

meisie mangantes 2

by Meisie Mangantes

Submission date: 23-Dec-2022 01:22PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1986100837

File name: Mangantes_KI_THE_RELATIONSHIP_BETWEEN_COLLECTIVE_TRUST....pdf (467.15K)

Word count: 3827

Character count: 22111

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLECTIVE TRUST AND
INDIVIDUAL INNOVATION: A PERCEPTION OF HIGH SCHOOLS'
TEACHERS

Meisie Mangantes

Faculty Of Education, Universitas Negeri Manado

Email: Meisiemangantes@Unima.Ac.Id

Meisie Mangantes. The Relationship Between Collective Trust And Individual Innovation: A Perception Of High Schools' Teachers -- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18 (8), 1667-1675. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Collective Trust, Individual Innovation, Senior High School, Teacher

ABSTRACT:

Learning from home for students in the current Covid-19 pandemic era needs teacher innovation in learning. This study aimed to explain the relationship between collective trust and teacher innovativeness in South Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. Quantitative approaches and survey methods were used in this study. The number of samples was 79 respondents. Using questionnaires for data collection and correlation analysis techniques for data processing. The results showed teachers' collective trust had a positive and significant correlation with teacher innovativeness. Likewise, the dimensions of trust in the principal, trust in peers, and trust in clients (students and parents) have a positive and significant correlation with teacher innovativeness. This article also provides a discussion of research results, conclusions.

INTRODUCTION:

In the 21st century, the world was shocked by the emergence of the Covid-19 epidemic. The impact has crossed all areas of life, including education. Educational services through learning also experience a shift. If previously students studied in classrooms at school, now they had to learn from home with the various challenges they face. Basically, learning for students is a necessity and can take place anywhere and anytime it can happen. Whether they learn through online media or teachers, either individually or in groups/teams. Surely, students can enjoy, feel happy, have fun, and be happy, and get high learning outcomes. The success and failure of students learning from home not only depend on themselves but also depend on the quality of the teacher. There are many dimensions of teacher quality that can be identified, one of which is innovativeness in learning. The level of teacher

innovativeness also depends on some influencing factors. One of the factors that the researchers have identified is the level of confidence of the teachers themselves. Research on innovativeness can be assessed from the organizational, group/team, and individual levels. The concept of innovativeness relates to differences between individuals based on their reactions to innovation (Coklar, 2012). Innovation is also classified as behavioral characteristics, general personal characteristics, and specific field characteristics (Parlar & Cansoy, 2017). This study focuses on individual teacher innovativeness that can be measured from the innovativeness dimensions. Likewise, trust in school can be understood in terms of interpersonal and collective trust. This research focuses on collective trust (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Previous research has identified that the relationship between trust and innovativeness is reciprocal. This is very interesting because on the one hand trust correlates with innovativeness (Golipour, 2011; Bawuro, et al., 2018) on the other hand innovativeness is correlated with trust (Tampi, et al., 2019). Another attraction can be explained that trust has consequences on performance and commitment (Colquitt, et al., 2015). On this basis, the researcher is of the view that research on the relationship between collective trust and innovativeness of teachers in Public Senior High Schools (SMAN) is important to research. If there are distrust of teachers, both the principal, peers, students, and parents, it will not increase the innovativeness of teachers, but it will worsen which will have an impact on reducing the level of learning outcomes of students. Therefore, in general, this study aims to explain the relationship between collective trust and innovativeness of teachers at SMAN in South Minahasa Regency. What is the picture of the situation, whether it will be positively correlated and proven to be significant, it all depends on the results of the research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Innovation

Review Studies on teacher innovativeness can be explained based on the perspectives used such as structuralist perspectives, innovation process perspectives, and individualist perspectives (Suharsaputra, 2010).

From a structuralist perspective, it is emphasized that innovativeness is determined by structural characteristic factors. In this perspective, innovativeness is seen as a linear, static process that focuses on the adoption of innovation. According to the perspective of the innovation process, it is seen that innovativeness results from the interaction of influences between structures and the characteristics of individual behavior. In this perspective, it is emphasized that innovativeness is a complex process characterized by the presence of surprises, deployments, innovative capabilities, and context. Then the individual perspective can be explained that if the structural perspective views innovativeness as influenced by structural characteristics and the process perspective views innovativeness as influenced by structural characteristics and individual behavioral characteristics by interaction, then

the individual perspective views that innovativeness is determined by individual competence to innovate. The role of context characteristics, in this case, is more moderate as a result, of innovation that occurs in the organization. Innovation as a concept can be studied in terms of categories and dimensions. From a categorization perspective, individual innovativeness is divided into five categories, namely: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and slow / traditionalists. (Rogers, 2003; Parlar and Cansoy, 2017).

Innovators are a category of individuals who can take risks like to experience something new in a social environment and use different thinking skills. The percentage of the innovator category is 2.5%. Early adopters are a category of individuals who guide other teachers about innovation, following developments, and setting models in practice. The early adopter category was 13.5%. The early majority adopters were a category of individuals who preferred to stay away from risk and focused on the benefits that innovation brought. The majority of the adapter category is 34%. The final majority are categories of individuals who are wary of innovation by fighting back and expecting other teachers to experience an innovation initially. The final majority category is 34%. Traditionalists, on the other hand, are a category of individuals who adhere to or adhere to tradition, preferring innovations that have been successful, and whose adoption is based on results. The traditionalist category is 16%.

Viewed from a dimensional perspective, individual innovativeness is resistance to change, leading opinion, openness to experience, and risk-taking (Rogers, 2003; Parlar and Cansoy, 2017). Resistance to change refers to negative feelings against innovation and change. Opinion leaders are concerned with the genuineness of individual ideas developed in groups and the characteristics that enable them to stand upfront. Openness to experience refers to seeking innovation and a willingness to experience it differently. Taking risks refers to overcoming an uncertain situation and demonstrating individual determination.

Based on the theoretical study of innovativeness, it can be found that the concept of teacher innovativeness in this study refers to individual teachers who are resistant to change, lead opinions, openness to experience, and take risks.

Collective Trust

At first, the study of trust in schools was adopted and adapted from the theory of organizational and interpersonal trust. The tradition of belief research stems from two main studies by Mayer et al. (1995) and Mishra (1996) from the field of business, however, thanks to the work of researchers in the field of education, the concept of trust in schools has progressed and developed rapidly. The conceptualization of trust in schools begins with the research on teaching staff or teachers collectively so that in the field of education it focuses more on the concept of collective trust which is used as a frame of mind to explain the concept of teacher belief in schools. Collective trust in question included: teacher trust in school principals, teacher trust in peers,

teacher trust in students, and teacher trust in students' parents (Forsyth, et al., 2011).

Research on teacher trust starts from a multi-dimensional perspective and trust is a perception that is the dominant paradigm in educational research (Romero, 2010). In general, the measurement of teacher confidence refers to benevolence/kindness, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness (Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2000; Forsyth, 2011).

The dimension of benevolence or kindness refers to caring, expanding goodwill, having positive intentions, supporting teachers, expressing appreciation, being fair, keeping confidential information (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Meyer, et al. (1995) explained that benevolence is the extent to which the *trustee* is believed to want to do good to the trustee, apart from or excluded from the egocentric profit motive. Shows the *Kindness trustee* who has a special bond with the *trustor* and kindness is the perception of the positive orientation *trustees* towards the *trustor*. For Forsyth, et al. (2011) the most common condition of trust is kindness, which is a belief that a trusted person or group will protect one's interests. A person relies on the good intentions of others to act in his best interest. The dimension of reliability refers to having consistency, being reliable, showing commitment, being dedicated, being diligent (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). According to Forsyth, et al. (2011) reliability is the extent to which a person can depend on others for actions and good intentions. It was also explained that reliability implies confidence that one's needs will be met positively. The competency dimension refers to setting an example, engaging in problem-solving, encouraging conflict resolution, working hard, pressing for results, setting standards, handling difficult situations, being flexible (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Meyer, et al. (1995) argued that ability or competence is related to aspects of skills, competencies, and characteristics that allow certain parties to influence in several specific domains. Forsyth, et al. (2011) explain that there are times when good intentions are not enough. When someone is dependent on another and some skill level is involved in meeting expectations, someone who is well-intentioned but has no competence is not trusted (Baier, 1986).

The dimension of honesty refers to having integrity, telling the truth, keeping promises, respecting agreements, having authenticity, accepting responsibility, avoiding manipulation, being honest with oneself (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Most scholars and researchers see honesty as an important feature of trust (Baier, 1986; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Cummings & Bromily, 1996). Honesty is assumed when thinking about trust (Forsyth, 2011).

The openness dimension refers to engaging in open communication, sharing important information, delegating, sharing decision making, sharing power (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Forsyth, et al. (2011) describes that openness is the extent to which relevant information is shared; actions and plans are transparent. Openness makes individuals vulnerable because it signifies a kind of mutual trust, namely the belief that the information being disclosed will not be exploited and that the recipient will feel the same trust in return. Openness

and transparency generate trust. Individuals who are unwilling to expand trust through openness end up isolated (Kramer et al. 1996).

Based on theoretical studies, it can be argued that teacher belief in research refers to teachers who have benevolence or kindness, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research uses a quantitative approach with survey methods (Sugiyono, 2007). The sample members consisted of 79 teachers who were drawn randomly from 19 schools spread across 17 Districts in South Minahasa Regency. The research data were collected using 2 questionnaire instruments. First, the teacher's collective trust questionnaire was adapted from the *Omnibus T-Scale* (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003), consisting of 26 items and details on trust in the principal (8 points), trust in peers (8 points), and trust in clients (10 items). This questionnaire is constructed with a Likert scale model that ranges from strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5. All questionnaire items are valid and reliable, spanning from 0.847 to 0.939, so they are suitable for data collection. Second, the teacher's innovative questionnaire was adapted from the *Individual Innovativeness Scale* (Hurt, et al., 2013), consisting of 20 items and detailing the dimensions of resistance to change (4 points), opinion leaders (4 points), openness to experience (8 points), and take risks (4 points). This questionnaire is constructed with a Likert scale model that ranges from strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5. All questionnaire items are valid and reliable at 0.952, so they are suitable for data collection. The research data for hypothesis testing was processed using the correlation analysis technique *Pearson Product Moment* (Riduwan and Sunarto, 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This section describes the results of the descriptive analysis which includes the average value and standard deviation as well as the results of testing the research hypothesis.

Table 1. Average Score and Standard Deviation

Variable	Score Average	Standard Deviation
Collective Trust	107,35	8,97
Trust in Principals (X_1)	32,97	2,81
Trust in Peers (X_2)	32,82	2,97
Trust in Clients (X_3)	40,91	3,62

Teacher Innovation	81.72	7.49
--------------------	-------	------

The results of the descriptive analysis as presented in table 1 show that the mean value and standard deviation of teachers' collective trust = 107.35 and 8.97, respectively; the mean value and standard deviation of the dimensions of teacher confidence in the principal = 32.97 and = 2.81, respectively; mean value and standard deviation of the dimensions of teacher trust in peers = 32.82 and = 2.97, respectively; the average value and standard deviation of the dimensions of teacher trust in clients (to students and parents) = 40.91 and = 3.62, respectively; the mean value and standard deviation of teacher innovativeness = 81.72 and 7.49, respectively.

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient and Significance Value

Variable	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Value
X - Y	$r = 0.981$	0.000
X ₁ - Y	$r = 0.926$	0.000
X ₂ - Y	$r = 0.748$	0.000
X ₃ - Y	$r = 0.868$	0.000

The results of testing the research hypothesis as presented in table 1 can be interpreted as follows.

1. Relations X - Y

- a. The value of the correlation coefficient (r) = 0.981. This can be interpreted that there is a very strong relationship between collective trust and teacher innovativeness.
- b. Probability value (= 0.05 which is greater than the significance value = 0.000 or $0.05 > 0.000$ indicates that H_0 is accepted. This can be interpreted that there is a significant relationship between collective trust and teacher innovativeness.

2. Relations X₁ - Y.

- a. The value of the correlation coefficient (r) = 0.926. It can be interpreted that there is a very strong relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in school principals and teacher innovativeness.
- b. Probability value (= 0.05 which is greater than the significance value = 0.000 or $0.05 > 0.000$ indicates that H_0 is accepted. This can be interpreted that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in school principals and teacher innovativeness.

3. Relations X_2 - Y.

A. The value of the correlation coefficient (r) = 0.748. This can be interpreted that there is a strong relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in peers and teacher innovativeness.

b. Probability value (= 0.05 which is greater than the significance value = 0.000 or $0.05 > 0.000$ indicates that H_0 is accepted. This can be interpreted that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in peers and teacher innovativeness.

4. Relations X_3 - Y.

A. The value of the correlation coefficient (r) = 0.868. This can be interpreted that there is a very strong relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in clients (students and parents) and teacher innovativeness.

b. Probability value (= 0.05 which is greater than the significance value = 0.000 or $0.05 > 0.000$ indicates that H_0 is accepted. This can be interpreted that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of teacher trust in clients (students and parents) and teacher innovativeness.

DISCUSSION

In general, this study aims to explain the relationship between collective trust and innovativeness of high school teachers in South Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. The results showed there was a strong and significant relationship between collective trust and teacher innovativeness. The results of this study support research from previous researchers (for example, Golipour, 2011; Bawuro, et al., 2018;) and at the same time become a comparison for the results of previous studies from researchers (for example, Tampi, et al., 2019) that individual innovativeness correlated with trust in schools. The strength and significance of this relationship further confirm that the collective trust factor of teachers is imperative for increasing teacher innovativeness which has an impact on the quality of the process and learning outcomes. In the current COVID-19 pandemic era, the pattern of learning services for students has shifted from inside school to learning from home. This has become government policy, so its successful implementation requires support for innovativeness, both in the form of making innovative works such as creating art, making props/lessons/practicum. Still, in the context of innovativeness, innovative work behavior is also needed for teachers in learning. This innovative work behavior can be shown in the form of generating ideas, promoting ideas, and implementing ideas. In this regard, de Jong and Hartog (2008) argue that innovative work behavior aims to initiate or deliberately introduce new and useful ideas, processes, products, or procedures as capital to form the personal character of teachers as innovators (Rogers, 2003). By baba, Taoefik, et al. (2017) recommend that teachers' innovative work behavior needs to be created, motivated, supported, and empowered. Besides, the results showed that the dimensions of teacher trust in school principals and clans (students and very old people) had a strong and significant relationship with teacher innovativeness. Only the dimension of trust in peers is

categorized as strong, but significant. Very strong and the significance of these dimensions implies that collective trust is a source of capital in schools (Forsyth, 2011) which needs to be developed continuously because it has a direct consequence on teacher innovativeness. Although this research focuses on collective trust and teacher innovativeness, these two factors are an integral part of the dimension of the quality of human resources (HR) of teachers in schools. Moreover, the two factors, as mentioned in the beginning, are reciprocally interconnected. The development of these two factors should be carried out simultaneously or without neglecting one another. Therefore, it is imperative for school management to instill collective trust, so that a personal figure of a teacher who is wise or kind, reliable, competent, honest, open, and with integrity is born. Thus, the innovativeness of the teacher is reflected in being open to new experiences, leading opinions likes to take the risk, and not being resistant to change.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it can be proven that there is a significant relationship between collective trust and teacher innovativeness. It is formed from the nature of the relationship between the dimensions of strong teacher trust in peers and dimensions of teacher trust in the principal and teacher trust in clients (students and parents) which are very strong.

REFERENCES

- Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96 (2), 231–260.
- Bawuro, Faiza Abubakar, Danjuma, Ibrahim, & Wajiga, Helavalada. (2018). Factors influencing the innovative behavior of teachers in secondary schools in the northeast of Nigeria. *Trajectoryâ Nauki = Path of Science*, 4 (3), 1007-1017.
- Butler, JK, & Cantrell, RS (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modeling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Psychological Reports*, 55, 81–105.
- Coklar, A. (2012). Individual Innovativeness levels of educational administrators. *Digital Education Review*: <http://greav.ub.edu/der>.
- Colquitt, JA, LePine, JA, and Wesson, MJ (2015). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.
- Cummings, LL, & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 302–330) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- De Jong, JPJ, and Hartog, DND 2008. *Innovative Work Behavior Measurement and Validation*. Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs. www.entrepreneurship-sme.eu.
- Forsyth, Patrick B, Adams, Curt M., & Hoy, Wayne K. (2011). *Collective trust: Why schools can't improve without it*. Amsterdam Avenue, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Golipour, Rahmatoullah, Jandaghi, Gholamreza, Mirzaei, Mohammad Amin, & Arbatan, Taher Roshandel. (2011). The impact of organizational trust on innovativeness at the Tehran oil refinery company. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5 (7), 2660-2667, DOI: 10.5897 / AJBM10,905.

- Hoy, WK, & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 184-208.
- Hurt, HT, Joseph, K., & Cook, CD (1977). Scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 58-65.
- Kramer, RM, Brewer, MB, & Hanna, BA (1996). Collective trust and collective action: The decision to trust as a social decision. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pages 357–389). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mayer, RC, Davis, JH, & Schoorman, FD (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (3), 709–737.
- Mishra, AK (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 261–287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parlar, H., and Casoy, R. (2017). Examining the Relationship between Teachers' Individual Innovativeness and Professionalism. *International Education Studies*, 10 (8), 1-11.
- Riduwan and Sunarto, H. (2010). *An introduction to statistics for educational, social, economic, communications, and business research*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Rogers, EM (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Romero, Lisa. (2010). *Student trust: Impacting high school outcomes*. Dissertation. Riverside: University of California.
- Schoorman, FD, Mayer, RC, & Davis JH (2007). An Integrative Model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (2), 344–354.
- Sugiyono, 2007. *Qualitative quantitative research methods and R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Suharsaputra. 2010. *Educational administration*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Tampi, Fera, Binilang, B., Rawis, Joulanda AM, & Londa, Treesje K. (2019). Relationship between Innovation, trust, and job satisfaction with kindergarten teacher performance in Manado City. *International Journal of Advanced Educational Research*, 4 (5), 79-85.
- Taoefik, Moh., Fakhruddin., & Thomas. 2017. The Mediating Effects of Emotional Intelligence on the Effect of Collaborative Supervision and Leadership on Teacher's Innovative Behavior. *Educational Management*, 6 (1), 71-79
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, WK (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 547-593.

meisie mangantes 2

ORIGINALITY REPORT

14%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

7%

STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

2%

★ Submitted to University of Oklahoma

Student Paper

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 3 words

Exclude bibliography On