沈阳建筑大学学报(自然科学版)
Journal of Shenyang Jianzhu University
(Natural Science)

卷：40 期：01 doi: 10.11717/j.issn: 1671-2021.2024.13
Vol: 40 No. 01

ENHANCING INSTRUCTOR INNOVATION THROUGH STRENGTHENING VISIONARY LEADERSHIP, SELF-EFFICACY, AND TRUST

Gian Yekti Widodo[1*], Didik Notosudjono[2], Suhendra[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Pakuan, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: gian.072120016@unpak.ac.id

Received: January 22, 2024
Accepted: February 20, 2024
Published: February 29, 2024

Abstract:

The aim of this research is to identify and fortify the variables of Organizational Culture and *Visionary Leadershi*p as a means to enhance innovation and accomplish organizational objectives. This research employed a survey methodology with a quantitative approach. The research's sample consisted of 142 respondents. Data collection in this research utilized a questionnaire. The data analysis process involved two main steps: Firstly, the examination of correlation and linear regression aspects for each of the two variables; and secondly, to compute the path coefficient, the product moment correlation coefficient was employed between each of the two research variables. The outcomes revealed that (1) there exists a direct positive impact between Organizational Culture (X_1) and Innovation (Y); and (2) there is a direct positive correlation between Visionary Leadership (X_2) and Innovation (Y). The conclusion drawn from this research asserts that organizational culture and visionary leadership positively influence innovation.

Keywords: Organizational culture, Visionary Leadership, Educator Innovation

Introduction

Education assumes a crucial role in fostering economic growth and constructing the civilization of a nation. This is attributed to its capacity to instigate positive transformations within society, exerting a substantial and enduring influence. Education contributes to the formation of individual character, advocates for ethical behavior, tolerance, and mutual respect, while enhancing awareness of universal human values (Ellitan & Mulia, 2019). Quality education enables a nation to cultivate superior and qualified human resources, propel sustainable economic growth, and mold an inclusive, responsible, and civilized society (Atika et al., 2021). (Atika et al., 2021; Girmanová et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, there are numerous challenges associated with cultivating superior human resources through education in our country, including the quality of human resources (HR) of educators, equitable distribution of education between regions, *miss-match* between *learning outcomes* and the demands of labour market qualifications, the need for curriculum design that is *agile to* dynamic changes due to technological leaps and the phenomenon of shifting market competition, educational facilities that are unable to keep up with the times, to the education budget which is always felt to be unable to provide and provide quality education (Alrasheedi et al., 2016; Oflaz, 2021)..

To address this issue, the pivotal role of instructors as innovative educators in labor sector centers becomes highly significant. Instructors, who are civil servants appointed as functional officials, possess a scope of duties, responsibilities, authority, and rights to engage in activities associated with the implementation and advancement of training (PermenPANRB No. 82 of 2020). Moreover, the innovation exhibited by educators in labor sector centers, as outlined earlier in the execution of their training functions following the guidelines of Permenakertrans No.8 of 2014, is intricately linked to the phenomenon of elevated unemployment rates in Indonesia, particularly in the West Java region. This has motivated researchers to recognize the imperative for investigating educator innovation. Furthermore, researchers have identified that extensive research on educator innovation at the Vocational Training Centre has not been conducted.

Furthermore, there are several studies on innovation related to other variables (Caliskan & Zhu, 2020) stated the outcomes of their research indicate that organizational culture impacts students' perceived necessity for innovation, their perspectives on innovative instructional approaches, receptiveness to instructional innovation, and the perceived degree of implementation of educational innovations. The research also concluded that hierarchical structure, lack of open communication and autonomy, workload, lack of financial resources and support are the main barriers to educational innovation in Turkish universities. Furthermore, Setyaningsih et al. (2020) found that strengthening Visionary Leadership can improve teacher performance in learning innovation. This is supported by research results (Ashlan, 2022) which shows that Visionary Leadership and innovation affect teacher performance.

While numerous studies delve into the topic of innovation, none have specifically investigated innovation in conjunction with visionary leadership, efficacy, and trust within the research subjects. Hence, researchers are keen on exploring instructor innovation at the Vocational and Productivity Training Centre within the Ministry of Manpower.

Building upon the provided background, the aim of this research is to identify and enhance the variables of Organisational Culture and Visionary Leadership, with the goal of devising methods and strategies to elevate innovation. This is intended to contribute towards achieving organizational objectives. In addition, this research is also expected to produce strategies and practical recommendations that can be applied to strengthen these factors and effectively increase innovation in order to achieve organisational goals.

Literature Review

Innovation (Y)

Innovation, whether conceived as a notion, activity, or entity deemed novel by an individual or another adopting entity (Licht et al., 2017). Creative ideas can be found every day in the form of new goods or services that satisfy consumers (Ramdhani et al., 2020).. Innovation is also considered as the act of creating new ideas and implementing them into new products/services that have practical uses (Sukmanasa et al., 2021)..

Visionary Leadership (X_1)

Visionary leadership is regarded as a leadership style characterized by personal attributes and the capacity to perceive holistically in order to generate, articulate, interpret, envision, and convey, as well as to reassess goals (Karwan et al., 2021). Leaders are able to drive the entire wheel of the institution (Ince, 2022). The actions of a leader in creating, formulating, communicating, socialising and implementing ideal thoughts to achieve the vision of the organization (Darma et al., 2021).

Self-efficacy (X_2)

Self-efficacy is perceived as an individual's assessment of their own capability to organize and execute tasks (Mookkiah, Mani & Prabu, 2019).An employee is considered to have self-efficacy if he has independence, trust, and is responsible for completing his performance (Ahmed & Asiksoy, 2021).The dimensions of self-efficacy are issues related to the degree of difficulty of individual tasks, the strength of the individual's ability, and the broad scope of the field of behaviour (Ridwan et al., 2021).

Trust Variable (X_3)

Trust is the belief that a trusted person will act competently and honestly. (Schmidt & Schreiber, 2019).*Trust is* an affective determinant or psychological cause that drives feelings without reasoning and rational reasons (Tamilina, 2018). *Trust* as a determinant of relationship quality at different levels of analysis in the context of relationships including friendships. The dimensions are *Competence, Benevolence*, and Integrity. (Firmansyah et al., 2019).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a survey methodology utilizing a quantitative approach. Such survey research aims to uncover causal relationships among variables. The dependent variable in this research is innovation (Y) and two independent variables, namely *Visionary Leadership (*X_1), Self-Efficacy (X_2), and Trust (X_3).

The research population comprised all instructors from Vocational Training Centre of Bekasi, Bandung, and West Bandung, Ministry of Manpower, totaling 220 individuals. The sample is a subset or representative of the population under investigation (Arikunto, 2010). The sample determination was carried out using the Taro Yamane formula, with an *error rate and confidence level of* 5% (Sugiyono, 2017). Based on the calculation results with the formula, a research sample of 142 respondents was obtained.

The data collection technique in this research used a questionnaire. The questionnaire according to Sugiyono (2013) is a data collection technique that is done by giving a set of questions or written statements to respondents to answer. Educator Innovation in this research is measured by indicators of (a) new processes, (b) new ways, (c) new products, (d) new services obtained through research instruments in the form of questionnaires given to instructors using a rating scale and values: namely *always (5)*, *often (4), sometimes (3)*, *never (2)*, and *never (1)* so that scores are obtained. To test the validity of this research instrument is based on the *Pearson Product Moment* correlation test. Meanwhile, to test the reliability of the instrument, it was carried out using *Cronbach's Alpha* technique.

The data analysis in this research consists of several steps. Firstly, the correlation and linear regression between each pair of variables were examined. Secondly, to compute the path coefficient, the *product moment* correlation coefficient was utilized for each pair of research variables. It is important to note that a prerequisite for conducting causal analysis is that the relationship between each pair of variables in the causal model is linear. Prerequisite tests are carried out with normality test, homogeneity test, linearity test and significance.

Description of Research Variable Data

The purpose of describing the data in this research is to offer an overview of the distribution or dispersion of the data. The data is processed using descriptive statistical techniques consisting of *mean*, *median*, frequent score, *standard deviation,* frequency distribution (*variance),* lowest and highest scores, range between lowest and highest scores (*range),* data diversity (*sample variance),* total score (*sum*) of the research variables. The presentation of each variable is successively as follows:

Description of Innovation Variable Data (Y)

The results of measuring the data of the Innovation variable (Y) through the research instrument obtained results, namely the amount of data (*sum) is* 16423, the amount of data (*count) is* 142, the highest score (*maximum) is* 163, the lowest score (*minimum)* is 70, the average score (*mean) is* 115.65, the middle value (*median) is* 116, the score that appears most often (*mode) is* 115, the highest-lowest score range (*range) is* 93, and the *standard deviation* is 21.251. The data can be explained through the table below.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Innovation Variables (Y)

No.	Statistical Measures	Results
1	A lot of data	142
2	Average (*Mean*)	115,65
3	*Median*	116
4	Frequent Score (*mode*)	115
5	*Std. Deviation*	21,251

6	Group mean (*Variance*)	451,603
7	*Range*	93
8	Minimum Score	70
9	Maximum Score	163
10	Many Classes	8
11	Class Length	12
12	Total	16423

Description of Visionary Leadership Variable Data (X)1

The results of measuring the data of the Visionary Leadership (X2) variable through the research instrument obtained results, namely the amount of data (*sum)* is 18947, the amount of data (*count) is* 142, the highest score (*maximum) is* 189, the lowest score (*minimum) is* 38, the average score (*mean) is* 133.43, the middle value (*median) is* 130.00, the score that appears most often (*mode) is* 131, the highest-lowest score range (*range) is* 151, and the *standard deviation* is 27.408. The data can be explained through the table below.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Visionary Leadership Variables (X_1)

No.	Statistical Measures	Results
1	A lot of data	142
2	Average (*Mean*)	122,09
3	*Median*	122,00
4	Frequent Score (*mode*)	119
5	*Std. Deviation*	22,233
6	Group mean (*Variance*)	587,233
7	*Range*	114
8	Minimum Score	59
9	Maximum Score	173
10	Many Classes	8
11	Class Length	14
12	Total	17337

Description of Variable Data Self-Efficacy (X)2

The measurement results of the Self-Efficacy variable (X2) data obtained through the research instrument indicate that the *sum* of the data is 18742, the amount of data (*count) is* 142, the highest score (*maximum) is* 180 the lowest score (*minimum*) is 53, the average score (*mean)* is 131.99, the middle value (*median*) is 131.50, the score that appears most often (*mode*) is 134, the highest-lowest score range (*range*) is 127, and the *standard deviation* is 26.697. The data can be explained through the table below.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Self-Efficacy Variables (X)2

No.	Statistical Measures	Results
1	A lot of data	142
2	Average (*Mean*)	131,99
3	*Median*	131,50
4	Frequent Score (*mode*)	134
5	*Std. Deviation*	26,697

6	Group mean (*Variance*)	712,752
7	*Range*	127
8	Minimum Score	53
9	Maximum Score	180
10	Many Classes	8
11	Class Length	15
12	Total	18742

Description of Trust Variable Data (X)3

The results of measuring the data of the Trust variable (X_4) through the research instrument obtained results, namely the amount of data (*sum*) is 17390 the amount of data (*count) is* 142, the highest score (*maximum) is* 171, the lowest score (*minimum*) is 60, the average score (*mean)* is 122.46 the middle value (*median*) is 123.00, the score that appears most often (*mode) is* 122, the highest-lowest score range (*range*) is 111, and the *standard deviation* is 22.846. The data can be explained through the table below.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of *Trust* Variables (X)3

No.	Statistical Measures	Results
1	A lot of data	142
2	Average (*Mean*)	122,46
3	*Median*	123,00
4	Frequent Score (*mode*)	122
5	*Std. Deviation*	22,846
6	Group mean (*Variance*)	504,846
7	*Range*	111
8	Minimum Score	60
9	Maximum Score	171
10	Many Classes	8
11	Class Length	13
12	Total	17390

Prerequisite Test

Normality Test

The normality calculation of the Visionary Leadership X variable$_1$ using the Liliefors test obtained L_{count} = 0.0422 while from the Liliefors table for α = 0.05 and n = 142 obtained the value L_{table} = 0.0789. Because the value of $L_{count} < L_{tabel}$, then H_0 is accepted, which means giving the conclusion that the standard error of the estimated Visionary Leadership Variable X_1 on Innovation Y comes from a normally distributed population, the details can be seen in Table 5 below:

Table 5. Test of Normality of Estimated Visionary Leadership Variable X_2 on Innovation Y

Number	L count	L table α = 0.05	Summary
1	0,0422	0,0789	Normal
The Normal distribution requirement is $L_{count} < L$ table			

The normality of the estimated standard error was tested using the Liliefors test. The value of L_{table} for N = 142 with α = 0.05 is 0.0789 at the significance level of 0.05. The requirement that the estimated standard error comes from a normally distributed population is $L_{count} <$ from Ltabel. The results of the normality test are as follows: The calculation using the Liliefors test obtained L_{count} = 0.0617 while from the Liliefors table for α = 0.05 and n = 198 obtained the value of L_{table} = 0.0789. Because the value of $L_{count} < L_{table}$, then H0 is accepted, which means giving the conclusion that the standard error of the estimated Self-Efficacy Variable X_2 on Innovation Y comes from a normally distributed population.

Table 6. Test of Normality of Estimated Self-Efficacy Variable X_2 on Innovation Y

Number	L count	L table α = 0.05	Summary
1	0,0617	0,0789	Normal
The Normal distribution requirement is $L_{count} < L_{table}$			

The normality of the estimated standard errors was assessed using the Liliefors test. The L_{table} value for N=142 with α=0.05 is 0.0789 at the 0.05 significance level. The requirement that the estimated standard error comes from a normally distributed population is $L_{count} <$ Ltable. The results of the normality test are as follows: The calculation using the Liliefors test obtained L_{count} = 0.0476 while from the Liliefors table for α = 0.05 and n = 142 obtained the value of L_{table} = 0.0640. Because the value of $L_{count} < L_{table}$, then H0 is accepted, which means it gives the conclusion that the standard error of the estimated Trust_X4 variable on Innovation_Y comes from a normally distributed population, the full can be seen in the following table:

Table 7. Test of Normality of Estimated Trust Variable X_3 on Innovation Y

Number	L count	L table α = 0.05	Summary
1	0,0640	0,0789	Normal
The Normal distribution requirement is $L_{count} < L_{table}$			

Homogeneity Test

The outcomes of the homogeneity test for the organizational culture variable (X_1) using the Bartlett test are presented in the following table:

Table 8. Test of Homogeneity of variance of Innovation variable data (Y) above Visionary Leadership variable (X_1)

Box's M		7,653
F	Approx.	2,307
	df1	3
	df2	355,619
	Sig.	,076
Tests the null hypothesis of equal population covariance matrices		

After calculating the Bartlett test, the obtained significance value (sig value) is 0.076, while the significance level utilized is 0.05. If the sig value exceeds the significance level (0.05), the data requirements are considered homogeneous. Consequently, the Innovation variable (Y) on the Visionary Leadership variable (X_1) stems from a population with consistent variances (homogeneity).

Furthermore, as for the results of the homogeneity test of the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) using the Bartlett test, the results are obtained as in the following table:

Table 9: Test of Homogeneity of variance of Innovation variable data (Y) over variable Self-Efficacy (X_2)

Box's M		5,929
F	Approx.	1,932
	df1	3
	df2	9051,472
	Sig.	,122
Tests the null hypothesis of equal population covariance matrices		

After conducting the Bartlett test calculation, the obtained significance value (sig value) is 0.122, whereas the significance level utilized is 0.05. Homogeneous data requirements if the sig value> 0.05 significance level, thus the Innovation variable (Y) on the Self-Efficacy variable (X_3) comes from a population that has the same variance (homogeneous). Additionally, the outcomes of the homogeneity test for the Trust variable (X_3) using the Bartlett test are presented in the following table.

Table 10: Homogeneity test of variance of data on Innovation variable (Y) above Trust variable (X_2)

Box's M		3,962
F	Approx.	1,293
	df1	3
	df2	10877,186
	Sig.	,275
Tests the null hypothesis of equal population covariance matrices		

Following the Bartlett test calculation, the obtained significance value (sig value) is 0.275, with a significance level of 0.05. If the sig value exceeds the significance level (0.05), it indicates homogeneous data requirements. Consequently, the data for the Innovation Variable (Y) based on the Trust Variable (X_3) emanates from a population with consistent variances (homogeneous).

Linearity Test

When analyzing the Linearity test, it can be conducted by utilizing the Anova table, specifically by examining the significance value of the *Deviation from Linearity.* The provisions of the Linearity test are if the significant value> 0.05 then there is a significant linear relationship between the variables Furthermore, the results of the data analysis of the linear regression model test between the Visionary Leadership variable data (X_1) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

ANOVA test of Visionary Leadership variable (X_2) on Innovation variable (Y)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I	Between Groups	(Combined)	45055,516	76	592,836	2,303	,000
		Linearity	28418,337	1	28418,337	110,417	,000
		Deviation from Linearity	16637,179	75	221,829	,862	,734
	Within Groups		16729,217	65	257,373		
	Total		61784,732	141			

Referring to the table above, the *Deviation from Linearity* yields a significance value (sig value) of 0.734. If the significance value (0.734) is greater than 0.05, then the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It is concluded that the regression between the Visionary Leadership variable data (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y) is linear. Therefore, it can be demonstrated that there exists a significant linear relationship between the Visionary Leadership variable (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y). With the confirmation of the linear relationship, the analysis can proceed to the linear regression test.

The criterion for the Linearity test states that if the significance value is greater than 0.05, then there exists a significant linear relationship between the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y). After the Linearity test is fulfilled, it can be continued to the linear regression test. By using the ANOVA (*analysis of variance*) table at a significance level of 0.05, the results of data analysis of the linear regression model test between the data of the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

Table 12. ANOVA test of Self-efficacy variable (X_2) to the Innovation variable (Y)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	(Combined)	48579,682	74	647,729	3,237	,000
		Linearity	26954,818	1	26954,818	134,723	,000
		Deviation from Linearity	21624,865	74	292,228	1,461	,059
	Within Groups		13205,050	66	200,077		
	Total		61784,732	141			

Based on the table above, *Deviation from Linearity is* obtained with a sig value of 0.059. If the sig value (0.059) > 0.05 then Ho is accepted. It is concluded that the regression between the data of the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y) is linear. Therefore, it can be established that there exists a significant linear relationship between the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y). With the confirmation of the linearity relationship, the analysis can proceed to the linear regression test.

The provisions of the Linearity test if the significant value> 0.05 then there is a significant linear relationship between the Trust variable (X_2) and the Innovation variable (Y). After the Linearity test is fulfilled, it can be continued to the linear regression test. By using the ANOVA (*analysis of variance*) table at a significance level of 0.05, the results of data analysis of the linear regression model test between the Trust variable data (X_3) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

Table 13. ANOVA test of Trust variables (X_3) to the Innovation variable (Y)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	(Combined)	45308,149	74	647,729	2,789	,000
		Linearity	28145,555	1	28145,555	121,28	,000
		Deviation from Linearity	17162,594	74	248,733	1,072	,386
	Within Groups		16476,583	66	232,065		
	Total		61784,732	141			

Based on table 4.38 above, *Deviation from Linearity is* obtained with a sig value of 0.386 If the sig value (0.386)> 0.05 then Ho is accepted. It is concluded that the regression between the *Trust* variable data (X4) on the Innovation variable (Y) is linear. Thus, it can be proven that there is a significant linear relationship between the *Trust* variable (X4) and the Innovation variable (Y). With the proof of the linearity relationship, it can be continued to the linear regression test.

Hypothesis Test

Test the Effect of Visionary Leadership Variables (X_2) on Innovation Variables (Y)

The results of data analysis of the linear test of the regression model of the Visionary Leadership variable (X_1) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

Table 14. Linear regression test (t test) Visionary Leadership variable (X) 1 to the Innovation variable (Y)

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	43,076	6,360		6,773	,000
	VL_x2	,544	,047	,702	11,648	,000

Based on Table 12 above, it is known that the slope constant (a) is 43.076 with the coefficient (b) X1 of 0.544 so that the regression equation formed between the Visionary Leadership variable (X_2) on the Innovation variable (Y) is $\hat{y}$ = 43.076 + 0.544 X. The significance value (sig) of the output above, obtained sig value is 0.000 < from α (0.05). So it can be concluded that the influence between the Visionary Leadership variable (X_2) on the Innovation variable (Y) is significant. To determine the amount of contribution of Visionary Leadership (X_2) to Innovation (Y) can be seen from the coefficient of determination $(ry21)^2$, as seen from the following SPSS test results:

Table 15. Coefficient of Determination of Visionary Leadership variables (X)2 on Innovation variable (Y)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,702[a]	,492	,489	15,19814

The contribution of Visionary Leadership (X_2) to Innovation (Y) $(rx21)^2$ is 0.492 which can be interpreted that 49.2% of Innovation (Y) can be explained by Visionary (X_2). The remaining 50.8% is the contribution of other factors outside Visionary Leadership. Guided by the interpretation of the correlation coefficient, the relationship between Visionary Leadership (X_2) to Innovation (Y) is a strong correlation (R value = 0.702).

Test the Effect of Self-Efficacy Variables (X2) on Innovation Variables (Y)

The results of data analysis of the linear test regression model of the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

Table 16. Linear regression test (t test) of Self-efficacy variable (X_2) on Innovation variable (Y)

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	43,896	6,616		6,635	,000
	BO_x1	,544	,049	,683	11,065	,000

Based on table 16 above, it is known that the slope constant (a) is 43.896 with the coefficient (b) X1 of 0.544 so that the regression equation formed between the Self-Efficacy variable (X3) on the Innovation variable (Y) is $\hat{y}$ = 43.896 + 0.544 X. The significance value (sig), from the output above, obtained sig value is 0.000 < than α (0.05). So it can be concluded that

the influence between the Self-Efficacy variable (X3) on the Innovation variable (Y) is significant. To determine the magnitude of the contribution of the Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) to the Innovation variable (Y) can be seen from the coefficient of determination $(ry21)^{2,}$ as seen from the following SPSS test results:

Table 17. Coefficient of Determination of Self-Efficacy variable (X_2) on Innovation variable (Y)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,683[a]	,467	,463	15,57688

a. Predictors: (Constant), BO_x1

Based on Table 17, the contribution of Self-Efficacy (X_2) to the Innovation variable (Y) $(rx21)^2$ is 0.467 which can be interpreted that 46.7% of Innovation (Y) can be explained by Self-Efficacy (X_2) The remaining 53.3% is a contribution from other factors outside the Organisational Culture. Guided by the interpretation of the correlation coefficient, the relationship between Self-Efficacy and Innovation is a strong correlation (R value = 0.683).

Test the Effect of Trust Variables (X_3) on Innovation Variables (Y)

The results of data analysis of the linear test regression model of the Trust variable (X_3) on the Innovation variable (Y) are obtained as follows:

Table 18. Linear regression test (t test) variable Trust (X_3) to the Innovation variable (Y)

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	35,071	7,148		4,906	,000
	VL_x2	,658	,057	,696	11,460	,000

According to the information provided in the aforementioned Table 12, it is evident that the slope constant (a) is 35.071, and the coefficient (b) for variable X3 is 0.658. Consequently, the resulting regression equation, which describes the relationship between the Trust variable (X2) and the Innovation variable (Y), can be expressed as $\hat{y}$ = 35.071 + 0.658X. The significance value (sig) of the output above, obtained sig value is 0.000 < than α (0.05). So it can be concluded that the influence between the Trust variable (X_3) on the Innovation variable (Y) is significant. To determine the magnitude of the contribution of Trust (X_3) to Innovation (Y) can be seen from the coefficient of determination $(ry21)^2$, as seen from the following SPSS test results:

Table 13. Coefficient of Determination of Trust variables (X_3) to the Innovation variable (Y)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1		,696[a]	,484 ,480	15,31917

The contribution of Visionary Leadership (X_2) to Innovation (Y) $(rx21)^2$ is 0.484 which can be interpreted that 48.4% of Innovation (Y) can be explained by Trust (X_3). The remaining 51.6% is the contribution of other factors outside Trust. Guided by the interpretation of the correlation coefficient, the relationship between Trust (X_3) to Innovation (Y) is a strong correlation (R value = 0.696).

The outcomes indicate a positive and direct influence between *Visionary Leadership* (X2) and Innovation (Y). High *Visionary Leadership* (X2) will increase Innovation (Y). The results of hypothesis testing show that there is a functional relationship between *Visionary Leadership* (X2) and Innovation (Y) through the regression equation $\hat{y} = 43.076 + 0.544$ X, which means that every one unit increase in the value of Visionary Leadership (X_2) will be followed by an increase in Innovation (Y) by 0.544 units. The notion of visionary leadership, encompassing a leader's proficiency in articulating a long-term vision, inspiring, and guiding team members toward a shared objective, has emerged as a significant focal point in management literature. James MacGregor Burns' transformational theory of leadership, positing that transformational leaders foster an environment conducive to innovation by motivating subordinates to attain elevated levels of performance and creative thinking, contributes substantially to this discourse (Hartini, 2017; Rinel, 2017). (Hartini, 2017; Rinel, 2018)..

Within the realm of innovation, visionary leadership could potentially exhibit greater effectiveness when an organization confronts challenges demanding creative solutions or substantial changes. Warren Bennis underscores the significance of vision in leadership, contending that visionary leaders possess the capability to navigate organizations through transformation. They achieve this by effectively communicating a clear vision, instigating change, and propelling innovation (Cobanoglu, 2021; Komariah et al., 2023). As per their perspective, a robust and inspiring vision has the potential to motivate team members to attain heightened levels of creativity, foster a collaborative ethos, and enhance the organization's capacity to adapt to market changes (Malaret et al., 2021; Rais et al., 2022)..

Moreover, the outcomes indicate a direct positive correlation between Self-Efficacy (X2) and Innovation (Y). Elevated levels of Self-Efficacy (X_2) have a significant impact on augmenting Innovation (Y). The results of hypothesis testing show that there is a functional relationship between Self-Efficacy (X3) and Innovation (Y) through the regression equation $\hat{y} = 43.896 + 0.544$ X which means that every one unit increase in the value of Self-Efficacy (X_2) will be followed by an increase in the value of Innovation (Y) by 0.544 units.

Furthermore, the results showed that there is a direct positive influence between *Trust* (X_3) and Innovation (Y). High *trust* (X_3) will have an impact on increasing innovation (Y). The results of hypothesis testing show that there is a functional relationship between *Trust* (X4) and Innovation (Y) through the regression equation $\hat{y} = 35.071 + 0.658$ X, which means that every one unit increase in the value of *Trust* (X4) will be followed by an increase in the value of Innovation (Y) by 0.658 units.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion presented in the above research, it can be concluded that: (1) there exists a direct positive influence between Visionary Leadership (X1) and Innovation (Y), implying that higher levels of Visionary Leadership (X1) correspond to increased levels of Innovation (Y); (2) a direct positive correlation is observed between Self-Efficacy (X2) and Innovation (Y), signifying that elevated levels of Self-Efficacy (X2) result in

increased levels of Innovation (Y); and (3) there is a direct positive influence between Trust (X3) and Innovation (Y), indicating that higher levels of Trust (X3) lead to increased levels of Innovation (Y). Therefore, it can be concluded that visionary leadership, self-efficacy, and trust positively contribute to innovation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, H. D., & Asiksoy, G. (2021). The effects of gamified flipped learning method on student's innovation skills, self-efficacy towards virtual physics lab course and perceptions. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(18), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810163

Alrasheedi, M., Capretz, L. F., & Raza, A. (2016). Management's Perspective on Critical Success Factors Affecting Mobile Learning in Higher Education Institutions - An Empirical research. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *54*(2), 253-274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633115620387

Ashlan, S. and H. (2022). JISAE (Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation) THE EFFECT OF VISIONARY LEADERSHIP AND LEARNING INNOVATION ON TEACHER PERFORMANCE ALIYAH STATE MADRASAH MEDAN CITY-INDONESIA. *|JISAE (Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, *8*(2), 109-119.

Atika, A., Arifin, Z., & Jannana, N. S. (2021). Integrated School Management-Character Education Affirmation: a Case research in Muhammadiyah Wirobrajan 3 Elementary School Yogyakarta. In *Al-Tanzim: Journal of Management* .... academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/download/78070330/pdf.pdf

Caliskan, A., & Zhu, C. (2020). Organisational culture and educational innovations in Turkish higher education: Perceptions and reactions of students. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *20*(1), 20-39. https://doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2020.1.003

Cobanoglu, N. (2021). The relationship between shared leadership, employee empowerment and innovativeness in primary schools: A structural equation modelling. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *10*(1), 327-339. https://doi.org/10.12973/EU-JER.10.1.327

Darma, D. Q., Notosudjono, D., & Herfina. (2021). Strengthening Teamwork, Visionary Leadership and Self Efficacy in Efforts to Improve Teachers Creativity. *Psychology and Education*, *58*(4), 3825-3837.

Ellitan, L., & Mulia, T. (2019). Total Quality Management Model in Indonesia Higher Education. *International Journal of Trend in Research and Development*, *6*(1), 105-109.

Firmansyah, M. R., Amelia, R., Jamil, R. A., Faturochman, F., & Minza, W. M. (2019). Benevolence, Competency, and Integrity: Which Is More Influential on Trust in Friendships? *Journal of Psychology*, *18*(1), 91. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.18.1.91-105

Girmanová, L., Šolc, M., Blaško, P., & Petrík, J. (2022). Quality Management System in Education: Application of Quality Management Models in Educational Organisations-Case research from the Slovak Republic. *Standards*, *2*(4), 460-473. https://doi.org/10.3390/standards2040031

Hartini, S. (2017). INFLUENCE OF VISIONARY LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL HEAD AND SCHOOL CLIMATE ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS. In *Journal of Educational Administration* (Vol. 11, Issue 2, pp. 151-159). University of Education Indonesia (UPI). https://doi.org/10.17509/jap.v21i2.6688

Ince, A. (2022). International Journal of Social Science, Innovation and Educational Technologies (Online)-Issn: 2717-7130. *International Journal of Social Science ...*, *11*, 146-155.

Karwan, D., Hariri, H., & Ridwan, R. (2021). *Visionary Leadership: What, Why, and How.* https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.16-10-2020.2305217

Komariah, A., Kurniady, D. A., Abdullah, Z., & ... (2023). Elementary School Principal Participative Leadership: Coordination in Character Education Implementation. *Padang International* .... https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-11-4_2

Licht, A. H., Tasiopoulou, E., & Wastiau, P. (2017). Open book of educational innovation. *European Schoolnet*, 185.

Malaret, S., Allan, E., Graham, G., Esquenazi, C., Bacon, D., & Whalen, P. (2021). Teaching student leadership, ethics, and group responsibility for hazing prevention: An exploratory research. *Journal of Campus Activities Practice and Scholarship*, *3*(1), 17-33. https://doi.org/10.52499/2021012

Mookkiah, Mani & Prabu, M. (2019). *ENHANCINGSELF-EFFICACYTHROUGHMASSIVEOPENONLINECOURSE (1)*.

Oflaz, A. (2021). Educational Quality Management in Latin America. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(2), 1117-1128.

Rais, S., Rubini, B., & Herfina. (2022). Increasing Teacher Creativity through Strengthening Transformational Leadership, Teamwork, and Work Engagement. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, *12*(1), 232-241. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.24

Ramdhani, N. K., Abdullah, T., Retnowati, R., Abidin, Z., & Riyad, M. (2020). Teacher Career Success with Strengthening Innovativity, Training Effectiveness and Personality (Correlation Analysis and Sitorem on Public Elementary School Civil Servant Teachers in Bogor Regency). *Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(6). ISSN 1567-214x*, *17*(6), 7743-7766.

Ridwan, R., Abdullah, T., & Sunaryo, W. (2021). Improving Organizational Citizenship Behavior through Organizational Climate Development, Transformational Leadership and Self-Efficiency (Empirical research Using ..... *International Research and ...*, 12409-12424.

Rinel. (2018). SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS: VISIONARY LEADERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL HEAD AND SCHOOL CLIMATE. In *Edum Journal* (Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 24-32). Wiralodra University. https://doi.org/10.31943/edumjournal.v1i1.37

Schmidt, S., & Schreiber, D. (2019). Inter-organizational trust: definitions, elements and operationalisation. *Desenvolvimento Em Questão*, *17*(48), 71-83. https://doi.org/10.21527/2237-6453.2019.48.71-83

Sukmanasa, E., Rubini, B., Sunaryo, W., & Programme, P. G. (2021). Increasing Innovativeness Through Knowledge Management, Transformational Leadership. and Personality Reinforcement. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, *12*(13), 6334-6343.

Tamilina, L. (2018). *Munich Personal RePEc Archive A brief overview of approaches to defining social trust*. *96510*.