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INTRODUCTION

There are still limited teachers with full awareness carry out tasks outside their primary 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 solid 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 essential factor in the smoothness of the relationship to realize the efficiency and effectiveness of school organizations. Mutual trust is needed in school organizations. With mutual trust, School organization members will positively influence more optimal performance results, thus impacting 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 is a pleasant thing. Teachers who are not satisfied with their work will try to eliminate the workload, given that it has become their responsibility to the organization. So the teacher's feelings are not satisfied, which will cause the difficulty of schools to be able to experience progress and improve quality in carrying out learning 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 organizational citizenship behavior of teachers has become very important in the world of education in the Medan region, especially at the senior high school level. Based on the results of the Medan Balitbangda research, 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

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 organization's effectiveness. 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), 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. 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).

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 almost everyone understands, although it is difficult to define precisely. Trust is a belief in something with positive thoughts.

Some experts give different definitions, but in essence, trust is an optimistic 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 community members. (Robbins, 2003) trust is positive that another will not passwords, actions, or decisions act opportunistically.

Robbins further stated that building 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. They were relying on people to give the absolute truth. Robbins believes that integrity (honesty) and competence (ability) are the essential characteristics leaders seek 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 (Wierzbicki, 2010) defines trust as inherently sociological. Barber divides four dimensions of trust into hope: 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 that an essential element in all cases of trust is the existence of a norm that motivates work together. According to Gambetta (Wierzbicki, 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 as a subjective expectation that trust and reputation are needed for mutual change.

Regarding Deutsch trust (Wierzbicki, 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 a person's desire to be sensitive to the actions of others based on the expectation that other people will take specific 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 someone willing to be sensitive to others based on the belief that others are generous, honest, open, reliable, and competent. According to (Lary, 2005), trust in other people is a positive work climate component. 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 would 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.

According to Woodman (Akbar & Tabatabei, 2015), Job satisfaction 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 are employee characteristics, type of work, work environment, and human relations. (Robbins, 2015); a general attitude towards one’s work as the difference between the number of rewards received by workers and the number 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 more significant 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 like the individual has a significant meaning to explain job satisfaction besides the characteristics of the work environment.

Meanwhile, in their research, 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 specific 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 make
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. This topic is an important thing to be studied in the field of education because it is related to the emotional condition of educators in carrying out their responsibilities at work. It will determine the quality of education.

METHODS

Some procedures were carried out to achieve this research’s purpose: 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 regression’s estimated error is done using the Lilliefors technique and the linearity test using the ANOVA 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.

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

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings
Profile of Respondents

The profile of respondents is seen from gender, length of work, and level of education. See table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>64.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Length of work</td>
<td>5 years - 10 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>51.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>68.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing Requirements Analysis

Certain statistical test requirements must meet data to do a path analysis (path analysis). Therefore, before conducting data analysis using path analysis, several statistical tests are first required. Some statistical tests that data in path analysis must meet 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.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>L count</th>
<th>Table (0.05; 85)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X₃ over X₁</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X₃ over X₂</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X₂ over X₁</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>The estimated error originates from the normally distributed population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test the Significance and Linearity of the Regression Model

The last requirement that must be met in conducting path analysis is that 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. This table shows that the F calculated regression model is greater than the F table (α = 0.05). Thus it can be stated that the alleged regression model is significant. Furthermore, the F-count value of the matched tuna is smaller than the F-table (α = 0.05). It shows that the relationship between the calculated variables is linear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>L count</th>
<th>Table (0.05; 85)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X₃ over X₁</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X₃ over X₂</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Estimated errors originate from normally distributed populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X₂ over X₁</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>The estimated error originates from the normally distributed population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing using path analysis is carried out in two stages: determination and testing of path coefficients and research hypotheses. The correlation matrix between variables in the structural model is presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₃</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**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 by calculating 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.

**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) rejects H0 and accepts H1, the path coefficient is significant. Based on these findings, trust has a real positive direct effect on teacher organizational citizenship behavior. This means that changes in increased confidence will lead to an increase in teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. This is in line with research by (Balay, 2007) that a school organization needs to be organizational commitment of every school member to avoid these problems. Organizational commitment also has benefits in schools, namely establishing relationships with parties related to school organizations, such as teacher commitments with principals or vice versa as well as commitments between teachers and other teachers.

**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) rejects H0 and accepts H1, the path coefficient is significant. Based on these findings, job satisfaction has a real positive direct effect on teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. This means that changes in increased job satisfaction will increase teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. It is in line with research by (Rezvani, et al., 2016), trust is one of the most important issues in increasing job satisfaction. If the teacher is satisfied, it will provide optimal work results and confidence to superiors or fellow teachers. In contrast, high dissatisfaction will result in a high level of distrust in work and life, feeling unhappy and less motivated in doing something positive and productive.

The findings of this study strengthen the theory put forward by (Bachelor, 2012) that job satisfaction is a person's feeling of pleasure towards the results of the work he has achieved with indicators of: appreciation for work results, promotions, opportunities for self-development, equal distribution of work, trust among members, and the creation of comfortable working conditions.

**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 (ρ21) is 0.51 with t-count = 10.01. At α = 0.05, obtained t-table = 1.65. Because the value of t-count (10.01) > t-table (1.65) rejects H0 and accepts H1, the path coefficient is significant. Based on these findings, 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 5. Summary of the Path coefficient Results in Sub-structure -1, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path coefficient (ρ)</th>
<th>Value t</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Test result</th>
<th>Koefisien Determinan R²</th>
<th>Other Variable Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ρ₁ = 0.251</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>31.478</td>
<td>Ho refused</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ₂ = 0.24</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ho refused</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ = 0.51</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>83.123</td>
<td>Ho refused</td>
<td>The coefficient reflected</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational commitment is getting to know the organization’s employees with the organization’s goals that will be used to achieve the goals of the company (Dessler, 2003). In addition, commitment is needed between employees and the university (organization). The predetermined goals can be achieved, as stated by (Dessler, 2003) that organizational commitment includes the discrepancy theory from Locke, which states that satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Some aspects of work reflect the weighing of two values: the perceived conflict between what an individual wants and what he or she receives and the importance of what is desired for the individual.

Organizational commitment is the desire of members of the organization to maintain membership, have a relatively strong relationship with the organization, and are willing to strive to achieve organizational goals and create a sense of belonging for workers towards the organization (Slocombe & Bluedorn, 1999). The study results (Altuntas & Baykal, 2010) that trust has a positive impact on increasing motivation, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Organizational citizenship behavior leads to increased organizational performance. The results of research conducted by (Koys, 2001) prove a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (Koys, 2001). The results of the study (Oemar Y., 2013) that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on the organizational citizenship behavior of employees at Bappeda Pekanbaru City. The findings in Oemar’s research are that if organizational commitment increases, the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of employees in the Bappeda of Pekanbaru City tends to increase. Moreover, vice versa, when organizational commitment decreases, organizational citizenship behavior among employees (OCB) decreases.

CONCLUSION

Based on the calculation of path analysis results on the effect of trust, job satisfaction, and 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 teachers' organizational citizenship behavior is equal to 0.22.

In substructure-2, as already stated, concerning an endogenous variable, X2 and one exogenous variable, X1. Based on the calculation results and testing, the path coefficient can be interpreted as the considerable 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.
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