survey method with path analysis applied in the testing hypothesis. It was conducted to 292 teachers as the respondents who were selected in a simple random way.The result of this study are: (1). There is a positive direct effect of trust on organizational citizenship behavior. (2).There is a positive direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior, and (3). There is a positive direct effect of trust on job satisfaction.

Keywords--trust, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are still limited teachers who with full awareness carry out tasks outside their main duties and functions as teachers, such as; attend student activities outside of class hours, foster extracurricular activities, increase the capacity of teachers themselves, other social activities that can improve teacher performance and insight. The unavailability of teachers to carry out activities outside their main tasks is because teachers do not yet have a strong Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). OCB does not automatically increase without being supported by interactions with other factors. Many factors influence OCB, including trust, job satisfaction, emotional intelligence, organizational culture, managerial effectiveness, organizational commitment, and leadership ((Titisari, 2014); (Wirawan (2014)). Factors that have the potential to increase OCB are trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Trust factors become the main foundation in a relationship between school members. Trust becomes an important factor in the smoothness of the relationship to be able to realize the efficiency and effectiveness of school organizations. A mutual trust is needed in school organizations, with mutual trust School organization members will have a positive influence on more optimal performance results, thus impacting on OCB improvement.

In addition, job satisfaction becomes an important factor for teachers as internal motivation, encouraging teachers to work effectively and efficiently. Not fulfilling job satisfaction will cause someone unable to feel the job as a pleasant thing. Teachers who are not satisfied with their work will try to get rid of the workload given that has become their responsibility to the organization. So the teacher's feelings are not satisfied, will be the cause of the difficulty of schools to be able to experience progress and improve quality in carrying out learning

[1] Universitas Negeri Jakarta, thurayah.unj16@gmail.com, thurayah_mp16s3@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id,

[2] Universitas Negeri Jakarta, sylvianamurni@unj.ac.id

[3] Universitas Negeri Jakarta, suparnoeko@unj.ac.id

activities. Teacher dissatisfaction at school is something that will keep him away from OCB. This study will address the teacher OCB problem as the main topic by linking the influence of trust and job satisfaction. Discussion on the problem of organizational citizenship behavior of teachers has become very important in the world of education in the Makassar region especially at the senior high school level, based on the results of the Makassar Balitbangda research that teacher factors influence the declining results of the national final exam (UAN). For this reason, researchers want to find out how much influence is trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment to OCB

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)*

There are various definitions of organizational citizenship behavior. Greenberg, Robert, & Baron, 2003 suggested that organizational citizenship behavior is an employee completing work outside of his responsibilities. While Yılmaz and Bokeoglu in (Özdem, 2012); make more efforts on behalf of the organization. Demir, 2015; an individual voluntary behavior (in this case employees) that is not directly related to the reward system but contributes to the effectiveness of the organization. Somech & Izhar, 2015; Euwema, Wendi, & Hety, 2007 divided organizational citizenship behavior into 5 dimensions, namely: 1) altruism; 2) courtesy; 3) sportsmanship; 4) civic virtue; 5) conscientiousness.

Meanwhile, Mesbahi (Makvandi, Naderi, Makvandi, Pasha, & Ehteshamzadeh, 2018) argues that organizational citizenship behavior is a set of voluntary behaviors that are not part of the formal duties of individuals, but which is done by someone to promote the organization. According to Djati as quoted by (Titisari, 2014) that organizational citizenship behavior is the behavior of employees both toward colleagues or organizations, which behavior exceeds the standard behavior set by the company and provides positive benefits for the company.

Organ et., Al. in (Titisari, 2014) suggested that the increase in increased organizational citizenship behavior is influenced by two factors, namely internal factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality, employee morale, and motivation, as well as external factors which include leadership style, trust in leadership, and culture organization. In line with Wirawan (2014) suggested that the factors that influence organizational citizenship behavior include personality, organizational culture, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, transformational leadership. This shows that trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment directly affect organizational citizenship behavior.

Based on the description above it can be synthesized that what is meant by organizational citizenship behavior is a set of voluntary behaviors that are not part of an individual's formal duties, but which someone does to promote an organization, with indicators: 1) altruism (voluntary action); 2) courtesy (courtesy); 3) sportsmanship (tolerance); 4) civic virtue (moral citizenship); 5) conscientiousness (self-control).

2.2   *Trust*

Trust is the most valuable foundation or asset for anyone who will succeed. Trust becomes an emotional glue that holds people together in an organization. This is reasonable because if there is no trust in someone, then

whatever is said, done, and no matter how good the vision, all people will no longer trust him. Belief is one of the fundamental understandings that is understood by almost everyone, although it is difficult to be precisely defined. Trust is basically a belief in something with positive thoughts.

Some experts give different definitions, but in essence, trust is a positive hope. According to (Colquitt, Le Pine, & Wesson, 2009); trust is defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to an authority based on positive expectations about the authority's actions and intentions. (Ruslani, 2007); the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behavior, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community. (Robbins, 2003) trust is positive that another will not pass words, actions, or decisions act opportunistically.

Robbins further stated that to build trust consists of five dimensions, namely: 1) integrity; 2) competence; 3) consistency; 4) loyalty; 5) openness. Robbins explains as follows: 1) integrity, refers to honesty and truth; 2) competence, including interpersonal technical knowledge and skills; 3) consistency, reliability, predictability, and consideration of handling the situation; 4) loyalty, the desire to protect and save the face of others; 5) openness. relying on people to give the real truth. Robbins believes that integrity (honesty) and competence (ability) are the most important characteristics sought by leaders to gain trust from subordinates. In line with Ferrin and Lee (Asamani, 2015) suggested that trust is generally defined as one's belief in the integrity of others. Meanwhile, Barber (Wierbzicki, 2010), defines trust as inherently sociological. Barber divides four dimensions of trust into hope, namely: 1) persistence in fulfilling social and moral commands; 2) the role of competent technical performance; 3) partners in the interaction will carry out their obligations and; 4) responsibility. Furthermore, Barber, trust is a normative idea in the sense that an important element in all cases of trust is the existence of a norm that provides motivation to work together. According to Gambetta (Wierbzicki, 2010) defining trust is a level of subjective probability that assesses that another person or group of people will take a particular action, both before he can monitor the action and in the context in which it affects the action itself. This opinion is supported by Mui defining trust is a subjective expectation, that trust and reputation are needed for mutual change.

Regarding Deutsch trust (Wierbzicki, 2010) divides three dimensions of trust, namely: 1) individuals are expected to follow a path that can lead to activities that are considered beneficial; 2) that the occurrence of a beneficial activity depends on the behavior of others; 3) the strength of beneficial activities is greater than the strength of events that are considered dangerous. Meanwhile (Covey, 2008) defines trust as the fruit of trustworthiness, both in people and in organizations.

According to Covey, trust comes from three sources, namely: (1) personal; (2) institutions; and (3) a person who consciously chooses to give trust to others with confidence will add value after trust has been given. Covey explained that trust is something that is shared and is reciprocal between us. (Kars & Inandi, 2018) suggested that trust is as a person's desire to be sensitive to the actions of others based on the expectation that other people will take certain actions on the people they trust, without depending on their ability to supervise and control them. Meanwhile (Reina & Reina, 2006) explain that a person's trust is by the way they behave, and to be trusted by others, one must first be willing to trust them. Because trust breeds trust. Reina presents five behaviors for a person to gain trust, namely: 1) respecting their agreement; 2) be consistent; 3) recognize the ability of employees by including them in decision making; 4) open channels of open communication; and 5) take

responsibility. Meanwhile, to build trust in action, Reina outlines six behaviors that contribute to trust with others. namely: 1) managing expectations; 2) set limits on work; 3) delegate appropriately; 4) encourage the intention to serve one another; 5) be consistent 6) keep the agreement.

According to Tschannen and Moran in (Onn, Nordin, & Yusof, 2018) Trust is described as someone willing to be sensitive to others based on the belief that others are generous, honest, open, reliable, and competent. According to (Lary, 2005) mentioned trust in other people is one component of a positive work climate. Further outlined by Lary, seven components of a positive work climate include: 1) trust in other members; 2) dare to take risks; 3) respect for one another; 4) accept responsibility; 5) recognition and respect for others; 6) open communication; 7) continuous improvement.

Trust is the willingness of people to trust the ability, integrity, and motivation of others to serve their needs and interests as agreed upon, covering four things: (1) a believer has confidence that he wants to trust to do what he has agreed to; (2) people's trust is related to the characteristics of their relationship partners, namely ability, integrity, and motivation; (3) people who are trusted will take care of the needs and interests of both parties; (4) trusted partner behavior will pay attention to their mutual expectations. From the description above it can be synthesized that what is meant by the trust is a positive expectation that other people will not do opportunistic through words, actions, or decisions, with indicators: 1) integrity; 2) competence; 3) consistency; 4) loyalty; and 5) openness.

2.3 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction according to Woodman (Akbar & Tabatabei, 2015) is the desired emotional and positive condition obtained from assessment or work experience. this concept has different dimensions, aspects, and factors that all parts must be considered. Among these factors, among others, employee characteristics, type of work, work environment and human relations. (Robbins, 2015); a general attitude towards one's work as the difference between the amount of rewards received by workers and the amount of rewards believed to be received.

Robbins further stated that the indicators that determine job satisfaction are: 1) mentally challenging work; 2) supportive working conditions; 3) adequate salary or wages; 4) compatibility of personality with work. Holland's "work-personality fit" theory concluded that a high match between an employee's personality and occupation would produce a more satisfied individual; 5) supportive colleagues. Furthermore, (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2001) that affect job satisfaction are: 1) need fulfillment. Satisfaction is determined by the level of job characteristics providing opportunities for individuals to meet their needs; 2) discrepancies. Satisfaction is a result of meeting expectations. The fulfillment of expectations reflects the difference between what is expected and what the individual gets from his work. When expectations are greater than what is received, people will not be satisfied. Instead the individual will be satisfied if he receives benefits above expectations; 3) value attainment. Satisfaction is the result of job perception providing fulfillment of important individual work values; 4) equity. Satisfaction is a function of how fairly individuals are treated at work; 5) genetic components; Job satisfaction is a function of personal traits and genetic factors. This implies differences in the nature of the individual has an important meaning to explain job satisfaction besides the characteristics of the work environment.

Meanwhile Saari and Judge (Rahim & Razzak, 2013) suggested that, job satisfaction is described as a pleasant or positive emotional state that results from evaluating one's work or experience at work. According to Swaminathan and Jawahar (Yangaiya & Magaji, 2017), job satisfaction is the inner satisfaction and happiness achieved when doing certain tasks. (Pavalache-ilie, 2014) shows that employees who are satisfied with their work tend to adopt organizational citizenship behavior. This shows that job satisfaction has a direct effect on organizational citizenship behavior. (Robbins, 2003) suggests there are four ways in which workers express dissatisfaction, namely: 1) leaving, leaving work including finding another job; 2) voice, provide suggestions for improvement and discuss problems with superiors to improve conditions; 3) neglect, the attitude by allowing the situation to get worse as is often absent or more often makes mistakes; 4) loyalty, waiting passively until conditions get better including defending the company against outside criticism.

Based on the descriptions above, it can be synthesized that job satisfaction is a pleasant or positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of one's work or experience at work, with indicators: (1) mentally challenging work; (2) supporting working conditions; (3) adequate salary or wages; (4) compatibility of personality with work; (5) supporting co-workers.

2.4   Hypotheses

Three Hypotheses were included to help guide the readers of this study. Path model of the study with three hypotheses

H1. There will be a direct influence on the trust in organizational citizenship behavior

H2. There will be direct influence trust in the work satisfaction

H3. There will be direct influence work satisfaction in organizational citizenship behavior

III.   METHODS

Some procedures were carried out to achieve the purpose of this research, namely; Using the survey method with a causal approach with path analysis, the validity of the instrument items was calculated using the Pearson Product Moment correlation formula. The instrument reliability coefficient was calculated using the Cronbach Alpha formula. Overall calculation of the item validity coefficient and instrument reliability coefficient is done through the Excel program. The data analysis technique used is descriptive and inferential data analysis techniques. The inferential analysis is used to test hypotheses using path analysis. All hypothesis testing was performed using $\alpha = 0.05$. Before testing the hypothesis, the normality of the estimated error of the regression is done by using the Lilliefors technique and the linearity test using the ANAVA test. To test the direct effect of the independent variable on a dependent variable, reflected by the path coefficient. The calculation is done, with computer aids. The program used is a data analysis package found in Microsoft Excel, SPSS, and Lisrel.

1.1   Research Time and Place

This research was carried out for 10 (ten) months in Makassar State High School with instruments distributed to teachers, starting in March to June 2019 to December 2019, starting with the administration of

research permits, instrument trials, and instrument refinement, data collection, data analysis, and writing research seminar results.

1.2 Population and SamplePopulasi dan Sample

The population in this study were all high school teachers in Makassar City. The target population is all teachers from 22 (twenty-two) state high schools in Makassar City, totaling 1088 teachers of Civil Servants.

The target population in this study were all PNS teachers from 22 (twenty two) state high schools in Makassar City. Sampling techniques use proportional random sampling using formulas from Yamane (Kuncoro, 2007). Thus the sample in this study was 292 respondents.

1.3 Research Instruments

Data collection techniques were carried out using questionnaire research instruments, namely: (1) instruments of trust (2) instruments of job satisfaction, (3) instruments of organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. Rating scale (branch scale) is used for all variables that have five categories of answer choices, namely: (a) very often, (b) often, (c) rarely, (d) rarely, (e) never and (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) doubt, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree. Alternative answer choices are given a value of 5 to 1 for positive statements, and weight values of 1 to 5 for negative statements.

The instrument was developed by the researcher himself. Before being used in research, instruments developed were first tested on 30 respondents. A simple randomly selected trial sample from the empirical trial research population was intended to determine the validity of items for which the instrument was calculated using Pearson's Product Moment correlation formula, as a basis for selecting valid instrument items that could be used in data collection. The acceptance and rejection of instrument items were obtained through calculations with the critical price r obtained from table r at $\alpha = 0.05$ and n = 30 which is equal to 0.361. An instrument item can be maintained if it has a coefficient (r)> 0.361. The instrument reliability coefficient was calculated using the Cronbach Alpha formula. Overall calculation of the item validity coefficient and instrument reliability coefficient is done through the Excel program.

1.3.1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior Instruments

Organizational citizenship behavior is a set of voluntary behaviors that are not part of an individual's formal duties, but which someone does to promote an organization, with indicators: 1) altruism (voluntary action); 2) courtesy (courtesy); 3) sportsmanship (tolerance); 4) civic virtue (moral citizenship); 5) conscientiousness (self-control). Then the validity of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Test is carried out with the help of Microsoft Excel. Based on testing the validity of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior instrument, it is known that from the 40 statement items, there are 3 items that are invalid. Thus, the number of items valid and used as a tool to collect 37 research data obtained a reliability coefficient (α) of 0.931

1.3.2 Trust Instruments

Trust is a positive expectation that others will not be opportunistic through words, actions or decisions, with indicators: 1) integrity; 2) competence; 3) consistency; 4) loyalty; and 5) openness. Furthermore, testing

the validity of the Trust Instrument is carried out with the help of Microsoft Excel. Based on testing the validity of the instrument Trust is known from 40 statements there are 2 items that are invalid. Thus the number of valid items and used as a research data collection tool as many as 38 items obtained the reliability coefficient (α) of 0.953.

1.3.3 *Job* Satisfaction *Instruments*

Job satisfaction is a pleasant or positive emotional state that results from evaluating one's work or experience at work, with indicators: 1) mentally challenging work; 2) supportive working conditions; (3) adequate salary or wages; 4) compatibility of personality with work; 5) supportive coworkers.

Furthermore, testing the validity of the Trust Instrument is carried out with the help of Microsoft Excel. based on testing the validity of the instruments of job satisfaction known from the 41 item statements there are 3 items that are not valid. Thus the number of valid items and used as research data collection tools as many as 38 items obtained the reliability coefficient (α) of 0.914.

1.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used is descriptive and inferential data analysis techniques. Whereas inferential analysis is used to test hypotheses using path analysis. All hypothesis testing was performed using α = 0.05. Before testing the hypothesis, the normality of the estimated error of the regression is done by using the Lilliefors technique and the linearity test using the ANAVA test. In the path analysis there are two types of variables, namely: exogenous variables and endogenous variables. In accordance with the mindset developed, the endogenous variable in this study is organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Y). While exogenous variables include: trust (X1), job satisfaction (X2), calculations performed, with computer aids. The program used is a data analysis package found in Microsoft Excel, SPSS, and Lisrel.

IV. RESULTS

1.5 Profile of Respondents

The profile of respondents seen from gender, length of work and level of education. See table 4.1.

No	Data Type	Classification	amount	Per cent (%)
1	Gender	Boy	1 05	3 5.96
		Girl	187	64.04
		Subtotal	292	100
2	Length of work	5 stars - 10 years	60	20, 55
		11 - 15	150	51, 37
		16-20	82	28.08
3	Education Level n	S1	200	68.49
		S2	90	30, 82
		S3	2	0.68

Source: Research Results

1.6   Testing Requirements AnalysisT

There are certain statistical test requirements that must meet data to be able to do a path analysis (path analysis). Therefore, before conducting data analysis using path analysis, a number of statistical tests are first required in path analysis. Some statistical tests that must be met by data in path analysis are: (1) error normality test; (2) Test the significance and linearity of the regression coefficients of this section describe the three statistical tests required in the path analysis.

1.6.1   Test for Normality of Error Distribution

The first requirement that must be met in a path analysis is that the sampling error must originate from a normally distributed population.

Table 4. 2 : Summary of the Estimated Error Normality Test

No	Variable	n	L count	Table ($_{0.05; 85}$)	Conclusion
1	X3 over X1	292	0.043	0.051	Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations
2	X3 over X2	292	0.046	0.051	Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations
3	X2 over X1	292	0.049	0.051	The estimated error originates from the normal distributed population

Source: Research Results

1.6.2   Test the Significance and Linearity of the Regression Model

The last requirement that must be met in conducting path analysis is the exogenous and endogenous variables formulated in the theoretical model have a significant and linear relationship.

The results of the analysis of variance (ANAVA) of this model are presented in Table 4.3. In this table, it can be seen that the F calculated regression model is greater than F table ($\alpha = 0.05$). Thus it can be stated that the alleged regression model is significant. Furthermore, the Fcount value of the matched tuna is smaller than F table ($\alpha = 0.05$). This shows that the relationship between the calculated variables is linear.

Tabel 4.3: Linearity Test Calculation Results

No	Variable	F count	F table (0.05)	Conclusion
1	X 3 over X1	0.75	1,650	linearly
2	X3 over X2	.89	1,650	linearly

| 4 | X2 over X1 | .86 | 1,650 | linearly |

Source: Research Results

1.7 Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing using path analysis is carried out in two stages of analysis in path testing, namely: determination and testing of path coefficients and testing of research hypotheses.

The correlation matrix between variables in the structural model as presented in Figure 4.5, can be seen in Table 4.4.

Table 4. 4 : Variable Correlation Matrix .

Correlation	X3	X1	X2
X3	1,000	0.422	.367
X1	0.422	1,000	.472
X2	.367	.472	1,000

Note: all correlation coefficients are significant at α = 0.05

In the table, it can be seen that all correlation coefficients between variables are positive. This shows that there is a positive relationship between variables. Based on the calculation results of the path analysis in substructure-1, sub-structure-2 obtained path coefficient values that show the direct and causal effects in the structural model analyzed and have been stated, all path coefficients in the structural model are significant.

1.8   Testing the Statistical Hypothesis

The results of the calculation of the path coefficient are used to test the proposed hypothesis and measure the effectiveness of both direct and indirect exogenous variables on endogenous variables in the structural model. Hypothesis conclusions are made through the calculation of the statistical value of t-count of each path coefficient, provided that if t-count> t-table then the path coefficient is significant and vice versa if t-count <t-table then the path coefficient is not significant. The results of the decision on all proposed hypotheses are explained as follows.

1.8.1   Hypothesis 1

There is a Direct Effect of Trust (X1) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Teachers (X3)

The calculation results get that the path coefficient X1 to X3 (ρ31) of 0.25 with t-count = 4.45. At α = 0.05, obtained t-table = 1.65. Because the value of t-count (4.45)> t-table (1.65) reject H0 and accept H1, the path coefficient is significant. Based on these findings it can be stated that there is a real positive direct effect of trust on teacher organizational citizenship behavior. This means that changes in increased confidence will lead to an increase in organizational citizenship behavior of teachers.

1.8.2   Hypothesis 2

There is a Direct Effect of Job Satisfaction (X2) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Teachers (X3)

The calculation results get that the path coefficient X2 to X3 (ρ32) is 0.22 with t-count = 3.90. At α = 0.05, obtained t-table = 1.65. Because the value of t-count (3.90)> t-table (1.65) reject H0 and accept H1, the path

coefficient is significant. Based on these findings it can be stated that there is a real positive direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. This means that changes in increased job satisfaction will lead to an increase in organizational citizenship behavior of teachers.

1.8.3   *Hypothesis 3*

There is a Direct Effect of Trust (X1) on Job Satisfaction (X2)

The calculation results get that the path coefficient X1 to X2 ($\rho21$) is 0.51 with t-count = 10.01. At $\alpha = 0.05$ obtained t-table = 1.65. Because the value of t-count (10.01)> t-table (1.65) reject H0 and accept H1, the path coefficient is significant. Based on these findings it can be stated that there is a real positive direct effect of trust (X1) on job satisfaction (X2). This means that changes in increasing teacher confidence will lead to increased teacher job satisfaction.

Table 4. 5: Summary of the Path coefficient Results in Sub-structure -1, 2

Path coefficient (ρ)	Value t		F value	Test result	Koefisien Diterminan R $_{square}$ or R ^{2} $_{X3X1X2}$	Other Variable Coefficients (residual)
	count	table				
ρ_{31} = 0.251	4.45	t $_{0.05 (292-3 - 1)}$ t $_{0.05; 288}$	31,478	Ho refused	0.497	0.41
ρ_{32} = 0.24	3.90	1.65 t $_{0.01 (292-3 - 1)}$ t $_{0.01; 288}$ 2.33		Ho refused		
ρ_{21} = 0, 51	10.01	t $_{0.05 (292-3 - 1)}$ t $_{0.05; 288}$ 1.65 t $_{0.01 (292-3 - 1)}$ t $_{0.01; 288}$ 2.33	83,123	Ho refused	The coefficient reflected by R $_{square}$ or R ^{2} $_{X2X1}$	0, 7

Source: Research Results

V.   DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the calculation of path analysis on the effect of trust, job satisfaction, on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers, both directly and indirectly, it turns out this study can prove the three hypotheses proposed.

Thus the next step is to determine the total effect of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. In substructure-1, as stated, to an endogenous variable, namely X3 and two exogenous variables, namely X1, and X2. Based on the calculation results and testing the path coefficient can be interpreted as the large direct influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. Determination of the direct influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables that the direct effect of trust on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers is 0.25. Similarly, the direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers is equal to 0.22.

In substructure-2, as already stated, with respect to an endogenous variable, X2 and one exogenous variable, X1. Based on the calculation results and testing the path coefficient can be interpreted as the large direct influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. Determination of the direct influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables that the direct effect of trust on job satisfaction is 0.51.

5.1   *Trust and organizational Citizenship behavior Teachers.*

Based on the results of the calculation of the direct effect of trust on organizational citizenship behavior teachers obtained results of 0.25. In the structural model as shown in Figure 4.6. Trust, besides having a direct effect, also shows an indirect effect on teacher organizational citizenship behavior through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. the indirect effect of trust on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers through job satisfaction has a significance value of 3.0272. While the indirect effect of trust on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers through organizational commitment has a significance value of 3,359.

5.2   *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship behavior Teachers.*

The direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers amounted to 0.22. Job satisfaction also shows the indirect effect on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers through organizational commitment. The indirect effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers through organizational commitment has a significance value of 3,197.

5.3   *Work Trust and Job Satisfaction*

The direct effect of trust on job satisfaction is 0.51. Trust is one of the most important issues in increasing job satisfaction. If the teacher feels satisfied it will provide optimal work results and give confidence to the boss or fellow teachers, while high dissatisfaction will result in a high level of mistrust at work and life feeling unhappy and less motivated in doing something positive and productive.

The findings of this study, reinforce the theory put forward by Bachelor (2012) that job satisfaction is a person's happy feelings about the results of the work achieved by indicators of appreciation of work results, promotion of positions, opportunities for self-development, work equality, trust between members, and the creation of comfortable working conditions.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, T., Asari, & Wibowo. (2018). The Effect of Personality, Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction on Teachers Organizational Citizenship Behavior at Public Vocational High School in DKI Jakarta Province. International Journal Of Scientific Research and Management, 06(04), 191–197. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v6i4.el02

2. Ahmadi, S., & Ahmadi, F. (2013). Teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior is there any relationship? New Educational Review, 33(3), 272–283.

3. Akbar, S., & Tabatabei, N. (2015). The Effective of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. International Journal Of Academic Research and Social Science, 5(1), 155–165. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i1/1416

4. Al sultan, A. (2016). The Relationship between Members Trust and OCB in the Private Sectors of Kuwait: The Role of Organizational Commitmen. International Businnes Management.

5. Altuntas, Serap, and Ulku Baykal. "Relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their organizational citizenship behaviors." Journal of nursing scholarship 42.2 (2010): 186-194.

6. Asamani, L. (2015). Interpersonal Trust At Work And Employees Organizational Citizenship Behavior. In International Journal of Business and Management Review (Vol. 3). Retrieved from www.eajournals.org

7. Asari. (2018). Effect of personality, Organizational climate, and Work satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship B ehavior Teacher In Secondary High S chool In The City Of Administration Jakarta Center Province DKI Jakarta. International Journal of Human Capital Management, 2(1), 10–16.

8. Astrining sari, S. (2016). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Sebagai Variabel Intervening. Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen (JIM), 4(3), 1–9.

9. Bakiev, E., & Buren, V. (2013). The Influence of Interpersonal Trust and Organizational Commitment on Perceived Organizational Performance. Journal Of Applied Economics and Business Research, 3(3), 166–180.

10. Berkovich, I. (2018). Effects of Principal-Teacher Gender Similarity on Teacher ' s Trust and Organizational Commitment. Journal Springer Science, 561–572. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0814-3

11. Budiman, A. (2014). Does Job Satisfaction Influence Organizational Citizenship Behavior ? An Empirical Study in Selected 4-Star Hotels in Jakarta , Indonesia. Journal Review Of Integrative Business and Economic, 3(1), 130–149.

12. Chi, H. (2013). The Organizational Commitment , Personality Traits and Teaching Efficacy of Junior High School Teachers : The Meditating Effect of Job Involvement. The Journal Of Human Resource and Adult Learning, 9(131), 131–142.

13. Colquitt, J., Le Pine, J., & Wesson, M. (2009). Organizational Behaviour. New York: MC Graw Hill.

14. Covey, R. S. (2008). 8 th Habbit, Melampaui Efektifitas, Menggapai Keagungan. Jakarta: Gramedia Utama.

15. Dessler, G. (2003). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. Jakarta: Indeks.

16. Demir, K. (2015). Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Identification in Public and Private Preschools. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174, 1176–1182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.734

17. Depdiknas. UUD No 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. , (2007).

18. Dwiastuti, R. (2013). Ilmu Perilaku Konsumen. Malang: UB Press.

19. Euwema, C., Wendi, H., & Hety, V. E. (2007). Ledership Style And Group Organizational Citizenship Behavior Across Culture. Journal Of Organizational Behavior.

20. Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M., & Halim, F. W. (2011). The Relationships between Organizational Justice , Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job Satisfaction. Journal Social Science and Humaniora, 19, 115–121.

21. Foote, David A., and Thomas Li-Ping Tang. "Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) does team commitment make a difference in self-directed teams?." Management Decision 46.6 (2008): 933-947.

22. Greenberg, Robert, & Baron. (2003). Organizational Behavior (Internatio). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

23. Ghozali, Imam. 2011. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

24. Hasselbein, F., & Jhonston, R. (2005). A leader To A Leader Guide On High Performance Organization. Jakarta: Elex Media Computindo.

25. Hilmi, Fakhri. 2011. Pengaruh Pengalaman, Pelatihan dan Skeptisme Profesional Auditor terhadap Pendektesian Kecurangan. Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah

26. Hermaningshih, A. (2011). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Budaya Organisasi. Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Kewirausahaan.

27. Idris, M., Nurdasila, T., & Mahdani, D. (2019). Impact of Job Satisfaction and Commitment to Performance : Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as a Mediator (Research on Teachers in State Islamic Elementary Schools (MIN) in Banda Aceh). Journal Of Education And Practice, 10(6), 47–53. https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP

28. Kars, M., & Inandi, Y. (2018). Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Behaviors and Teachers' Organizational Trust. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 18, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2018.74.8

29. Kiliç, E., Relations, G. I., & Journal, H. R. (2013). The Relationship Among Organizational Commitment And Organizational Citizenship Behavior - A research Study On Call Center Employee. Journal Industrial Relation And Human Resources, (July), 83–93. https://doi.org/10.4026/1303-2860.2013.0233.x

30. King, A. (2011). Psikologi Umum (Dua). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

31. Koesoma, D. A. (2010). Pendidikan Karakter: Strategi Mendidik Anak Di Zaman Global. Jakarta: Grasindo.

32. Koys, Daniel J. "The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover

on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study." Personnel psychology 54.1 (2001): 101-114.

33. Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2001). Organizational Behaviour (Fifth). Jakarta: MC Graw Hill.

34. Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2014). perilaku Organisasi (9th ed.). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

35. Kuncoro, R. (2007). Cara Menggunakan dan Memakai Analisis Jalur. Bandung: Alfabeta.

36. Kurniawan, Albert. "Pengaruh komitmen organisasi terhadap Organizational citizenship behavior (ocb) Pt x bandung." Jurnal Manajemen 15.1 (2015): 95-118.

37. Kusumaninggati, Mukhtar, M., & Sujanto, B. (2018). The Influence of Self Efficacy , Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Toward Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Ocb) of Teachers Of Private Vocational Schools in South Jakarta. International Journal Of Scientific Research and Management, 06(06), 406–414. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v6i6.el06

38. Lary, A. R. (2005). Succesful-Site Based Management- A Pratical guide (Terjemahan). Jakarta: Diva Pustaka.

39. Leelamanothum, A., Na-nan, K., & Ngudgratoke, S. (2018). The Influences of Justice and Trust on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Generation X and Generation Y. Journal Of Asian Social Science, 14(5), 60–68. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v14n5p60

40. Luthans, F. (2006). Perilaku Organisasi. Jogyakarta: Andi.

41. Luthans, F. (2011). Organizational Behavior; An Evidence Based Approach (12th ed.). MC Graw Hill.

42. Makvandi, A., Naderi, F., Makvandi, B., Pasha, R., & Ehteshamzadeh, P. (2018). Academic optimism and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst secondary school teachers. International Journal of Emotional Education, 10, 164–166.

43. Muthuraman, S., & Al-haziazi, M. (2017). Examining the Factors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour with reference to Corporate Sectors in Sultanate of Oman. International Review of Management and Marketing, 7(1), 413–422.

44. Ngurah, P., & Yasa, S. (2017). The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior through the Mediation of Organizational Commitment (A Case Study in the Westin Resort Nusa Dua , Bali). Journal Of Law, Policy and Globalization, 57, 64–74.

45. Oemar, Yohanas. "Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Kemampuan Kerja dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Organizational Citizenhsip Behavior (OCB) Pegawai pada BAPPEDA Kota Pekanbaru." Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen 11.1 (2013): 65-76.

46. Onn, C. Y., Nordin, J., & Yusof, H. (2018). The mediating effect of trust on the dimensionality of organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour amongst teachers in Malaysia. Educational Psychology, 3410, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1426836

47. Özdem, G. (2012). The Relationship Between The Organizational Citizenship Behaviors And The Organizational And Professional Commitment Of Secondary School Teachers. Journal Of Global Strategic Management, 47–64. https://doi.org/10.20460/JGSM.2012615773

48. Pavalache-ilie, M. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviour , work satisfaction and employees ' personality. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 127, 489–493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.296

49. Podsakoff, Philip M., et al. "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies." Journal of applied psychology 88.5 (2003): 879.

50. Rahim, N., & Razzak, S. (2013). School Teachers of Karachi Review of Relevant Literature. Journal Of Education and Social Science, 1(1), 20–30.

51. Ramadhan, H., Karnati, N., & Eko widodo, S. (2017). the Effect of Leader Member Exchange (Lmx), Trust, and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Ocb) of the State Junior High School Teachers in Surakarta. International Journal of Advanced Research, 5(12), 633–641. https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/6002

52. Reina, D. S., & Reina, M. L. (2006). The need for trust in the workplace. Trust and Betrayal in the Workplace: Building Effective Relationships in Your Organization.

53. Robbins, S. P. (2003). Perilaku Organisasi. Jakarta: Indeks.

54. Robbins, S. P. (2015). Perilaku Organisasi. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

55. Ruslani. (2007). Trust : Kebijakan Sosial Dan Penciptaan Kemakmuran. Jakarta: Kalam.

56. Sandhika, D., & Sobandi, A. (2018). Perilaku Kewargaan Organisasi (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) Sebagai Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Pegawai. Jurnal Manajerial, 3(5), 174–183.

57. Sarjana, S. (2012). Pengaruh supervisi dan iklim organisasi terhadap kepuasan kerja. Jurnal Kependidikan, 42(2), pp 173-186.

58. Sjahruddin, H., Sudiro, A., & Tanjung Alang. (2013). Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment and Trust in Manager as predictor of Organizational Citizenship. Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Businnes, (June). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278726944

59. Slocum, & Hellriegel. (2011). Organizational behavior. USA: South Western College Publishing.

60. Sofyandi, H., & Garniwa, I. (2007). Perilaku Organisasi. Jogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

61. Somech, A., & Izhar, O. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior in school. Oxon: Routledge.

62. Sopiah. (2008). Perilaku Organisasi. Jogyakarta: Andi Offset.

63. Suwatno, & Priansa. (2011). Manajemen SDM dalam organisasi Publik dan Bisnis. Bandung: Alfa Beta.

64. Tang, & Gilbret. (2007). Quality Planning And Analysis. New York: MC Graw Hill.

65. Titisari, P. (2014). Peranan Organizational Behavior Dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Karyawan. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.

66. Tribune Online. (2019). Imran Yasin Limpo Kesal Dapati Ruang Kelas Di SMA 15 Makasar Tanpa Murid Dan Guru.

67. Undang-undang No 14 Tahun 2005 Tentang Guru dan Dosen. , (2005).

68. Wahyu Ariani, D. (2014). Relationship Personality, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Behaviour Of Service Industries In Indonesia. Research Journal Of Business Mnagement, 3, 262–283.

69. Wibowo. (2012). Manajemen Kinerja. Jakarta: raja Grafindo Persada.

70. Wierbzicki, A. (2010). Trust And Fairness In Open Distributed System. Berlin: Springer.

71. Wirawan, 2014, Kepemimpinan, Teori, Psikologi, Perilaku Organisasi, Aplikasi dan Penelitian:Contoh Aplikasi untuk Kepemimpinan Wanita, Organisasi Bisnis, Pendidikan dan Militer , Rajagrafindo Persada, Jakarta

72. Yangaiya, S. A., & Magaji, K. (2017). The Relationship Betwen School Leadership And Job Satisfaction Of Secondary School Teachers : A mediating Role Of Teacher Empowerment. PEOPLE : International Journal Of Social Science, 1(1), 1239–1251.

https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2015.s21.12391251

73. Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5, 998–1003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.225

74. Zeinabadi, Hassanreza, and Keyvan Salehi. (2011) "Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model." Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 29 (2011): 1472-1481.