

The Role of Nahdlatul Ulama's (NU) *Shared Values* in Optimizing Lecturers' *Organizational Pride* in University ff Nahdlatul Ulama

Ima Nadatien¹, Seger Handoyo², Widodo Jatim Pudjirahardjo³, Yusti Probawati⁴

^{1,2,3,&4}Airlangga University, Indonesia

Abstract

Organizational values which was adapted by organizational members, affected the way of organizational members in working and behaving (Cushway, Lodge, 2000). UNUSA lecturers who had NU values could show a pride. Moreover, the purpose of this research was to prove the influence of NU's shared value through organizational pride of UNUSA lecturers. This study was an observational study design with explanatory type, and cross sectional method. The respondents of this study were 105 UNUSA lecturers. The independent variables were NU's Shared Value (at-tawassuth, at-tawazun, at-ta'adul, at-tasamuh, amar ma'ruf nahi munkar) and dependent variable which was organizational pride. The data were analyzed by using linear regression test. The research result had proven that NU's Shared Value affected Organizational Pride ($p = 0.001$), $b = 0.583$ that meant NU's Shared Value was able to increase organizational pride with a contribution of 58.3%. In conclusion, the stronger the NU's Shared Value, the higher the Organizational Pride of UNUSA lecturers. Hopefully, the NU's values that strengthened UNUSA lecturers in doing Tridharma of college could foster pride, love, and loyalty. Lecturer would be enthusiastic in carrying out NU's Shared Value to optimize performance of Tridharma implementation.

Keywords: NU's Shared Value, Organizational Pride

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Changes in globalization era required people to adapt in order to survive. Challenges which were faced became increasingly complex in various fields which required mastery and application of the science and technology. The ability in creating innovation and creativity was needed to be able to compete with the support of entrepreneurs. Under these conditions, it required human resources (HR) who had reliable provision not only in *knowledge, skill, and attitude* but also *soft skills* in order to qualify working world expectations in global market. Colleges were solution to produce human resources who qualified those qualifications. College that was an institution of educational services had a responsibility to carry out teaching and learning activities in order to achieve the goal of national education by educating the nation. HR that was produced by the college was equipped with professional academic ability, had character and personality appropriately to the demands and needs of work. In addition, colleges had an obligation to develop science according to programs they were held. Achieving the goal of college education for resulting qualified, competent, professional, excellent, and competitive human resources in their filed needed a guidance and optimal role from the lecturers. Lecturers as educators were college's human resources who had an important role in realizing the goal of education. Lecturer as a professional one had an obligation to implement *Tridharma* of college to achieve qualified education programs. This research was conducted in UNUSA which had a base value of NU as a guidance of attitude and behavior for its members. Unusa which was an educational institution conducted the function in implementing college tridharma. Concept which was created by researcher regarding the implementation of NU's shared value was as a basic value in creating a pride of Unusa (*Organizational Pride*). Having a pride and love for UNUSA could improve the implementation of college *tridharma* in UNUSA. This study identified factors that might affect the pride as UNUSA lecturer such as NU's basic values as organizational culture implementation in UNUSA. NU's basic value became behavioral guideline for lecturers in doing their obligations and a source of pride as a member of NU which was internal strength to increase motivation and enthusiasm to work properly. Pride as part of NU was a source of UNUSA pride which applied NU's value as its basic value.

B. Research Questions

The research questions of this study were:

- 1) What was *Organizational Pride* condition of UNUSA lecturers?
- 2) Did NU's Shared Value (*At-Tawassuth, At-tawazun, At-Ta'adul, At-tasamuh, Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar*) influence *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers?

C. Objectives

- 1) General Objective:

The general objective of this study was to prove the influence of NU's Shared Value (*At-tawassuth, At-tawazun, At-ta'adul, At-tasamuh, Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar*) through *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers.

2) Specific Objective:

- a. Measuring *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers
- b. Measuring *NU's Shared Values* of UNUSA lecturers
- c. Analysing the effect of *NU's Shared Values* against *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *NU's Shared Value*

This study took organizational culture that was values, which concentrated on *NU's Shared Value*. *Shared Value* was the result of giving and receiving of values that was occurred in a group of people in organization. *NU's Shared Value* was a distribution of values which were used in organization based on Nahdlatul Ulama, thus, it would be a shared value in doing interaction among organizational members.

According to Schultz, organizational culture emphasized more on fundamental framework in which people were treated properly such as in the context of their social and work activities. Those included beliefs, values, and meanings which were latent, qualitatively, relatively, and sometimes subjectively.

January A. Pfister stated that organizational culture was combination of organizational culture definition by Edgar H. Schein, O'Reilly, and Chapman. Pfister defined that organizational culture was:

"... a pattern of basic assumptions that a group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which is represented in a system of shared value s defining what is important, and norms, defining appropriate attitudes and behaviors, that guide each individual's attitude and behaviors..."

According to Pfister, organizational culture had four characteristics, those were:

- (1) Common understanding among group members;
- (2) Interaction of group members;
- (3) Implicitly or explicitly;
- (4) Based on its history and traditions.

Values and norms that regulated group members' behaviors were keywords to observe organizational culture. Value implied what was important or upheld by an organization. Norm was the organization's efforts to regulate expected behavior of its members. Organizational culture was relatively different in each organization, depended on the values and norms that were developed.

According to Cushway and Lodge (GE: 2000), organizational culture was organizational values system and would affect the way of doing work and how employees behaved. It could be concluded that the definition of organizational culture in this study was organizational values system that was adapted by organizational members, then, affected the work and behavior of organizational members.

- (1) Joann Keyton
"...is the set(s) of artifacts, values, and assumptions that emerge from the interactions of organizational member."
- (2) Keyton stated that the artifacts, values and assumptions in an organization was a growing element from interaction among organizational members. Human became an important factor in the study of organizational culture.
- (3) Geert H. Hofstede defined organizational culture as *"...the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from another."*

Organizational culture was a collective mind programming, which distinguished members of one organization with other organizations. Each organization might develop different cultures.

From the variety of definitions by experts above, it could be concluded that almost the entire organizational culture emphasized concepts of values, norms, and prevailing assumption in organizations. Those values, norms, and assumptions were socialized and internalized to both of senior members and especially new members. Values, norms, and assumptions were instrumental regulations of individual behavior in thinking or acting in organization by adapting toward external environment and internal integration.

According to Ahmad Zahro (2000) in *NU Intellectual Tradition (Tradisi Intelektual NU)*, stated that the shape of NU's robustness in maintaining the earliest good values was tolerant and cooperative attitude towards diversity traditions that had developed in the community, such as reading litany (*barzanji*) and *diba'an* (history and praise for prophet Muhammad SAW), collective *wiridan* after congregated praying, praises between *Azan* and *Iqamat*,

tahlilan (reading sentence la ilaha illa Allah, coupled with certain recitation). The basic attitude of NU community was included in the following universal values (Zahro, 2000):

- (1) *At-Tawassuth* and *I'tidal*
At-Tawassuth and *I'tidal* were middle and straight attitude that had core principles upheld a necessity of being fair and straight in the middle of a life together, and avoided any kinds of approach that was *tatarruf* (extreme).
- (2) *At-Tasamuh*
At-Tasamuh was a tolerance toward dissent, both in religious problems (especially regarding things which were *furu'* (branches), *khilafiyah* (disputed), community and culture.
- (3) *At-Ta'adul* or *I'tidal*
At-Ta'adul or *I'tidal* (perpendicular) was firmly "straight", being fair and neutral in view, weighing, addressing and resolving all problems. Fair was proportionally attitude based on rights and obligations of each. Assertive was connected with *tawassut*, *Tauhid* assertive (truth principle that was believed to be true), *tasamuh* was firmly upright in the middle of the truth.
- (4) *At-Tawazun*
At-Tawazun was poised attitude in *khidmah* (serving), whether to Allah who associated with social life, people, or environment and aligned the interests of past, present and future.
- (5) *Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar*
Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar meant to always have sensitivity to encourage good deeds and beneficial to others, and to reject and prevent all things that could be misleading and demeaning life's values.

According to the Statute and Bylaw of Nahdlatul Ulama which was decided at 32nd *Muktamar* NU in Makassar 2010 AD or 1431 BC, it was stated that principles upheld in developing *ukhuwah Islamiyah*, *ukhuwah Wathoniyah* and *ukhuwah Insaniyah*. Those were *al-ikhlas* (sincerity), *al-adalah* (justice), *at-tawassuth* (moderation), *at-tawazun* (balance), and *at-tasamuh* (tolerance).

Another opinion about NU's value that was stated by KH.Muhyiddin Abdusshomad 2008, there were three characters which were consisted of *At-tawassuth*, *at-tawazun* and *al-I'tidal*. Three attitudes had always been taught by the Prophet Muhammad and his companions, those were:

- 1) *At-tawassuth* (impartiality, moderate, not extreme) such as summarized from the words of Allah:
"And we made you (Muslims) the middle people (fair and chosen) to be witnesses (the size of the vote) over (attitudes and actions) humans generally, and Allah to be witness (the size of the vote) over (attitudes and actions) you all." (*Qur'an, al-Baqarah: 143*).
 - 2) *At-tawazun* (balanced in all aspects, including in the use of 'aqli and naqli propositions). Allah SWT said:
"Indeed We have sent Our Messengers bringing the real truth and We have sent down with them the Book and the balance (justice weighing) to enable people in carrying out justice." (*Qur'an, al-Hadid: 25*).
 - 3) *Al-I'tidal* (Perpendicular). In the Qur'an Allah SWT said:
"O ye devout people, let you all be upright, defend (the truth) because Allah is a witness (measure of truth) that is fair. And do not be unjust. Do justice because it is closer to the piety. And fear to Allah because Allah doth see all that you do." (*Qur'an, al-Maidah: 8*).
- In addition of these three principles, *nahdliyyin* group also performed *at-tasamuh* attitude (tolerance).

They respected diversity and respected people who had different principles. However, they did not mean that they recognized or justified those different beliefs to be confirmed. Words of Allah SWT:
"So speak both of you (Prophet Musa and Harun AS) to him (Pharaoh) with words that are gentle, hopefully he remembers or fear." (*QS. Taha: 44*).

B. Organizational Pride

Referring to *Organizational Pride* theory that was stated by Tyler and Blader (2000), indicators were used to measure *Organizational Prides* as followed:

- (1) *I am pride to be a member of an organization, with a charitable cause.*
- (2) *I am pride of being a member of [organization].*
- (3) *I feel good when people describe me as a typical volunteer.*

Pride was caused by internal events which were relevant to a person's identity (Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng) as well as one's life so that it would always be maintained. *Pride* was self-conscious emotion that would rise from achievements of his own abilities. This reflected to how a person felt as him/herself. *Pride*, however, its presence appeared from oneself (Tracy & Robins, 2007). According to Lewis (1993), *Pride* could only be known as *Pride*

when there were different types of cognition-related factors for self. People evaluated or compared their behavior with the standards. However, new theories and findings supported the view of Cooley and Scheff, and suggested that the *Pride* was an important psychological and emotional adaptive evolutionary. The subjective feeling of a pleasant, accompanying the *Pride* could reinforce *pro-social* behavior, usually elicited emotion (achievement and parenting).

Organizational Pride based on the theory by Tyler and Blader (2002), *Pride* was a belief of lecturers referring to the way the lecturers evaluated UNUSA without making any explicit comparisons with other universities. *Pride* became part of an organization that was UNUSA. The UNUSA lecturers' pride supported and provided a positive value for them.

Lecturers' pride of becoming part of UNUSA was caused by the presence of NU's value. Lecturer had an obligation to implement *Tridharma* and those were in the field of teaching, research, and community service.

1) Pride of being UNUSA lecturer because of NU's value

Lecturers' pride of becoming part of UNUSA was caused by the presence of NU's value. Lecturer had an obligation to implement *Tridharma*, and those were in the field of teaching, research, and community service.

2) Internally pride of being lecturer in UNUSA

It was a pride of being lecturer in UNUSA where lecture had an obligation to implement *tridharma*.

3) Sense of happiness when others perceived as a lecturer in UNUSA

Happiness that was owned by Unusa lecturers was shown by using UNUSA's attribute (logo, PIN, Mars or Hymn, Jackets, Batik)

III. METHOD

This research was observational analytic by using explanatory research method. The study explored the effects of *NU's Shared Value* toward *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers. The data were collected by using *cross sectional*. The population was UNUSA lecturers of the entire programs which were consisted of 140 people. Respondents were 105 UNUSA lecturers of all programs. The variables which were used included the independent variable: *NU's Shared values*. The dependent variable was the *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers. The instrument that was used was questionnaire. The data were analyzed by using *Linear Regression Test*.

IV. RESULT

A. *NU's Shared value* of UNUSA's Lectures

NU's shared value in the study was defined as *shared value* of UNUSA lecturers that was applied in implementing *Tridharma*, which were described in Table 1

Table 1. Measurement Description of *NU's Shared value* of UNUSA lecturers 2016

No.	<i>NU's Shared value</i>	Criteria			Total	Mean	SD
		Low	Medium	High			
1.	<i>At-tawassuth</i>	0	40 (38,1%)	65 (61,9%)	105 (100%)	2,62	0,49
2.	<i>At-tawazun</i>	0	36 (34,3%)	69 (65,7%)	105 (100%)	2,66	0,48
3.	<i>At-ta'adul</i>	1 (1%)	52 (49,5%)	52 (49,5%)	105 (100%)	2,49	0,52
4.	<i>At-tasamuh</i>	3 (2,9%)	44 (41,9%)	58 (55,2%)	105 (100%)	2,52	0,56
5.	<i>Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar</i>	1 (1%)	35 (33,3%)	69 (65,7%)	105 (100%)	2,65	0,50
<i>NU's Shared value</i>		0	37 (35,2%)	68 (64,8%)	105 (100%)	2,65	0,48

Table 1 showed that UNUSA lecturers had *NU's shared value*, thus, it became *NU's Shared values* which were implemented in *Tridharma* with enough category (mean 2.65). *At-tawazun* value had the highest average (2.66) rather than the average of other values, which the lecturers had poise and harmony in integration and synergy between worship (serving Allah SWT) and obligation to carry out *Tridharma* by rules. UNUSA lecturers implemented *Tridharma* as implementation practice of their religion in daily life. The lowest average was *at-ta'adul*, explaining that UNUSA lecturers were still sufficient in complying regulations because the principle of *at-ta'adul* was unequivocal. Lecturers held principle of truth in all aspects which were believed to be true. It meant that lecturers was still in enough category in taking a professional attitude based on the correct rules, unequivocal in dealing with problems of *Tridharma* implementation.

B. Description of UNUSA Lectures Organizational Pride

Organizational Pride of UNUSA lecturers was measured from three indicators, those were pride of being UNUSA lecturers because of *NU's value*, internal pride of being lecturer, and pleasure when others perceived them as UNUSA lecturer. Each indicator was sub-variable. *Organizational Pride* variable measurement results could be seen in table 2

Table 2. Description of Composite Variable Measurement of UNUSA Lecturer *Organizational Pride* 2016

No.	<i>Organizational Pride</i>	Criteria			Total	Mean	SD
		Low	Medium	High			
1.	Pride of being UNUSA lecture because of <i>NU's values</i>	0	49 (46,7%)	56 (53,3%)	105 (100%)	2,53	0,50
2.	Internally pride of being UNUSA lecturer	1 (1,0%)	57 (54,3%)	47 (44,8%)	105 (100%)	2,44	0,52
3.	Pride of being perceived as UNUSA lecturer	0	53 (50,5%)	52 (49,5%)	105 (100%)	2,50	0,50
<i>Organizational Pride</i>		0	48 (45,7%)	57 (54,3%)	105 (100%)	2,54	0,50

From Table 2 it could be seen that UNUSA lectures had *Organizational Pride* in enough category (mean 2.54). Pride of being UNUSA lecturer internally had enough mean (2.44), and it was the lowest one if it was compared with other variables. This showed that lecturers still had low pride in potential and existence of UNUSA regarding to UNUSA fulfillment of lecturers' needs. It meant that if UNUSA had not given meaningful or beneficial things to lecturers, it had not increased pride toward UNUSA (internally).

Cross-tabulation between *NU's Shared value* and *Organizational Pride* could be seen in table 3 below,

Table 3. Cross-tabulation between *NU's Shared Value* and *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturers 2016

No.	<i>NU's Shared value</i>	<i>Organizational Pride</i>		Total
		Enough	High	
1.	Enough	31 (83,8%)	6 (16,2%)	37 (100,0%)
2.	High	17 (25,0%)	51 (75,0%)	68 (100,0%)
	Total	48 (45,7%)	57 (54,3%)	105 (100,0%)

Table 3 illustrated *NU's Shared Value* that was owned by UNUSA lecturers was in high category, pushing *Organizational Pride* that was owned by lecturers to be high. The higher the *NU's Shared value*, the higher the *Organizational Pride* that was owned by UNUSA lecturers.

Linear regression test results indicated that there was significant effect on *NU's Shared value* toward *Organizational Pride* with p value = 0.001, answering hypothetic. Value b = 0.583 showed that *NU's Shared values* could improve the *Organizational Pride* with a contribution of 58.3%.

V. DISCUSSION

The pride that was owned by lecturers created tolerance atmosphere in working place, mutual help between lecturers were organizational factors which contributed to provide a comfort and security atmosphere physically and mentally psychologically. The members' behaviors were commitment of organizational members with a sense of belonging as an integral part in the college. This condition was positive for organization to increase the sense of belonging and love of organization, which led to the realization of UNUSA lecturers' loyalty.

Lecturers were educators who had pedagogical, professional, personal and social competence (Teachers and Lecturers Law no.14 of 2005). With pedagogical competence, lecturers were able to manage learning activities of the students. Personality competence demanded lecturers to have steady personality, noble, wise, authoritative, as a role model of student. Professional competence made lecturers to be the master of learning materials widely and deeply appropriated with their science background. Social competence required lecturers to be able to communicate effectively and interact with the academic community, parents and community.

NU's basic value in this study was defined as the implementation of an organizational culture that was adapted by UNUSA and already internalized in lecturers' self. NU's basic value was as behavioral basis of lecturers in doing duties and obligations according to *Tridharma of the college*. *NU's Shared values* were consisted of *at-tawassuth* (moderate), *at-tawazun* (balanced), *at-ta'adul* (straight), *at-tasamuh* (tolerant), *amar ma'ruf nahi munkar* (commanding the good and forbidding the evil), which were owned by UNUSA lecturers since before joining UNUSA. It was known that NU's values which were adapted by UNUSA were values that guided NU members in acting and behaving. Meanwhile, all UNUSA lecturers were NU people who owned NU's value. UNUSA was educational organization was owned by YARSIS, whose background was NU under PBNU advisory. The purpose of this study was to prove the influence of *NU's shared value* toward *Organizational Pride* of UNUSA lecturer.

NU shared value was important as a fundamental value of attitude and behavior which were adopted by UNUSA lecturers. *NU's shared value* was already owned by lecturers before entering UNUSA, thus, rising pride was because of NU based. Pride would contribute to increase *organizational pride* that would ultimately be able to improve the performance of UNUSA lecturers.

VI. CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that NU's *shared value* had strength to increase *Organizational Pride*. The more *NU Shared Value* in lecturer self that was implemented for doing *tridharma*, the more it supported to increase lecturer's organization pride and as the effect, it could support to increase lecturer's performance.

The suggested solution was the strengthening of *NU's Shared Value* in the self-lecturer that was conducted continuously so that always becoming the soul and spirit for serving to UNUSA. The NU's shared value that had been owned by the lecturer became a factor that emerged *Organizational Pride*. *Nu's shared Value* was lecturer's strength in Unusa which was influenced by a situation from the outside that was NU organization. The NU value in macrosystem discipline influenced in giving big contribution on the organization that followed NU value (mezzo system) and influenced the lecturer as organization member (microsystem). This could become a major strength for increasing *Organizational Pride*.

NU's *Shared value* was implemented on the attitude of Organizational Pride. Organizational Pride that was from NU's *shared value* strengthened the attitude, love, and loyalty to Unusa. Organizational Pride was created from relevant NU's *shared value* in creating conducive academic atmosphere, increasing love and sense of belonging Unusa. Furthermore, these were the advantages and positive benefits that contributed to increase human resources quality of the lecturer. Therefore, the creating of Organizational Pride that based on NU's *shared value* realized Unusa lecturer's behavior in Islamic nuances and full of sincerity without expecting for reward. By improving the NU's shared values was a strength for supporting Organizational Pride attitude and finally, it contributed positively to improve lecturer's performance in implementing tridharma in accordance with the appointment. The lecturer was spurred, enthusiastic, and competed healthily for being the best by reaching high achievement in either academic field or non-academic field for individual level, group, or institution. The condition was the lecturer's effort in optimizing tridharma performance, realizing the Unusa Rahmatan Lil'alamin.

References

1. Zahro, A. (2000). Bahtshul Masail Nahdhatul Ulama (Telaah Kritis terhadap Hukum Fiqih). Dalam *Disertasi*. Yoryakarta: IAIN Sunan Kalijaga.
2. Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (3), 506-525.
3. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. United States of America: Sage Publication, Inc.
4. Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Domely, J., & James, H. (1996). *Organisasi* (8nd ed.). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
5. Malthis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2002). *Human Resource Management. Tenth Edition*. Soth-Western: Ohio.
6. Dessler, G. (2013). *Human Resources Management. 13rd Edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Education. Inc.
7. Tilaar, H., & Fadjar, M. (2000). *Paradigma Baru Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta: Rineka /cipta.
8. Purba, S. (2009). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Modal Intelektual, dan Perilaku Inovatif terhadap Kinerja Pemimpin Jurusan di Universitas Negeri Medan. *KINERJA*, 13 (2), 150-167.
9. Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
10. Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-technology fit individual Performance. *MIS Quarterly*, 9 (2), 213-236.
11. Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The Group Engagement Model: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Cooperative Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 349-361.
12. Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavior Engagement*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
13. Arnett, D. B., Laverie, D. A., & Mclane, C. (2002). Using job Satisfaction and pride as internal marketing tools. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 43 (2), 87-96.
14. Katzenbach, J. R. (2003). Pride: a strategic asset. *Journal of Strategy & Leadership*, 31 (5), 34-38.
15. Boezeman, E., & Ellemers. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers organizational commitment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 159-172.
16. Verbeke, W. J., Belschak, F. D., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2004). The Adaptive consequences or Pride in Personal Selling. *Journal of The Academy of marketing Science*, 32, 386-402.
17. Deutsch, M. A. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 265-279.
18. Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identify: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton & Company.
19. Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and replaces aggression: Does self-love or self hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219-229.
20. Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion and Inovation*. New York: The Free Press.
21. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). *Expanding The Criterion Domain to Include Elementsof Extra-Role Performance*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
22. Ahdiyana, M. (2009). Dimensi Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) dalam Kinerja Organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 4 (2), 109-184.
23. Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-marketing model of leadership in formal organization: a developmental approach. I. Dalam J. H. Larson (Penyunt.), *Leadership Frontiers* (hal. 143-166). Ken, OH: Ken State University Press.
24. Whitmore, J. (1997). *Coaching Performance*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
25. Rivai, V. (2004). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Muria Kencana.
26. Cushway, B. (2002). *Human Resources Manajemen*. Jakarta: PT. Elex. Media Compotindo.

27. Mink. (1993). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Kinerja)*. 4th printing. Jakarta: PT. Elex. Media Computindo.
28. Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2007). *Perilaku dan Manajemen Organisasi*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
29. Mangkunegara, A. A. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya manusia*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
30. McClelland, D. C. (1953). *The Achievement Motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
31. Gibson, J., Ivancevich, J., & Donnelly. (1987). *Organisasi dan Manajemen: Perilaku, Struktur, Proses*. Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
32. Alwi, S. (2001). *Manajemen sumber Daya Manusia Strategi Keunggulan*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
33. Kupprlwieser, V. G., Grefrath, R., & Dziuk, A. (2011). A Classification of Brand Pride Using Trust and Commitment. *Journal of Business and Social* , 2 (3).
34. Pickton, D., & Masterson, R. (2010). *Marketing an Introduction* (5th ed.). London: SAGE Publication.
35. Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Building Strong Brands*. New York: The Free Press.
36. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness preception influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 76 (6), 845-855.
37. Bungin, B. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana.
38. Singaribun, M., & Effendi, S. (1995). *Metode Penelitian Survei* (Revisi ed.). Jakarta: PT Pusaka LP3ES.
39. Indriartoro, & Supomo. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis untuk Akuntansi dan Manajemen* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: BPFE.
40. Sekaran, U. (2006). *Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
41. Walpole , R. E. (1995). *Pengantar Statistika* (3rd ed.). Jakarta : Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
42. Trihendradi, C. (2007). *SPSS 13: Step by step Analisis Data Statistik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
43. Suharjo, B. (2008). *Analisis Regresi Terapan SPSS*. Yogyakarta : Graha Ilmu.