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ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to examine the effects of quality of work life and organizational trust on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The population of this study is the lecturer at Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEI) in Malang-Indonesia. The analysis technique in this research was Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). In accordance with the objectives that wanted to be achieved, this research could be categorized as explanatory research, i.e. research that aims to find an explanation of the causal relationships or effects of relationships between one variable with other variables through hypothesis testing. The variables in this study were Quality of Work Life (QWL), Organizational Trust, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. The result shows that Quality of work life is able to create job satisfaction of lecturers. This is due to the important roles of quality of work life that lecturers are physically and psychologically feel safe, comfortable, relatively satisfied and able to grow and develop properly as human so that technically and humanely can take on comfortable and positive work environmental conditions. Quality of work life is able to build the commitment of lecturers at the institution. It means the better the quality of work life at PHEIs is, the better the commitment of lecturers to the institution is. It is because the important role of quality of work life that lecturers physically and psychologically perceive safe, comfortable, and able to grow and develop as human so that technically and humanely bring better quality of work life. Organizational trust is able to create the commitment of permanent lecturers of foundation at PHEIs. It is because of the important role of organizational trust, in which the trust in the organization requires open communication, information sharing, perceptions and feeling sharing, and bigger lecturers’ involvement in decision-making. These conditions will be able to increase the job satisfaction of lecturers. Organizational trust is able to create the commitment of permanent lecturers of foundation at PHEIs. This is due to the important role of organizational trust. The creation of trust in the organization requires open communication, sharing information, sharing perceptions and feelings, and greater lecturers involvement in decision – making. This condition will be able to increase the commitment of lecturers. The job satisfaction will be able to establish the organizational commitment. Better job satisfaction of lecturers will be able to establish the commitment of lecturers to PHE Institutions.
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A. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research is to examine the effects of quality of work live and organizational trust on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In national education system, it is emphasized that education is conscious and planned efforts to create learning atmosphere and learning process so that learners actively develop their potential to have the strengths of religious spiritual, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills needed by society, nation and state. Furthermore, it is emphasized that the government establishes and conducts a national education system to increase faith and devotion to God Almighty and noble character in order to educate the life of nation governed by laws. Of the total number of students registered in 2009/2010 equal to 3,849,626 people, whereby the capacity of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) was 3 times (75.27%) of the capacity of higher education institutions conducted by the government (24.73%) (Republic Online, 2010). This indicates that the participation of public/private sector in higher education must be taken into account. Moreover, the ability of capacity growth of PHEIs is also very high. In the last decade, there have been an increasing numbers of private higher education institutions nearly doubled, i.e. 1,243 PHEIs in 1996, to 2,530 PHEIs in 2006, and to 2,800 PHEIs in 2009-2010 (PTS On Line).
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The government and public/private as organizers of higher education should realize the function of education, that is to develop skills and form character and dignified civilization of the nation in order to educate the intellectual life of the nation, aimed at developing the potential of students to become a man of faith and fear of God Almighty, noble morals, healthy, knowledgeable, skilled, creative, independent, and becoming responsible citizens. In practical terms, they are to meet the Indonesian people who are educated, academic capable, competent, having a noble personality and integrity. Indonesian human who is responsive, strong, and capable in dealing with issues related to personal, family, and social life. Quality of education in higher education institutions becomes big responsibility for lecturers, so that it is properly that the lecturers' professionalism and welfare should be improved. Sigit in Widagdo (2006) states that the quality of education will increase if the lecturers' professionalism and welfare are improved, the curriculum should be obeyed, there are adequate infrastructure, regular and orderly administration. Sonhadji, (1990) also argues that, based on the fact that lecturers have intellectual, professional, personal and social abilities to improve the quality of education, lecturers are the main human resources at institutions of higher education, so the lecturers' professionalism and welfare should be increased.

B. EMPIRICAL AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

B1. Empirical Background

The preparation of this conceptual framework refers to a series of studies by several previous studies becoming the framework for thinking in this study. They are presented respectively as follows:

First, Connell & Hannif (2009) in a study entitled Call Centres, Quality of Work Life and HRM Practices an in-House/Outsourced Comparison, examining the quality of work life and human resource management practices, a comparison between outsourc and in-system. The results of study stated that the quality of work life had a significant impacts on the organization's ability to attract and retain skilled people, as well as to achieve high levels of production, employees satisfaction, employees morale, innovation and teamwork. The quality of work was significant to the style and quality of management.

Second, Huanget al., (2007), in The Effect of Quality of Work Life on Commitment and Turnover Intention, describing the effects of quality of work life on commitment and intention turnover. However, there had been a little research studying quality of work life and work-related attitudes. The purpose of this study was to study the impacts of quality of work life on career and organizational commitment of auditors in public accounting firms in Taiwan, and how this commitment, in turn, affected the intention turnover.

Third, meanwhile, the trust relationship on job satisfaction was by the researchers of Chathot and Mak, (2007) in their study entitled Employee’s Perceptions of Organizational Trust and Service Climate: A Structural Model Combining Their Effects on Employee Satisfaction. The results of study showed that the hotel employee’s satisfaction could be increased by increasing the trust and climate services at the hotel.

Fourth, a study by Wong et al. (2002) entitled: “Affective Organizational Commitment of Workers in Chinese Joint Ventures”, examining the factors that influence the affective commitment of joint venture employees in a province in the southern part of PRC. The study examined the relationship among the variables of distributive justice, procedural justice, perceived job security, trust to the organization and organizational commitment and turnover intention for the work.

B2. Theoreical Background

1. Quality of Work Life (QWL)

Beukema (1987) explains that quality of work life is as levels of employees who must be able to shape their own work actively, according to their choice, benefit and necessity. This is the level of force provided by the organization to its employees in order to establish the work they pursue.

It is also stated by Heskett, et al., (1997), that quality of work life is as feeling possessed by employees on their work, co-workers, and organization. Comfortable feeling to the work will create a productive work environment.

Two important aspects that need to consider in the description of quality of work life are: (1) Quality of work life is not only on how people can do the jobs better, but also how the jobs can cause people to become better so that provide impacts on organizational effectiveness. (2) All decisions are made in a participatory manner and involve members of the organization in a variety of levels.

Based on a concept of quality of work life, it can be concluded that quality of work life is basically management practices with the aims to create working conditions that is able to motivate every employee to be able to develop themselves and contribute optimally to the achievement of organizational
goals. Employees will contribute greater if they perceive that they have freedoms to express ideas and able to establish reciprocal relationship with the organization.


2. Organizational Trust

Trust refers to the belief of workers to the organization leaders that the main actions of organization would benefit workers. Organizational trust will directly affect the amount of their contribution to the organization in terms of performance, intention to persist in the organization, as well as their behaviour (Robinson, 1996).

Mishra and Morrissey (1990) state that organizational trust requires open communication, sharing of information, greater employee’s involvement in decision-making. Many studies have shown that the decreasing level of confidence is associated with the declined communication and increased conflict. Gilbert & Tang (1998) finds a strong positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

There are five dimensions in organizational trust according to Mishra, (1998), they are: competence is the extent to which individuals perceive the capacity and capability possessed by the organization. The organization is effective, able to survive and be competitive. Openness and honesty are the extent to which the suitability and accuracy of information communicated by the organization. Concern for employees is a sense of concern, empathy, member tolerance, sense of security when workers do their activities. Reliability is the extent to which co-workers consistency, working team or organization leaders in acting that can be relied upon. In other words, we can rely on them to do what they say. Identification is the extent to which a similarity of purpose and the workers confidence upon norms, values and confidence associated with organizations.

3. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an individual’s general attitude toward his or her job satisfaction reflecting the attitude of behaviour. The confidence that the satisfied employees are more productive than employees not satisfied settles for a basic principle for managers and leaders (Robbins, 2006). According to Robbins (2006), there are still many evidences questioning the causal relationship, because in advanced society they do not only concern with quantity of life such as increased productivity and the acquisition of material, but also the quality.

Locke (1976) gives a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction which includes reactions or attitudes of cognitive, affective and evaluative and states that job satisfaction is “a state of happy emotions or positive emotions derived from work assessment or work experience of someone”. According to the opinion above, job satisfaction is a person’s attitude toward his or her work encountered in his or her work environment.

In this study, the theory of job satisfaction uses the theory developed by Locke in Luthans (2006), which consists of five dimensions of work having affective responses, namely:

1. **The work itself**, in terms of which the work provides an interesting task, the opportunity to learn and opportunity to accept responsibility.
2. **Salary**, the amount of wages received and the levels where it can be viewed as it is considered appropriate compared to other people in the organization.
3. **Promotional opportunity**, the opportunity to advance within the organization
4. **Supervision**, the ability of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and support behaviour.
5. **Co-workers**, the level in which co-workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

4. Commitment to the Organization

Organizational commitment is divided into two groups that view organizational commitment as an attitude and view organizational commitment as behaviour (Meyer and Allen 1991; Jaros et al., 1993). Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1991) state that the commitment of attitude is as a way people feel and think about the organization, while the commitment of behaviour describes the way the individual gets into the organization. The attitude approach produces commitment as the attitude of employees reflecting the attitude and quality of the relationship between employees and the organization.

Three-component models of organizational commitment include: affective, continuance, and normative as three-dimension of organizational commitment. The details are as follows:

a. Affective commitment
Allen and Meyer (1990) describe affective commitment as employee’s emotional setting, identified with involvement in the organization. Affective commitment involves three aspects: creation, emotion setting to the organization, identification, and desire to maintain organizational membership. Jaros et al., (1993) state that affective commitment is an extensive form of psychological statement on employees in the organization. Meyer and Hercofits (2002) state that affective commitment is found to have positive correlation with outcomes, such as turnover, absenteeism, employees performance and behaviour of members of the organization.

b. Continuance commitment
The second dimension of organizational commitment is continuance commitment, which is the desire of individual in the organization for a long time. Allen and Meyer (1990) describe continuance commitment as a form of psychological binding on the organization reflected as employee perception to keep working in the organization. Romzek (1990) describes this type as transactional binding. Therefore, continuance commitment reflects the calculation of cost to leave the organization or benefit if keep working in the organization.

c. Normative commitment
The third dimension of organizational commitment is normative commitment, which reflects a sense of obligation to continue the jobs. Employees with a high level of normative commitment perceive that they are in line with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Randall and Cote (1991) consider normative commitment as a moral obligation of employees to the organization. Furthermore, it is explained that when employees begin to feel self-development by the organization, then they feel obliged to keep working in the organization. This is supported by the opinion of Jaros et. al., (1993) stating that normative commitment is as a moral obligation, which is not tied to emotional bonding because it does not depend on profit and loss calculation personally.

C. METHODOLOGY

The population of this study is the lecturer at Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEI) in Malang-Indonesia. The analysis technique in this research was Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). In accordance with the objectives that wanted to be achieved, this research could be categorized as explanatory research, i.e. research that aims to find an explanation of the causal relationships or effects of relationships between one variable with other variables through hypothesis testing. The variables in this study were Quality of Work Life (QWL), Organizational Trust, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. SEM analysis model is based on the following conceptual framework:
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**Figure 1. Research Hypothesis Model**

**D. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results of goodness of fit overall model test, in accordance with the results of SEM analysis, to determine whether the hypothetical model is supported by empirical data, is given in Table 2 below:
Table 2: Goodness Of Fit Overall Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cut-off value</th>
<th>Test Results</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>≥ 0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>The model is marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square/DF</td>
<td>≤ 2.00</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>The model is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>The model is marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>The model is marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>The model is marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>The model is marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>The model is good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2 it can be seen that not all of the criteria indicate good models. It is seen that Chi Square/ DF criteria that have met the limit are less than 2 and RMSEA that have met the limit are less than 0.08. According to Arbuckle and Wothke (1999), the best criteria used as an indication of model goodness is the value of Chi Square/ DF less than 2 and RMSEA below 0.08. In this study, the value of CMIN/ DF and RMSEA has met the cut off value. Therefore, the model is suitable and feasible to use. Interpretation can be conducted for further discussion.

An assumption that must be met prior to the SEM analysis was the assumption of normality, the absence of outliers, and linearity. Assumption of multivariate normality was tested with the help of AMOS 6 software. Of the normality test results, it was obtained critical ratio value equal to 11.451 with the critical value of Z_{calculate} for α 5% was equal to 1.96. Because the absolute value of CR for multivariate was equal to 11.451 > 1.96, then the multivariate normality assumption was not met.

However, referring to the central limit theorem, that if the research involves a large number of samples (n = 145), the sample data can be treated as population data so that the data normality problem can be considered not critical or negligible.

To test whether there were the outliers or not, it could be seen using Mahalanobis Distance (Md). Mahalanobis distance was evaluated using the value of 104.72. Of the Mahalanobis distance to the most distant point of observation was the 72nd respondent with the value of Md = 55 995. When compared to the value of 104.72, the value of Md of the point of 72nd was > 104.72. It is then concluded that all data were not outliers, so that the assumption of the absence of outliers in the data could be met.

Linearity assumption testing was conducted using Curve Fit method. The results of linearity testing showed that all linear models were significant because the value of Sig < 0.05, therefore it could be concluded that the assumption of linearity was met.

The value of loading factor indicates the weight of each indicator as the gauge of each latent variable. Indicator with the largest loading factor indicates that the indicator variable is as the strongest (dominant) variable gauge. The results of measurement model are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Value of Loading factor on Each Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life (X1)</td>
<td>Participation (X1.1)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth and Development (X1.2)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation and Reward (X1.3)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Environment (X1.4)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust (X2)</td>
<td>Ability (X2.1)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness (X2.2)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern (X2.3)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability (X2.4)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification (X2.5)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction(Y1)</td>
<td>Salary Satisfaction (Y1.1)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion Satisfaction (Y1.2)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction (Y1.3)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision Satisfaction (Y1.4)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers Satisfaction (Y1.5)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment (Y2)</td>
<td>Affective Commitment (Y2.1)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance Commitment (Y2.2)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Commitment (Y2.3)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 3, the highest loading factor value is on Quality of Work variable. It is known that the highest loading factor value equal to 0.683 is the indicator of compensation and reward with the mean of 2.65. So if you want to improve the Quality of Work, it is suggested to pay more attention on indicators of compensation and reward. Furthermore, of the Organizational trust variable, it is obtained the highest loading factor value equal to 0.675 by indicators of ability with the mean of 3.73. It means that if you want to improve Organizational Trust, you have to pay more attention on ability factor. On job
satisfaction variable, the highest loading factor value equal to 0.614 is the indicator of Salary Satisfaction with the mean value of 3.12. Then, to increase job satisfaction, the best way is by increasing the salary. For organizational commitment variable, the strongest indicator that measures it is affective commitment with the value of loading factor equal to 0.817 with the mean of 3.88. Thus, if you want to increase the organizational commitment variable, you have to consider the affective commitment factor first.

The testing of direct effect hypothesis is conducted by testing CR (Critical Ratio) on each path of direct effect partially. If the value of CR > 1.96 or P < 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a significant effect, otherwise, if the value of CR < 1.96 or P > 0.05 then it can be concluded that there is no effect. The complete analysis of the results, in the results of SEM analysis, can be seen in Table 4 below, presenting the results of testing of direct effect hypothesis.

### Table 4. Results of Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relationship between Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Value</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>QWL (X1) on Job Satisfaction (Y1)</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>3.440</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>QWL (X1) on Organizational Commitment (Y2)</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organizational Trust (X3) on Job Satisfaction (Y1)</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>3.431</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizational Trust (X3) on Organizational Commitment (Y2)</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction (Y1) on Organizational Commitment (Y2)</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>0.020*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: Signs * state that it is significant at the level of 5%

From the results of model of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis of Table 4, it can be seen that in overall, all paths affect significantly. Job Satisfaction (Y1) is directly affected by QWL (X1) and Organizational Trust (X3), while the Organizational Commitment (Y2) is directly affected by QWL (X1), Organizational Trust (X3) and Job Satisfaction (Y1).

**The first hypothesis.** Of the results of structural model of SEM analysis in the coefficient of direct effect path of quality of work variable on job satisfaction, it is obtained the Standardized value equal to 0.466 by Critical Ratio (CR) equal to 3.440 with P-value of 0.000. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P < 0.05, the first hypothesis is accepted. Positive marked coefficient of 0.466 indicates that the effect of quality of work life on job satisfaction is positive or unidirectional. It means that the better the quality of work life is, the better the job satisfaction is and vice versa, the worse the quality of work life is, the worse the job satisfaction is.

**The second hypothesis.** From the results of structural model of SEM analysis in the coefficient of direct effect path of quality of work life variable on organizational commitment, it is obtained the Standardized value equal to 0.399 by Critical Ratio (CR) equal to 2.980 with P-value of 0.003. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P < 0.05, the second hypothesis is accepted. Positive marked coefficient of 0.399 indicates that the effect of quality of work life on organizational commitment is positive or unidirectional. It means that the better the quality of work life is, the better the organizational commitment is and conversely, the worse the quality of work life is, the worse the organizational commitment is.

**The third hypothesis.** Of the results of structural model of SEM analysis in the coefficient of direct effect path of organizational trust variable on job satisfaction, it is obtained the Standardized value equal to 0.481 by Critical Ratio (CR) equal to 3.431 with P-value of 0.000. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P < 0.05, the third hypothesis is accepted. Positive marked coefficient of 0.481 indicates that the effect of organizational trust on job satisfaction is positive or unidirectional. It means that the better the organizational trust is, the better the job satisfaction is and vice versa, the worse the organizational trust is, the worse the job satisfaction is.

**The fourth hypothesis.** Of the results of structural model of SEM analysis in the coefficient of direct effect path of organizational trust variable on organizational commitment, it is obtained the Standardized value equal to 0.505 by Critical Ratio (CR) equal to 3.400 with P-value of 0.000. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P < 0.05, the fourth hypothesis is accepted. Positive marked coefficient of 0.505 indicates that the effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment is positive or unidirectional. It means that the better the organizational trust is, the better the organizational commitment is and conversely, the worse the organizational trust is, the worse the organizational commitment is.

**Fifth hypothesis.** Of the results of structural model of SEM analysis in the coefficient of direct effect path of job satisfaction variable on organizational commitment, it is obtained the Standardized...
value equal to 0.382 by Critical Ratio (CR) equal to 2.322 with P-value of 0.020. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P < 0.05, the fifth hypothesis is accepted. Positive marked coefficient of 0.382 indicates that the effect between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is positive or unidirectional. It means that the better the job satisfaction is, the better the organizational commitment is and vice versa, the worse the job satisfaction is, the worse organizational commitment is.

Of the results of analysis, the quality of work life variable is explained by participation, growth and development, compensation and work environment as described by Walton (1975), Nadler and Lawler III, (1983), David & Edward (1983). It means that the quality of work life experienced by lecturers is seen on four indicators that reflect the reality of quality of work life of a lecturer teaching at PHEIs.

The empirical condition of PHEIs in Malang-Indonesia is that the respondents' perception on the condition compensation is perceived as strong enough by respondents but shows the lowest numbers, while the highest is growth and development. So it can be interpreted that the respondent’s perceptions of quality of work life perceived from the highest to the lowest orders are growth and development, work environment, participation, compensation. It means that the quality of work life of the compensation given is still perceived as the lowest by the respondents. However, the compensation as a reward received by lecturers outside of given salaries (such as allowances, honorarium, labour insurance/social security, old age insurance) are still perceived as the lowest compared to the quality of work life perceived from growth and development, work environment, and participation.

In this condition, PHEIs leaders have higher attention on growth-development and work environment when compared to participation and compensation. Compensation is the reward received by lecturers outside of salary in exchange for their contributions to the organization (institutions). It will directly satisfy a number of specific needs of employees, and indirectly have reward such as allowances, honorarium, labour insurance (social security), old age security, as a reward for the employees who have contributed in achieving the organization’s objectives through activities called working (Nawawi, 2001).

The results of analysis show that the variable of organizational trust is explained by ability, openness, concern, reliability and identification as verified by Mishra, (1998), Gomez and Rosen (2001), and Zalabak et al., (2000). It means that the organizational trust experienced by lecturers, seen on four indicators reflects the reality of organizational trust of a lecturer teaching at PHEIs.

The empirical condition of PHEIs in Malang-Indonesia is that the respondents' perceptions towards the reliability of its condition is perceived as strong by the respondents but shows the lowest numbers, while the highest is identification. So, it can be interpreted that the respondents' perceptions on perceived organizational trust, from the lowest to the highest orders are identification, ability, concern, openness and reliability. It means that reliability determined by lecturers’ trust towards the consistency of head of the organization, co-workers, all teams in the organization to act or whether or not they can be relied upon, are still perceived as lower. The openness of organization in delivering information that should be passed to lecturers is still perceived lower when compared to the organizational trust perceived by the respondents from identification, ability, and concerns.

In this condition, the leaders of PHEIs have higher attention to identification, concern, openness and ability when compared to reliability. Mishra (1998) states that reliability is determined by the trust towards leader’s consistency of the organization, co-workers, all teams in the organization to act or whether or not they can be relied upon.

From the results of analysis, job satisfaction variable is explained by salary, promotion, job, supervision, co-workers as verified by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) in Spector (1986), Gibson et al., (1996), Locke in Luthans (2005). The degree of job satisfaction perceived by lecturers is seen on the five indicators that reflect the realities of job satisfaction of a lecturer teaching at PHEIs.

The empirical conditions of PHEIs in Malang-Indonesia, of the respondents' perceptions on salary satisfaction, the condition is perceived as strong by the respondents, but show the lowest numbers. Meanwhile, the highest is job satisfaction. So it can be interpreted that the respondents' perceptions on perceived job satisfaction, from the highest to the lowest orders are job satisfaction, co-workers, supervision, promotion and salary. It means that the salary satisfaction, that is the satisfaction of income earned or received by lecturers from the amount of money paid periodically and definitely comparable to the efforts done the same with the remuneration received in the same job position, is still perceived as lower when compared to the job satisfaction perceived by respondents from the promotion, works, supervision and co-workers.

From the results of analysis, it is stated that the variable of organizational commitment is explained by affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, as verified by Meyer and Allen (1991). It means that the commitment experienced by lecturers is seen on three indicators (dimensions) that reflect the reality of the organizational commitment of a lecturer at PHEIs.
The empirical condition of PHEIs in Malang-Indonesia is that the respondent's perception towards continuance commitment is perceived as strong by the respondents, but shows the lowest numbers, while the highest is affective commitment. So it can be interpreted that the respondents' perceptions on perceived organizational commitment from the highest to the lowest orders are affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. It means that continuance commitment reflecting cost calculation to leave the organization or profit calculation if they remain in the organization are perceived as lower when compared to the organizational commitment perceived by the respondents from affective commitment and normative commitment.

In this condition, the leaders of PHEIs have higher attention on affective commitment and normative commitment when compared to continuance commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) state that continuance commitment reflects cost calculation to leave the organization or profit calculation if they remain in the organization.

E. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Quality of work life is able to create job satisfaction of lecturers. This is due to the important roles of quality of work life that lecturers are physically and psychologically feel safe, comfortable, relatively satisfied and able to grow and develop properly as human so that technically and humanely can take on comfortable and positive work environmental conditions. Quality of work life is able to build the commitment of lecturers at the institution. It means the better the quality of work life at PHEIs is, the better the commitment of lecturers to the institution is. It is because the important role of quality of work life that lecturers physically and psychologically perceive safe, comfortable, and able to grow and develop as human so that technically and humanely bring better quality of work life. Organizational trust is able to create the commitment of permanent lecturers of foundation at PHEIs. It is because of the important role of organizational trust, in which the trust in the organization requires open communication, information sharing, perceptions and feeling sharing, and bigger lecturers’ involvement in decision-making. These conditions will be able to increase the job satisfaction of lecturers. Organizational trust is able to create the commitment of permanent lecturers of foundation at PHEIs. This is due to the important role of organizational trust. The creation of trust in the organization requires open communication, sharing information, sharing perceptions and feelings, and greater lecturers involvement in decision-making. This condition will be able to increase the commitment of lecturers. Organizational trust is able to create the commitment of lecturers to PHE Institutions. Better job satisfaction of lecturers will be able to establish the commitment of lecturers to PHE Institutions.
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