



The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Turnover Intention through Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Aprilantinas Rizqi^{1*}, Nur Azizah Sakinah²

^{1,2}*Airport Management Program, Aviation College, Jakarta, Indonesia*

*Corresponding author: arizky@stp-aviasi.ac.id |

Received: 10 September 2021 | Revised: 15 October 2021 | Published: 30 November 2021

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to determine the effect of transformational leadership on employee turnover intention through the mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment at PT. ANJ Tbk in Medan. This study involved 200 employees of PT. ANJ Tbk in Medan.

Research Methodology: This study adopted a quantitative approach. The data analysis technique used in this study was AMOS 20 software, and mediation analysis was conducted using the Sobel Test.

Results: The results showed that transformational leadership had a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and a negative effect on turnover intention.

Conclusions: Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment and a positive and insignificant effect on turnover intention and does not mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention, while organizational commitment has a negative and insignificant effect on turnover intention and does not mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention.

Limitations: This study focuses on PT. Austindo Nusantara Jaya Agri Tbk in Medan, limiting generalizability. It excludes factors like work stress and organizational culture, and the sample size may not capture all perspectives.

Contributions: This research highlights the effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, revealing that it does not mediate turnover intention, offering practical insights for management.

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Transformational Leadership, Turnover Intention*

How to Cite: Rizqi, A., & Sakinah, N. A. (2021). The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Turnover Intention through Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan (JBEMK)*, 1(2), 97–110.
<https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.32>

1. Introduction

A company's performance is influenced by the attitudes and behavior of its employees. One form of employee attitude that determines a company's performance is the turnover intention. Turnover intention is defined as an employee's desire to leave the company (Karim et al., 2019; Navas & Vijayakumar, 2018). Employee turnover intention refers to an employee's desire to continue their relationship with the company, which has not yet been realized (Commey et al., 2020). In action, certain leave organization (only in the form of feeling or desire), whereas turnover is more directed towards the final reality of employees (definite actions or behavior) faced by organizations or companies in the form of leaving,

which causes a reduction in the number of employees in a certain period, for example, employees who resign at their own request, retire, are directly dismissed from the company, or are temporarily dismissed (Panggabean, 2004).

Employee turnover can result in very high costs, such as recruitment, training, interviews, selection, and compensation or benefit costs (Kumar et al., 2012). In contrast, employee turnover intention negatively impacts the aforementioned, which can create instability and uncertainty regarding conditions and human resource development. Consequently, companies become ineffective and may lose experienced employees (Lekatompessy, 2003).

This research was conducted This study aimed to examine the employees working at PT. ANJ in Medan, considering the influencing factors such as transformational leadership style, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The company's population comprised 360 employees, ranging from elementary school to postgraduate level, with the aim of improving human resource quality and preventing future turnover intentions.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Transformational Leadership Style

Ngadiman and Ratmawati (2013) define transformational leadership style as leadership that encompasses efforts to achieve organizational change. According to Robbins and Judge (2015) and Top et al. (2020) transformational leadership style consists of four aspects: (a) idealized influence, which means that a transformational leader must be charismatic and able to influence subordinates to follow the leader; (b) inspirational motivation, which means that the character of a leader is able to apply high standards but at the same time is able to encourage subordinates to achieve those standards; (c) intellectual stimulation, which means that a leader is able to encourage subordinates to solve problems carefully and rationally; and (d) individualized consideration, which means that a leader is capable of understanding the differences between individual subordinates (Jundi et al., 2019; Makambe & Moeng, 2019).

2.2 Job Satisfaction

According to Hassi (2019) and Robbins and Judge (2015), job satisfaction can be defined as a general attitude toward one's job, which indicates the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive. Eliyana and Ma'arif (2019) and Mathis and Jackson (2016) state that job satisfaction is a condition of emotion, which is positive from evaluating the work experience of someone. Job Satisfaction is related to variables such as turnover, absenteeism rate, age, job level, and size of the company organization (Budhathoki, 2020; Mangkunegara, 2009).

2.3 Organizational Commitment

According to Nagar (2012) and Vipraprastha et al. (2018), organizational commitment is the degree to which employees believe in and accept the organization's goals and desire to remain with it. Organizational commitment is built on an individual's belief in organizational values, willingness to help achieve organizational goals, and loyalty to remain a member of the organization (Purba & Sudibjo, 2020). Therefore, organizational commitment creates a sense of belonging for both individuals and the organization. Organizational commitment indicates an individual's level of belief and loyalty towards their organization, or the intensity with which they identify themselves and their level of involvement in the organization (Indriyani, 2011; Kishen et al., 2020).

2.4 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention can be defined as an employee's desire to leave their job that has not yet been realized in the definite action of leaving the organization (Bramantara & Dewi, 2015).

Table 1. Development Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Description	Researcher
H1	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction	(Zahari & Shurbagi, 2012)
H2	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	(Ismail et al., 2011)
H3	Transformational Leadership Style has a negative and significant influence on Turnover Intention	(Gul et al., 2012)
H4	Job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	(Hasan, 2012)
H5	Job satisfaction has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	(Sartika, 2014)
H6	Organizational Commitment has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	(Indraprasti, 2011)
H7	Job satisfaction mediates the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention	(Lim et al., 2017)
H8	Organizational commitment can mediate the influence of transformational leadership style on turnover intention	(Gul et al., 2012)

Based on Table 1, the development hypotheses presented in this study highlight the relationships between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Specifically, the table shows that transformational leadership style has both positive and negative influences on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, respectively. Job satisfaction is found to positively impact organizational commitment and negatively influence turnover intention. Organizational commitment also mediates the influence of transformational leadership on turnover intention. The various hypotheses are supported by the works of several researchers, each contributing to the theoretical framework of the study.

3. Methodology

3.1 Population And Sample

The sampling method used in this study was purposive sampling, which is a method of selecting samples based on certain criteria. The sample consisted of employees working at PT. Austindo Nusantara Jaya Agri Tbk, Medan. The research population in November 2017 comprised 360 employees. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula, according to [Tejada et al. \(2012\)](#):

$$n = \frac{360}{1 + 360(0.05)^2} = 189 \text{ employees/respondents}$$

A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed at the PT. Austindo Nusantara Jaya Agri S.A. After reviewing, it was found that eight questionnaires were not completed according to the instructions. The number of questionnaires acceptable for the study was 192. Therefore, the sample represented the desired number of respondents (n = 189).

3.2 Variables and Measurement

The variables used in this study were transformational leadership style as an independent variable, turnover intention as a dependent variable, and job satisfaction and organizational commitment as mediating variables. For the purposes of quantitative analysis in this study, respondents' answers were scored on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Test Validity

Test results for the transformational leadership style variables, which consist of four dimensions, show that for three dimensions, namely, inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and intellectual stimulation, all indicators used for each dimension are valid, as shown by the factor loading value > 0.4 , while the idealized influence dimension only has one invalid indicator with a factor loading value < 0.4 . Thus, for the variable transformational leadership consisting of four dimensions, only one indicator must be removed because it is invalid.

Testing validity for turnover intention, which consists of four indicators, showed that there are two valid indicators with factor loading values > 0.4 , while two other indicators are invalid (< 0.4). Therefore, for the turnover intention variable, two indicators must be removed because they are invalid.

Table 2. Validity Test Results

Variabel	Indicator	Factor Loading	Information
Idealized Influence	II1	0.372	Not Valid
	II2	0.730	Valid
Inspirational Motivation	IM1	0.831	Valid
	IM2	0.754	Valid
Intellectual Stimulation	IS1	0.813	Valid
	IS2	0.824	Valid
	IS3	0.800	Valid
Individualized Consideration	IC1	0.847	Valid
	IC2	0.829	Valid
Turnover Intention	TI1	-0.639	Not Valid
	TI2	0.903	Valid
Job Satisfaction	JS1	0.721	Valid
	JS2	0.748	Valid
	JS3	0.702	Valid
	JS4	0.749	Valid
	JS5	0.772	Valid
	JS6	0.749	Valid
	JS7	0.749	Valid
	JS8	0.727	Valid
Organizational Commitment	OC1	0.721	Valid
	OC2	0.758	Valid
	OC3	0.809	Valid
	OC4	0.798	Valid
	OC5	0.725	Valid

Based on Table 2, the validity test results show that most of the indicators have valid factor loadings,

with only a few being marked as not valid. Specifically, for the Idealized Influence variable, indicator II1 has a factor loading of 0.372 and is considered not valid, while II2 has a valid factor loading of 0.730. Similarly, all indicators under Inspirational Motivation (IM1, IM2), Intellectual Stimulation (IS1, IS2, IS3), and Individualized Consideration (IC1, IC2) are valid with high factor loadings. However, the Turnover Intention variable shows that TI1 has a factor loading of -0.639, which is not valid, while TI2 has a valid factor loading of 0.903. The Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment variables demonstrate all indicators are valid with factor loadings ranging from 0.721 to 0.749 and 0.721 to 0.809, respectively

4.2 Reliability Test

According to Now2013<empty citation>, base taking decision test reliability as follows:

1. If coefficient Cronbach's Alpha ≥ 0.6 so Cronbach's Alpha acceptable (construct reliable).
2. If coefficient Cronbach's Alpha < 0.6 then Cronbach's Alpha poor acceptable (construct unreliable).

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variabel	Cronbach's Alpha	information
Idealized Influence	0.671	Reliable
Inspirational Motivation	0.846	Reliable
Intellectual Stimulation	0.779	Reliable
Individualized Consideration	0.767	Reliable
Turnover Intention	0.774	Reliable
Job Satisfaction	0.897	Reliable
Organizational Commitment	0.810	Reliable

Based on Table 3, show that all variables in the study have a Cronbach's Alpha greater than 0.6, indicating reliable constructs. The Idealized Influence variable has a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.671, which is considered reliable. The Inspirational Motivation variable has the highest Cronbach's Alpha at 0.846, followed by Individualized Consideration with 0.828, and Intellectual Stimulation with 0.779. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment have Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.897 and 0.899, respectively, confirming their strong reliability. Turnover Intention also exhibits a reliable Cronbach's Alpha of 0.774, indicating that all variables in the model meet the criteria for construct reliability

4.3 Hypothesis Testing

Data analysis was performed using the results of hypothesis testing. The purpose of hypothesis testing is to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) so that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) can be accepted. This can be done by examining the significance of each relationship. The explanation of the analysis of the results relates to the testing of the hypotheses proposed in the study using the SEM model to answer the research problem. There are two stages in using the SEM model:

4.3.1 Testing the Goodness of Fit Model

Based on Table 4, as a whole, produces good model fit coefficients. The RMSEA, IFI, and CFI criteria produce model fit conclusions, whereas the marginal fit criteria produce GFI, RFI, and TLI criteria. The chi-square test produced a model fit conclusion with no significant correlation. fit. With thus criteria model fit, there are three fit, three marginal fit, And One No fit, so testing of the theoretical hypothesis can be continued.

Table 4. Goodness of Fit Results

Goodness of Fit Index	Criteria (cut-off value)	Results	Conclusion
χ^2 -Chi-Square	It is expected small	732,502	
Significance Probability	≥ 0.05	0.000	Model not Fit
RMSEA	≤ 0.1	0.065	Fit Model
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.784	Marginal Fit
IFI	≥ 0.90	0.903	Fit Model
RFI	≥ 0.90	0.760	Marginal Fit
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.890	Marginal fit
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.901	Fit Model

4.3.2 Testing the Hypothesis Theory

Table 5. Results Estimate Direct Effect Model SEM

Hypothesis	Description	Estimate	C.R.	1-Tailed P	Conclusion
H1	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction	0.233	5.113	0.000	Ho failed to be accepted
H2	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	0.164	3.448	0.000	Ho failed to be accepted
H3	Transformational Leadership Style has a negative and significant influence on Turnover Intention	-0.280	-3.351	0.000	Ho failed to be accepted
H4	Job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	0.812	6.007	0.000	Ho failed to be accepted
H5	Job satisfaction has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	0.116	0.560	0.287	Ho accepted
H6	Organizational Commitment has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	-0.022	-0.123	0.451	Ho accepted

Based on Table 5, show that several indicators have achieved valid factor loadings, while some indicators were deemed invalid. Specifically, for the Idealized Influence variable, indicator II1 has a factor loading of 0.372 and is considered invalid, while II2 has a factor loading of 0.730, making it valid. For the Inspirational Motivation variable, both IM1 (0.831) and IM2 (0.754) are valid. In the Intellectual Stimulation category, indicators IS1 (0.813), IS2 (0.824), and IS3 (0.800) are all valid. Similarly,

Individualized Consideration indicators IC1 (0.847) and IC2 (0.829) are valid. However, the Turnover Intention variable shows that TI1 with a factor loading of -0.639 is invalid, whereas TI2 with a factor loading of 0.903 is valid. Regarding Job Satisfaction, all indicators (JS1 to JS8) have valid loadings, with JS1 at 0.721 and JS8 at 0.727. Lastly, the Organizational Commitment variable demonstrates valid results across all indicators, ranging from OC1 (0.721) to OC5 (0.725), with the highest loading seen for OC3 at 0.809.

Table 6. Results Test Hypothesis Theory Direct Effect

Hypothesis	Description	Researcher	Results	Conclusion
H1	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction	(Zahari & Shurbagi, 2012)	Transformational Leadership Style has a positive and significant influence on Job Satisfaction	Support
H2	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	(Ismail et al., 2011)	Transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	Support
H3	Transformational Leadership Style has a negative and significant influence on Turnover Intention	(Gul et al., 2012)	Transformation Leadership Style has a negative and significant influence on Turnover Intention	Support
H4	Job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	(Hasan, 2012)	Job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment	Support
H5	Job satisfaction has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	(Sartika, 2014)	Job Satisfaction has a positive but insignificant effect on Turnover Intention	Does Not Support
H6	Organizational Commitment has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention	(Indraprasti, 2011)	Organizational commitment has a negative and insignificant effect on turnover intention.	Does Not Support

Based on Table 6, the results of the hypothesis testing show that transformational leadership style has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as demonstrated by H1 and H2. Specifically, H1 indicates that transformational leadership style has a positive effect on job satisfaction, supported by the researcher (Aprillita & Perkasa, 2021; Zahari & Shurbagi, 2012). H2

shows that transformational leadership style also positively influences organizational commitment, as confirmed by (Anggraini, 2021; Ismail et al., 2011). On the other hand, H3, which hypothesized that transformational leadership style has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention, was not supported by the data, as it was concluded to have no significant effect according to (Abdullah, 2021; Gul et al., 2012). Job satisfaction, as reflected in H4 and H5, shows significant results for organizational commitment, but H5 reveals that job satisfaction does not significantly influence turnover intention, as indicated by (Sartika, 2014; Solihin, 2021). Finally, H6 states that organizational commitment has a negative influence on turnover intention but was not supported by the data from (Indraprasti, 2011; Satria, 2021).

Further analysis of turnover intention requires examining the descriptive statistics for the transformational leadership style dimension in Table 7 below. This table shows that individualized consideration has the lowest average value of 3.7708. The next step was to analyze the descriptive statistics in Table 4, which illustrates each indicator by looking at the lowest average value.

Table 7. Statistics Descriptive On Indicator Individualized Consideration

Indicator		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
ICI	192	1.00	5.00	3.75	0.892
IC2	192	1.00	5.00	3.79	0.849

Based on Table 7, the lowest indicator results are in IC1, with an average value of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.892, while IC2 has an average value of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 0.849. From the results above, it is necessary to detail them again by looking at the level of employee education between the two indicators in Table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Education Level in IC1 and IC2

Variable	Education Level		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
IC1	SD	46	1.00	5.00	3.63	0.974
	SLTP	38	2.00	5.00	3.82	0.896
	SLTA	82	1.00	5.00	3.80	0.808
	D3	3	2.00	4.00	3.00	1.000
	S1	21	2.00	5.00	3.76	0.995
	S2	2	3.00	5.00	4.00	1.414
	Total	192				
IC2	SD	46	1.00	5.00	3.65	0.849
	SLTP	38	1.00	5.00	3.82	0.926
	SLTA	82	1.00	5.00	3.85	0.833
	D3	3	2.00	5.00	3.33	1.528
	S1	21	3.00	5.00	3.76	0.625
	S2	2	5.00	5.00	5.00	
	Total	192				

Based on Table 8, the D3 education level has the lowest average value. (IC1 and IC2 were 3.00 and 3.33, respectively.) This indicates that respondents with a D3 education level responded neutrantly to individualized consideration. Further analysis of this hypothesis was conducted by examining the lowest average value of the ten job satisfaction indicators in Table 9.

Table 9. Statistics Descriptive on Indicator Job Satisfaction

Indicator	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
JS1	192	1	5	3.64	1.024
JS2	192	1	5	3.79	0.955
JS3	192	1	5	3.53	0.915
JS4	192	1	5	3.36	0.972
JS5	192	2	5	3.71	0.763
JS6	192	1	5	3.69	0.840
JS7	192	1	5	3.77	0.898
JS8	192	1	5	3.80	0.872
JS9	192	1	5	3.64	0.807
JS10	192	1	5	3.54	0.874

The results in Table 9 show that JS4 has the smallest average value of ≥ 3.365 , and a standard deviation of 0.972, compared to other indicators with an average of Further details can be obtained by examining the education level of the JS 4 indicator in Table 10.

Table 10. Statistics Descriptive on Level Education in JS4

Variable	Education Level		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
JS4	SD	46	1.00	5.00	3.26	1.042
	SLTP	38	1.00	5.00	3.24	1.149
	SLTA	82	2.00	5.00	3.54	0.905
	D3	3	2.00	4.00	3.00	1.000
	S1	21	2.00	4.00	3.14	0.655
	S2	2	4.00	4.00	4.00	
	Total	192				

Based on Table 10, show that the smallest to largest average value at the D3 education level is 3.00, and the standard deviation is 1, followed by the others at elementary school, junior high school, and undergraduate levels, which have not yet reached an average of 4.00.

Table 11. Statistics Descriptive on Indicator Organizational Commitment

Indicator	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
OC1	192	1	5	3.91	0.845
OC2	192	2	5	3.98	0.745
OC3	192	1	5	3.74	0.956
OC4	192	2	5	3.98	0.769
OC5	192	1	5	3.64	0.774
OC6	192	1	5	3.81	0.925

The results of data processing in Table 11 show that all organizational indicators of commitment have an average value of ≥ 3.5 . This indicates that all employees working at PT. Austindo Nusantara Jaya Agri Tbk in Medan is committed to the company. Furthermore, Table 12 shows the results of estimating job satisfaction as a mediator of the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention and testing organizational commitment as a mediator of the effect. transformational leadership style on turnover intention using the Sobel test. Table 14 presents the results of the indirect effect hypothesis test.

Table 12. Results Estimate Indirect Effect Model Sobel Test

Hypothesis	Description	Estimated	Value Z	2-Tailed P	Conclusion
H7	Mediating Job Satisfaction The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intentions	0.042	5	3.91	Ho accepted
H8	Organizational Commitment Mediates the Effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intention	-0.0056	-0.124	0.901	Ho accepted

Based on Table 12, the results from the Sobel Test for indirect effects show that H7, which posits that job satisfaction mediates the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intentions, has an estimated value of 0.042, a Z value of 5, and a two-tailed P value of 3.91, leading to the conclusion that the hypothesis is accepted. However, H8, which states that organizational commitment mediates the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention, has an estimated value of -0.0056, a Z value of -0.124, and a two-tailed P value of 0.901, resulting in the hypothesis also being accepted despite the negative effect.

Table 13. Results Test Hypothesis Indirect Effect

Hypothesis	Description	Researcher	Results	Conclusion
H7	Mediating Job Satisfaction The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intentions	(Lim et al., 2017)	Job Satisfaction cannot mediate the effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intention	Does Not Support
H8	Organizational Commitment Mediates the Effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intention	(Gul et al., 2012)	Organizational Commitment cannot mediate the effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Turnover Intention	Does Not Support

Based on Table 13, the results of the hypothesis test for indirect effects show that H7, which suggests that job satisfaction mediates the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention, does not support the hypothesis, as concluded by Lim et al. (2017), stating that job satisfaction cannot mediate the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention. Similarly, H8, which proposes that organizational commitment mediates the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention, is also not supported. The conclusion drawn from Gul et al. (2012) is that organizational commitment cannot mediate the effect of transformational leadership style on turnover intention.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings and hypothesis testing that have been explained in the chapter previously, the following conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study: (1) the results of the transformational leadership style test show a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction ; (2) transformational

leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment ; (3) transformational leadership style has a negative and significant influence on turnover intention ; (4) job satisfaction is proven to have a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment ; (5) job satisfaction has a positive and insignificant influence on turnover intention ; (6) the organizational commitment variable has a negative and insignificant influence on turnover intention ; (7) job satisfaction cannot mediate the influence of transformational leadership style on turnover intention ; and (8) organizational commitment cannot mediate the influence of transformational leadership on turnover intention.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the management and employees of PT. Austindo Nusantara Jaya Agri Tbk for their participation in this study. Special thanks to the academic staff at the Airport Management Program, STP Aviasi, Jakarta for their support and guidance throughout the research process. We also appreciate the constructive feedback from the reviewers, which greatly contributed to the improvement of this manuscript.

Author Contributions

AR conceptualized the study, designed the research methodology, collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript. NAS contributed to the review and refinement of the research design, data analysis, and provided critical revisions to the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this study. This research was conducted independently, and no financial or personal relationships influenced the results or interpretation of the findings.

References

- Abdullah, M. A. F. (2021). Analysis of consumer motives in purchasing decisions and the use of instant cooking seasonings. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.24>
- Anggraini, D. (2021). The impact of covid-19 on stock price changes. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.22>
- Aprillita, D., & Perkasa, D. H. (2021). The impact of the covid-19 pandemic on consumer purchasing power in the online retail sectors. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.23>
- Bramantara, B., & Dewi, K. (2015). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap turnover intention karyawan pada krisna oleh – oleh khas bali iii. *E- Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 4(1), 1–20.
- Budhathoki, P. B. (2020). Impact of financial and non-financial benefit on employees' job satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 3(1), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jom.v3i1.30916>
- Commeey, V., Kokt, D., & Hattingh, J. (2020). Innovative human resources management: Key competencies expected from hospitality graduates in ghana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism and Entrepreneurship*, 1(4), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.35912/joste.v1i4.403>
- Eliyana, A., & Ma'arif, S. (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment effect in the transformational leadership towards employee performance. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 25(3), 144–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2019.05.001>
- Gul, S., Ahmad, B., Rehmann, S., Shabir, N., & Razzaq, N. (2012). Leadership styles, turnover intention and the mediating role of organizational commitment [ISSN 2224-5758 (Paper), ISSN 2224-896X (Online)]. *Information and Knowledge Management. Information and Knowledge Management*, 2(7), 44–51.
- Hasan, L. (2012). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan disiplin terhadap komitmen organisasi pegawai dinas perindustrian perdagangan pertambangan dan energi kota padang. *Jurnal Manajemen dan kewirausahaan*, 3(1), 57–92.
- Hassi, A. (2019). You get what you appreciate: Effects of leadership on job satisfaction, affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27(3), 786–811. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2018-1506>
- Indraprasti, D. (2011). *Pengaruh komitmen organisasional, kepuasan kerja, dan stres kerja terhadap intensi keluar studi pada karyawan alih daya (outsourcing) pt. bank rakyat indonesia di wilayah yogyakarta* [Master's thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada].
- Indriyani, E. (2011). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel intervening pada workshop smk katolik santo mikael surakarta. *EXCELLENT*, 1(1).
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, H. A. B., Sulaiman, A. Z., Mohamad, M. H., & Yusuf, M. H. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship between transformational leadership, empowerment and organizational commitment. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 2(1), 89.
- Jundi, K., Ghazalat, A., & Yahya, S. (2019). The sustainable development practices role and transformational leadership: Interaction and impact on the financial performance. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics*, 8(1), 591–603. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-7092.2019.08.51>
- Karim, M. M., Choudhury, M. M., & Latif, W. B. (2019). The impact of training and development on employees' performance: An analysis of quantitative data. *Noble International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 3(2), 25–33.
- Kishen, K., Syah, T. Y. R., & Anindita, S. R. (2020). The transformational leadership effect on job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, 4(1), 47–51.

- Kumar, R., Ramendran, C., & Yacob, P. (2012). A study on turnover intention in fast food industry: Employees' fit to the organizational culture and the important of their commitment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 9.
- Lekatompessy, J. E. (2003). Hubungan profesionalisme dengan konsekuensinya: Komitmen organisasional, kepuasan kerja, prestasi kerja, dan keinginan berpindah. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 5(1), 69–84.
- Lim, A., Loo, J., & Lee, P. (2017). The impact of leadership on turn over intention: The mediating role of organization commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 1(1), 27–41.
- Makambe, U., & Moeng, G. J. M. (2019). The effects of leadership styles on employee performance: A case of a selected commercial bank in botswana. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 1(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.35912/amor.v1i1.274>
- Mangkunegara, A. (2009). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R., & Jackson, J. (2016). *Human resource management*. Cengage Learning.
- Nagar, K. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction among teachers during times of burnout. *Vikalpa*, 37(2), 43–60.
- Navas, M. S., & Vijayakumar, M. (2018). Emotional intelligence: A review of emotional intelligence effect on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job stress. *International Journal of Advance Scientific Research & Development*, 5(6), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.26836/ijasrd/2018/v5/i6/50602>
- Ngadiman, A. E., & Ratmawati, D. (2013). Influence of transformational leadership and organization climate to the work satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior on the educational personnel of sebelas maret university, surakarta. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(10), 97–114.
- Panggabean, M. S. (2004). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Purba, K., & Sudibjo, K. (2020). The effects analysis of transformational leadership, work motivation and compensation on employee performance in pt. sago nauli. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 1606–1617. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i3.1091>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational behaviour*. Pearson Educational Limited.
- Sartika, D. (2014). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap keinginan keluar karyawan dengan komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel mediasi (studi kasus di cv. putra tama jaya). *Management Analysis Journal*, 3(2).
- Satria, B. (2021). The effect of transformational leadership and work motivation on employee performance at pt. xyz. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.25>
- Solihin, A. (2021). The effect of workload, compensation, and career development on employee loyalty at pt. abc. *Jurnal Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jbemk.v1i1.26>
- Tejada, J. J., Raymond, J., & Punzalan, B. (2012). On the misuse of slovin's formula. *The Philippine Statistician*, 61(1), 8.
- Top, C., Abdullah, B. M. S., & Faraj, A. H. M. (2020). Transformational leadership impact on employees performance. *Eurasian Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 1(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ejmss.v1i1p49>
- Vipraprastha, T., Sudja, I. N., & Yuesti, A. (2018). The effect of transformational leadership and organizational commitment to employee performance with citizenship organization (ocb) behavior as intervening variables. *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review*, 9(2), 20503–20518. <https://doi.org/10.15520/ijcrr/2018/9/02/435>

Zahari, I. B., & Shurbagi, A. M. A. (2012). The effect of organizational culture and the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in petroleum sector of libya. *International Business Research*, 5(9), 89.