



ISSN 2964-3902 (Online)

SUJANA: Journal of Education and Learning Review

<https://journal.ifpublisher.com/index.php/sujana>

Vol. 4, Issue. 1, (2025)

doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v4i1.767

Strategies for Enhancing Commitment to the Organization through Programs to Strengthen Transformational Leadership, Self-Efficacy, Teamwork, and Job Satisfaction

Susilawati^{1*}, Sri Setyaningsih², Widodo Sunaryo³

¹susilawati512@gmail.com, ²sri_setva@unpak.ac.id, ³widodosunaryo20@gmail.com

Postgraduate School of Universitas Pakuan

*Corresponding Author: Susilawati

Email: susilawati512@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teacher absenteeism remains a persistent issue in Indonesia, particularly in madrasah settings, driven by factors such as low income, secondary employment, and dissatisfaction with the work environment. This study explores the influence of transformational leadership, self-efficacy, teamwork, and job satisfaction on organizational commitment among madrasah teachers, both directly and indirectly through job satisfaction. Using a quantitative survey method supported by SITOREM analysis, the research examines structural relationships and identifies key indicators for improvement. The study found moderate explanatory power with R^2 values of 0.415 for organizational commitment and 0.580 for job satisfaction. Results show that transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.342$), teamwork ($\beta = 0.537$), and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.279$) have significant direct effects on organizational commitment, while self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.121$) has a positive but insignificant effect. Only self-efficacy demonstrated a significant indirect effect ($\beta = 0.154$) on commitment through job satisfaction, highlighting job satisfaction as an effective mediator in this pathway. These findings offer practical insight into how school leadership and supportive work environments can strengthen teacher commitment, potentially reducing absenteeism and improving educational outcomes in Indonesian madrasahs.

Keywords: *Organizational Commitment, Transformational Leadership, Self-Efficacy, Teamwork, Job Satisfaction*

INTRODUCTION

Education is a crucial element in national life. Therefore, the government holds the responsibility to ensure that every citizen receives a proper education. One of the government's efforts to enhance the intellectual capacity of the nation is through the Indonesia Smart Program (*Program Indonesia Pintar*), which is regulated under the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia No. 19/2016. This program supports the implementation of education by providing learning opportunities for Indonesian citizens aged 6 to 21 years, or until they complete senior secondary education or its equivalent.

In addition, the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia No. 80/2015 concerning Universal Secondary Education (*Pendidikan Menengah Universal/PMU*) further reinforces the government's commitment to expanding access to secondary education for all citizens. Secondary education serves as the next level following basic education and includes senior high schools, Islamic senior high schools (*Madrasah Aliyah*), vocational high schools, Islamic vocational high schools (*Madrasah Aliyah Kejuruan*), or other equivalent forms of education.

One form of formal secondary education in Indonesia is the Madrasah Aliyah (MA), which is equivalent to general senior high schools (*Sekolah Menengah Atas/SMA*) and is administered under the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Education at MA spans three years, from grade 10 to grade 12. There are two types of MA: Madrasah Aliyah Negeri (MAN), which are government-managed, and Madrasah Aliyah Swasta (MAS), which are managed by foundations. The MA curriculum is generally the same as the SMA, but with a greater emphasis on religious subjects, such as Qur'an-Hadith, Islamic Creed and Ethics (*Aqidah Akhlak*), Islamic Jurisprudence (*Fiqh*), and Arabic Language.

In order to provide quality education services, MA requires clear guidelines to direct teacher performance. This is regulated in the Decree of the Minister of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (*Keputusan Menteri Agama Republik Indonesia/KMA*) No. 1367/2022, which regulates the attendance of madrasah teachers, including working days and hours, attendance records, entry criteria, and other provisions.

In addition, Law No. 14/2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, Article 7, Paragraph 1b, states that teachers and lecturers must demonstrate a strong commitment to improving the quality of education, faith, piety, and noble character. This underscores the crucial role of teacher commitment in the successful implementation of education. Teachers with a high level of commitment tend to perform their duties and responsibilities diligently, whereas those with low commitment are generally less accountable, which may ultimately hinder the achievement of madrasah objectives.

One form of such commitment is the presence of teachers at school to carry out their teaching duties. The Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia No. 25/2024 regulates the workload of teachers, school principals, and school supervisors, stipulating a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 40 face-to-face teaching hours per week. However, in practice, teacher attendance rates have not yet aligned with these requirements.

Research by Yarrow et al. (2020) indicates that approximately one-third of schools in Indonesia experience teacher absenteeism rates exceeding 20%, particularly in private schools located in rural areas. The absenteeism rate among teachers under the Ministry of Religious Affairs (Kemenag) reaches 20%, while those under the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) report even higher rates, at 25.5%, with classroom absenteeism reaching up to 40%. Other data shows that in 2008, the national teacher absenteeism rate was 14% (McKenzie et al., 2014). Furthermore, according to ACDP (2014), the figure ranged between 9.7% and 10.7%.

Teacher absenteeism can be attributed to various factors, including secondary employment, training sessions, meetings, low salaries, official duties outside of teaching, illness, and the school principal's leadership style. According to ACDP (2014), a significant number of teachers are absent due to these reasons, including pursuing further education or taking on additional jobs to meet their living needs (McKenzie et al., 2014).

This condition is further supported by field evidence. In a national dialogue held at the Annida Al Islamy Islamic Boarding School in Bekasi (Detik.com), Mahfud MD stated that many madrasah teachers receive extremely low salaries—only around IDR 300,000 per month, and even then, payments are often delayed by up to six months. Elsewhere, as reported by Antara, some contract teachers have had to work as motorcycle taxi drivers to make ends meet.

Interviews with several madrasah principals in Bekasi City also confirm this reality. Mr. Syahrul Romdhoni, M.M., Principal of MA Daarul Qirom, stated that some permanent foundation-employed teachers also teach elsewhere due to insufficient salaries. A number of teachers have even resigned in order to work at other schools, particularly public schools. Mr. Muhammad Kasim, M.Pd., Principal of MA Assyafiiyah, also explained that teachers who teach at other madrasahs are not prohibited from doing so, as the salaries provided are not yet adequate. Ms. Asmanih, M.Pd., added that several teachers have stopped teaching because they were accepted as government contract teachers (P3K) in Bekasi and Jakarta.

Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that several factors influence teachers' commitment to their organizations. The first factor is transformational leadership. School principals who adopt this leadership style are able to inspire their staff to develop their potential, prioritize organizational interests, and become creative and innovative individuals. Research by Asmaul Husna et al. (2024) and

Ausat et al. (2022) indicates a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. The second factor is self-efficacy. Teachers with high self-efficacy believe in their ability to carry out tasks effectively, even when faced with challenges. Koswara et al. (2021) and Aryati & Ana (2023) concluded that self-efficacy has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment. The third factor is teamwork. Strong collaboration among teachers facilitates the exchange of knowledge, skills, and support in achieving shared goals. Prasnavidya et al. (2020) found that teamwork contributes 34.4% to the improvement of organizational commitment. The fourth factor is job satisfaction. Teachers who are satisfied with their work tend to form a stronger emotional attachment to their organization. M. H. Ali & Bashir (2018) also found that job satisfaction has a significant influence on organizational commitment.

Therefore, this study aims to identify the influence of transformational leadership, self-efficacy, teamwork, and job satisfaction on organizational commitment, both directly and indirectly through job satisfaction. Specifically, the study analyzes: (1) the direct effects of transformational leadership, self-efficacy, teamwork, and job satisfaction on organizational commitment; (2) the direct effects of transformational leadership, self-efficacy, and teamwork on job satisfaction; and (3) the indirect effects of these three variables on organizational commitment through job satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative approach using a survey method. As explained by Soegiyono (2011), this method relies on numerical data and statistical analysis. The analytical technique used is path analysis is designed to measure both direct and indirect effects between variables based on a strong theoretical foundation (Ananda & Fadhli, 2018; Duryadi, 2021). In addition, this study utilizes the SITOREM analysis, which, as stated by Setyaningsih (2020), aims to identify key variables within the context of educational management. Through SITOREM, as highlighted by Hardhienata (2017), it becomes possible to determine which indicators need improvement, as well as those that should be maintained and further developed. Thus, the study not only maps the relationships among variables but also offers strategic recommendations based on prioritized findings.

This research was conducted with permanent foundation-employed teachers (GTY) at 20 privately managed Madrasah Aliyah (MA) institutions accredited with an 'A' rating, located across eight districts in the city of Bekasi. The study examines five variables, consisting of one endogenous variable, three exogenous variables, and one intervening variable. Organizational Commitment (Y) serves as the endogenous variable, while Transformational Leadership (X_1), Self-Efficacy (X_2), and Teamwork (X_3) function as the exogenous variables. Job Satisfaction (X_4) acts

as the intervening variable in the relationships among these constructs. The research hypotheses proposed in this study are as follows:

- H₁: There will be a direct positive effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, suggesting that strengthening transformational leadership can enhance such commitment.
- H₂: There will be a direct positive effect of self-efficacy on organizational commitment, indicating that improving self-efficacy can lead to higher organizational commitment.
- H₃: There will be a direct positive effect of teamwork patterns on organizational commitment, meaning that strengthening teamwork can enhance organizational commitment.
- H₄: There will be a direct positive effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, implying that greater job satisfaction can increase organizational commitment.
- H₅: There will be a direct positive effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction, indicating that improving transformational leadership can enhance job satisfaction.
- H₆: There will be a direct positive effect of self-efficacy on job satisfaction, suggesting that higher self-efficacy contributes to greater job satisfaction.
- H₇: There will be a direct positive effect of teamwork patterns on job satisfaction, meaning that enhancing teamwork can improve job satisfaction.
- H₈: There will be an indirect positive effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through job satisfaction, indicating that improving transformational leadership, via its impact on job satisfaction, can strengthen organizational commitment.
- H₉: There will be an indirect positive effect of self-efficacy on organizational commitment through job satisfaction, suggesting that enhancing self-efficacy, mediated by job satisfaction, can boost organizational commitment.
- H₁₀: There will be an indirect positive effect of teamwork patterns on organizational commitment through job satisfaction, meaning that strengthening teamwork, through improved job satisfaction, can lead to greater organizational commitment.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test of the Error Estimation

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used to determine whether the sample under study originates from a population that follows a normal distribution. Based on the analysis of the five research variables, the results of the normality test of the residuals using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method are summarized in the following table:

Table 1. Summary of Normality Test

No.	Error Estimation	N	Normality Test Requirement: Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05	Findings
1	Variable Y on X ₁	113	0.859 > 0.05	Normal
2.	Variable Y on X ₂	113	0.574 > 0.05	Normal
3	Variable Y on X ₃	113	0.126 > 0.05	Normal
4	Variable Y on X ₄	113	0.241 > 0.05	Normal
5	Variable X ₄ on X ₁	113	0.786 > 0.05	Normal
6	Variable X ₄ on X ₂	113	0.481 > 0.05	Normal
7	Variable X ₄ on X ₃	113	0.444 > 0.05	Normal

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Homogeneity Test

The test of variance homogeneity is used to determine whether the data distributions of two or more variances originate from a homogeneous population. In this study, the homogeneity test was conducted using the SPSS application, with the output based on Bartlett's test and a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The decision rule is based on the significance value (Sig.); if Sig. > 0.05, the variances of the two or more data groups are considered equal (homogeneous).

Table 2. Variety of The Homogeneity Test Summary

No.	Data Classification	Sig.	α	Results
1	Variable Y ₁ on X ₁	0.603	0.05	Homogenous
2	Variable Y ₁ on X ₂	0.887	0.05	Homogenous
3	Variable Y ₁ on X ₃	0.552	0.05	Homogenous
4	Variable Y ₁ on X ₄	0.504	0.05	Homogenous
5	Variable X ₄ on X ₁	0.132	0.05	Homogenous
6	Variable X ₄ on X ₂	0.417	0.05	Homogenous
7	Variable X ₄ on X ₃	0.941	0.05	Homogenous

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Linearity Test

The linearity test aims to determine whether the relationship between the independent and dependent variables in this study forms a straight line. Conceptually, this test evaluates whether the independent variable can be used to predict the dependent variable within a specific relationship Widana & Muliani (2020). The linearity test was conducted using SPSS software with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The decision criterion is based on the significance (Sig.) value in the linearity row: if Sig. > 0.05, the relationship between variables is considered linear; if Sig. < 0.05, the relationship is considered non-linear.

Table 3. Summary of Regression Equation Linearity

Pairs of Variable	Linearity Test		Results
	Sig.	Requirement	
$\hat{Y}-X_1$	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Organizational Commitment influenced by Transformational Leadership
$\hat{Y}-X_2$	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Organizational Commitment influenced by Self-Efficacy
$\hat{Y}-X_3$	0.005	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Organizational Commitment influenced by Teamwork
$\hat{Y}-X_4$	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Organizational Commitment influenced by Job Satisfaction
X_4-X_1	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Job Satisfaction influenced by Transformational Leadership
X_4-X_2	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Job Satisfaction influenced by Self-Efficacy
X_4-X_3	0.000	< 0.05	Linear Can be used to predict the level of Job Satisfaction influenced by Teamwork

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Evaluation of the Excellence of the Measurement Model (Outer Model)

This study involves latent variables composed of multiple dimensions and complex indicators. Therefore, the evaluation of the measurement model's quality is conducted hierarchically using Hierarchical Component Models (HCMs) for each variable. HCMs consist of two main elements:

1. Lower Order Components (LOCs), which refer to the evaluation of the outer model based on reflective indicators within each dimension, followed by an assessment of the formative dimensions that construct the latent variable;
2. Higher Order Components (HOCs), which refer to the evaluation of the inner model based on formative dimensions that integrate all latent variables into the designed model (Hair et al., 2021).

Based on the results of the outer model evaluation for reflective indicators, a summary of the test results for Construct Reliability, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), Convergent Validity, and Discriminant Validity is presented in the following table.

Table 4. Summary of Outer Model Evaluation for Reflective Indicators

Dimension	Construct Reliability		Convergent Validity	Discriminant Validity
	Composite Reliability	AVE		
Dimensions of Transformational Leadership				
Idealized Influence	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Inspirational Motivation	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Intellectual Stimulation	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Individual Consideration	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Dimensions of Self-Efficacy				
Magnitude	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Strength	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Generality	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Teamwork Dimensions				
Collective Purpose	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Demonstrates knowledge and skills	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Communication	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Team cohesion	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction				
Salary Satisfaction	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Working Conditions	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Promotion	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Employment Protection	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Dimensions of Organizational Commitment				
Affective Commitment	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Continuance Commitment	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90
Normative Commitment	> 0.70	> 0.50	Loading Factor > AVE	HTMT < 0.90

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Table 5. Summary of the Measurement Model Evaluation for the Outer Model of Formative Indicators

Indicator → Dimensions of Transformational Leadership	Original Sample	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P-Values
Intellectual Ability (X ₁ .19-21) → Intellectual Stimulation	0.555	10.915	0.000
Idealist (X ₁ .1-4) → Idealized Influenced	0.389	3.499	0.001
Supports (X ₁ .10-14) → Inspirational Motivation	0.454	6.505	0.000
Enthusiasm (X ₁ .15-18) → Inspirational Motivation	0.602	8.461	0.000
Innovative and Creativity (X ₁ .22-27) → Intellectual Stimulation	0.504	9.536	0.000
Attention (X ₁ .28-33) → Individualized Consideration	0.734	8.250	0.000
Coaching (X ₁ .34-37) → Individualized Consideration	0.293	3.109	0.002
Trust (X ₁ .5-9) → Idealized Influenced	0.644	6.042	0.000
Indicator → Self-Efficacy Dimensions			
Task Difficulty (X ₂ .1-6) → Magnitude	0.486	4.728	0.000
Task Completion (X ₂ .14-18) → Strength	0.498	8.954	0.000
Success Experience (X ₂ .25-30) → Generality	0.753	9.423	0.000
Job performance assessment (X ₂ .31-36) → Generality	0.298	3.290	0.001
Task Completion (X ₂ .7-13) → Magnitude	0.540	5.262	0.000
Working ability (X ₂ .9-24) → Strength	0.563	10.376	0.000
Indicator → Teamwork Dimension			
Working Knowledge (X ₃ .12-16) → Skills & Knowledge	0.492	6.088	0.000
Working Skills (X ₃ .17-20) → Skills & Knowledge	0.554	7.062	0.000
Co-worker relationships (X ₃ .21-23) → Communication	0.493	5.033	0.000
Transparency (X ₃ .24-26) → Communication	0.553	5.657	0.000
Shared work (X ₃ .27-29) → Cohesiveness	0.526	5.025	0.000
Problem-solving (X ₃ .30-33) → Cohesiveness	0.556	5.254	0.000
Responsibility execution (X ₃ .7-11) → Aligned Goals	0.440	6.840	0.000
Goal Achievement (X ₃ .1-6) → Aligned Goals	0.635	10.957	0.000

Indicator → Dimensions of Job Satisfaction			
Salary (X _{4.1-5}) → Salary Satisfaction	0.584	7.907	0.000
Suitable Job (X _{4.10-14}) → Work Condition	0.651	9.524	0.000
Convenience (X _{4.15-18}) → Work Condition	0.395	5.295	0.000
Promotion (X _{4.19-22}) → Promotion	0.672	9.820	0.000
Development (X _{4.23-25}) → Promotion	0.384	5.257	0.000
Job Security (X _{4.26-29}) → Work Protection	0.796	11.021	0.000
Insurance (X _{4.30-32}) → Work Protection	0.255	2.975	0.003
Fulfillment of Needs (X _{4.6-9}) → Salary Satisfaction	0.463	6.168	0.000
Indicator-> Dimension of Organizational Commitment			
Sense of belonging (Y _{1-Y5}) → Affective commitment	0.571	6.576	0.000
Income (Y _{10-Y15}) → Continuous commitment	0.623	12.69	0.000
Carrier development (Y ₁₆₋₂₁) → Continuous commitment	0.428	8.192	0.000
Responsibility (Y ₂₂₋₂₇) → Normative commitment	0.675	8.369	0.000
Loyalty (Y _{28-Y33}) → Normative commitment	0.397	4.632	0.000
Involvement (6-Y ₉) → Affective commitment	0.505	5.867	0.000

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Evaluation of the Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The evaluation of the coefficient of determination is used to measure the extent to which exogenous variables can explain the variability of endogenous variables within the model. According to Hair et al. (2021), an R^2 value of 0.25 is considered weak, 0.50 moderate, and 0.75 strong.

In this study, the R^2 value for the Organizational Commitment variable is 0.415, indicating a moderate influence of the exogenous variables on commitment. Similarly, the R^2 value for the Job Satisfaction variable is 0.580, also indicating a moderate level of influence on this intervening variable.

An R^2 value of 0.415 for Organizational Commitment means that 41.5% of the variance in commitment can be explained by the exogenous variables in the model, while the remaining 58.5% is influenced by other factors outside the scope of this study.

The Influence of Exogenous Variables on Organizational Commitment

Based on the path coefficients, the contribution of each exogenous variable to Organizational Commitment is as follows:

1. Transformational Leadership contributes 6.4% (path coefficient = 0.254), indicating a weak influence.
2. Self-Efficacy contributes 12.9% (path coefficient = 0.360), indicating a moderate influence.
3. Teamwork contributes 3% (path coefficient = 0.174), also indicating a weak influence.
4. Job Satisfaction contributes only 0.07% (path coefficient = 0.027), indicating a very weak influence.

From these results, Self-Efficacy emerges as the strongest predictor of Organizational Commitment, while Job Satisfaction has the weakest direct effect.

Hypothesis Testing

The final stage of the quantitative analysis in this study is hypothesis testing. The significance of the influence between exogenous and endogenous variables is determined using the criteria: $t\text{-statistic} > 1.96$ and $p\text{-value} < 0.05$.

The constructed model consists of seven direct effect paths and three indirect effect paths. Each of these paths is tested individually, as detailed in the following table.

Table 6. Recapitulation of Path Coefficient, T-Statistics, and P-value of Structural Model

No.	Direct Influence	Coefficient Path (β)	t-statistics	p-values	Conclusion
1	$X_1 \rightarrow Y$	0.342	$4.144 > 1.96$	$0.000 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant direct influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment.
2	$X_2 \rightarrow Y$	0.121	$1.353 < 1.96$	$0.084 > 0.05$	There is a direct influence that is not significant of self-efficacy on organizational commitment.
3	$X_3 \rightarrow Y$	0.537	$6.038 > 1.96$	$0.000 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant direct influence of teamwork on organizational commitment.
4	$X_4 \rightarrow Y$	0.279	$2,906 > 1.96$	$0.000 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant direct influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment.

No.	Direct Influence	Coefficient Path (β)	t-statistics	p-values	Conclusion
5	$X_1 \rightarrow X_4$	0.166	$1.570 < 1.96$	$0.042 < 0.05$	There is a positive but not significant influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction.
6	$X_2 \rightarrow X_4$	0.553	$6.638 > 1.96$	$0.000 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant influence of self-efficacy on job satisfaction.
7	$X_3 \rightarrow X_4$	0.226	$2.723 > 1.96$	$0.006 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant direct influence of teamwork on job satisfaction.
8	$X_1 \rightarrow X_4 \rightarrow Y$	0.046	$1.396 < 1.96$	$0.083 > 0.05$	There is a positive but not significant direct influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction. This result shows that the direct influence path coefficient value of 0.342 is greater than the indirect influence path coefficient value of 0.046, indicating that Job Satisfaction, as an intervening variable, does not function effectively in moderating the influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment.
9	$X_2 \rightarrow X_4 \rightarrow Y$	0.154	$3.168 > 1.96$	$0.001 < 0.05$	There is a positive and significant indirect influence of Self-Efficacy on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction. This result indicates that the direct influence coefficient value of 0.121 is smaller than the indirect influence coefficient value of 0.154, meaning that Job Satisfaction, as an intervening variable, functions effectively in moderating the influence of Self-Efficacy on

No.	Direct Influence	Coefficient Path (β)	t-statistics	p-values	Conclusion
					Organizational Commitment.
10	$X_3 \rightarrow X_4 \rightarrow Y$	0.063	$2.124 > 1.96$	$0.018 < 0,05$	There is a positive but not significant indirect influence of Teamwork on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction. This result shows that the direct influence path coefficient value of 0.537 is greater than the indirect influence path coefficient value of 0.063, indicating that Job Satisfaction, as an intervening variable, functions ineffectively in moderating the influence of Teamwork on Organizational Commitment.

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

SITOREM Analysis

Scientific Identification Theory to Conduct Operation Research in Education Management (SITOREM) is a scientific method used to identify variables within Operations Research in Educational Management (Hardhienata, 2017). This method is applied to measure the strength of relationships between variables, analyze the performance of each indicator, and assign weights based on four criteria: Cost, Benefit, Urgency, and Importance. Through this process, indicators that need to be improved or maintained can be systematically prioritized.

In this study, SITOREM is applied to analyze both the contribution and weighting of indicators, as well as to determine the classification and prioritization of improvement efforts.

Table 7. Determining the Order of Indicators That Need Improvement and Maintenance

SITOREM Analysis Result		
Priority Indicators Needing Improvement	Priority Indicators Maintained	
Self-Efficacy (β :0.360), Rank I		
	1	Task completion (20.1%), (4.3)
	2	Task execution (18.4%), (4.,2)
	3	Success experience (15.5%), (4.0)
	4	Work ability (15.5%), (4.0)
	5	Task difficulty (15.5%), (4.3)

SITOREM Analysis Result			
		6	Job performance assessment (14.9%), (4.3)
Transformational Leadership (β : 0.254) Rank II			
1	Attention (13.9%), (3.7)	7	Idealism (13.9%), (4.0)
2	Innovative & creativity (13%), (3.7)	8	Trust (13.9%), (4.0)
3	Enthusiasm (11.3%), (3.8)	9	Mentorship (13%), (4.0)
4	Support (10.5%), (3.8)		
5	Thinking power (10.5%), (3.6)		
Teamwork (β : 0.174), Rank III			
6	Shared-work (13%), (3.9)	10	Transparency (13%), (4.1)
		11	Problem-solving (13%), (4.5)
		12	Task Implementation (12.5%), (4.5)
		13	Working knowledge (12.5%), (4.4)
		14	Working skills (12.5%), (4.3)
		15	Co-worker relationship (12.5%)
		16	Goal achievement (11%), (4.5)
Job Satisfaction (β : 0.027), Rank IV			
7	Fulfillment of needs (12.4%), (3.9)	17	Salary (13.4%), (4.2)
8	Insurance (12.4%), (3.9)	18	Development (13.4%), (4.1)
		19	Convenience (12.4%), (4.3)
		20	Suitable job (12.4%), (4.1)
		21	Promotion (11.9%), (4.0)
		22	Job security (11.4%), (4.1)
Organizational Commitment			
9	Involvement (15.5%), (3.8)	23	Loyalty (20.5%), (4.1)
10	Responsibility (13.5%), (3.9)	24	Carreer development (17.5%), (4.0)
		25	Sense of belonging (17.0%), (4.2)
		26	Income (15.8%), (4.1)

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

Table 8. Summary of Indicators That Ought to Be Improved and Those That Should Be Maintained or Further Developed

Priority Indicators that Ought to be Improved
1. Attention (13.9%), (3.7)
2. Innovative and creativity (13%), (3.7)
3. Enthusiasm (11.3%), (3.8)
4. Support (10.5%), (3.8)
5. Thinking power (10.5%), (3.8)
6. Shared-work (13%), (3.9)
7. Fulfillment of needs (12.4%), (3.9)
8. Insurance (12.4%), (3.9)
9. Involvement (15.8%), (3.8)
10. Responsibility (13.5%), (3.9)

Priority Indicators Maintained or Further Developed
1. Idealism (13.9%), (4.0)
2. Trust (13.9%), (4.0)
3. Mentorship (13%), (4.0)
4. Task completion (20.1%), (4.3)
5. Task execution (18.4%), (4.2)
6. Task difficulty (15.5%), (4.3)
7. Working ability (15.5%), (4.0)
8. Success experience (15.5%), (4.0)
9. Job performance assessment (14.9%), (4.3)
10. Transparency (13%), (4.1)
11. Problem solving (13%), (4.0)
12. Responsibility execution (12.5%), (4.5)
13. Working knowledge (12.5%), (4.4)
14. Working skills (12.5%), (4.3)
15. Co-worker relationship (12.5%), (4.2)
16. Goal achievement (11%), (4.5)
17. Salary (13.4%), (4.2)
18. Development (13.4%), (4.1)
19. Convenience (12.4%), (4.3)
20. Suitable job (12.4%), (4.1)
21. Promotion (11.9%), (4.0)
22. Work security (11.4%), (4.1)
23. Loyalty (20.5%), (4.1)
24. Career development (17.5%), (4.0)
25. Sense of belonging (17%), (4.2)
26. Income (15.8%), (4.1)

Source: Processed Data by Researchers (2025)

The Positive Direct Influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment

The first hypothesis test indicates that Transformational Leadership has a positive and significant direct effect on Organizational Commitment, with a t-statistic value of 4.002 (> 1.96), a p-value of 0.000 (< 0.05), and a path coefficient (β) of 0.342. This suggests that an increase in transformational leadership contributes 34.2% to the improvement of organizational commitment, while the remaining variance is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

These findings are consistent with previous studies by Andi et al., (2023); Chai et al. (2017); Hermanto et al. (2023); Xu et al. (2022), which also reported a significant positive influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, supported by comparable β values and t-statistics. Other studies, including Bano Fakhra Batool (2013); Jiatong et al. (2022); Pratama & Putri (2019), further support these results with p-values below 0.05. However, a contrasting

result was reported by Siregar & Winarso (2025), who found no significant effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment ($t = 1.232$; $p = 0.219$).

The Positive Direct Influence of Self-Efficacy on Organizational Commitment

The second hypothesis test indicates that Self-Efficacy has a positive but not statistically significant direct effect on Organizational Commitment ($t = 1.385 < 1.96$; $p = 0.084 > 0.05$; $\beta = 0.121$). The β coefficient of 0.121 suggests that Self-Efficacy contributes only 12.1% to Organizational Commitment, while the remaining 87.9% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

This finding aligns with previous research by Rathi & Rastogi (2009), who reported a weak and non-significant correlation ($r = 0.06$), and Nhi et al. (2023), who found a negative effect ($\beta = -0.171$). However, several other studies report contrasting results. For example, Hameli & Güven (2022) found a strong positive effect ($\beta = 0.462$; $p < 0.001$), as did Maria et al. (2021) ($t = 6.929$; $p = 0.000$), Almutairi (2020) ($p = 0.000$), Ahammad & Alam (2016) ($t = 11.849$; $p = 0.000$), Aryati & Ana (2023) ($t = 7.312$; $p = 0.002$), Runa (2023) ($t = 3.512$; $p = 0.000$), Magistra et al. (2023) ($t = 33.695$; $p = 0.000$), Quines et al. (2023) ($r = 0.984$; $p = 0.000$), and Pradipto et al. (2022) ($r = 0.28$; $\beta = 0.35$; $p < 0.05$).

The Positive Direct Influence of Teamwork on Organizational Commitment

The third hypothesis test reveals a positive and statistically significant direct effect of Teamwork on Organizational Commitment, with a t-statistic of 6.814 (greater than 1.96), a p-value of 0.000 (less than 0.05), and a path coefficient (β) of 0.573. This indicates that the stronger the teamwork within an organization, the higher the level of individual commitment toward the organization. The coefficient suggests that Teamwork contributes 57.3% to the improvement of organizational commitment, while the remaining 42.7% is explained by other factors not examined in this study.

These findings are consistent with previous research, including Riyadi & Auliya (2021), who reported a β value of 0.730 with a t-statistic of 15.535 and a p-value of 0.000, and Azeem et al. (2019), who found a β of 0.141, a t-statistic of 2.364, and a p-value below 0.05. Similar results were also reported by Koswara et al. (2021) with a correlation coefficient (r_{y1}) of 0.346 and an R^2 of 0.12, and Usmar et al. (2024) with a t-statistic of 13.563 and a p-value of 0.000.

Further support comes from Ghorbanhosseini (2013) ($r = 0.068$; $p = 0.01$), Sambadjati & Salosso (2024) ($\beta = 0.374$; $p = 0.000$), and Ampler and Jr (2024) ($R = 0.619$; $p < 0.05$). Other studies, such as Hidayah & Chaerudin (2020) ($t = 6.177$; $p = 0.000$), Nailul et al. (2023) ($r = 0.579$; $p = 0.000$), also support these results.

Taken together, the findings consistently highlight Teamwork as a key factor that significantly contributes to the development and enhancement of Organizational Commitment.

The Positive Direct Influence of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment

The fourth hypothesis test shows that Job Satisfaction has a positive and statistically significant direct effect on Organizational Commitment. This is indicated by a t-statistic value of 3.492 (greater than 1.96), a p-value of 0.000 (less than 0.05), and a path coefficient (β) of 0.279. These results suggest that higher job satisfaction is associated with a higher level of individual commitment to the organization. The path coefficient indicates that job satisfaction contributes 27.9% to the improvement of organizational commitment, while the remaining 72.1% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

This finding is consistent with various previous studies that have also demonstrated a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, Darimi (2016) and Moon et al. (2014) reported a β value of 0.628 with a t-statistic of 7.765 and an R^2 of 0.394. Another study by Winarsih & Fariz (2021) found a path coefficient of 0.415, while Nahita & Saragih (2021) reported a t-statistic of 17.101 with a p-value of 0.000.

Additional support for this relationship comes from studies conducted by Afriawanto & Ferine (2023); Arsadi et al. (2021); Bagis et al. (2021); Dengo et al. (2023); Hidayat et al. (2023); Jahid & Adnyana (2021); Özgedik & Güney (2023); Rahman & Kanasro (2015); Soenanta et al. (2020). These studies consistently found statistically significant evidence supporting the link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The Positive Direct Influence of Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction

The fifth hypothesis test reveals that Transformational Leadership has a positive but statistically non-significant direct effect on Job Satisfaction. This is evidenced by a t-statistic of 1.744, which is below the critical threshold of 1.96, even though the p-value of 0.042 is slightly below 0.05. The path coefficient (β) of 0.166 indicates a positive relationship, but the strength of the effect does not reach statistical significance. Therefore, although there is a tendency for transformational leadership to enhance job satisfaction, this result does not provide strong enough evidence to confirm a significant relationship within the context of this study. The β coefficient also suggests that transformational leadership accounts for 16.6% of the variance in job satisfaction, while the remaining 83.4% is influenced by other unexamined factors.

This result presents an interesting dynamic when compared to previous findings. For example, a study by Setyaningsih (2020) even reported a negative relationship with a coefficient of $B = -0.217$. However, most previous studies support a positive and significant effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction. For instance, Bushra et al. (2011) reported $R = 0.61$, $R^2 = 0.37$, $F = 78.356$, $\text{Sig} = 0.000$, and $B = 0.83$, indicating a strong association. Other studies by

Jahid & Adnyana (2021); Manik (2016); Rahman & Kanasro (2015); Silitonga et al. (2020) also reported statistically significant p-values below 0.05.

Additional support comes from studies by Allozi et al. (2022); Boamah et al. (2018); Dappa et al. (2019); Özbek & Bozkurt (2020); Sukrajap (2016); Trianziani (2020)—all of which reported t-statistics and p-values indicating a significant influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction.

The Positive Direct Influence of Self-Efficacy on Job Satisfaction

The sixth hypothesis test shows that Self-Efficacy has a positive, direct, and significant effect on Job Satisfaction. This is evidenced by a t-statistic of 6.975, which far exceeds the critical threshold of 1.96, and a p-value of 0.000, which is well below 0.05. The path coefficient (β) = 0.553 indicates a strong and positive relationship, meaning that the higher an individual's level of self-efficacy, the higher their perceived job satisfaction. Thus, self-efficacy contributes 55.3% to job satisfaction, while the remaining 44.7% is influenced by other factors not covered in this study.

This finding aligns with various prior studies that consistently demonstrate a significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Abun (2021) reported a p-value of 0.000 with a correlation coefficient of $R = 0.712$, indicating a very strong association. Svr Babu et al. (2022) found an F-value of 8.95 at the 0.01 significance level, reinforcing the impact of self-efficacy on job satisfaction. F. Ali et al. (2021) reported a t-value of 8.899, while Lai (2012) recorded a t-statistic of 7.83.

Additionally, Narotama & Sintaasih (2022) obtained a t-statistic of 3.157 with a p-value of 0.002, and Paramarta (2020) showed a t-statistic of 3.678 and p-value of 0.000, both affirming a positive and significant relationship. Studies by Bale Doto et al. (2023); Prayudi et al. (2018); Sari & Budiarta (2024); Tinggi et al. (2020) further strengthen this conclusion with p-values and t/F-statistics indicating strong significance.

The Positive Direct Influence of Teamwork on Job Satisfaction

The seventh hypothesis test reveals a positive and significant direct effect of teamwork on job satisfaction. This is evidenced by a t-statistic of 2.583, which exceeds the critical value of 1.96, a p-value of 0.006, which is below 0.05, and a path coefficient (β) = 0.226. Thus, teamwork contributes 22.6% to job satisfaction, while the remaining 77.4% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

This finding is consistent with a range of previous research that also identified a significant influence of teamwork on job satisfaction. For instance, Dash (2014) reported a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.663$, and Suparno et al. (2020) found a t-statistic of 4.067. Other studies by Allozi et al. (2022); Dewi et al. (2024); Memon (2024) each reported a p-value of 0.000, indicating strong significance. Similar support is found in the research of Al-Aziz et al. (2025) with a t-statistic of 4.534

and p-value of 0.000, and Ekhsan (2024) with a t-statistic of 6.211 and p-value of 0.000. All of these results consistently affirm that teamwork plays a crucial role in enhancing job satisfaction.

The Positive Indirect Influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction

The eighth hypothesis test reveals a positive but not significant indirect effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through job satisfaction. This is evidenced by a t-statistic of 1.396, which falls below the critical value of 1.96, a p-value of 0.083, which exceeds 0.05, and a path coefficient (β) = 0.046. Although the relationship is positive in direction, these results indicate that job satisfaction does not serve as an effective intervening variable in the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.

Conceptually, transformational leadership is expected to foster loyalty and commitment by providing attention, direction, and support to individuals within the organization. For instance, a school principal who demonstrates inspirational leadership, sets a positive example, and encourages innovation in the workplace has the potential to cultivate teachers' commitment to their school. Conversely, a lack of support and enthusiasm from leadership can hinder the development of organizational commitment.

However, the findings of this study suggest that job satisfaction does not play a strong mediating role in this dynamic. This is further evidenced by the direct effect coefficient (0.342) being substantially higher than the indirect effect through job satisfaction (0.046). Therefore, it can be concluded that job satisfaction is not an effective intervening variable in the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.

The Positive Indirect Influence of Self-Efficacy on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction

The ninth hypothesis test indicates a positive and significant indirect effect of self-efficacy on organizational commitment through job satisfaction. This hypothesis is supported by a t-statistic of 3.168 (greater than 1.96), a p-value of 0.001 (less than 0.05), and a path coefficient (β) = 0.154. The positive coefficient suggests that job satisfaction functions effectively as a mediating variable.

Conceptually, self-efficacy reflects an individual's belief in their ability to complete tasks and overcome challenges. Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to be more resilient, solution-oriented, and capable of working optimally. This, in turn, leads to greater job satisfaction—defined as a positive perception of one's work experience—which subsequently strengthens their commitment to the organization.

These findings clarify that job satisfaction serves as a critical pathway linking self-efficacy and organizational commitment. This is evidenced by the higher

indirect effect coefficient (0.154) compared to the direct effect (0.121). Therefore, it can be concluded that job satisfaction is an effective intervening variable that enhances the influence of self-efficacy on organizational commitment.

The Positive Indirect Influence of Teamwork on Organizational Commitment through Job Satisfaction

The tenth hypothesis test reveals a positive but insignificant indirect effect of teamwork on organizational commitment through job satisfaction. This hypothesis is supported by a t-statistic of 2.124 (greater than 1.96), a p-value of 0.018, and a path coefficient (β) of 0.063.

In general, job satisfaction is the immediate outcome felt by individuals in carrying out their work, whereas organizational commitment reflects a strong sense of attachment and loyalty to the organization, which enables individuals to fulfill their responsibilities effectively. Although teamwork is often associated with self-efficacy and the ability to handle challenges, these results indicate that job satisfaction is not an effective mediating variable in the relationship between teamwork and organizational commitment.

This finding highlights that while the relationship is positive, job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the effect of teamwork on organizational commitment. This is further supported by the fact that the direct effect coefficient (0.537) is much greater than the indirect effect (0.063). Thus, job satisfaction is not an effective mediator in moderating the influence of teamwork on organizational commitment.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully identified strategies to enhance organizational commitment by analyzing both direct and indirect influences among the research variables and by uncovering which variable indicators require improvement or further development. Based on the interpretation of the results and hypothesis testing, it can be concluded that there are positive and significant direct effects of transformational leadership, teamwork, and job satisfaction on organizational commitment, with path coefficients of $\beta = 0.342$, $\beta = 0.537$, and $\beta = 0.279$, respectively. Conversely, the direct effect of self-efficacy on organizational commitment was positive but not significant ($\beta = 0.121$).

Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, and teamwork also showed positive direct effects on job satisfaction, with coefficients of $\beta = 0.166$, $\beta = 0.553$, and $\beta = 0.226$, respectively—though only the effects of self-efficacy and teamwork were statistically significant. Regarding indirect effects, transformational leadership and teamwork did not show significant indirect effects on organizational commitment through job satisfaction (with $\beta = 0.046$ and $\beta = 0.063$, respectively). In contrast, self-efficacy demonstrated a positive and significant indirect effect (β

= 0.154), indicating that job satisfaction effectively mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment.

REFERENCES

- Abun, D. (2021). Employees' self-efficacy and work performance of employees as mediated by work environment. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3958247>
- Afriawanto, D., & Ferine, K. F. (2023). THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AT BPJS KETENAGAKERJAAN BRANCH OFFICES ALL MEDAN RAYA AREA. *SIBATIK JOURNAL: Jurnal Ilmiah Bidang Sosial, Ekonomi, Budaya, Teknologi, Dan Pendidikan*, 2(12), 3845–3858. <https://doi.org/10.54443/SIBATIK.V2I12.1530>
- Ahammad, A., & Alam, S. (2016). Management Development, 30 (1&2) Bangladesh Institute of Management (BIM). In Effects of Self Efficacy Alam A. A. S.
- Al-Aziz, M. F., Bahiroh, E., & Mulyani, A. S. (2025). The Effect of Teamwork and Work Dicipline on Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, 3(1), 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.69693/IJIM.V3I1.286>
- Ali, F., Tri, D., & Wardoyo, W. (2021). Pengaruh Self Efficacy terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi PT. Ultrajaya Milk Industry, Tbk Surabaya Bagian Marketing). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 9(1), 367–379. <https://doi.org/10.26740/JIM.V9N1.P367-379>
- Ali, M. H., & Bashir, I. (2018). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Teacher's Organizational Commitment, with Special Reference to Private Sector Universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.8.3.2018.P7519>
- Allozi, A. I., Alhamad, A. Q., & Kurdi, B. Al. (2022). Impact of Transformational Leadership on the Job Satisfaction With the Moderating Role of Organizational Commitment: Case of UAE and Jordan Manufacturing Companies. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 21(2), 1–13.
- Almutairi, Y. M. N. (2020). Leadership Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment of Faculty Members: Higher Education. *Administrative Sciences* 2020, Vol. 10, Page 66, 10(3), 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ADMSCI10030066>
- Ananda, R., & Fadhli, M. (2018). Educational Statistics Theory And Practice In Education.
- Andi, M., Nurhasanah, S., & Mu'ammal, I. (2023). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Komitmen Organisasional dengan Komunikasi Sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *Peradaban Journal of Economic and Business*, 2(1), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.59001/PJEB.V2I1.61>
- Arsadi, A., Husin, H., & Handra, T. (2021). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment and Its Impact on the Turnover Intentions of Insurance Agents. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(11), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.18415/IJMMU.V8I11.3116>
- Aryati, S., & Ana. (2023). The Influence of Self-efficacy on Organizational Commitment and Ethical Behavior: The Role of Job Satisfaction. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori Dan*

- Terapan| Journal of Theoretical and Applied Management, 16(2), 321–338.
<https://doi.org/10.20473/JMTT.V16I2.43769>
- Asmaul Husna, Maulida Maulida, Nisa Febriyanti Tanjung, & Santi Sari Devi Manurung. (2024). Peran Budaya Organisasi dalam Meningkatkan Prestasi Akademik di Sekolah. *Khatulistiwa: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sosial Humaniora*, 4(3), 83–89.
<https://doi.org/10.55606/KHATULISTIWA.V4I3.3921>
- Ausat, A. A., Ausat, A. M. A., Suherlan, S., Peirisal, T., & Hirawan, Z. (2022). The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Work Performance. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, 4(1), 61–82.
<https://doi.org/10.22146/jlo.71846>
- Azeem, M., Hayat, A., Nawaz, R., Humayon, A. A., & Ahmed, M. (2019). Mediating Effect of Human Capital on Organizational Culture, Teamwork, Organizational Development and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 5(3), 1–9.
- Bagis, F., Dianti, L., Darmawan, A., & Rahmawati, D. V. (2021). THE EFFECT OF JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND WORK STRESS ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS AT THE REGIONAL SECRETARIAT OF PEMALANG REGENCY. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 5(3), 3499–2507.
<https://doi.org/10.29040/IJEBAR.V5I3.3360>
- Bale Doto, A., Timuneno, T., Putu Nursiani, N., & Fanggidae, R. E. (2023). PENGARUH EFIKASI DIRI DAN PEMBERDAYAAN TERHADAP KEPUASAN KERJA KARYAWAN PADA BANK BRI KANTOR CABANG UTAMA KUPANG. *GLORY Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 4(1), 79–91.
<https://doi.org/10.35508/GLORY.V4I1.10364>
- Bano Fakhra Batool, B. F. B. (2013). An Empirical Study on Effect of Transformational Leadership On Organizational Commitment In The Banking Sector Of Pakistan. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 8(2), 38–44.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-0823844>
- Boamah, S. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., Wong, C., & Clarke, S. (2018). Effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and patient safety outcomes. *Nursing Outlook*, 66(2), 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2017.10.004>
- Bushra, F., Usman, A., & Naveed, A. (2011). Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan).
- Chai, D. S., Hwang, S. J., & Joo, B. K. (2017). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment in Teams: The Mediating Roles of Shared Vision and Team-Goal Commitment. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 30(2), 137–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/PIQ.21244>
- Dappa, K., Bhatti, F., & Aljarah, A. (2019). A study on the effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction: The role of gender, perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational commitment. *Management Science Letters*, 9(6), 823–834. <https://doi.org/10.5267/J.MSL.2019.3.006>
- Darimi, I. (2016). DIAGNOSIS KESULITAN BELAJAR SISWA DALAM PEMBELAJARAN AKTIF DI SEKOLAH. *Jurnal Edukasi: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling*, 2(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.22373/je.v2i1.689>

- Dash, M. (2014). Team Work and Its Effect on Employees Job Satisfaction and Performance Evidence from Hotels in Eastern India. *ILJTEMAS*, 3(9).
- Dengo, S. Y., Canon, S., Sudirman, S., Ilato, R., & Mahmud, M. (2023). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Komitmen Organisasi Pada Karyawan PT. Mega Finance Cabang Gorontalo. *Journal of Economic and Business Education*, 1(1), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.37479/JEBE.V1I1.18724>
- Dewi, S. R., Deviyantoro, D., Husain, K., & Safaria, S. (2024). Does job satisfaction mediate the effect of teamwork and organizational citizenship behavior on job performance? *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 10(3), 232–241. <https://doi.org/10.29210/020244560>
- Duryadi. (2021). METODE PENELITIAN ILMIAH. Metode Penelitian Empiris Model Path Analysis dan Analisis Menggunakan SmartPLS. Penerbit Yayasan Prima Agus Teknik, 1–150.
- Ekhsan. (2024). Indonesian Management.
- Ghorbanhosseini, M. (2013). THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, TEAMWORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF HUMAN CAPITAL.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R. In *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* (Vol. 21, Issue 1). <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7>
- Hameli, K., & Güven, O. (2022). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 27(1), 75–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMS-05-2021-0033>
- Handayani, V. T., & Rofii, M. S. (2023). Evaluasi Kebijakan Pencegahan Perkawinan Anak Melalui Program Strategi Nasional Pencegahan Perkawinan Anak (STRANAS PPA). *Kolaborasi : Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 9(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.26618/kjap.v9i1.10159>
- Hardhienata, S. (2017). Preface: International Conference On Recent Trends In Physics. *Journal Of Physics: Conference Series*.
- Hermanto, Y. B., Srimulyani, V. A., & Pitoyo, D. J. (2023). Mediating Role of Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment on the Influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.4513149>
- Hidayah, N., & Chaerudin, C. (2020). THE INFLUENCE OF WORKLOAD, WORK ENVIRONMENT AND TEAMWORK AGAINST TURNOVER INTENTION WHICH MEDIATED THROUGH ORGANIZATION COMMITMENT (CASE STUDY ON EMPLOYEE AT PT. MULTIPRO JAYA PRIMA). *Dinasti International Journal of Management Science*, 2(2), 302–310. <https://doi.org/10.31933/DIJMS.V2I2.615>
- Hidayat, R., Wayan, I., & Supartha, G. (2023). Job Satisfaction Mediates the Effect of Job Characteristics on Organizational Commitment (Study on Employees of PT. Marga Yumma Adventure): English. *Muhasabatuna : Jurnal Akuntansi Syariah*, 5(2), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.54471/MUHASABATUNA.V5I2.2748>
- Jahid, I. A., & Adnyana, I. M. (2021). Analysis of The Effect of Motivation, Discipline and Job Satisfaction, on Employee Performance With Organizational Commitment As An Intervening Variable. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, 1(2), 82–98. <https://doi.org/10.46799/IJSSR.V1I2.23>

- Jiatong, W., Wang, Z., Alam, M., Murad, M., Gul, F., & Gill, S. A. (2022). The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Affective Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 831060. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2022.831060/BIBTEX>
- Koswara, D., Hardhienata, S., & Retnowati, R. (2021). Increasing Teacher's Organizational Commitment Through Strengthening Teamwork, Situational Leadership and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 2(4), 228–238. <https://doi.org/10.7777/JIEMAR.V2I4.179>
- Lai, M.-C. (2012). Self-Efficacy, Effort, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention: The Effect of Personal Characteristics on Organization Performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJIMT.2012.V3.260>
- Magistra, A. R., Firdaus, S. U., & Raharjo, P. S. (2023). The Impact of Modernization in Education, Economics, Social and Cultural Sectors on the Existence of Democracy. *Proceedings of the International Conference for Democracy and National Resilience 2022 (ICDNR 2022)*, 122–128. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-75-6_18
- Manik, E. (2016). The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Achievement Motivation and Organizational Climate and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(12), 599. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v6-i12/2522>
- Maria, S., Lestari, D., Rochaida, E., Darma, D. C., & Rahmawati, H. R. (2021). SELF-EFFICACY, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE – FROM PUBLIC OFFICE. *CACTUS*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.24818/CTS/3/2021/1.01>
- McKenzie, P., Nugroho, D., Ozolions, C., McMillan, J., Sumarto, S., Toyamah, N., Febriany, V., Sodo, R. J., Bima, L., & Sim, A. A. (2014). Study on Teacher Absenteeism in Indonesia 2014. 1–130.
- Memon, S. (2024). Teamwork And Its Impact On Employee Performance : Mediated By Job Satisfaction.
- Moon, K., Cho, H., Lee, K., & Oah, S. (2014). Effect of pay satisfaction on organizational commitment. *Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 585–615. <https://doi.org/10.24230/KJIOP.V27I3.585-615>
- Nahita, P., & Saragih, E. (2021). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Komitmen Organisasional Karyawan pada Organisasi Kantor Hukum. *Journal of Management and Business Review*, 18(2), 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.34149/JMBR.V18I2.296>
- Nailul, D., Abg, M., Dahalan, N. A., Zakaria, R., & Omar, M. K. (2023). The Impact Of Organizational Culture , Teamwork And Work Environment On Organizational Commitment.
- Narotama, I. B. I., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2022). The role of job satisfaction in mediation the effect of self-efficacy and job insecurity on turnover intention. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 9(4), 494–513. <https://doi.org/10.21744/IRJMIS.V9N4.2108>
- Nhi, B. T., Trang, T. Van, Nam, T. T., Uyen, V. H. K., & Anh, N. H. D. (2023). Influences of person-environment fit, self-efficacy, working meaningfulness on work engagement and organizational commitment of lecturers at public universities in Ho Chi Minh City. *Tạp Chí Nghiên Cứu Tài Chính - Marketing*, 14, 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.52932/JFM.VI3.364>
- Özbek, Ö., & Bozkurt, S. (2020). The Investigation of Generational Differences in the Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Job

- Satisfaction: A Research in the Pharmaceutical Industry. *Istanbul Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.26650/IMJ.2020.89.0002>
- Özgedik, G., & Güney, S. (2023). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment: A Research. *The International Journal of Business & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.24940/THEIJBM/2023/V11/I9/BM2309-009>
- Paramarta, V. (2020). PENGARUH EFIKASI DIRI TERHADAP KEPUASAN KERJA KARYAWAN PADA PDAM KOTA BANDUNG. *Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif*, 2(4), 609–615. <https://doi.org/10.32493/JEE.V2I4.10694>
- Pradipto, Y. D., Jati, W., Johannes, A., Setyorini, A., & Rifai, I. (2022). The Roles Of Authentic Leadership , Self-Efficacy , And Employees ' Silence On Organizational Commitment In Binus University.
- Prasnavidya, M., Rubini, B., Sunaryo, W., & Abidin, Z. (2020). IMPROVING COMMITMENT TO ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH STRENGTHENING THE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE, TEAMWORK, AND LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS (Empirical Study using Correlation Approach and SITOREM Analysis on Permanent Teachers of Private High School Foundation in Bogor Regency). *Journal of Archaeology of Egypt*, 17(6).
- Pratama, L. A., & Putri, V. W. (2019). The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) through Organizational Commitment and Trust in Leaders as Mediation. *Management Analysis Journal*, 8(4), 434–443. <https://doi.org/10.15294/MAJ.V9I4.34964>
- Prayudi, M. A., Dewi, G. A. K. R. S., Vijaya, D. P., & Ekawati, L. P. (2018). TEORI PERAN DAN KONSEP EXPECTATION-GAP FUNGSI PENGAWASAN DALAM PENGELOLAAN KEUANGAN DESA. *EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, 2(4), 449–467. <https://doi.org/10.24034/J25485024.Y2018.V2.I4.3931>
- Quines, L. A., Pablo, R. V., & Journal, E. (2023). THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL HEADS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF TEACHERS. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(5), 14. <https://doi.org/10.46827/EJES.V10I5.4771>
- Rahman, F. naz, & Kanasro, H. A. (2015). TEAM WORK: A KEY TO ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS.
- Rathi, N., & Rastogi, R. (2009). Assessing The relation ship between emotional intelligence, occupational selfefficacy and organizational commitment. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*.
- Riyadi, R. P., & Auliya, Z. F. (2021). THE ROLE OF EMPLOYEE EMPOWERMENT, TEAMWORK, AND EMPLOYEE TRAINING ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT. *Journal of Management and Islamic Finance*, 1(1), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.22515/JMIF.V1I1.3564>
- Runa, R. (2023). Determinants of Employee Change Readiness: A Study of Transformational Leadership and Self-Efficacy and the Role of Organizational Commitment. *Almana : Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.36555/ALMANA.V7I1.2144>
- Sambadjati, I. T. R., & Salosso, M. (2024). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Teamwork Terhadap Komitmen Organisasi Dan Dampaknya Pada Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Tenaga Kerja Dan Transmigrasi Kabupaten Manokwari. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 9(1), 714–723. <https://doi.org/10.37531/MIRAI.V9I1.6925>

- Sari, L. M., & Budiarta, K. (2024). Analisis Aktualisasi Diri dan Efikasi Diri dalam Mempengaruhi Kepuasan Kerja Pengemudi Gojek di Kota Medan. *Jurnal Arastirma*, 4(2), 509–517. <https://doi.org/10.32493/JARAS.V4I2.38825>
- Setyaningsih, S. (2020). Penguatan Sumber Daya Manajemen Pendidikan Melalui Analisis Jalur (Path Analysis) & Metode Sitorem. ALFABETA.
- Silitonga, N., Novitasari, D., Sutardi, D., Sopa, A., Asbari, M., Yulia, Y., Supono, J., & Fauji, A. (2020). The Relationship Of transformational Leadership, Organizational Justice And Organizational Commitment: A Mediation Effect Of Job Satisfaction. *Journal Of Critical Reviews*, 7(19), 108–119.
- Siregar, A. H., & Winarso, A. P. B. (2025). The Effect of Transformational Leadership and Career Management on Organizational Commitment with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, 5(6), 5972–5987. <https://doi.org/10.38035/DIJEFA.V5I6.3707>
- Soegiyono. (2011). Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D.
- Soenanta, A., Akbar, M., & Sariwulan, R. T. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to employee retention in a lighting company. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 8(4), 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.15739/IBME.20.009>
- Sukrajap, M. A. (2016). PENGARUH KEPEMIMPINAN TRANSFORMASIONAL TERHADAP KEPUASAN KERJA DAN KOMITMEN ORGANISASIONAL DENGAN DIMEDIASIOLEH PEMBERDAYAAN PSIKOLOGIS. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 12(1), 22–45.
- Suparno, S., Sutjipto, S., & Suryadi, S. (2020). The Effect of Teamwork and Trust on Job Satisfaction of The Teachers of The State High School in Bekasi City. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 3(1), 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3750973>
- Svr Babu, P., Mosisa Gemeda, T., & Nefa, A. G. (2022). Job Satisfaction As a Function of Self-Efficacy and Personal Strain Among High School Teachers' in Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh State of India. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*.
- Tinggi, S., Ekonomi, I., Sibolga, A.-W., Diri, P. E., Lingkungan, D., Terhadap, K., Kerja, K., Utami, K., Lestari, P., & Sinambela, E. A. (2020). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Ekonomi Syariah)*, 3(2), 529–536. <https://doi.org/10.36778/JESYA.V3I2.615>
- Trianziani. (2020). View metadata.
- Usmar, U., Sismiati, S., Sulaiman, S., Tamrin, T., Rudhan, A., Katriel Swy, I., & Tunas Nusantara, S. (2024). Examining the interplay between personality and teamwork on organizational commitment and employee performance. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 10(2), 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.29210/020244014>
- Widana, I. W., & Muliani, L. (2020). Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Guru Di Smk Negeri 3 Sinjai. *Jurnal.Stiemuhpekalongan.Ac.Id*, 2(2), 36–53.
- Winarsih, T., & Fariz, F. (2021). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment and Work Discipline. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 4(1), 1328–1339. <https://doi.org/10.33258/BIRCI.V4I1.1759>

- Xu, H., Wang, Z., Lian, N., Khan, A., & Zhang, L. (2022). The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Intention to Stay: Empirical Evidence From China's Performing Arts Industry. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 874803. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2022.874803/BIBTEX>
- Yarrow, N., Afkar, R., Masood, E., & Gauthier, B. (2020). Measuring the Quality of MoRA's Education Services. *Measuring the Quality of MoRA's Education Services*, november. <https://doi.org/10.1596/34808>