

The Influence of Trust and Organizational Commitment on Quality Management Education

Abd. Sokib Zunaidi^{1*}, Eny Rochaida², Siti Maria³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Economics and Business, Mulawarman University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This study aims to test and analyze Leader Humility and Trust and Organizational Commitment to Quality Management of Education in Samarinda City. Primary data collection was carried out by giving a questionnaire to 85 samples of respondents. The data were analyzed descriptively and inferentially using the Partial Least Square (PLS) method. The results showed that: Trust has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment, Trust has a positive but insignificant effect on Quality Management, and Organizational Commitment has a positive but insignificant effect on Quality Management of Education in Samarinda City.

Keywords: *Trust, organizational commitment, quality management education*

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance of primary and secondary education is a systematic, integrated and sustainable mechanism to ensure that the entire process of providing education is following established quality standards and regulations. To be able to carry out education quality assurance properly, it is necessary to have an education quality assurance system. The primary and secondary education quality assurance system aims to ensure the fulfillment of standards in primary and secondary education units in a systemic, holistic, and sustainable manner so that a quality culture grows and develops in educational units independently.

In the context of improving quality, it appears that the learning process that occurs in class is generally not going well. About 74% of class activities are carried out by the teacher alone and about 11% of class activities are carried out jointly by the teacher and students. This illustrates that the learning process in the classroom has not been carried out interactively which has an impact on several things, namely student creativity has not increased and students' critical thinking skills and students' analytical skills have not been formed. In addition to the process of learning outcomes for Primary and Middle Education, they have not been encouraging. Student learning outcomes are still low, especially seen from the value of the National Examination.

Meanwhile, the implementation of the primary and secondary education curriculum in Indonesia is still problematic. The curriculum is developed by forming a space for developing student interest and potential in preparing for global developments. Increasing teacher competence can be done by strengthening the use of a holistic thematic approach in the learning process. Thus it is hoped that it can form a strong learner character, especially in the school community.

Some experts have a perspective and see humility as a strength, and have adaptive abilities, but others associate humility with humility and low self-esteem leaders, (Miller et al., 2013). As a result, humility is often and mistakenly considered a weakness indicating low self-esteem (Begen et al., 2014), a personality characteristic that is incompatible with the realities faced by leaders in modern and competitive organizations. But in its development, the negative perspective of humility has changed and is considered an important component of organizational success.

In addition to the empirical gaps, this study is directed towards contributing to the literature of humble leaders, perceptions of support, ongoing commitment, and educational organizational performance in an integrated model. Also, although many definitions have been suggested, there is no conceptual consensus regarding leader humility. Given the problem of this measurement and the interpersonal nature of the interaction of organizational life, the third significance of this research is to focus the definition on expressed behavior that shows humility and how that behavior is perceived by others in educational organizations in particular, and Indonesia in general.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Relationship of trust, commitment, and organizational performance

Trust in leaders refers to a psychological state in which a person accepts their vulnerability when they have expectations of positive intentions or the behavior of their leaders, Huang et al., (1998). The level of trust in leaders is influenced by employees' views on the quality of leader-member relationships, Blau 1964). Employees can develop a higher level of trust in a leader who keeps promises and behaves consistently. This is because such ethical leaders usually value ethical behavior and undisciplined behavior. They tell employees what is expected of them and how they can positively contribute to the organization. When they feel supported and treated fairly, employees tend to trust the main leader, Mo & Shi (2017).

Trust can be expressed as the belief that someone has the competence and willingness to work fairly and ethically, Javed (2018). Trust in a leader has been defined as a psychological state of employees, which involves positive expectations about the intention or behavior of the leader in risky situations, Gao et al., (2011). Validating Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, previous research has determined that leaders who are concerned about the well-being of followers instill a positive psychological state in them, which followers reciprocate in the form of gratitude and increased trust Zhang et al., (2014). Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, (2013) also argue that leaders are believed to be more effective in increasing the higher performance of their subordinates. It has further been observed that employees' trust in leadership reflects their desire to be vulnerable to a leader's actions because they believe that leaders will not suppress their rights, Javed et al., (2018).

This study uses a compilation of various scales to obtain an assessment of trust in leadership using six items including Two items from, Robinson & Rousseau (1994) namely "My boss is open to me" and "I can tell various things to the leader"; two items from McAllister (1995), "I can freely share ideas with my leaders: and" I can share my hopes with my leaders ". Two items are the belief in competence, namely: "I believe that my leader has sufficient abilities to lead the organization", and "I believe that my leader can bring progress to the organization".

It cannot be denied that Organizational commitment (OC) has important implications for both employees and the organization. Therefore, to be effective, managers need to influence their subordinates, co-workers, and superiors to help and support proposals, plans and motivate them to implement their decisions Wu & Lo, (2009). According to Mathieu & Zajac (1990), if organizational commitment is intact, there will be relatively no turnover. Employees with a sense of Organizational commitment are less likely to engage in withdrawal behavior and are more willing to accept change. In several studies related to organizational commitment, Meyer & Herscovitch (2001), raised three components of organizational commitment that combine affective, continuity, and normative as three dimensions of organizational commitment.

Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, (2002), define organizational commitment as the degree to which employees identify with organizational goals and values and are willing to exert efforts to help organizational success. Commitment is a combination of attitudes and behaviors that involve a sense of being identified with organizational goals, a sense of involvement with organizational tasks, and a sense of loyalty to the organization, Meyer & Allen (1997). Meanwhile, Robbins & Judge, (2015), define commitment as a condition in which an individual side with the organization and its goals and desires to maintain membership in the organization.

Quality emerges as a business and industrial problem and then becomes a social problem 'affecting all areas of society, especially public services. These concerns have sparked controversial debate about how best to achieve quality in public services and also about the implications of implementing quality management (QM) frameworks in public services designed for business and manufacturing. There appears to be an aversion to the word 'management' in the various pieces of literature with the education sector. In particular, education quality management refers to quality management as a quality assurance by applying the principles established by Manatos et al., (2017). Furthermore, these principles are part of an integrated paradigm that can be seen from Total Quality Management (TQM), which describes some general guiding principles and core quality concepts Mehta, Verma, & Seth, (2014). Attention to quality in education encompasses teaching, research, service, and the institutional level.

In the world of education, education quality management can be expressed as an art and science to manage services that are oriented towards providing satisfaction to education stakeholders through quality assurance so that complaints do not occur. In the context of education, education quality management can be stated as a guarantee of the learning process that can meet the quality standards set through implementation in the field so that it can provide added value to students.

Based on the description above, it can be stated that education quality management is an effort to fulfill the principles of quality standards that have been set. The purpose of implementing education quality management is to meet the expectations of stakeholders in the world of education from the input, process, and output side of education in Indonesia.

The relationship model that places trust, commitment, and quality management has been widely used although in different leadership contexts. (Koochang et al., 2017), in their study involving the construction of leadership, trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance in various organizations in nine US regions. The findings of this study reveal a positive and significant linear relationship between leadership (leading organizations, prominent people, and self-leading), trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance. These findings imply that effective leadership (leading the organization, leading people, and leading oneself) contributes to increased trust among people, promotes the successful implementation of knowledge management processes, and in turn improves organizational performance.

(Simsek & Heavey, 2011), uses the basic commitment-trust theory (Morgan & Hunt, 1999), and tests trust as an antecedent of motivation, commitment, and organizational performance. Their results confirm that all aspects of trust have a significant impact on motivation and performance. Also, trust affects commitment, and trust and commitment simultaneously affect organizational performance. (Ghazinejad et al., 2018), show that the three values (trust, openness, and commitment) practiced in this study are essential for effective teamwork. These findings also show that trust and openness promote shared understanding, and encourage commitment.

The role of organizational commitment as a mediator

Research (Macey & Schneider, 2008), shows trust as a mediating factor that underpins the effect of transformational leadership on work engagement because employees need to believe that their investment of time, energy, and career opportunities will pay off in a meaningful way. Using different types of leadership (Ständer & Luger, 2015), we conclude that authentic leadership is a significant predictor of optimism and trust, and in turn, this optimism and belief mediate the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement.

Another study conducted by (Engelbrecht & Silvertant, 2018), concluded that leader integrity and ethical leadership can affect trust in leaders and employee work engagement. From this description, it can be seen that the research model involving leadership, trust, and engagement focuses more on the transformational leadership (Macey & Schneider, 2008); authentic leadership (Ständer & Luger, 2015); (Hsieh & Wang, 2015), and leader integrity, (Engelbrecht & Silvertant, 2018).

The study (Jin et al., 2017) specifically examined the mediating role of trust and commitment on the relationship between leadership and performance, and the results concluded that leadership indirectly improves employee performance through employee trust and organizational commitment.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a quantitative design to obtain empirical data and test hypotheses. The approach used is causal, where exogenous variables are used to predict endogenous variables. In this study, the exogenous variables were leadership humility, and three endogenous variables, namely trust, ongoing commitment, and school quality management. Collecting data using a cross-sectional approach, namely data collected at one time through a survey approach by distributing questionnaires to respondents.

The study only covers the area of Samarinda City in East Kalimantan in three education groups, namely Elementary School (SD), Junior High School (SMP), and General / Special Secondary School (SMU / SMK).

The data in this study used quantitative research data, namely data in the form of numbers or qualitative data which were assessed (scoring). Quantitative data can be grouped into two, namely discrete data and continuum data. Discrete data is data obtained from counting or counting (not measuring). This data is also often called nominal data. Nominal data are usually obtained from exploratory or survey research.

In this case the total population is all schools from the SD, SMP, SMA, and SMK levels in Samarinda City, East Kalimantan Province, totaling 409 schools (Data for 2020).

Table 1. Number of schools by grade

Level	Number of schools
SD	222
SMP	93
SMA	41
SMK	53
Total	409

In this study, the number of indicators is 17 which is used to measure 5 variables, so that the number of respondents used is 17 statement items multiplied by 5 equal to 85 respondents. Because they are stratified and taken proportionally, the samples at each stratum are calculated as follows:

Table 2. Proportional sample size

Level	Number of schools	n	n group
SD	222	85	46
SMP	93	85	19

SMA	41	85	9
SMK	53	85	11
Total	409		85

Validity and Reliability Test

The validity test serves to show the validity level of an instrument. Valid instruments have high validity. The instrument is said to be valid if it can measure what is desired, it can reveal data from the variables studied Sugiyono, (2010). The correlation value (r) is compared to 0.3, if the correlation (r) is greater than 0.3 then the questions made are categorized as valid.

Table 3. Test instrument validation

n	item	R ² > 0,3	Inf.
30	TR1	0.903	Valid
30	TR2	0.946	Valid
30	TR3	0.884	Valid
30	TR4	0.876	Valid
30	TR5	0.793	Valid
30	TR6	0.921	Valid
30	CM1.1	0.663	Valid
30	CM1.2	0.686	Valid
30	CM1.3	0.498	Valid
30	CM2.1	0.757	Valid
30	CM2.2	0.652	Valid
30	CM2.3	0.634	Valid
30	CM3.1	0.760	Valid
30	CM3.2	0.851	Valid
30	CM3.3	0.383	Valid
30	MU1	0.556	Valid
30	MU2	0.383	Valid
30	MU3	0.677	Valid
30	MU4	0.678	Valid
30	MU5	0.498	Valid

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Convergent validity

The SmartPLS output for convergent validity can be seen in the outer loadings table as follows:

Table 4. Outer loadings

	CM	MU	TR
CM1	0.875		
CM2	0.868		
CM3	0.549		
MU1		0.718	
MU2		0.793	
MU3		0.776	
MU4		0.412	
MU5		0.844	
TR1			0.805
TR2			0.821
TR3			0.835
TR4			0.712
TR5			0.800

Discriminant Validity

This value is the value of the cross-loading factor which is useful for knowing whether the indicator has adequate discrimination, by comparing the loading value of the intended indicator, it must be greater than the loading value than other indicators.

Tabel 5. Cross loadings

	CM	MU	TR
CM2	0.868	0.358	0.419
CM3	0.549	0.271	0.143
MU1	0.221	0.718	0.367
MU2	0.292	0.793	0.444
MU3	0.413	0.776	0.443
MU4	0.289	0.412	0.110
MU5	0.388	0.844	0.522
TR1	0.605	0.340	0.805
TR2	0.453	0.338	0.821
TR3	0.338	0.549	0.835
TR4	0.261	0.470	0.712
TR5	0.309	0.575	0.800
TR6	0.414	0.384	0.815

In the table above, it can be explained that:

Cross loadings of the Organizational Commitment Indicator (CM) on all its indicators show a greater value of cross-loadings than the indicators on Leader Humanity (LH), Quality Management (MU), and Trust (TR) indicators, so that the cross-loadings of the Organizational Commitment Indicator valid and predict indicators in their block better than indicators in other blocks;

Cross loadings for Leader Humanity (LH) Indicators, on all indicators, show the value of cross-loadings that is greater than the indicators on the Indicators of Organizational Commitment (CM), Quality Management (MU), and Trust (TR), so that the cross-loadings of Leader Humanity Indicators can be declared valid and predicts indicators in their block better than indicators in other blocks;

Cross loadings of Quality Management Indicators (MU), on all indicators, show the value of cross-loadings that is greater than the indicators on the Indicators of Organizational Commitment (CM), Leader Humanity (LH), and Trust (TR), so that the cross-loadings of Leader Humanity Indicators can declare validly and predicts indicators in their block better than indicators in other blocks; and

Cross loadings for Trust Indicators (TR), all of the indicators show a value of cross-loadings that is greater than the indicators on the Indicators of Organizational Commitment (CM), Leader Humanity (LH), and Quality Management (MU) so that the cross-loadings of Trust Indicators can be declared. valid and predict indicators in their block better than indicators in other blocks.

The average variance extracted (AVE)

The next method to see the validity of the discriminant validity indicator is to look at the square root average variance extracted or AVE value. The recommended value is 0.5. The SmartPLS output for average variance extracted can be seen in the following table:

Table 6. The average variance extracted (AVE)

Variable	AVE
CM	0.607
MU	0.526
TR	0.638

The table above shows that the AVE value of each indicator is above 0.5, so the discriminant validity based on the average variance extracted is valid. After the indicators can be declared valid, the next step is to test the reliability of the research indicators.

Composite reliability dan Cronbach alpha

A reliability test is done by looking at the composite reliability value of the indicator block that measures the indicator. The results of composite reliability will show a satisfactory value if it is above 0.7.

The reliability test can also be strengthened with a Cronbach alpha value greater than 0.6.

Table 7. Composite reliability dan Cronbach alpha

Variable	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
CM	0.817	0.677
MU	0.841	0.758
TR	0.913	0.887

The table above shows that:

All Indicators show the Composite Reliability value is greater than 0.7;

All indicators show a Cronbach Alpha value greater than 0.6; and

So that all indicators in this study can be declared reliable.

Analisis uji model structural**Table 81. Koefisien R²**

	R Square
CM	0.268
MU	0.399
TR	0.503

The table above shows that:

Structural model 1 places Organizational Commitment (CM) as an endogenous variable, amounting to 26.80%, and the rest is influenced by other factors outside the model;

Structure model 2 places Quality Management (MU) as an endogenous variable, amounting to 39.90%, and the rest is influenced by other factors outside the model; and

Structure model 3 places Trust (TR) as an endogenous variable, amounting to 50.30%, and the rest is influenced by other factors outside the model.

Direct impact testing**Table 9. Direct impact**

Variable		Koef. Jalur	T Stat	P-Value	Information
Exogen	Endogen		(1960)	(0,05)	
TR	CM	0.414	2.950	0.004	significant
TR	MU	0.194	0.934	0.353	Not significant
CM	MU	0.204	1.806	0.074	Not significant

The results of the direct effect test can be explained as follows:

The effect of trust (TR) on organizational commitment (CM)

The influence of Trust (TR) on Organizational Commitment (CM), through the path coefficient value of 0.414 and t count of 2.950, and p-value of 0.004. This value fulfills the requirements for acceptance of H1, which is a calculated t value greater than 1.96 and a p-value <0.05. Thus it can be concluded that Trust is proven to have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Commitment in Samarinda City. This coefficient value indicates that there is a significant influence between Trust and Organizational Commitment in Samarinda City.

The effect of trust (TR) on quality management (MU)

The influence of Trust (TR) on Quality Management (MU), through the path coefficient value of 0.194 and t count of 0.934 and p-value of 0.353. This value does not meet the requirements for acceptance of H1, namely the calculated t value greater than 1.96 and the p-value <0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that Trust is proven to have a positive but insignificant influence on the Quality Management of Education in Samarinda City. This coefficient value indicates that there is an insignificant influence between Trust and Quality Management Education.

Effect of organizational commitment (CM) on quality management (MU)

The influence of Organizational Commitment (CM) on Quality Management (MU), through the path coefficient value of 0.204 and t count of 1.806, and p-value of 0.074. This value does not meet the requirements for acceptance of H1, namely the calculated t value greater than 1.96 and the p-value <0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that Organizational Commitment (CM) is proven to have a positive but insignificant effect on Quality Management in Education in Samarinda City. This coefficient value indicates that there is an insignificant influence between Organizational Commitment and Quality Management of Education in Samarinda City.

Indirect effect testing**Table10. Indirect effect**

Variable			Koef. lane	T stat	P-value	Information
Exogen	Mediation	Endogen		(1.96)	(0,05)	
TR	CM	MU	0.084	1.442	0.152	Not significant

The results of the indirect effect test can be explained as follows:

The influence of trust (TR) with quality management (MU) through organizational commitment (CM)

The indirect effect of Trust (TR) with Quality Management (MU) through Organizational Commitment (CM), can be seen from the Path Coefficient value of 0.084 and the statistical t-test result of 1.442 <of 1.96 and the P-value or significance of 0.152> 0.05. . These results indicate that Trust (TR) with Quality Management (MU) through Organizational Commitment (CM) has a positive but insignificant effect. This means that the Organizational Commitment variable cannot mediate between Trust and Quality Management Education in Samarinda City.

V. CONCLUSION

Trust has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment, thus it can be said that trust in an organization will increase Organizational Commitment and be able to maximize the goals of the organization itself.

Trust has a positive but not significant effect on Quality Management, thus it can be said that Trust affects Quality Management but cannot maximize Quality Management.

Organizational Commitment has a positive but not significant effect on Quality Management, it can be said that Organizational Commitment has an influence on Quality Management but is not sufficient to maximize it.

REFERENCES

- [1] Altunoğlu, A. E., Şahin, F., & Babacan, S. (2019). Transformational leadership, trust, and follower outcomes: a moderated mediation model. *Management Research Review*.
- [2] Ariyabuddhipongs, V., & Kahn, S. I. (2017). Transformational leadership and turnover intention: The mediating effects of trust and job performance on café employees in Thailand. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 16(2), 215–233.
- [3] Begen, A., Cai, Y., & Ou, H. (2014). H. Ou," Duplication Grouping Semantics in the Session Description Protocol. RFC 7104, January.
- [4] Engelbrecht, N., & Silvertant, M. (2018). ASD superpowers.
- [5] Ghazinejad, M., Hussein, B. A., & Zidane, Y. J.-T. (2018). Impact of trust, commitment, and openness on research project performance: A case study in a research institute. *Social Sciences*, 7(2), 22.
- [6] Hsieh, C.-C., & Wang, D.-S. (2015). Does supervisor-perceived authentic leadership influence employee work engagement through employee-perceived authentic leadership and employee trust? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(18), 2329–2348.
- [7] Jaiswal, N. K., & Dhar, R. L. (2017). The influence of servant leadership, trust in the leader and thriving on employee creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- [8] Jeung, C.-W., & Yoon, H. J. (2016). Leader humility and psychological empowerment: investigating contingencies. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- [9] Jin, L., Vu, T., Yuan, G., & Datta, P. K. (2017). STRAP promotes stemness of human colorectal cancer via epigenetic regulation of the NOTCH pathway. *Cancer Research*, 77(20), 5464–5478.
- [10] Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- [11] Koohang, A., Paliszkiwicz, J., & Goluchowski, J. (2017). The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance: A research model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 117(3), 521–537.
- [12] Le, P. B., & Lei, H. (2018). Fostering knowledge sharing behaviors through ethical leadership practice: the mediating roles of disclosure-based trust and reliance-based trust in leadership. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 16(2), 183–195.
- [13] Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3–30.
- [14] Miller, R. L., Lee, J. H., & Owens, M. L. (2013). Methods of improving skin quality. Google Patents.
- [15] Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. (1999). Relationship-based competitive advantage: the role of relationship marketing in marketing strategy. *Journal of Business Research*, 46(3), 281–290.
- [16] Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 787–818.
- [17] Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1517–1538.
- [18] Rego, A., Owens, B., Leal, S., Melo, A. I., e Cunha, M. P., Gonçalves, L., & Ribeiro, P. (2017). How leader humility helps teams to be humbler, psychologically stronger, and more effective: A moderated mediation model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(5), 639–658.
- [19] Seto, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2016). Servant Leadership Influence on Trust and Quality Relationship in Organizational Settings. *International Leadership Journal*, 8(3).
- [20] Simsek, Z., & Heavey, C. (2011). The mediating role of knowledge- based capital for corporate entrepreneurship effects on performance: A study of small-to-medium-sized firms. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(1), 81–100.
- [21] Ständer, S., & Luger, T. A. (2015). NK-1 antagonists and itch. In *Pharmacology of Itch* (pp. 237–255). Springer.
- [22] Tangney, C. C., Tang, Y., Evans, D. A., & Morris, M. C. (2009). Biochemical indicators of vitamin B12 and folate insufficiency and cognitive decline. *Neurology*, 72(4), 361–367.

- [23] Vera, D., & Rodriguez-Lopez, A. (2004). Strategic virtues:: humility as a source of competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 393–408.
- [24] Zhang, M., Ren, C., Wang, G. A., & He, Z. (2018). The impact of channel integration on consumer responses in omnichannel retailing: The mediating effect of consumer empowerment. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2018.02.002>