



The influence of transformational leadership and job training on employee performance at PT. Adira Finance Yogyakarta, with job satisfaction as an intervening

Dimas Arya Janti¹, Trias Setiawati², Andriyastuti Suratman³

^{1,2,3}Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Jan 29, 2023

Revised Feb 17, 2023

Accepted Feb 28, 2023

Keywords:

Coaching
Finance
Performance
Satisfaction
Transformational leadership

ABSTRACT

Several companies, including those in the finance industry, have seen a drop in employee performance. Stagnation in leadership and training models has decreased performance indicators. This study aims to figure out how a transformational leadership style and training affect the performance of PT Adira Multifinance Tbk. Employees, with job satisfaction as a mediator. The quantitative method was used by giving questionnaires to 35 office workers at the Yogyakarta branch of PT Adira Multifinance Tbk. This was accomplished via quota sampling. Directly collected data were analyzed using simple and multivariate linear regression. So, human resources are an essential part of corporate governance, and PT Adira Multifinance Tbk in Yogyakarta needs them to be successful. Confirmation of the hypothesis suggests transformational leadership and employee training partially affect employee performance. In addition, transformational leadership styles and employee training partially affect employee satisfaction. Lastly, tests done simultaneously showed that transformational leadership styles improve employee performance by making employees happier, and employee training improves employee performance by making employees happier. As a result, the whole hypothesis was accepted, and a significance value of 0.05 was used to test it. The better the transformational leadership model and job training in a company, the greater job satisfaction there will be, which will have implications for improving performance.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Dimas Arya Janti,
Department of Management, Faculty of Economics,
Universitas Islam Indonesia,
Prawiro Kuat Street Ngringin, Condongcatur, Kec. Depok, Kabupaten Sleman, Daerah Istimewa
Yogyakarta 55283, Indonesia
Email: 18311262@students.uii.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is a metric to measure how well people and businesses perform in the workplace over time. The employee's work becomes an indicator of the results of the work that the worker has done in carrying out the duties and responsibilities given by the company (Bernardin & Russell, 2006). Explaining Mangkunegara & Huddin (2016), if employees can complete tasks and responsibilities according to a predetermined

schedule, their performance is considered good. The higher the job satisfaction obtained, the better the performance of employees, including, in this case, the governance of company leaders. Satisfaction is the (Luthans et al., 2006) presence of pleasant or positive emotions resulting from evaluating the work or experience of employees in the workplace.

Hasibuan (2020) says that work satisfaction is a positive emotional state in which employees like their work. However, the phenomenon in the field found that there are still many employees in a company who experience a decline in performance, which is caused by dissatisfaction in position, excessive workload, a lack of skills and abilities, poor leadership governance, and other factors that support the decline in performance. The performance condition of an employee in a company is generally measured based on the employee's ability and transformational leadership style. According to Bass (1985), the best leadership is transformational leadership, which can increase the motivation of employees and encourage them to go beyond what is required by the company. Danim (2012) says that transformational leadership is the ability of a leader to work with others to change the organization's resources to reach meaningful goals that align with the set goals. Nevertheless, inadequate corporate governance and a style of leadership that could be more transformational have caused the performance of employees at one company, PT. Adira Finance Yogyakarta, to go down.

Employee performance can be improved in a company through transformational leadership. The individual attention provided by transformational leadership promotes employee satisfaction in the workplace. Several studies al Khajeh (2018); Anggraeni & Santosa (2013); Dung & Hai (2020); Iskandar & Andriani (2020); Wicaksono & Arjanggih (2020) show that there are positive and significant links between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in employees. However, unlike the research of Hendri & Kirana (2021), which came up with contradictory results and did not find a link between transformational leadership and performance, job satisfaction is closely linked to an employee's ability to get another job. Companies that give their workers regular training to improve their skills and knowledge can help them do a better job. An employee's performance improves as a result of job satisfaction. Training is a procedure to improve employee competence. It can teach workers the skills, knowledge, and abilities they need to do their jobs well and help the company reach its goals. Mathis et al. (2015) employee who receives training performs better for the business. In line with previous research that revealed a beneficial and substantial relationship between job training and employee performance (Arif, 2021; Djuraidi & Laily, 2020; Magasi, 2021). In contrast to Husna (2015), we found a negative correlation between job training and employee performance in an enterprise.

These results show that transformational leadership and job training are not the only things that affect how well employees do their jobs. On the other hand, Habibie & Mustika (2020) said that good employee performance is affected directly and indirectly by job training and is helped by each person's satisfaction. Aygul & Akbay (2019); Osewe & Gindicha (2021); Yademawi & Nasrul (2019) showed the results of a significant influence between job training and job satisfaction. High or low job satisfaction is affected by training. While Santika (2019) stated that there was no correlation between training and employee job satisfaction, following the theory, employee satisfaction is influenced by leadership and performance. Employee satisfaction has been proven to be influenced by transformative leadership and employee performance (Asriani et al., 2020; Djuraidi & Laily, 2020; Feri et al., 2020; Hilmawan, 2020; Marsudi & Pambudi, 2021). Arumugam et al. (2019) did find a negative link between transformational leadership and employee performance, but job satisfaction can help explain this.

Based on the inconsistency of results related to factors that affect employee performance in the company, this study seeks to investigate and analyze the correlation between transformational leadership, job training, and employee performance. PT. Adira

Finance Yogyakarta chooses variables based on differences between different studies, with job satisfaction as a link. The place of study is selected based on low performance in the company. It is hoped that this research will help companies in the same field improve the quality and quantity of their human resources. This could include making the company more successful by improving employee performance and happiness.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

A quantitative approach was used in this study (Darwin et al., 2021). The research was conducted at PT Adira Finance Yogyakarta, Jalan H.O.S. Cokroaminoto No. 221 Yogyakarta. The research was carried out using the survey method through the distribution of questionnaires. All 35 permanent PT Adira Finance Yogyakarta employees were included as research samples. Determination of research samples using quota sampling (Adnyana, 2021) The primary data obtained relates to transformational leadership styles (X_1), employee training (X_2), employee performance (Y), and job satisfaction (Z).

There are seven hypotheses established to confirm the relationship between variables. All the data obtained is then tabulated and statistically tested. In the first step of analyzing the data, the validity and reliability of the research instruments were tested with the correlation of the Pearson product-moment (validity test) and Alfa Cronbach (reliability test), assuming that they were met when a value of > 0.60 was found. The classical assumption test used a data normality test with Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S). If it passed, a multicollinearity test was done by looking at the tolerance value of 0.10 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) of 10. If they match, there is no multicollinearity between independent variables. Finally, a heteroskedasticity test was carried out by looking at the p-value of > 0.05 , so heteroskedasticity did not occur. The next stage is a linear regression analysis to measure the strength of a relationship between variables. In this study, simple linear regression is used with the model $Y = a + b_1Z$. In contrast. Multiple linear regression consists of two models: Model I regression (employee performance) with the equation $Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2$ and Model II regression (job satisfaction) with the equation $Z = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2$. At the final stage, hypothesis confirmation is carried out with the adjusted R-squared test with results between zero and one ($p < 0.05$, significant effect).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Validity and Reliability Test Results

Using the Pearson product-moment correlation indicator to test the data's validity, all variables have a $r_{\text{calculated}}$ value more significant than the r_{table} value and a significance value of 0.05. So, the variables of transformational leadership, job training, job satisfaction, and employee performance are all true. Furthermore, all data were obtained in reliability testing, and each variable obtained a cronbach alpha value greater than 0.6, so the data was declared reliable.

3.2 Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 shows the results of testing and analyzing respondents' data about their gender, age, most recent education, marital status, length of employment, and income. On gender characteristics, the percentage of male respondents is higher than that of female respondents. Respondents aged 25 years dominated the age variable. Undergraduates (S1) dominated the last characteristic of education. Unmarried respondents dominated the marital status variable. Furthermore, respondents aged five years dominated the characteristics of long work. Finally, the characteristics of income are concentrated between Rp. 2,000,000 and Rp. 4,100,000–Rp. 5,000,000.

Table 1. Characteristics of research respondents

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Men	23	65,7
Woman	12	34,3
Age		
Less than 25 years old	20	57,1
25 years - 30 years	5	14,3
31 years - 40 years	7	20,0
41 years - 50 years	3	8,6
Final Education		
High School/Vocational School	8	22,9
Diploma	2	5,7
Undergraduate (S1)	25	71,4
Marital Status		
Marry	12	34,3
Unmarried	23	65,7
Length of Service		
Less than five years old	24	68,6
Five years - 10 years	9	25,7
11 years - 15 years	1	2,9
16 years - 20 years	1	2,9
Income		
Less than 2,000,000	8	22,9
IDR 2,000,000 - IDR 3,000,000	6	17,1
IDR 3,100,000 - IDR 4,000,000	6	17,1
IDR 4,100,000 - IDR 5,000,000	8	22,9
More than 5,000,000	7	20,0

3.3 Test Classical Assumptions

a. Heteroskedasticity test

Heteroskedasticity testing using the Glejser method reveals that each independent variable has a significance value greater than 0.05. This means that for each independent variable in this study, the heteroskedasticity presented in Table 2 does not occur.

Table 2. Heteroskedasticity testing

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2,383	2,455		0,971	0,339
1 Transformational Leadership	0,105	0,084	0,409	1,244	0,223
Job Training	-0,103	0,077	-0,466	-1,341	0,190
Job Satisfaction	0,028	0,083	0,117	0,343	0,734

a. Dependent variable: Abs_RES

b. Multicollinearity Test

Using tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) values to test for multicollinearity, the results showed that all three independent variables had tolerance values above 0.1 and VIF values below 10; therefore, no multicollinearity was shown in table 3.

Table 3. Multicollinearity testing

	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIP
Transformational Leadership	0.276	3.619
Job Training	0.248	4.037
Job Satisfaction	0.256	3.901

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

c. Normality Test

The results of the Kolomogorov-Smirnov test for normality yielded asymptotic values. Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05, i.e., 0.197, indicates the customarily distributed data presented in table 4.

Table 4. Normality Testing

		Unstandardized Residual
N		35
Normal Parameters	Mean	0,0000000
	Std. Deviation	0,19048034
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0,123
	Positive	0,123
	Negative	-0,100
Test Statistics		0,123
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.197

3.4 Multiple linear regression analysis

a. Multiple linear regression I

Multiple linear regression test results I obtained the regression equation: Y (employee performance) = 18.181 (constant) + 0.686 X_1 (transformational leadership) + 0.422 X_2 (job training) + E (error value). A constant value of 18.181 indicates that when the variables X_1 and X_2 are worth 0, the employee's performance is worth 18.181. Furthermore, the findings show that transformational leadership partially had a significant positive effect on employee performance, with a B grade of 0.686 and a significance of 0.05. As a result, every one-unit increase in transformational leadership will increase the employee performance value by 0.686 units. Meanwhile, job training partially has a significant positive effect on employee performance, with a B value of 0.422 and a significance of 0.05. Thus every 1% increase in job training will increase the employee's performance value by 0.422% (table 5). Furthermore, the adjusted R-square value is 0.848, which means transformational leadership and job training have an 84.8% influence on employee performance. Meanwhile, 15.2% is explained by other variables not studied (table 5).

Table 5. Multiple linear regression testing I

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
	1 (Constant)	18,181	4,413		
Transformational Leadership	0,686	0,141	0,565	4,873	0,000
Job Training	0,422	0,121	0,404	3,486	0,001

a. Dependent variable: Employee Performance

Model Summary				
Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error in the Estimate
1	.926a	0,857	0,848	3,795

b. Multiple linear regression II

From the results of the multiple linear regression test II, the regression equation Z (job satisfaction) = 5.067 (constant) + 0.416 X_1 (transformational leadership) + 0.466 X_2 (job training) + E (error value) was found. A constant value of 5,067 indicates that when the variables X_1 and X_2 are worth 0, the employee's performance is 5,067. Also, the results show that transformational leadership had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, with a B grade of 0.416 and a significance of 0.05. So, job satisfaction will increase by 0.416 units for every one-unit increase in transformational leadership. On the other hand, job training has a small but significant positive effect on job satisfaction, with a B value of 0.466 and a significance level of 0.05. Hence, if job training goes up by 1%, employee satisfaction will go up by 0.466% (table 6). Also, the adjusted R-square value is 0.848, which means that transformational leadership and job training have a 72.8% effect on job satisfaction. Meanwhile, 27.2% is explained by other variables not studied (table 6).

Table 6. Multiple linear regression testing II

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	5,067	5,171		0,980	0,335
Transformational Leadership	0,416	0,165	0,393	2,526	0,017
Job Training	0,466	0,142	0,511	3,288	0,002

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Model Summary				
Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error in the Estimate
1	.862a	0,744	0,728	4,447

c. Simple Linear Regression

The results of a simple linear regression test were given as Y (employee performance) = 24.131 (constant) + 0.989 Z (job satisfaction) + E (error value). A constant value of 24.131 indicates that when Z is worth 0, the employee's performance is worth 24,131. B value of 0.989 and a significance level of 0.05 show that job satisfaction significantly affects employee performance. Meanwhile, job satisfaction affects 74.0% of employee performance, and the remaining 26.0% is explained by other variables that were not studied presented in table 7.

Table 7. Simple linear regression testing

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	24,131	5,481		4,403	0,000
Job Satisfaction	0,989	0,100	0,865	9,888	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Model Summary				
Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error in the Estimate
1	.865a	0,748	0,740	4,968

3.5 Hypothesis Confirmation

a. Transformational leadership in influencing employee performance

Transformational leadership positively affects employee performance, with a significance of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) and a B value of 0.686. This result is based on the assumption that the value of employee performance will increase by 0.686 if the transformational leadership component increases by 1. The findings indicate a correlation between transformational leadership and influencing employee performance. Bass & Avolio (1994) transformational leadership theory was used in this study. It shows idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual care. The employee performance theory used is Mathis & Jackson's, with indicators of quantity, quality, work efficiency, interpersonal impact, punctuality, and results. Transformational leadership styles can motivate employees to improve their performance. The results of the hypothesis confirmation found that this study is in line with previous studies, namely the correlation between transformational leadership styles and employee performance (Arif, 2021; Djuraidi & Laily, 2020; Magasi, 2021). In the Yogyakarta café industry, Jauhar & Suratman (2022) say that work involvement is an intermediary variable between transformational leadership and performance. In contrast to the research of (Hendri & Kirana, 2021), which shows that the results of leadership style have a negative and insignificant effect on employee performance.

b. Influencing employee performance through job training

In this study, it was found that there was a correlation between job training activities and improved employee performance. So, our results had a significant value of less than 0.05 and a positive B value of 0.422. This means that there is a direct link between more training on the job and better job performance. At the same time, every 1% increase in the value of job training increases employee performance by 0.422. The training theory by Mangkunegara & Agustine (2016) was used in this study. It has indicators for instructors, trainees, methods, materials, and training goals. The employee performance theory used is Mathis et al. (2015), with indicators of quantity, quality, work efficiency, interpersonal impact, punctuality, and results. The results of this study back up what other studies have found: that training on the job has a positive and significant effect on how well employees do their jobs. Job training on the job can improve employees' skills and understanding of their jobs, which can help the company do better work. This result is in line with the findings of Habibie & Mustika (2020); Kuruppu et al. (2021); Osewe & Gindicha (2021); Widodo & Wijayanto (2020) which all show that training employees have a positive and significant effect on how well they do their jobs. Purwanto & Suratman (2022) that there was a strong link between the performance of the PT. Bank Rakyat Indonesia Manado Branch Office and training and development using e-learning. Corporate e-learning has worked out according to the company's goals and expectations. The company's e-learning process has a good application (a learning management system) and can give a complete learning experience. Also, companies use many different kinds of e-learning training to meet the training needs of each employee. However, in contrast to the research of Husna (2015), which found that training has a negative influence on employee performance.

c. Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction

At PT. Adira Finance Yogyakarta, transformational leadership positively affects how happy employees are with their jobs. Our findings were significant at less than 0.05 and had a positive B value of 0.416. This means that Adira Finance Yogyakarta employees are more satisfied with their jobs if they believe their boss is a transformational leader. The assumption is that employee job satisfaction increases by 0.416% for every one-grade increase in transformational leadership. In this study, the transformational leadership theory used was based on the findings of Bass & Avolio (1994) with indicators of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration, while the theory of job satisfaction using the findings of Robbins (2006)

with indicators of challenging work, appropriate rewards, working conditions, and colleagues. In the context of correlation, transformational leadership styles pay attention to each person, which can affect employees' happiness. This study has proven and confirmed previous studies concerning confirmed variables. Research al Khajeh (2018) in Abu Dhabi found a strong link between transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction. Also, research done by Anggraeni & Santosa (2013); Dung & Hai (2020); Osewe & Gindicha (2021); Yani et al. (2017) shows that transformational leadership styles make employees happier. However, Santika (2019) research confirm that employee training harms satisfaction.

d. Job training influences employee job satisfaction.

With a significance value of less than 0.05 and a B value of 0.466, job training positively and significantly affects how happy employees are with their jobs. The idea is that Adira Finance Yogyakarta employees will be happier with their jobs if they feel like they are getting more training. Every 0.416 increase in the one-on-one training score increases employee job satisfaction. In this study, we used Mangkunegara (2011) training theory, which had indicators for instructors, trainees, methods, materials, and training goals. On the other hand, Robbins, (2002) job satisfaction had indicators for a challenging job, good rewards, good working conditions, and good coworkers. Based on their skills and competencies, our research showed that training activities could affect employees' job happiness. These findings support the findings of Aygul & Akbay (2019); Jami'Juniawan & Utami (2020); Osewe & Gindicha (2021); Yademawi & Nasrul (2019) that job training can affect employee job satisfaction both directly and indirectly. However, in contrast to the research of Santika (2019) which proved the negative impact of job training on employee job satisfaction.

e. Job satisfaction influences employee performance.

With a significant value of less than 0.05 and a positive B value of 0.989, employee performance is affected positively by job satisfaction. This means that job satisfaction is directly related to employee performance. The assumption is that if job satisfaction increases by one point, employee performance will increase by 0.989 points. In this study, Robbins, (2002) theory of job satisfaction was used with indicators of challenging jobs, fair rewards, good working conditions, and good coworkers. The theory of employee performance by Mathis et al. (2015) was used with indicators of quantity, quality, work efficiency, social impact, punctuality, and results. Job satisfaction affects the performance of employees within the company. When employees are happy with where or for whom they work, their performance is more likely to be good and meet company standards. This is consistent with the findings of Egenius et al. (2020); Mokoagow et al. (2020); Sudiyant0 (2020); T. Wicaksono & Gazali (2021) studies, which show that job satisfaction has a positive impact on employee performance. Meanwhile, Hariana (2021) research found that job satisfaction has a more significant direct influence on employee performance than indirect influence.

f. Transformational leadership influences employee performance through job satisfaction.

The results of the linear test X_1 against Z showed that transformational leadership showed a standardized coefficient beta of 0.881, so the regression equation Z (job satisfaction) = 12.193 (constant) + 0.860 X_1 (transformational leadership) + E (error value) was obtained. As a result, a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) was obtained. Also, the test results led to the equation Y (employee performance) = 19.005 (constant) + 0.690 X_1 (transformational leadership) + 0.461 Z (job training) + E (error value). Based on the calculations, a t -calculated value of 3.218 was obtained. A comparison is also made between the calculated t value and the t value from the table. Where the table t value obtained is 2.030 with $N = 35$, and the significance value is 0.05, the calculated t value is greater than the t_{table} value ($3,218 > 2,030$). Hence, variable Z , which acts as a link between X_1 (job satisfaction) and Y (employee performance) and has an influence value of

0.396, is essential. The way a leader uses transformational principles can be used to measure employee satisfaction. Employees who are happy and satisfied at work do a better job. In line with the research of Asriani et al. (2020); Djuraidi & Laily (2020); Hariana, (2021); Hilmawan (2021) which found that transformational leadership style has a significant effect on employee performance through employee job satisfaction, Bass & Avolio (1994) theory of transformational leadership was used in this study. It shows idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual care. The employee performance theory used is Mathis et al. (2015), with indicators of quantity, quality, work efficiency, interpersonal impact, punctuality, and results. Robbins (2002) theory of satisfaction is used. It has indicators like challenging work, good rewards, a good work environment, and good coworkers. On the other hand, Feri et al. (2020) research found a link between transformational leadership style, organizational culture, and employee performance. On the other hand, job satisfaction does not have much of an effect as a third variable.

g. Job satisfaction mediates the effect of job training on employee performance.

The results of the regression test X_2 against Z obtained the equation Z (job satisfaction) = 7.330 (constant) + 0.759 X_2 (job training) + E (error value). Also, the regression results from X_2 and Z_2 to Y led to the equation: Y (employee performance) = 17.999 (constant) + 0.499 X_2 (job training) + 0.533 Z (job training) + E (error value). Our findings obtained a calculated t value of 3.176 with a t_{table} value of 2.030 with $n = 35$ and a significance value of 0.05. This means the calculated t value is greater than the table t value (3,176 > 2,030). So, the influence value of 0.405 for Z (job satisfaction) as a mediator between X_2 (job training) and Y (employee performance) is significant. Training is the company's effort to improve the ability of employees to work, and it is expected that employee performance will also increase. If employees' performance goes up, they will likely be happy with how their work turned out. These findings are in line with Hilmawan (2020); Prasetya et al. (2020); Setiawan et al. (2021); Sitawati et al. (2020), all of which show that the effect of employee training on employee performance has a positive impact on employee satisfaction. Mangkunegara & Huddin (2016) training theory is used. It has indicators for instructors, trainees, methods, materials, and training goals. The employee performance theory used is Mathis et al. (2015), with indicators of quantity, quality, work efficiency, interpersonal impact, punctuality, and results. The satisfaction theory used is Robbins (2006) with indicators of challenging work, rewards for that something, the work environment, and colleagues.

4. CONCLUSION

Human resources are significant to the management and corporate governance of PT Adira Multifinance Tbk in Yogyakarta. The findings suggest that transformational leadership and employee training partially affect employee performance. In addition, transformational leadership styles and employee training partially affect employee satisfaction. Lastly, tests simultaneously showed that transformational leadership styles improve employee satisfaction and that employee training improves employee performance by making employees happier. With a significance value of 0.05, the whole hypothesis was accepted and shown to be true. In the future, more research needs to be done on how each variable affects the global state of PT Adira Multifinance Tbk. One of the problems with this research is that it only looks at the Yogyakarta branch, so in the future, the number of samples needs to be increased so that the results can be confirmed with changes in the elements of each variable studied.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank everyone who helped with research and writing so that this manuscript is good enough to be published.

REFERENCES

- Adnyana, I. M. D. M. (2021). *Populasi dan Sampel*. In *Metode Penelitian Pendekatan Kuantitatif* (1st ed., pp. 103–116). CV Media Sains Indonesia.
- Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2018, 1–10.
- Anggraeni, Y., & Santosa, T. E. C. (2013). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 10(1), 51–68.
- Arif, F. (2021). The Influence of Transformational Leadership, Dicipline, Productivity on Employee Performance. *Scientific Journal of Reflection: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business*, 4(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.37481/sjr.v4i1.247>
- Arumugam, T., Rahman, A., Maideen, M., & Arumugam, S. (2019). Examining the effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on employee satisfaction in conglomerate companies. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 7(5), 152–158.
- Asriani, A., Mintarti, S., & ZA, S. Z. (2020). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Budaya Organisasi terhadap Kinerja dan Kepuasan Kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 217–234.
- Aygul, T.-A., & Akbay, S. E. (2019). Smartphone addiction, fear of missing out, and perceived competence as predictors of social media addiction of adolescents. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 559–566.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership: good, beter, best, organizational dynamics*. NY: Academy of Leadership.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(3–4), 112–121.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (2006). *Human resource management*. Tata McGraw-Hill New York.
- Danim, S. (2012). *Motivasi kepemimpinan & efektivitas kelompok*.
- Darwin, M., Mamondol, M. R., Sormin, S. A., Nurhayati, Y., Tambunan, H., Sylvia, D., Adnyana, I. M. D. M., Prasetyo, B., Vianitati, P., & Gebang, A. A. (2021). *Quantitative approach research method* (T. S. Tambunan, Ed.; 1st ed.). CV Media Sains Indonesia.
- Djuraidi, A., & Laily, N. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 13(1), 1–14.
- Dung, L. T., & Hai, P. van. (2020). The effects of transformational leadership and job satisfaction on commitment to organisational change: a three-component model extension approach. *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 14(1), 6.
- Egenius, S., Triatmanto, B., & Natsir, M. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction on employee performance through loyalty at Credit Union (CU) Corporation of East Kutai District, East Kalimantan. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 7(10), 480–489.
- Feri, S., Rahmat, A., & Supeno, B. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi, Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening Studi Pada PT. Champion Kurnia Djaja Technologies. *INOBI: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen Indonesia*, 4(1), 134–151.
- Habibie, M., & Mustika, I. (2020). The Effect of Training on Work Motivation and Its Impact on Employee Performance (Case Study at BPJS Ketenagakerjaan Headquarters). *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(7), 51–57.
- Hariana, F. (2021). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja dan Stress Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Mekar Karya Mas. *Jurnal Humaniora: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Ekonomi Dan Hukum*, 5(1), 170–183.

- Hasibuan, D. (2020). Pengaruh Komunikasi, Efektivitas Kepemimpinan Dan Kondisi Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Kementerian Agama Kabupaten Labuhanbatu. *Ekonomi Bisnis Manajemen Dan Akuntansi (EBMA)*, 1(2), 131–136.
- Hendri, M., & Kirana, K. C. (2021). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Locus of Control, Komitmen Organisasi dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di Roy Sentoso Collection. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, 2(1), 119–128.
- Hilmawan, I. (2020). Pengaruh realisasi pelatihan kerja dan kualitas lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada PT. Rakka Abadi Jaya. *Khazanah Ilmu Berazam*, 3(3), 665–672.
- Hilmawan, I. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening (Studi Kasus Pada PT. Multi Pratama Azalea, Kragilan, Banten). *Rekaman: Riset Ekonomi Bidang Akuntansi Dan Manajemen*, 5(1), 1–8.
- Husna, A. M. H. M. (2015). Pengaruh Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Dan Pelatihan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt Bank Riau Kepri Kantor Pusat Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa (JOM) Bidang Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(1), 1–10.
- Iskandar, Y., & Andriani, I. (2020). Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Dan Kepuasan Kerja Pada Pekerja Bumh. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 12(2), 169–178.
- Jami'Juniawan, A., & Utami, E. (2020). Pengaruh Pelatihan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pada Lembaga Penyiaran Publik Televisi Republik Indonesia Stasiun Kalimantan Timur. *Borneo Student Research (BSR)*, 2(1), 544–551.
- Jauhar, M. F., & Suratman, A. (2022). Transformational Leadership on Performance: Mediating Role of Flexible Work Arrangements and Work Engagements (Study on the Coffee Shop Industry in Yogyakarta). *Review of Management and Entrepreneurship*, 6(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.37715/rme.v6i1.2385>
- Kuruppu, C. L., Kavirathne, C. S., & Karunarathna, N. (2021). The impact of training on employee performance in a selected apparel sector organization in Sri Lanka. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*.
- Luthans, F., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Lester, P. B. (2006). Developing the psychological capital of resiliency. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(1), 25–44.
- Magasi, C. (2021). The Role of Transformational Leadership on Employee Performance: A Perspective of Employee Empowerment. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(6), 21–28.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2011). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*.
- Mangkunegara, A., & Huddin, M. (2016). The effect of transformational leadership and job satisfaction on employee performance. *Universal Journal of Management*, 4(4), 189–195.
- Mangkunegara, A. P., & Agustine, R. (2016). Effect of Training, Motivation and Work Environment on Physicians' Performance. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 173.
- Marsudi, A. S., & Pambudi, R. (2021). The Effect of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) on Performance with Information Technology Capability as Moderating Variable. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura*, 24(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.14414/jebav.v24i1.2066>
- Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J. H., & Valentine, S. R. (2015). *Human Resource Management: Essential Perspectives*. Cengage Learning. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=7jN-BAAAQBAJ>
- Mokoagow, Z., Soegoto, A. S., & Sumarauw, J. S. B. (2020). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Pln (Persero) Wilayah Suluttenggo. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 8(1), 491–500.
- Osewe, J. O., & Gindicha, J. Y. (2021). Effect of Training and Development on Employee Satisfaction: A Case of the Judiciary of Kenya. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 661–667. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejsocial.2021.1.3.50>
- Prasetya, L., Utari, W., & Hartati, C. S. (2020). Pengaruh kompensasi, pelatihan dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai non pns melalui kepuasan kerja dinas PKP Cipta Karya Bojonegoro. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen*, 4(3), 463–476. <https://doi.org/10.52160/ejmm.v4i3.372>
- Purwanto, R., & Suratman, A. (2022). Pengaruh Pelatihan & Pengembangan Melalui Metode E-Learning terhadap Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia PT. Bank Rakyat Indonesia Kantor Cabang Manado. *Selekta Manajemen: Jurnal Mahasiswa Bisnis & Manajemen*, 1(4 SE-Internship Articles), 254–266. <https://journal.uui.ac.id/selma/article/view/25453>

- Robbins, S. P. (2002). *Prinsip-prinsip perilaku organisasi*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.
- Robbins, S. P. (2006). *Perilaku organisasi*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.
- Santika, L. G. (2019). Pelatihan dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Serta Dampaknya Untuk Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen (Edisi Elektronik)*, 10(1), 77–92.
- Setiawan, I., Ekhsan, M., & Parashakti, R. dhyan. (2021). Pengaruh pelatihan terhadap kinerja karyawan yang di mediasi kepuasan kerja. *Jurnal Perspektif Manajerial Dan Kewirausahaan (JPMK)*, 1(2), 186–195. <http://jurnal.undira.ac.id/index.php/jpmk/article/view/32>
- Sitawati, E. D., Suswati, E., & Wahyono, G. B. (2020). Analisis Dampak Pelatihan Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Melalui Kepuasan Kerja Guru Sekolah Dasar Negeri Kota Mojokerto. *Suparyanto Dan Rosad* (2015, 5(3), 248–253.
- Sudiyanto, T. (2020). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Dinas Tenaga Kerja dan Transmigrasi Banyuwasin. *Jurnal Media Wahana Ekonomika*, 17(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.31851/jmwe.v17i1.4338>
- Wicaksono, T., & Gazali, M. (2021). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *At-Tadbir: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 5(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.31602/atd.v5i1.3219>
- Wicaksono, Y. H., & Arjanggal, R. (2020). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional terhadap Kepuasan Kerja pada Karyawan. *Psisula: Prosiding Berkala ...*, 2(November), 251–260. <http://lppm-unissula.com/jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/psisula/article/view/13088>
- Widodo, G., & Wijayanto, A. (2020). The Effect of Training, Employee Engagement, and Coaching on Employee Performance in the Human Capital Division Pt. Bank Danamon Indonesia, Tbk. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(1), 727–736.
- Yademawi, D., & Nasrul, H. W. (2019). Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Pelatihan Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. BPR Prima Raga Sejahtera Padang. *JURNAL DIMENSI*, 8(3), 573–588.
- Yani, N. W. M. S. A., Sudibya, I. G. A., & Rahyuda, A. G. (2017). Pengaruh Work-Family Conflict dan Stres Kerja terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan Turnover Intention Karyawan Wanita. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 5(3), 629–658. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/44800/pengaruh-work-family-conflict-dan-stres>.