

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE PERSONALITY, PERFORMANCE AND COMMITMENTS OF KADESI THEOLOGICAL HIGH SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS

Muner Daliman, Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kadesi Yogyakarta
Hanna Suparti, Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kadesi Yogyakarta
David Ming, Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kadesi Yogyakarta

ABSTRACT

Based on the abstract that personality has a positive direct effect on organizational commitment, meaning that strengthening personality will have an effect on increasing organizational commitment. This implies that improving the organizational commitment of lecturers requires improvements in personality. The efforts that need to be improved in relation to the personality of the lecturer are: Prioritizing lecturer services as professional staff, improving the quality of the lecturers themselves in relation to abilities and careers, improving scientific development, increasing personality competence. Meanwhile, the next suggestion is that performance has a positive direct effect on organizational commitment. So this will have the implication that to improve the commitment of lecturers to the organization it is necessary to improve the performance of good lecturers. As for the efforts that can be made to improve lecturer performance, there are efforts made to improve lecturer performance: Fair treatment in job services, improvement and increase in wages, attention to the welfare of lecturers, Personality is the characteristics and characteristics that represent the attitude or character of the lecturer, including patterns of thought and feeling, self-concept, temperament, and mentality which are generally in line with general habits in the future. This means that strengthening the personality of the lecturers will have an effect on improving lecturer performance. Efforts that can be made with the personality of the lecturer are: Always improve their competence because a strong personality of the lecturer will improve the performance of good lecturers, Increase lecturers' wages and salaries, Improve training and facilities, Improve education and promotion, Join certification programs for those who have not, Expanding knowledge and skills, Providing awards and punishments, Removing diverse lecturer status.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Personality and Performance

INTRODUCTION

The concept of transformational leadership was originally introduced by James MacGregor Burns in 1979, in his book entitled Leadership, Burns uses the term transforming leadership, which is transformed is leadership to followers, namely changing the leadership process between leaders and subordinates helping each other to advance to a higher level based on passion and motivation¹.

Furthermore it is said that transformational leadership can be seen when leaders and followers make each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation. Through the power of vision and personality, transformational leaders are able to inspire subordinates to change expectations, perceptions and motivations towards a common goal².

Transformational leadership according to Lesli & Lioyd is a leadership style that can create mutually motivating conditions between leaders and followers, so that leaders can change followers for the better and create a sense of trust from followers to leaders. The factors that influence transformational leadership according to Lesli are: 1). Charisma, 2). Inspiration from Leaders, 3). Motivation from the leader, and 4). Intellectual Stimulation³.

According to Bernard, who has extended the original idea, developed this theory of transformational leadership with an understanding based on the impact of his subordinates instilling in the trust, respect and admiration of his subordinates. According to Bass himself, there are four components of transformational leadership, namely: 1) Intellectual-transformational stimulation challenges the status quo, and encourages subordinate creativity, 2) Individual consideration involves, offers support and encouragement to subordinates is free to share ideas and the leader gives direct recognition. From subordinates as a unique contribution. 3) Inspirational motivation has a vision that is able to articulate to subordinates, and 4) The ideal influence serves as a role model for subordinates, to have more trust and respect and imitate the leader who is internalized in ideals, so that transformational leadership can increase motivation, enthusiasm and performance subordinates through various mechanisms, so as to align subordinates with tasks to improve their performance kinerja⁴.

Bass & Riggio see that transformational leadership is more about intrinsic motivation and positive development from subordinates. Both also view that transformational leadership represents a more interesting view of leadership than transactional leadership which emphasizes the process of exchanging social roles. According to Bass & Riggio transformational leadership is more likely to be applied in today's increasingly complex organizations where followers not only want leaders who can inspire in helping followers through their environment but also leaders want followers to have loyalty or not and whether followers show good performance or not⁵.

Stephen & Timothy state that transformational leadership is a leader who inspires followers to go beyond eliminating self-interest and who is able to exert a tremendous influence on followers. The factors are 1). Ideal influence, 2). Inspirational motivation, 3). Intellectual stimulation, 4). Individual considerations⁶. Transformational leadership according to Darwis & Gani et al., is leadership where there is a process of raising each other to a higher level of morality and motivation based on trust, respect, and pride in the importance of togetherness in achieving common goals. The influencing factors are: 1) Having a vision, 2) Inspiring, 3) Encouraging, 4) Coaching and 5) Team building⁷.

Jerald Greenberg and Robert A. Baron stated that, transformational leadership is leadership that uses charisma to change and revitalize the organization. The factors that influence transformational leadership according to Jerald are: 1). Charisma, 2). Have a strong vision and mission of the organization, 3). Intellectual stimulation, 4). Individual attention, 5). Inspirational motivation⁸. Furthermore, Kreitner & Kinicki assert that transformational leadership changes subordinates by creating changes in goals, values, beliefs and aspirations⁹.

1. Transformational leadership is a leadership pattern through three elements, namely charisma, individual considerations, and intellectual stimulation in the Head of the Theological College.
2. Charisma is described as the most important component in the concept of transformational leadership. There is little that can be used to describe a charismatic leader, which contains feelings of love from subordinates, even subordinates feel confident and trust each other under a charismatic leader, subordinates accept their leader as a model they want to emulate, every time the enthusiasm for the work of subordinates grows., able to make subordinates work harder and longer happily. The transformational leadership charisma scale describes the degree to which the leader creates enthusiasm for followers, being able to discern what really matters. Generating a sense of mission towards the organization, through charisma the leader inspires loyalty and perseverance instills pride and loyalty and inspires respect.
3. Individual consideration means that under transformational leadership, the generalization of differences between individuals does not have its place. A transformational leader will pay attention to individual factors as not to be generalized, because there are differences in interests and self-development that differ from one another.
4. Intellectual stimulation means that in transformational leadership a leader will carry out intellectual stimulation. This element of leadership can be seen, among others, in the ability of a leader to create, interpret and elaborate symbols that appear in life, teach subordinates to think in new ways. In short, subordinates are conditioned in situations to always ask themselves and compare them with the assumptions that develop in society, which in turn develops problem-solving abilities freely¹⁰

Based on various studies, it can be seen that Olga Epitropica, suggests 6 things, why transformational leadership is important, for an organization:

1. Significantly improve organizational performance
2. Positively associated with long-term marketing orientation and customer satisfaction
3. Generating a high commitment of its members to the organization.
4. Increase employee confidence in the organization's daily management and behavior
5. Increase job satisfaction through work and leadership
6. Reduce the stress of workers and improve welfare.

Gary presents some of the results of research on transformational leadership. Gary argues that transformational leadership is leadership that can create an atmosphere so that followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect for the leader, and they must be motivated to do more than expect. Good leaders change and motivate followers by: 1) Making followers realize the importance of the task, 2) Persuading followers to put the interests of the team or organization above personal interests, 3) Activating the higher needs of followers. The factors that influence it are as follows: 1) Ideal influence, 2) Individual considerations, 3) Inspirational motivation, d) Intellectual stimulation¹¹.

Some guidelines for implementing transformational leadership are as follows ¹²:

1. Develop a clear and compelling vision
2. Develop a mission to achieve the vision
3. Articulation and promotion of the vision
4. Act with confidence and optimism
5. Express trust in followers
6. Use dramatic and symbolic actions to discover key values
7. Celebrate success
8. Leading by example
9. Creating, modifying or deleting cultural forms

10. Use transitional sayings to help people through change are: 1) charisma, 2) inspiration, 3) intellectual stimulation, 4) individual consideration ¹³.

Sukarso, et al., stated that transformational leadership is leadership that provides individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation to subordinates or followers. Characteristics of transformational leadership. Leaders/Chairmen are the highest expectations for staff and students. The chairman is a person who knows a lot about the duties of his subordinates and subordinates who determine the rhythm for the school ¹⁴.

Educational institutions are a form of moral organization, which is certainly different from other forms of organization, especially profit-oriented as an organizational institution; its success is not only determined by the Chair but also by the lecturers and the process of the institution itself.

Based on the theories above, it can be synthesized that transformational leadership is the behavior of an individual or a leader who seeks to change, direct, and develop the values that exist in his organization in order to create good relationships between lecturers in order to realize shared goals in the future., with the following indicators: a 1) Charismatic, 2) Individualized consideration 3) Ideal influence 4) motivating inspiration, 5) Intellectual stimulation

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a research that uses quantitative methods. In practice: This study uses the Quantitative Research Stage through descriptive analysis, linkert scale and path analysis using the survey method. There are three variables in this study, namely the exogenous variables of Personality (X1) and performance (X2) and endogenous variables of organizational commitment¹⁵.


Tabel 1 RESEARCH SUBJECTS				
No.	Name	Gender	Functional	Education Background
1	lecturers at theological colleges. A	Women	Pastoral Colleges	Graduation from theological school
2	lecturers at theological colleges B	Women	Pastoral Colleges	Graduation from theological school
3	lecturers at theological colleges C	Male	Pastoral Colleges	Graduation from theological school
4	lecturers at theological colleges D	Women	Pastoral Colleges	Graduation from theological school
5	lecturers at theological colleges E	Male	Team Pastoral Colleges	Graduation from theological school
6	lecturers at theological colleges F	Male	Senior Diacon	Diploma Ministry

7	lecturers at theological colleges. G	Male	Senior Pastoral Colleges	Diploma Ministry
8	lecturers at theological colleges H	Male	Junior Pastoral Colleges	Diploma Ministry


RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Thus based on the explanation and frame of mind above, the hypothesis proposed is presumed: There is an influence of Personality, Lecturer Performance on Organizational Commitment

Based on the description above, research constellations can be made as shown in Figure 1:



**FIGURE 1
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**



**FIGURE 2
CONSTELATION RESEARCH**

Statistic Hypothesis

1. The first hypothesis examines the positive direct influence of Personality on Organizational Commitment

Ho: $\beta_{13} \leq 0$,

H1: $\beta_{13} > 0$

2. The second hypothesis tests the positive direct effect of performance on organizational commitment.

Ho: $\beta_{23} \leq 0$,

H1: $\beta_{23} > 0$

3. The third hypothesis tests the positive direct effect of personality on performance.

Ho: $\beta_{12} \leq 0$

H1: $\beta_{12} > 0$,

RESEARCH RESULTS

		Organisation commitment	Personality	Performances
N	Valid	94	94	94
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		95.69	89.37	90.91
Std. Error of Mean		2.641	2.606	2.614
Median		94	88	89
Mode		89	86	88
Std. Deviation		25.605	25.267	25.344
Variance		655.613	638.408	642.337
Range		127	118	121
Minimum		48	32	34
Maximum		175	150	155
Sum		8995	8401	8546

DESCRIPTIF TESTING

			Statistic	Std. Error
Organisation Commitment	Mean		95.69	2.641
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	90.45	
		Upper Bound	100.94	
	5% Trimmed Mean		94.97	
	Median		94	
	Variance		655.613	
	Std. Deviation		25.605	
	Minimum		48	
	Maximum		175	
	Range		127	
	Interquartile Range		34	
	Skewness		0.435	0.249
	Kurtosis		0.112	0.493
Personality	Mean		89.37	2.606
	95% Confidence	Lower Bound	84.2	

	Interval for Mean	Upper Bound	94.55	
	5% Trimmed Mean		89.32	
	Median		88	
	Variance		638.408	
	Std. Deviation		25.267	
	Minimum		32	
	Maximum		150	
	Range		118	
	Interquartile Range		34	
	Skewness		0.037	0.249
	Kurtosis		-0.319	0.493
	Performances	Mean		90.91
95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Lower Bound	85.72	
		Upper Bound	96.11	
5% Trimmed Mean		90.82		
Median		89		
Variance		642.337		
Std. Deviation		25.344		
Minimum		34		
Maximum		155		
Range		121		
Interquartile Range		34		
Skewness		0.062	0.249	
Kurtosis		-0.263	0.493	

NORMALITY TEST

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Organization commitment	0.064	94	.200*	0.984	94	0.295
Personality	0.049	94	.200*	0.994	94	0.936
Performances	0.058	94	.200*	0.994	94	0.932

*: This is a lower bound of the true significance, a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 5 CASE PROCESSING SUMMARY						
	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Organization Commitment * Personality	94	100.00%	0	0.00%	94	100.00%

Table 6 ANOVA TABLE							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organization Commitment * Personality	Between Groups	(Combined)	54405.387	43	1265.242	9.634	0
	Within Groups		6566.667	50	131.333		
	Total		60972.053	93			

Table 7 CASE PROCESSING SUMMARY						
	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Organization Commitment * Performances	94	100.00%	0	0.00%	94	100.00%

Table 8 ANOVA TABLE							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organization Commitment *	Between Groups	(Combined)	56938.187	43	1324.144	16.413	0
Performances	Within Groups		4033.867	50	80.677		
Total			60972.053	93			

REABILITY TESTING

Table 9 RELIABILITY STATISTICS	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.951	3

**Table 10
MODEL SUMMARY**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.790 ^a	0.623	0.619	15.798

a. Predictors: (Constant), KEPRIBDIAN

**Table 11
ANOVA^a**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38009.618	1	38009.618	152.287	.000 ^b
	Residual	22962.435	92	249.592		
	Total	60972.053	93			

a. Dependent Variable: Organization Commitment, b. Predictors: (Constant), Personality

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

**Table 12
COEFFICIENTS^A**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.183	6.019		4.017	0
	Personality	0.8	0.065	0.79	12.34	0

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

CORRELATION TESTING

**Table 13
CORRELATIONS**

		Organization commitment	Personality	Performance
Organization commitment	Pearson Correlation	1	0.790**	0.921**
	Sig.(2-tailed)		0	0
	N	94	94	94
Personality	Pearson Correlation	0.790**	1	0.886**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0		0
	N	94	94	94

Performances	Pearson Correlation	0.921**	0.886**	1
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0	0	
	N	94	94	94
**: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

The data descriptions presented in this section include the Organizational Commitment variable (Y) which is the endogenous variable and the performance variables (X2) and personality (X1).

a. Commitment data to the organization

Organizational Commitment variable data obtained through quantitative research has a tendency to result, namely:

Table 14 COMMITMENT DATA								
No.	Variabel	X _{min}	X _{max}	Range	Mean	St.Deviasi	Median	Modus
1	OrganizationalCommitments	116	174	58	139,1	12,2	137	135

b. Peak Performance Variable Data

The peak performance obtained through quantitative research has a tendency to result

Table 15 PEAK PERFORMANCE VARIABLE DATA								
No.	Variabel	X _{min}	X _{max}	Range	Mean	St.Deviasi	Median	Modus
1	Peak performance	108	154	46	135,1	11,5	137,5	140

Based on the results of the statistical description analysis for the three research variables, namely: the personality of the lecturer (X1), the performance of the lecturer (X2), and the Commitment to Organization (Y), it can be revealed about the symptoms of data centering as summarized in the following Statistical Description Summary Table.

Table 16 SUMMARY STATISTICAL DESCRIPTIONS			
Criteria	X ₁	X ₂	Y
Mean	89.37	89.37	90.91
Standard Error	2.606	2.606	2.614

Median	87	88	89
Modus (Mode)	87	86	88
Stand. Deviation	25.271	25.267	25.344
Sample Variance	638.602	638.408	642.337
Range	118	118	121
Minimum	32	32	34
Maximum	150	150	155
Sum	8401	8401	8546
Count	94	94	94
Confidence Level (95.0%)	3.3	2.4	3.3
Maximum Class	8	8	8
Minimum Class	15	15	16

Table 17
DESKRIPSI DATA VARIABLE RECAPITULATION X₁, X₂, DAN Y

No.	Variable	X _{min}	X _{max}	Range	Mean	St.Deviasi	Median	Modus
1	Organizational Commitments	116	174	58	139,1	12,2	137	135
2	Peak Performance	108	154	46	135,1	11,5	137,5	140
3	Personality	103	160	57	127,8	15,9	124,5	160

Prior to the path analysis, the data must meet several statistical test requirements, namely (1) Error Normality Test, and (2) Test of Significance and Linearity of Regression Coefficient.

Table 18
TEST NORMALITAS GALAT CONCLUSION

NO.	Range Galat	N	L _{hitung}	L _{tabel}	
				α= 0.05	Decision
1	Y atas X ₁	94	0.0898	0.0914	Normal
2	Y atas X ₂	94	0.0839	0.914	Normal
3	X ₂ atas X ₁	94	0.0839	0.0914	Normal

In accordance with the description above, the normality requirements for the estimated error have been met.

No	Hub Model. Between Variables	F=hitung(tuna cocok)	F=table($\alpha= 0,05$)	F=table($\alpha= 0,01$)	Pola Test Linieritas
1	Y atas X_1	1,613	8,557	26,254	Linier
2	Y atas X_2	2,628	8,557	26,254	Linier
3	X_2 atas X_1	2,832	8,557	26,254	Linier

From the table above, it can be concluded that there is a positive direct influence of personality on organizational commitment, a positive direct effect of performance on organizational commitment, and a positive direct influence of personality on performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of hypothesis testing that has been done, it can be concluded that the personality of the lecturer has a positive and significant direct effect on organizational commitment. These findings provide evidence that empirically the increase in personality by a lecturer has an impact on increasing organizational commitment. The quantitative data obtained quantitatively in the study is strengthened by the data from observations in qualitative research which gives the direction that personality is closely related to lecturer commitment. Lecturer commitment is determined by the personality factor possessed by the lecturer himself.

Personality has a very strong role in a lecturer in carrying out his duties. Personality traits can help a person in the selection process as a lecturer, adjust the field of work, and help someone in his career development. Patterns of thought and feeling as well as mentality will influence a lecturer in adjusting to his environment. This is in accordance with the theory put forward by Greenberg & Robert (2008) which states that personality is a unique and relatively stable pattern of behavior, thoughts, and emotions, shown by individuals, so the lecturer will be able to carry out their duties properly and shows his role as a lecturer who is full of loyalty.

Performance has a Positive Direct Effect on Commitment to the Organization

The results of hypothesis testing and the results of the above analysis can be concluded that lecturer performance has a positive and significant direct effect on Commitment to the Organization. This finding illustrates empirically that the strong performance possessed by lecturers will strengthen the commitment of lecturers to their institutions. This obedience will shape the character of the lecturers who are always part of the institution where they work. The quantitative data above is reinforced by data from observations of qualitative research which have conclusions about performance, which is an expression of employee attitudes towards work that reflects a pleasant or unpleasant experience based on the compatibility between expectations and reality obtained from their work.

Performance has a very strong role in a lecturer, if someone does a job with the orientation or purpose of meeting the needs of life and welfare, then when an institution is able to provide a

high salary, so that the level of welfare of the lecturer is very good, then the lecturer should enjoy performance.

Colquitt et al., (2009) argues that performance is the value of a set of employee behaviors that contribute positively or negatively to achieving organizational goals. Basically, performance has three dimensions, namely (a) task behavior, (b) moral behavior, and (c) challenging behavior.

Direct Positive Effect of Lecturer Personality on Lecturer Peak Performance

Based on the results of hypothesis testing and research findings, it shows that the personality of the lecturer has a positive and significant direct effect on the performance of the lecturer. Thus, it is expected that lecturers are loyal and provide themselves to work with high enthusiasm in their work community and have a high sense of trust in the institution where they work. This shows that personality cannot be ignored in a person. The personality of the lecturer will determine how a person can work well. This means that in an institution if someone can feel satisfied at work, a strong self-confidence is needed, so that they can carry out their duties with full responsibility.

Related to this research, the effect of personality on performance is reinforced by the theory put forward by Robbins and Judge, which states that proactive personality is an attitude that tends to be opportunistic, initiative, daring to act, and persevering until it achieves significant changes. It was continued that personality is explaining the factors that determine how a person's individual treatment of an institution such as theological schools so that the goals and objectives contained in this vision and mission are achieved properly.

Based on the analysis and discussion of the influence of transformational leadership, personality, performance on organizational commitment at theological schools in West Java, it can be concluded as follows:

1. The higher the personality of the lecturer, the higher the results of commitment to the organization, and vice versa, the lower the personality of the lecturer, the lower the results of commitment to the organization.
2. The greater the work performance, the stronger the results of the Commitment to the Organization, and vice versa, the lower the performance, the lower the results of the Commitment to the Organization.
3. Personality has a positive direct effect on performance, meaning that empirically a stable personality will be able to improve performance.

Thus, if the organizational commitment of lecturers, personality, and performance is improved properly, it can give an optimal influence and contribution to the progress of theological schools in West Java.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In behalf of this my purpose resulting, we give an appreciated and thanks so much for Bogor Theology Seminary in Faculty of Theology upon this opportunity who support or processing this education journal accomplished well.

END NOTES

1. Burns, James M. Leadership, (New York: Harper and Raw, 2007), p.71-73
2. Ibid

3. Lesli W. Rue dan Llyod L. Byars, *Human Resource Management* (New York, N.Y. : McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2011) p.14
4. Bernard M, Bass, *Leadership and performance*, (New York: free Press, 2005), p. 86-87
5. Ibid p.14
6. Stephen P. Robbins & Timothy A. Judge, *Organizational Behavior*, Global Edition, 15th Edition (USA: Pearson Education Ltd., 2013), hal. 416-418.
7. Darwis S. Gani, Djoehana Setyamidjaja dan Sumardi, *Kepemimpinan dan Organisasi Pendidikan* (Bogor: PPS UNPAK, 2008). P. 10-11
8. Jerald Greenberg. Robert A. Baron, *Behavior in Organizations*, Nine Edition (New Jersey: Person Education, Inc, 2008), pp. 518-519.
9. Kreitner & Kinicki, *Organizational Behavior*, New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc., 2008, hal. 66-68.
10. Aan Komariah dan Cepi Triatna, *Visionary Leadership* (Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara, 2010), p. 78
11. Gary Yukl, *Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi*, terjemahan Budi Suprianto (Jakarta: PT. Indeks, 2009), p. 304-305
12. Ibid p.14
13. Soekarso, Agus Sosro, Iskandar Putong dan Cecep Hidayat, *Teori Kepemimpinan* (Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media, 2010), p. 188
14. Lesli W. Rue dan Llyod L. Byars, *Human Resource Management* (New York, N.Y: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2011) p.14
15. Zaluchu, Sonny. Eli 2020. "Strategi Penelitian Kualitatif Dan Kuantitatif Di Dalam Penelitian Agama." *Evangelikal: Jurnal Teologi Injili Dan Pembinaan Warga Jemaat* 4(1), 28–38.

REFERENCES

- Jason, A.C., Jeffery, A.L., & Michael J.W. (2009). *Organizational performance and commitment in the workplace*. (New York: McGraw-Hill), 8.
- Colquit, L., & Wesson. (2009). *Organizational behavior*. (New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin,), 67.
- Fred, L. (2011). *Organizational behavior an evidence-based approach*. (New York: Published By McGraw-Hill/Invin, 2011), 147.
- James, L.G., John M.I., James H.D.Jr., & Robert, K. (2009). *Organization behavior structure processes, (Fourteenth Edition)*. (McGraw-Hill Irwin, 2009), 129.
- Michael, A. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice, (10th edition)*. (London NI 9.1N: Kogan Page Limited), 271.
- Wood, W., Zetianc, S.H., & Osborn. (2001). *Organizational behavior*. GlobalPerspective (Singapore: John Wiley & Sons Australia Ltd), 113.
- McShane, & Von, G. (2010). *Organizational Behavior, Emerging knowledge and practice for the real world*. (New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin), 112.
- Curtis, S., & Dennis, W. (2001). *Retaining employees - The fast track to commitment, management research news, 24(65)*.
- Luthans, & Fred. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. New York, McGraw Hill, 71.
- Stephen, P.R. (2009). *Organizational behavior, (translated by Diana Angelica, et al)*. (Jakarta: Salemba Empat Publishers), 45.
- Robert, L.M., & John, H.J., (2006). *Human resource management (Eleventh Edition)*. (Jakarta: Salemba Empat), 91.
- Fred, L. (2008). *Organizational behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.,) (Eleventh Edition)*, 147.
- Greenberd, J., & Robert, A.B. (2008). *Behavior in organization understanding and managing the milian side of work (ninth edition)*. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2008), 174.
- Kreitner, & Kinicki. (2008). *Organizational behavior (Eight Edition)*. New York: Mcgraw-Hill/Irwin, 166.
- Paul, E. (n.d). *Spector, industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. (USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc), 349-350.
- Schermerhorn, Jr. (1997). *Management*. United States: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc, 13.
- Jason, A.C., Jeffery A.L., & Michael, J.W. (n.d). Op.cit.
- John, A.W., & John, R.H. (2020). *Organizational behavior: Securing competitive. Advantage* (South-Western, Thomson Learning USA, 2005), p.143.
- Greenberg dan Baron, op. cit., 183.
- Leslie, W.R., & Llyod L.B. (2007). *Supervision key link to productivity*. (New York, McGraw-Hill,), 278
- Colquitt.,Lepine, Wesson, op.cit.p. 37

- Edy Sutrisno, Budaya Organisasi (Jakarta, Kencana,2010), p.170
- Jhon R. Schermerhorn, James G. Hunt, Richard N. Osborn, & Marry Uhl-Bien. Organizational Behavior(USA, John Wiley & Sons,2010), p.76
- Edy Sutrisno. (2010). *Organizational Culture (Jakarta, Kencana)*, 179-180.
- Anwar, P. (2011). *Mangkunegara, Manajemen SDM Company (Bandung, Rosda Karya)*, 67, Edy Sutrisno, op. cit, 172.
- Ujam, J. (2012). *Personality Psychology (Bandung: CV Pustaka Setia, 2012)*, 72 .
- Feist & Feist, 2006., Mahdi, 2005., Robin, 2005., John, S. (2009). *Educational Psychology, (Jakarta: Salemba Publisher, 2009)*. 177.
- Robbins dan Judge, (2013). *Organizational Behavior, Global Edition, 15 (Pearson Education Limited)*, 167.
- Wilson, B. (n.d.). *Human Resource Management (Jakarta: Erlangga)*, 185.
- Greenberg, J., Robert, A.B. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations (New Jersey: Pearson Education International,)*, 142-143.
- Suzanne, C., De-Janasz., Karen, O.D., Dan-Beth, Z.S. (2008). *Interpersonal skills in organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition)*, 182.
- Curtis, W.C., Phillip, L.H. (2008). *Management and Organizational Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition, 2008)*, 182-183.
- Yusuf, S. (2011). *Child Development Psychology, (Bandung: PT. Teen Rosdakarya, 127-188*.
- Tain-fung Wu., Mei-Hui Tsai., Yeh Hsun Fey & Robert, T.Y.Wu. (2006). "A study of the relationship between manager's leadership style and organizational commitment in Taiwan's International tourist hotels", *Asian Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences, 1(3)*, 434-452.
- Marselius, S.T., & Rita, A. (2004). *The relationship between perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership styles with employee job satisfaction, (Palembang, Bina Darma, 35-42*.
- Akbar, S.A.A. Freyedon, A.S.M.Z. (n.d.). Effect of the leadership styles on the organizational commitment given the staff personality traits (The case study: Iran's State Retirement Organization). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research, 4(1)*. Public management Department, Payame Noor University, Tehran, I.R. of IRAN.
- Samuel, O.S. (2008). *Demographic and psychological factors predicting organizational commitment among industrial Workers*. Department of Guidance and Counseling. University of Ibadan, Ibadan Nigeria. 2008.
- Lee Huey Yung, (2008). *The association between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance, Thesis (Malaysia Faculty Of Business and Accountancy*.