



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijms.v7i3.6223>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Improving The Quality of Teacher Services Through Teacher Personality Development and Organizational Justice

Uli Rohana Siregar¹, Andi Hermawan²

¹Institut Nalanda, Jakarta, Indonesia, email. uli@nalanda.ac.id

²Universitas Pakuan, Bogor, Indonesia, email. gus.andi.evolutioner@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: uli@nalanda.ac.id¹

Abstract: The quality of teacher service is an important element related to achieving national education goals and developing the whole Indonesian person. The initial survey of the quality of service of Civil Servant teachers in Senior High Schools in Bogor Regency has not achieved optimal results. Therefore, the quality of teacher service is interesting to study. This study aims to find efforts on how the quality of teacher service can be improved by examining the relationship between the quality of teacher service and the variables of teacher personality and organizational justice. The study used correlational statistical methods, and a SITOREM method analysis was conducted. The research analysis unit was Civil Servant teachers in Senior High Schools with a population of 279 and a sample of 103 teachers. The results of the study showed a positive relationship between teacher personality and the quality of teacher service, with a relationship strength of $r_{y1} = 0.421$ and there was a positive relationship between organizational justice and the quality of teacher service, with a relationship strength of $r_{y2} = 0.297$, so that the quality of teacher service can be improved through teacher personality and organizational justice. It can be concluded that to improve the quality of teacher service, one can pay attention to indicators that are not yet optimal for recommendations and determine the priority order of improvements that need to be made.

Keyword: Quality of Teacher Service, Teacher Personality, Organizational Justice

INTRODUCTION

Education is a key factor in national development and an aspect of life inextricably linked to rapid change. Global advances in information and communication technology also increase challenges and competition, necessitating rapid adjustments. These challenges and competition also shape the expectations for how education will face the present and the future. Education, as a key pillar of human resource development, must not be left behind or merely survive; instead, efforts must be made to excel and compete with educational advancements in other countries. This excellence, in this case, means serving as a benchmark for other nations in developing human resources in the field of education.

High expectations for educational excellence require awareness and commitment from stakeholders to empower educational institutions to ensure their effective operation, resulting

in superior educational outcomes across all competencies. Professional governance is essential for every educational institution, from early childhood education (PAUD) to elementary, middle, and high schools (SMP). This is essential to ensure the continued improvement of students' knowledge and life competencies, which serve as the foundation for national development in facing the changing and challenging times.

The quality of human resources is inextricably linked to the quality of education, a key component of which is teachers. Quality schools are closely linked to the provision of quality educational services. Therefore, teachers are required to possess high qualifications, competence, and dedication in carrying out their professional duties. Civil Servant (PNS) teachers, as state officials, are tasked with providing services to the public professionally, honestly, fairly, and equitably in carrying out state, government, and development tasks.

Service quality is a form of consumer assessment of the level of service received (perceived service) compared to the level of service expected (expected service). Public trust among users of educational services is closely related to the quality of service provided by the school organization. This level of trust is built through the service relationship between educators, specifically teachers, and their students. The quality of teacher service is related to trust, which essentially means providing the best service to students, parents, and the surrounding community.

According to Kotler (2000), service quality is the comparison between the perceived quality after receiving a service and the expected quality. Meanwhile, according to Paul Baines, Chris Fill, and Kelly Page (2011), service quality is the customer's perception of the difference between the service received and the service expected. According to Kabir Hussain (2010), service quality is a model for identifying the difference between consumer expectations for a service and their assessment of the service received. According to Hermen Jan Van Ree (2009), service quality is an assessment of how well the level of service provided matches customer expectations.

According to Manasa Nagabushanam (2013), service quality is a term used in business administration that describes service achievement on both the objective and subjective sides of the service, namely customer expectations of the service received versus the service provider's service delivery capabilities. According to Murat Yoslioglu, Burcu Ozge Ozaslan Caliskan, and Omer (2013), service quality is the comparison between expected service and actual performance. According to Ahmad A. Rabbai, Guy G. Gable (2012) stated that service quality was developed to assess the gap between customer expectations and the level of service quality provided. According to J. Paul Peter and James H. Donnelly (2011) service quality is a comparison made by customers between the service received and the service expected.

Based on the above theory, it can be concluded that teacher service quality is the comparison between expected service and actual performance to meet customer expectations, particularly students. Service quality indicators are divided into five categories: (a) Teacher physical appearance, (b) Teacher reliability, (c) Responsiveness, (d) Teacher assurance, (e) Teacher attention.

According to J.L. Gibson, J.M. Ivancevich, J.H. Donnelly, & R. Konospake (2006), personality is a set of relatively stable individual characteristics, tendencies, and temperaments that have been significantly shaped by inheritance and social, cultural, and environmental factors. According to Suzane, Dowd, and Schneider (2006), personality is a group of stable characteristics, tendencies, and temperaments formed by both heredity and sociocultural environmental factors. According to Kreitner, Robert, and Angelo Kinicki (2007), personality is defined as a combination of stable physical and mental characteristics that constitute a person's identity. According to Greenberg and Baron (2008), personality is an individual's unique and relatively stable patterns of behavior, thoughts, and emotions.

According to Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2011), teacher personality refers to the structures and tendencies within individuals that explain their distinctive patterns of thought,

emotion, and behavior. According to Helriegel and Solum (2011), personality is the overall profile or combination of stable psychological attributes that constitute a person's unique traits. According to Crae and Costa (2012), personality is a dimension of individual differences in the tendency to exhibit consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions.

Based on the opinions of several experts, personality can be synthesized as a unique and relatively stable individual character, including behavior patterns, thoughts, and emotions, with the following indicators: (a) sincerity, (b) openness to experience, (c) enthusiasm, (d) agreeableness, and (e) stable emotions.

Yakuz Demirel (2013) defines organizational justice as an individual's perception of comparing their outcomes and inputs with those of others and then assessing the equality of this relationship through a ratio. Akanbi, Paul Ayobami Ofoegbu, and Onyema Eugene (2013) define organizational justice as employees' perceptions of fairness within the organization. Jerald Green and Robert A. Baron (2008) define organizational justice as organizational members' perceptions of the fairness within the organization. According to Robbins and Judge (2015), most employees evaluate how fairly they are treated by the organization. Susanna Baldwin (2006) defines organizational justice as the extent to which employees perceive that work procedures, workplace interactions, and work outcomes are treated fairly.

According to Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2015), organizational justice is an employee's assessment of the fairness or justness of decision-making by authorities. According to Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnely and Konospake (2012) organizational justice is the degree or intensity of a person's feelings about the fair treatment they receive in the workplace. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2007) Organizational Justice reflects the extent to which people in the organization feel that they have been treated fairly in their workplace. Based on the opinions of experts, it can be synthesized that organizational justice is a level at which an individual feels treated equally or equalized in the organization where he works, with indicators (a) distributive justice (b) procedural justice (c) informational justice (d) interpersonal justice.

METHOD

This research employed a quantitative method with a correlation survey model. The independent variables were personality (X1) and organizational justice (X2), while the dependent variable (Y) was teacher service quality. The population was 103 civil servant teachers at public high schools in Bogor Regency. The sample size was calculated using the Slovin formula. The sampling technique used was multistage sampling. The first stage was cluster sampling, the second stage was purposive sampling, and the third stage was proportional random sampling at each school.

The quantitative research data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Inferential statistics used regression-correlation analysis. Data analysis was conducted using the normality test for estimated errors, homogeneity of variance test, regression equation determination, significance test for regression equations, regression linearity, and hypothesis testing using correlation tests. The qualitative data analysis process was conducted in two stages: analysis during field data collection and post-data collection analysis, which compared the data values for each item using the SITOREM method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Testing Analysis Requirements

1. Normality Test

The results of the normality test for the estimated error ($Y - \hat{Y}_1$) for the teacher service quality variable on the teacher personality variable yielded a calculated L of 0.060, while the L-table value was 0.080. The normal requirement is that calculated $L < L$ -table, therefore, the estimated standard error ($Y - \hat{Y}_1$) for the teacher service quality variable on the teacher personality variable is normally distributed. The results of the normality test for the estimated

error ($Y-\hat{Y}_2$) for the teacher service quality variable on the organizational justice variable yielded a calculated L of 0.070, while the L-table value was 0.080. The normal requirement is that calculated $L < L\text{-table}$, therefore, the estimated standard error ($Y-\hat{Y}_2$) for the teacher service quality variable on the organizational justice variable is normally distributed.

Table 1. Normality Test Standard Error of Estimate ($Y-\hat{Y}$)

No.	Estimation Error	L-count	L-table(0.05;103)	Conclusion
1	($Y-\hat{Y}_1$)	0,060	0.080	Normal
2	($Y-\hat{Y}_2$)	0,070	0.080	Normal

2. Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity of variance for the teacher service quality variable on teacher personality yielded a calculated t^2 of 27.82, while the $t^2\text{table}$ value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was 47.39. Therefore, the variance of the teacher service quality variable on teacher personality was declared homogeneous. The homogeneity of variance for the teacher service quality variable on organizational justice yielded a calculated t^2 of 46.28, while the $t^2\text{table}$ value at $\alpha = 0.05$ was 55.75. Therefore, the variance of the teacher service quality variable on organizational justice was declared homogeneous.

Table 2. Test of Homogeneity of Variance of Data Variable Y Based on Data X1 and X2

Variance of Y Based on X	Dk	χ^2_{count}	$\chi^2_{\text{table}} (\alpha = 0,05)$	Conclusion
Y based on X ₁	33	27,82	47,39	Homogeneous
Y based on X ₂	40	46,28	55,75	Homogeneous

Hypothesis Testing

1. Relationship between Teacher Personality and Teacher Service Quality

The correlation between the teacher personality variable (X1) and the service quality variable (Y) is determined by the coefficient of determination (r^2_{y1}). Based on the estimation results, the r^2_{y1} value is 0.177. This result indicates that 18% of the teacher service quality variable (Y) can be influenced by the teacher personality variable (X1). The relationship between the teacher personality variable (X1) and the teacher service quality variable (Y) is determined by the correlation coefficient r_{y1} of 0.421. The correlation test results show that the calculated t is 5.15 and the table value is 1.98. This indicates that the correlation coefficient between the teacher personality variable (X1) and the teacher service quality variable (Y) is significant. Based on the test results, it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between the teacher personality variable (X1) and the teacher service quality variable (Y).

Table 3. ANOVA Significance of Correlation X1-Y

Dk (N-K)	T-count	t-table		Conclusion
		$\alpha = 0,05$	$\alpha = 0,01$	
101	5,15**	1,98	2,62	Significant

2. The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Teacher Service Quality

The correlation between the organizational justice variable (X2) and the teacher service quality variable (Y) is determined by the coefficient of determination (r^2_{y2}). Based on the estimation results, the r^2_{y2} value is 0.089. This result indicates that 9% of the teacher service quality variable (Y) can be influenced by the organizational justice variable (X2). The relationship between the organizational justice variable (X2) and the teacher service quality

variable (Y) is determined by the correlation coefficient (r2) of 0.297. The correlation test results show that the calculated t is 3.28, while the t table is 1.98. This indicates that the correlation coefficient between the organizational justice variable (X2) and the teacher service quality variable (Y) is significant. Based on the test results, it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between the organizational justice variable (X2) and the teacher service quality variable (Y).

Table 4. ANOVA Significance of X2-Y Correlation

Dk (N-K)	t _{count}	t _{table}		Conclusion
		α = 0,05	α = 0,01	
101	3,28	1,98	2,62	Significant

3. The Relationship between Teacher Personality and Organizational Justice and Teacher Service Quality

The correlation between teacher personality (X1) and organizational justice (X2) and teacher service quality (Y) is determined by the coefficient of determination (r²_{y12}). Based on the estimation results, the r²_{y12} value is 0.179. This result indicates that 18% of the teacher service quality (Y) is influenced by teacher personality (X1) and organizational justice (X2). The relationship between teacher personality (X1) and organizational justice (X2) and teacher service quality (Y) is determined by the correlation coefficient r_{y12} of 0.423. The regression test results show that the calculated F is 7.30 and the F-table is 3.08. This indicates that the correlation coefficient between teacher personality (X1) and organizational justice (X2) and teacher service quality (Y) is significant. There is a positive relationship between the teacher personality variables (X1) and organizational justice (X2) together with the teacher service quality variable (Y). Based on the test results, it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between the teacher personality variables (X1) and organizational justice (X2) together with the teacher service quality variable (Y).

Table 5. ANOVA

Multiple Correlation Coefficient (R _{y.12})	T _{count}	t _{table}		Conclusion
		α = 0,05	α = 0,01	
0,423	7,30	3,08	4,82	Significant

4. Partial Correlation Test

Based on the results of the first partial correlation test, the partial correlation value of teacher personality (X1) with teacher service quality (Y) with control for organizational justice (X2) (r_{y12}) = 0.215. Based on the results of the significance test, this value is significant (t_h = 2.27 > t_t = 1.98 (α = 0.05)). Thus, it can be concluded that the relationship between teacher personality and teacher service quality is not influenced by the organizational justice variable.

Table 6. Results of the Partial Correlation Test for the Relationship between X1 and Y with X2 as the Control

Control Variables	r partial	t _{count}	T table α = 0,05	Conclusion
X ₂	0,215	2,27	1,98	Significant

Based on the results of the second partial correlation test calculation, the partial correlation value between organizational justice (X2) and the quality of teacher services (Y) with control on teacher personality (X1) (r_{y12}) = 0.084 was obtained. Based on the results of the significance test, the value was very significant (t_h = 0.86 < t_t = 1.98 (α = 0.05)). Thus, it

can be concluded that the relationship between organizational justice and the quality of teacher services is influenced by the teacher personality variable.

Table 7. Results of the Partial Correlation Test for the Relationship between X2 and Y with X1 as the control variable

Control Variables	r partial	t-count	T table $\alpha = 0,05$	Conclusion
X ₁	0,084	0,86	1,98	Not Significant

Indicator Weighting Assessment

The indicator weighting assessment was conducted by expert judgment using the following data:

Table 8. Indicator Weighting Assessment for Teacher Service Quality Variable (Y)

No	Indicators	Assessment Aspects				Mark	Weight (%)
		C	B	U	I		
1	(Tangibles)	3	4	3	4	3,5	18%
2	(Reliability)	4	4	4	4	4	21%
3	(Responsiveness)	4	5	4	5	4,5	23
4	(Empathy)	4	4	4	5	4,3	22
5	(Assurance)	3	3	3	3	3	16
Total						19,3	100%

Table 9. Assessment of the Weight of Teacher Personality Variable Indicators (X1)

No	Indicators	Assessment Aspects				Mark	Weight (%)
		C	B	U	I		
1	(Conscientiousness)	3	4	3	4	3,5	19
2	(Openness To Experience)	3	4	4	5	4,0	22
3	(Extraversion)	4	4	3	4	3,8	20
4	(Agreeableness)	2	3	2	3	2,5	14
5	(Emotional Stability)	4	5	4	5	4,5	25
Total						18,3	100%

Table 10. Assessment of the Weight of the Organizational Justice Variable Indicator (X2)

No	Indicators	Assessment Aspects				Mark	Weight (%)
		C	B	U	I		
1	(Distributive Justice)	3	3	3	4	3,3	21
2	(Procedural Justice)	3	4	4	5	4	26
3	(Interpersonal Justice)	4	5	4	5	4,5	30
4	(Informational Justice)	3	4	3	4	3,5	23
Total						15,3	100%

Table 11. Average expert assessment Service quality variable (Y)

Indicators	Expert I	Expert II	Average
Physical Appearance	18%	25%	22%
Reliability	21%	16%	19%
Responsiveness	23%	19%	21%
Attention	22%	16%	19%
Warranty	16%	23%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 12. Average expert assessment of teacher personality variable (X1)

Indicators	Expert I	Expert II	Average
Sincerity	19%	26%	23%
Be Open To New Experiences	22%	21%	22%
Enthusiasm	20%	18%	19%
Agreement	14%	12%	12%
Stable emotions	25%	24%	25%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 13. Average expert assessment Organizational Justice Variable (X2)

Indicators	Expert I	Expert II	Average
Distributive Justice	21%	22%	22%
Procedural Justice	26%	15%	21%
Interpersonal Justice	30%	30%	30%
Informational Justice	23%	33%	28%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Determination of Indicator Classification

The determination of indicator classification is as follows:

Table 14. Determination of Indicator Classification

No	Score Weighting	Indicator Classification
1.	4,00-5,00	Maintained or Developed
2.	3,00-3,99	To Be Improved
3.	< 3,00	Unclassifiable (Not Identified)

DISCUSSION

1. The Relationship between Teacher Personality and Service Quality

The strong relationship between teacher personality and service quality can be seen in the correlation test results, with a correlation coefficient of 0.421. The variability in service quality is related to teacher personality, as evidenced by the coefficient of determination of 0.177. This suggests that teacher personality contributes 18% of the variability in service quality. The remaining 82% is influenced by factors other than personality. Personality is a unique and relatively stable individual's character, behavior patterns, thoughts, and emotions. A strong teacher personality will improve the quality of service. It can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between teacher personality and service quality, making teacher personality a crucial factor in efforts to improve service quality.

2. The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Teacher Service Quality

The strength of the relationship between organizational justice and teacher service quality can be seen in the correlation test results, with a correlation coefficient of 0.297. The variability in teacher service quality is related to organizational justice, as evidenced by the coefficient of determination of 0.089. Therefore, 9% of the variability in teacher service quality can be explained by organizational justice, contributing 9%. The remaining 91% is influenced by factors other than organizational justice. This aligns with Kreitner and Kinicki's (2007) statement that organizational justice in schools reflects the extent to which individuals within the organization perceive they are treated fairly in their workplace.

Based on these results, organizational justice can influence teacher service quality. When individuals perceive fair treatment and feel comfortable in their work environment, service quality improves. It can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and teacher service quality, making organizational justice a significant factor in efforts to improve teacher service quality.

3. The Relationship between Teacher Personality and Organizational Justice and Teacher Service Quality

The strength of the relationship between teacher personality and organizational justice and teacher service quality can be seen in the correlation test results, with a correlation coefficient of 0.179. The variability in teacher service quality is related to teacher personality and organizational justice, as evidenced by the coefficient of determination of 0.423. Therefore, the variability in teacher service quality can be explained by teacher personality and organizational justice, with 18% of the teacher service quality factor being jointly determined by teacher personality and organizational justice. Furthermore, to determine the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, to obtain an optimal solution for this study, and to optimize each indicator, each research variable was weighted based on the Scientific Introduction Theory for Operations Research in Educational Management, also known as SITOREM (Hardhienata, S: 2017).

CONCLUSION

The results of the study indicate that there is a positive relationship between teacher personality and the quality of teacher services with a relationship strength of $r_{y1} = 0.421$ and there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and the quality of teacher services with a relationship strength of $r_{y2} = 0.297$. This reflects that improving the quality of teacher services can be done by improving teacher personality and organizational justice. Indicators that are already good are maintained or developed and indicators that are not good are improved.

The results of the Sitorem Analysis show that there are 9 indicators of teacher personality, organizational justice and the quality of teacher services that are in good condition so they just need to be maintained, namely: (1) sincerity (2) enthusiasm (3) consensus (4) interpersonal justice (5) informational justice (6) distributive justice (7) physical appearance (8) assurance (9) reliability. Meanwhile, there are 5 components that still need to be improved in order of priority for improvement, namely: (1) stable emotions (2) openness to experience (3) procedural justice (4) responsiveness (5) attention. Indicators that still need to be improved need to get attention so that the quality of teacher services continues to improve.

REFERENCE

- Akanbi, Paul. Ofeogbu Ayobami dan Eugene Onyema. (2013). "Impact of perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment of a Food and Beverage Firm in Nigeria". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol 3 NO. 14. Pp 217-218
- Azizzadeh, Fariba, Khalili, Karam, Soltani Iraj. (2013). Service Quality Measurement in the Public Sector, *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management*. Vol. 2 No. 1, March 2013 pp.114-154
- Baines, Paul. Fill, Chris dan Page, Kelly (2011). Marketing New York Oxford University Press pp 503-505.
- Belausteguigoitia, Imanol. Patlan, Juanan dan Marcedes, Maria NJ . (2007). Organizational Climates as Antecedents of Commitment, Effort and Entrepreneurial Orientation in Mexican Family and Non Family firms. *Revista del Centro de Investigación. Universidad La Salle (Mex)* Vol. 7 Num. 27. Ene-Jun, pp 5-24
- Baldwin Susanna. (2006), Organizational Justice. Pp.1-13 Brighton Institute For Employment Studies
- Colquitt, Jason. Lepine, Jeffrey A dan Wesson, Michael J. (2015). Organizational Behavior, Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace. pp 133 Pp 224-233,. New York McGraw Companies, Inc

- Crae, Mc dan Costa Robert. (2012), Personality in Adulthood, Second Edition. A Five-Factor Theory Perspective, Edition 2, Guilford Press
- Cropanzano, Bowen R dan Gilliland. (2018). The Management of Organizational Justice. *Academy of Management Perspective* 21 (4) 34-38.
- Demirel, Yavuz dan Yucel, Ilhami. (2013). "The Effect Of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment : A Study on the Automotive Industry.". *International Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 11 NO .3 , PP. 26-37.
- Freddy Rangkti. (2013). Konsep Pengukuran Kepuasan, PT Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Gibson, James L. Ivancevich, John M. Donnely, James H dan Konospake, Robert (2012). *Organizations Behavior, Structure, Processes* 14 th Ed (New York Mc Graw-Hill), 2012, pp 148-150
- Greenberg. Jerald dan Baron A. Robert. (2008). *Behavior in organizations* (New Jersey: Pearson Educational International , pp 45-53 ,pp 135
- Gronons, Michael. (1990). *Perceived Service Quality Model*. Publised Hall California Press.
- Helriegel, Don dan Solum, John, *Organizational Behavior*, (2011). 13 th edition (South – Western; Changage learning, 2011), p70
- Hussain Kabir, (2010). *Service Quality: Expectations, perceptions and satisfaction about Service Quality at Destination Gotland- a case study* (Gotland University; Master's program in International Management 15 ETCS, 2010, p 27-29
- Jan Van Ree, Hermen (2009). *Service Quality Indicators for Business Support Service* (University College London, August 2009). P 43-44
- Kotler, P. *Marketing Management*. (2000). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Kreitner Robert dan Kinichi. Angle, (2007). *Organizational Behavior*, (New York Mc Graw-Hill), 2007, pp 244-245
- Momeni, Mikail, Habib Ebrahimpour dan Mohammad Bashokoh Ajirloo, (2014). "Surveying The Impact of Inferential Organizational Justice on Innovative Work Behavior, *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, Vol 2, No.9, 2014
- Nagabushanam, Manasa, (2013). *A Studi On Customer Service Quality of Banks in India* (Bangalor, Analyz Research Solution Pvt. Ltd, 2013). P 318
- Nunung Ayu Sofiati, (2016). *Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan dan Kinerja Guru Terhadap Kepuasan Peserta Didik di SMK Angkasa Bandung*. *Jurnal Indonesia Membangun* Vol2 No.,1 Mei- Agustus 2016
- Parasuraman, Valerie. (2007). *Delivering Quality Service The Free Pres*. New York
- Peter J. Paul dan Donnely H. James, Jr, (2008). *Marketing Management Knowledge And Skills*, Eleventh Edition USA; McGraw-Hill
- Rabaai, Ahmad. Gable, Guy g, (2009). *IS Service Quality As A Multi-dimensional Formative Construct* (Pacific Asia Conference on Information System (PACIS), *Proceedings*, 2012 p.59
- Robbins, Stephen P dan Judge Timothy A. (2009). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Salemba Empat. Jakarta. Pp. 249-251
- Sallis, Edward, (2008). *Total Quality Management in Education*, (Yogyakarta: IRCiSod, 2008), Pp 67-71
- Suci Novia Putri. (2017). *Pengaruh Persepsi Keadilan Organisasi Sekolah dan Pemberdayaan Karyawan Bank Syariah*, *JON Fekom* Vol4 NO 1 (Februari) 2017
- Soewarto Hardhienata. (2017). *The Development Of Scientific Identification Theory to Conduct Operation Research in Education Management*, IOP Conference Series: *Materials Science and Engineering*. Vol 166, 2017
- Suzane, De Janasz Dowd, Karen. Schneider, Beth Z, (2006). *Interpersonal Skills in Organizations* New York:Mc Grow-Hill, 2006, pp 112-116

- Supardi U.S (2013). Aplikasi Statistika dalam Penelitian: Konsep Statistika yang Lebih Komprehensif. Jakarta:Change Publication
- Tedja Susadya. (2007). Kualitas Layanan, Samarinda : Dharma Ilmu Press
- Uhl-Bien, Mary, Schmerhorn.dan Ricahrd Jr.. Osborn. (2014). Organizational Behavior. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wirawan. (2008). Budaya dan Kepribadian guru . Jakarta : Salemba Empat
- Yosliogu, Murat. Ozaslan Burcu C dan Omer.,. (2013). The Role of Innovation and Perceived Quality in Creating Customer