

# The Influence Of Transformational Leadership And Secretary Support On Employee Organizational Commitment Through Mediation: Psychological Empowerment And Moderation: Structural Distance On Bintan Regency In The New Normal Era

Putri Rahmawati<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Indrayani<sup>a,2</sup>, Muamar Kaddafi<sup>a,3</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Fakultas Ekonomi, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Batam, Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> 102519006@univbatam.ac.id\*; <sup>2</sup> indrayani@univbatam.ac.id; <sup>3</sup> muammar@univbatam.ac.id

\* corresponding author

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history

Received

Revised

Accepted

### Keywords

Transformational Leadership

Secretary Support

Structural Distance

Psychological Empowerment

Organizational Commitment

## ABSTRACT

Organizational commitment is very important for organizations in order to improve organizational performance. Employee organizational commitment can increase or decrease. Knowing the factors that influence organizational commitment is the key to solving the problem of decreasing employee organizational commitment. This research aims to determine the influence of transformational leadership and Secretary support on employee organizational commitment through empowering psychologists as an intervening agent and structural distance as a moderating variable. Data was obtained by distributing questionnaires to 276 civil servants who worked at the Regional Apparatus Organization of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province. The research uses a quantitative approach. The data analysis method used is a structural equation model using the Smart-PLS device. The research results show, 1) Transformational leadership and support from the Secretary directly have a positive and significant effect on psychological empowerment. 2) Transformational leadership and psychological empowerment directly have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Commitment, while 3) Secretary Support and Structural Distance do not have a significant effect on organizational commitment. 4) psychological empowerment fully mediates the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, and also mediates the influence of Secretary support on organizational commitment. 5) Structural distance moderates the influence of transformational leadership on employee organizational commitment in the Bintan Regency Regional Apparatus Organization. And also moderates Psychological Empowerment of Organizational Commitment, but does not moderate Secretary Support for Organizational Commitment. The results of this research recommend that practitioners and leaders in the Bintan Regency Regional Apparatus Organization be able to improve transformational leadership competence in inspiring followers, and encourage the Secretary to accommodate opinions from subordinates, include subordinates in the planning process and increase employee organizational commitment.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



## 1. Introduction

Employees with high organizational commitment are valuable assets for the organization. Retaining employees with high commitment is a desire and a big challenge for every organization. Organizational commitment is defined as the strength of an employee's relationship with the organization. In other words, organizational commitment is a process where organizational members feel ownership and contribute to increasing the success and success of the organization. Organizational commitment has important implications for employees as well as the organization. Organizational commitment can also increase creativity in organizations. In addition, organizational commitment is one of the determining factors in employee success in achieving better organizational performance.

Employee organizational commitment is an important element in improving organizational performance. Therefore, an organization needs to know what aspects play an important role or have a big impact in increasing employee organizational commitment. One of the most important factors influencing organizational commitment is leadership behavior.

Another factor that influences organizational commitment is the Secretary's support. Successful secretarial support today requires technological skills, effective communication, the ability to process information, and the ability to adapt to rapidly changing work environments. From a general perspective, the Secretary plays an important role in subordinate empowerment, personal growth, and development, which is an important aspect of the growth of subordinate organizational commitment. Secretary support has been studied in several studies which conclude that Secretary support has an important role in increasing organizational commitment. Employees who receive Secretary support demonstrate a higher level of organizational commitment.

Another factor that is believed to influence organizational commitment is structural distance. Structural distance is defined as the physical structure in an organization (e.g., the physical distance between leaders and followers), the organizational structure (e.g., hierarchical level, span of management control, and management centralization), and the supervisory structure (e.g., the frequency with which leaders interact with followers). Shamir argues that physically close leaders have a greater opportunity to demonstrate individual consideration, sensitivity to followers' needs, and support for employee development; these actions can increase employees' trust in their superiors and can influence their organizational commitment. Howell and Hall-Merenda report that trust between followers and close leaders is higher than between followers and distant leaders because close leaders have more opportunities to interact directly, establish personal contact, and build relationships. This situation can give rise to employees' feelings of happiness and a sense of belonging to their organization because they feel cared for and appreciated by their superiors.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Place and Time of Research

The research location is at the Bintan Regency Regional Government Organization. The research period was eight months from February 2021 to September 2021. The research began with a literature review, consultation, instrument preparation, instrument testing, instrument improvement, data collection, data analysis, and reporting of dissertation results and consultation.

### 2.2. Research Methods

This research method uses a cross-sectional method using path analysis techniques. This research method uses a cross-sectional method using path analysis techniques. Cross-sectional research is research to study the correlation between risk factors by approaching or collecting data all at once at a certain time (Ariani: 2014). Based on the reasons for this research, this study aims to identify the relationship between various variables and to study the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable being studied at a certain time, in this study, we also observe it without influencing it.

### 2.3. Population and Sample

The population of this study is all ASNs who work in the Bintan Regency Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD), totaling 1,307 people who work in 30 OPDs. Using Slovin the samples that

must be taken is 306, if using Gay then 131 to 262 samples. If you use Ferdinand's formulation, then sample 21 (indicator) is multiplied by 5 to 10 (101 to 210 samples). In this research, initially, 306 respondents were used (using the Slovin method), but 30 respondents were taken for the pilot test, resulting in 276 respondents (which still meet the requirements) following the theorists above to produce valid and reliable data in conducting analysis and making conclusions in research.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### Outer Model Analysis (Measurement Model)

**Table 1.** Validity Testing based on Outer Loading Factors

Indicator	Secretary Support	Kep. Transformational	Organizational Commitment	Psychological Empowerment	Structural Distance
<b>DS1.1</b>	0.734	0.730	0.719	0.704	-0.011
<b>DS1.2</b>	0.810	0.798	0.796	0.782	0.052
<b>DS1.3</b>	0.802	0.797	0.776	0.757	0.074
<b>DS1.4</b>	0.830	0.826	0.801	0.731	0.038
<b>DS1.5</b>	0.804	0.798	0.759	0.669	0.090
<b>DS2.1</b>	0.788	0.780	0.746	0.659	0.056
<b>DS2.2</b>	0.796	0.793	0.762	0.690	0.020
<b>DS2.3</b>	0.781	0.777	0.742	0.665	0.039
<b>DS2.4</b>	0.765	0.753	0.724	0.727	0.105
<b>DS2.5</b>	0.865	0.861	0.838	0.777	0.194
<b>DS3.1</b>	0.802	0.796	0.763	0.693	0.072
<b>DS3.2</b>	0.821	0.816	0.802	0.785	0.115
<b>DS3.3</b>	0.810	0.804	0.804	0.725	0.108
<b>DS3.4</b>	0.847	0.842	0.820	0.756	0.066
<b>DS3.5</b>	0.775	0.770	0.754	0.706	0.115
<b>DS4.1</b>	0.851	0.844	0.830	0.765	0.215
<b>DS4.2</b>	0.805	0.798	0.773	0.723	0.208
<b>DS4.3</b>	0.798	0.793	0.763	0.774	0.188
<b>DS4.4</b>	0.743	0.734	0.710	0.664	0.070
<b>DS4.5</b>	0.757	0.704	0.703	0.536	0.072
<b>KO1.1</b>	0.720	0.724	0.763	0.756	0.008
<b>KO1.2</b>	0.783	0.782	0.801	0.505	0.071
<b>KO1.3</b>	0.788	0.791	0.799	0.769	0.110
<b>KO1.4</b>	0.813	0.811	0.817	0.755	0.015
<b>KO1.5</b>	0.756	0.761	0.768	0.685	0.116
<b>KO1.6</b>	0.690	0.690	0.737	0.654	0.025
<b>KO1.7</b>	0.753	0.746	0.787	0.716	0.020
<b>KO2.1</b>	0.443	0.457	0.740	0.667	0.048
<b>KO2.2</b>	0.724	0.715	0.761	0.478	0.095
<b>KO2.3</b>	0.846	0.847	0.852	0.780	0.172
<b>KO2.4</b>	0.753	0.755	0.794	0.732	0.068
<b>KO2.5</b>	0.791	0.789	0.819	0.812	0.119
<b>KO2.6</b>	0.792	0.793	0.800	0.740	0.124
<b>KO2.7</b>	0.815	0.812	0.848	0.785	0.070
<b>KO3.1</b>	0.733	0.733	0.778	0.761	0.136
<b>KO3.2</b>	0.551	0.545	0.834	0.762	0.212
<b>KO3.3</b>	0.779	0.777	0.792	0.753	0.212
<b>KO3.4</b>	0.727	0.733	0.775	0.772	0.204
<b>KO3.5</b>	0.704	0.695	0.732	0.679	0.071
<b>KO3.6</b>	0.710	0.715	0.771	0.749	0.103
<b>KT1.1</b>	0.721	0.725	0.717	0.711	0.002
<b>KT1.2</b>	0.785	0.791	0.783	0.772	0.059
<b>KT1.3</b>	0.782	0.795	0.769	0.751	0.082
<b>KT1.4</b>	0.818	0.822	0.795	0.722	0.041
<b>KT2.1</b>	0.785	0.795	0.754	0.659	0.102
<b>KT2.2</b>	0.763	0.773	0.725	0.643	0.071
<b>KT2.3</b>	0.771	0.783	0.746	0.670	0.038
<b>KT2.4</b>	0.765	0.769	0.727	0.655	0.049

<b>KT3.1</b>	0.740	0.742	0.701	0.703	0.118
<b>KT3.2</b>	0.857	0.860	0.834	0.771	0.207
<b>KT3.3</b>	0.783	0.789	0.747	0.681	0.092
<b>KT3.4</b>	0.803	0.813	0.806	0.775	0.112
<b>KT4.1</b>	0.790	0.795	0.795	0.713	0.114
<b>KT4.2</b>	0.818	0.834	0.794	0.742	0.086
<b>KT4.3</b>	0.759	0.769	0.748	0.694	0.119
<b>KT4.4</b>	0.848	0.850	0.830	0.764	0.218
<b>KT5.1</b>	0.790	0.797	0.775	0.714	0.205
<b>KT5.2</b>	0.780	0.789	0.756	0.764	0.188
<b>KT5.3</b>	0.735	0.737	0.705	0.667	0.080
<b>KT5.4</b>	0.726	0.741	0.740	0.712	0.058
<b>PP1.1</b>	0.655	0.657	0.699	0.733	-0.019
<b>PP1.2</b>	0.765	0.770	0.782	0.828	0.066
<b>PP1.3</b>	0.748	0.743	0.777	0.828	0.086
<b>PP1.4</b>	0.727	0.737	0.755	0.792	0.154
<b>PP2.1</b>	0.715	0.709	0.758	0.780	0.099
<b>PP2.3</b>	0.641	0.640	0.675	0.718	0.082
<b>PP2.4</b>	0.800	0.797	0.823	0.882	0.093
<b>PP2.5</b>	0.722	0.717	0.741	0.796	0.164
<b>PP3.1</b>	0.643	0.636	0.669	0.723	0.107
<b>PP3.2</b>	0.708	0.706	0.735	0.771	0.049
<b>PP3.3</b>	0.791	0.790	0.831	0.833	0.058
<b>PP3.4</b>	0.757	0.751	0.785	0.825	0.124
<b>PP3.5</b>	0.579	0.574	0.604	0.646	0.090
<b>PP4.1</b>	0.675	0.669	0.695	0.753	0.183
<b>PP4.2</b>	0.549	0.528	0.569	0.641	0.190
<b>PP4.3</b>	0.737	0.738	0.761	0.788	0.119
<b>PP4.4</b>	0.554	0.562	0.590	0.612	0.135
<b>PP4.5</b>	0.634	0.645	0.642	0.695	0.112
<b>SD1.1</b>	0.119	0.124	0.121	0.137	0.799
<b>SD1.2</b>	0.098	0.107	0.101	0.120	0.825
<b>SD1.4</b>	0.084	0.096	0.073	0.073	0.728
<b>SD2.2</b>	0.073	0.089	0.064	0.077	0.803
<b>SD2.4</b>	0.048	0.058	0.059	0.078	0.814
<b>SD3.1</b>	0.072	0.077	0.081	0.077	0.779
<b>SD3.3</b>	0.081	0.096	0.105	0.098	0.756
<b>SD3.4</b>	0.014	0.023	0.021	0.041	0.786
<b>SD4.3</b>	0.136	0.137	0.154	0.146	0.771
<b>SD5.2</b>	0.089	0.105	0.089	0.099	0.795

### Inner Model Testing (Structural Model)

**Table 2.** Path Coefficient Values and P-Value

Exogenous	Endogenous	Path Coeff.	Q Statistics	P Values	Information
<b>Kep. Transformational (X1)</b>	Psychological Empowerment (Y1)	0.327	2,278	0.030	Significant (+) Influence
<b>Secretary Support (X2)</b>	Psychological Empowerment (Y1)	0.585	4,189	0,000	Significant (+) Influence
<b>Kep. Transformational (X1)</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.416	2,480	0.018	Significant (+) Influence
<b>Secretary Support (X2)</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.234	1,388	0.152	Influence (+) Not Significant
<b>Psychological Empowerment (Y1)</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.354	6,445	0,000	Significant (+) Influence
<b>Structural Distance (SD)</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.004	0.355	0.375	Influence (+) Not Significant
<b>SD * X1</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.247	2,444	0.020	Significant (+) Influence
<b>SD * X2</b>	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.041	0.143	0.395	Influence (+) Not Significant

SD * Y1	Organizational Commitment (Y2)	0.065	2,305	0.028	Significant (+) Influence
Exogenous	Mediation	Endogenous	Indirect Coeff	T Statistic	P Values
<b>Kep. Transformational</b>	Psychological Empowerment	Organizational Commitment	0.116	2,469	0.019
<b>Secretary Support</b>	Psychological Empowerment	Organizational Commitment	0.207	2,946	0.009

## Hypothesis test

**Table 3.** Summary of Research Hypothesis Testing

ITEMS	Path Coefficients	Q Statistics	P-Values	Note
Work Motivation (X1) -> Performance (Y)	0.096	3,023	0.006	Significant
Experience (X2) -> Performance (Y)	0.128	2,080	0.040	Significant
Workload (X3) -> Performance (Y)	0.262	2,051	0.040	Significant
Communication (X4) -> Performance (Y)	0.366	2,383	0.017	Significant
Work Motivation (X1) -> Competency (I)	0.425	9,776	0,000	Significant
Experience (X2) -> Competency (I)	0.146	2,440	0.015	Significant
Workload (X3) -> Competency (I)	0.172	3,232	0.001	Significant
Communication (X4) -> Competency (I)	0.275	6,719	0,000	Significant
Competency (I) -> Performance (Y)	0.012	2,082	0.035	Significant
Competency (I) * Work Motivation (X1) -> Performance (Y)	0.204	2,190	0.034	Significant
Competency (I) * Experience (X2) -> Performance (Y)	0.160	2,076	0.042	Significant
Competency (I) * Workload (X3) -> Performance (Y)	0.137	2,469	0.042	Significant
Competency (I) * Communication (X4) -> Performance (Y)	0.137	0.777	0.437	Not significant
Technology (Z) * Competency (I) -> Performance (Y)	0.137	2,469	0.042	Significant

## 1. The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Psychological Empowerment

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that Transformational Leadership (KT) had a positive and significant effect on Psychological Empowerment with a respective coefficient value of 0.327 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.003 (significant at the 5% level). This means that if the leadership applies the Transformational Leadership (KT) pattern, Psychological Empowerment (PP) efforts will increase for employees in the OPD in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. In other words, the transformational leadership pattern played by the leadership in the Bintan Regency OPD where the leader tries to build employee trust, carry out actions with integrity, motivate employees, encourage innovative thinking, and train and develop employees, will increase efforts to empower employee psychology, where employees will have a personal purpose or connection to their work, the growth of employees' confidence that they have the skills and abilities necessary to do their jobs well, employees will have a sense of freedom about how to do their work and a growing sense of confidence that they can influence the organizational system in which they are at.

The results of descriptive statistics show that the indicator for the transformational leadership variable is known to have the highest value in the dimension of encouraging innovative thinking with the leader's questions always stimulating followers to be creative and innovative. This means that most respondents agreed to have leaders who inspire and motivate employees to work innovatively. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest value is the indicator in the dimension of building trust with the question that the leader always inspires followers well so that subordinates become strong in facing work challenges. This shows that there are still some employees in the

Bintan Regency OPD who feel that the leadership has not been able to inspire them to be better prepared and stronger to accept challenges.

## 2. Effect of Secretary Support on Psychological Empowerment

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that Secretary Support (DS) had a positive and significant effect on Psychological Empowerment (with a coefficient value of 0.585 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.000 (significant at the 1% level). This means that an increase in Secretary Support ( DS) will increase Psychological Empowerment (PP) efforts for employees at OPD in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands.

The results of descriptive statistics show that the highest score for the Secretary support variable is the indicator in the role model dimension with the question My Secretary demonstrates how someone can be successful together inside and outside. This means that most respondents agreed to have a Secretary who is a role model for Bintan Regency OPD employees. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest value is the indicator in the emotional support dimension with questions. My secretary made me feel comfortable talking to him about my conflict between work and non-work. This shows that employees have not felt comfortable talking to the Secretary about conflicts or work issues or work issues. The impact is that many work problems faced by employees cannot be resolved properly and this can reduce employee organizational commitment.

The concept of Secretary support is defined as the extent to which superiors can be relied on by subordinates to help and resolve problems, especially during difficult times (Bell, Menguc, & Stefani; House). Secretary support is also defined as the extent to which the Secretary provides encouragement and support, while also maintaining a positive contribution to the career development of subordinates (Griffin, Patterson, & West; Kram).

Supportive secretaries improve teamwork arrangements (McIntryre & Salas), increase subordinate job satisfaction (Agho, Mueller, & Price) and career satisfaction (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley), and decrease turnover rates (Shore & Wayne). Secretary support can include emotional and psychological influence, instrumental support, role role-modeling behavior. (Hammer et al.). Managers and Secretaries are a very important resource for employees supporting them to balance the demands of work and family roles. Several studies have found that Secretary support is an important source of employee psychological empowerment including their emotional recovery (Anderson et al.; Burke & Greenglass; Duxbury and Higgins; Thomas and Ganster ). Secretarial support means that managers provide emotional psychological and instrumental support to workers in balancing work and family responsibilities.

## 3. The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that Transformational Leadership (KT) had a positive and significant effect on Organizational Commitment (KO), where the coefficient value was 0.416 and the significant value was 0.018 (significant at the 5% level). This means that the application of transformational leadership patterns affects increasing the organizational commitment of employees in the Bintan Regency OPD. Transformational leadership is played by leaders at the Bintan Regency OPD by always trying to build employee trust, carry out actions with full integrity, motivate employees, encourage innovative thinking, and train and develop employees, it will increase employee organizational commitment which is characterized by the emergence of employee affective commitment where employees feel emotionally attached to their organization, employees feel attached to the organization based on the accumulation of value sides such as retirement, transfer of skills, relocation, and self-investment that varies with organizational membership (continuing commitment) and employees feel obliged to continue their work based on the motivation to conform to norms social (normative commitment).

## 4. The Effect of Secretary Support on Organizational Commitment

Based on data analysis, it was found that Secretary Support (DS) did not significantly influence Organizational Commitment (KO), where the coefficient value obtained was 0.234 with a p-value of 0.152 (not significant). This means that the Secretary's support has not been able to increase the organizational commitment of employees in the Bintan Regency OPD. As is known, the Secretary is

someone who plays a role. A secretary is someone who is given the main task of supervising employees so that they carry out work to improve better performance. In carrying out their duties, secretaries also provide emotional support and instrumental support, become role models, and maintain good relationships through creative work-family management. This support provided by the Secretary to employees has not significantly increased the employees' organizational commitment. This situation is normal because the main task of the Secretary is to supervise employee work to achieve better performance. However, a good secretary should also be able to provide support to employees to increase their organizational commitment. This role should be carried out in parallel with the supervisory duties carried out by the Secretary.

## 5. The Effect of Psychological Empowerment on Organizational Commitment

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that Psychological Empowerment (PP) had a positive and significant effect on employee Organizational Commitment (KO), with a coefficient value of 0.254 and a p-value of 0.000 (significant at the 1% level). This means that the psychological empowerment carried out by the leadership can increase the organizational commitment of employees in the Bintan Regency OPD. As is known, psychological empowerment is a managerial practice in the Bintan Regency OPD that shares power with subordinates at all levels in the transformational psychological empowerment needed to feel control over their work. Psychological empowerment carried out by leaders at the Bintan Regency OPD includes empowering employees to have clear personal goals or relationships regarding their work, developing employee competencies to foster a sense of confidence that they have the skills and abilities needed to do their work well, providing autonomy or freedom so that employees have a sense of freedom in doing their work and empowering employees to have confidence that they can influence the organizational system in which they are located. The success of employee psychological empowerment in the Bintan Regency OPD has had an impact on increasing organizational commitment, employee affective commitment where employees feel emotionally attached to their organization, employees feel attached to the organization based on the accumulation of value aspects such as retirement, transfer of skills, relocation, and self-investment which varies with membership, organization (continuing commitment) and employees feel obliged to continue their work based on the motivation to conform to social norms (normative commitment).

The results of descriptive statistics show that the indicators for the employee psychological empowerment variable are known to have the highest value in the meaning dimension with the question that my job is important to me. This means that the majority of respondents agreed that employees felt that what they had done was important for the success of their organization. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest value is the indicator in the dimension of self-determination with the question of my opinion being important in working group decision-making. This shows that some employees have not been given the freedom to carry out their work activities and determine how they do and when they complete their work.

## 6. Influence of Limited Distance Structure Organizational Commitment

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that Distance Structure (SD) had a positive but not significant effect on employee Organizational Commitment (KO), with a coefficient value of 0.004 and a p-value of 0.375. This means that the existing Distance Structure or that implemented by the leadership does not have a sufficient effect in increasing the organizational commitment of employees in the Bintan Regency OPD.

Distance Structure is the physical structure in an organization (e.g., physical distance between leaders and followers), organizational structure (e.g., hierarchical level, span of management control, and centralization of management), and supervisory structure (e.g., frequency of leader, follower interactions), Antonakis & Atwater (2002). Closeness can influence leadership quality while leader-follower communication distance can reduce the direct influence of leadership effectiveness (Chen & Bliese, 2002; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne). Structural distance is defined as the distance generated by the organizational structure. One aspect of organizational structure is the span of control, which refers to the number of subordinates who report to a particular Secretary. "A narrow span of control implies close supervision, while a wider span of control requires more autonomy on the part of subordinates." It can be assumed that the span of control is a distance factor between the Secretary

and employees because it affects the amount of attention, support, and feedback that the Secretary can provide to each employee. Additionally, organizational size is a distance factor when considering the average structural distance between all employees as well as the distance between higher management and employees or staff. Larger organizations imply greater structural distance and may reduce opportunities for the development of personal relationships and employee communities.

The structure of Distance is not very clear whether it is distance, relationship, authority, motivation, and others (not specific in this research). There are some inconsistencies within that may influence how committed they are to the organization, as well as how empowered they are. Although as Beyer & Trice said, it is organizational factors (including the distance structure) and personal factors that influence Organizational Commitment. However, many experts doubt whether the distance structure is effective, including Avolio et.al (2004). Among them are Dvir and Shamir, Howell and Hall-Merenda, Lord and Brown, Kerr and Jermier Napier and Ferris, etc.

## 7. The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Employee Organizational Commitment through Psychological Empowerment

Based on statistical testing, it can be seen that the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through psychological empowerment produces an indirect coefficient of 0.116 and a p-value of 0.019. This shows that there is a significant positive influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through psychological empowerment. This means that better transformational leadership can have an impact on increasing psychological empowerment so that it can increase organizational commitment.

The research results mean that the psychological empowerment of employees is the main requirement that must be present so that transformational leadership can play a full role in increasing organizational commitment. Without efforts to psychological empowerment, even if the leader applies a transformational leadership pattern, he cannot fully play a role in increasing organizational commitment. Transformational leadership will play an increasingly important role in increasing organizational commitment if it is accompanied by efforts to empower employee psychology. Psychological empowerment of employees carried out by transformational leaders will have a greater impact on increasing organizational commitment compared to implementing transformational leadership patterns without employee psychological empowerment.

## 8. The Effect of Secretary Support on Organizational Commitment through Empowerment Psychology

The influence of secretary support on organizational commitment through psychological empowerment produces an indirect coefficient of 0.207 and a p-value of 0.009. This shows that there is a significant positive influence of secretary support on organizational commitment through psychological empowerment. This means that the better the secretary's support, the more impact it can have on increasing psychological empowerment so that it can increase organizational commitment.

Based on the results of the mediation effect analysis, it was found that psychological empowerment mediates the influence of Secretary support on employee organizational commitment in the Bintan Regency Regional Government Organization. This conclusion means that psychological empowerment can be an intermediary in increasing the Secretary's supportive role in increasing organizational commitment. Secretary support can directly influence psychological empowerment, psychological empowerment also significantly influences organizational commitment. This means that the psychological empowerment that has been carried out at the Bintan Regency OPD can bridge the role of the Secretary's support for increasing organizational commitment.

## 9. The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Employee Organizational Commitment through Structural Distance Moderation

The influence of the interaction of structural distance with transformational leadership on organizational commitment. The influence produces a path coefficient of 0.247 with a p-value of

0.020. The test results show that there is an interaction effect of structural distance with transformational leadership on organizational commitment. Thus, it can be said that structural distance can strengthen the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment. Where structural distance is a pure moderation variable for the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.

Based on the results of the moderation effect test, it was found that the Structural Distance (SD) variable moderates the influence of Transformational Leadership (KT) on employee Organizational Commitment (KO).

Structural distance has been defined as the physical structure in organizations (e.g., the physical distance between leaders and followers), the organizational structure (e.g., hierarchical level, span of management control, and management centralization), and the supervisory structure (e.g., frequency of leader-follower interactions) ( Antonakis & Atwater). The structural distance perspective can also be interpreted as the hierarchical distance between leaders and followers Antonakis & Atwater. suggests that the distance between leaders and their followers can partly explain how leaders are perceived and the leadership outcomes obtained at both the transformational and organizational levels. Shamir suggests that the effects of charismatic/transformational leadership can be observed in followers who are separated from their leaders in terms of both physical and structural distance.

## **10. The Influence of Secretary Support on Employee Organizational Commitment Through Structural Distance Moderation**

The effect of the interaction of structural distance with secretary support on organizational commitment produces a path coefficient of 0.041 with a p-value of 0.395. The test results show that structural distance is unable to moderate the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment.

Structural distance has been defined as the physical structure in organizations (e.g., the physical distance between leaders and followers), the organizational structure (e.g., hierarchical level, span of management control, and management centralization), and the supervisory structure (e.g., frequency of leader-follower interactions) ( Antonakis & Atwater ).

The structural distance perspective can also be interpreted as the hierarchical distance between leaders and followers. Antonakis and Atwater suggest that the distance between leaders and their followers can partly explain how leaders are perceived and the leadership outcomes obtained at both the individual and organizational levels. Shamir suggests that the effects of charismatic/transformational leadership can be observed in followers who are separated from their leaders in terms of both physical and structural distance. Physical proximity between leaders and followers may moderate the quality of communication between leaders and their followers, while physical distance may decrease the direct influence, and perhaps effectiveness, of leaders working with their followers (Chen & Bliese; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne). Dvir and Shamir argue that differences in the information followers have about distant and close leaders may contribute to the different impacts of leadership on followers. Shamir argues that physically close leaders have a greater opportunity to demonstrate individualized consideration, sensitivity to followers' needs, and support for employee development.

Howell and Hall-Merenda report that trust between followers and close leaders is higher than between followers and distant leaders because close leaders have more opportunities to interact directly, establish personal contact, and build relationships. They also found that transformational leadership at a closer level resulted in significantly higher follower performance than transformational leadership at a distance. Previous research has focused on physical distance, similar arguments can also be applied to structural distance (hierarchical level in particular) as both variables are highly correlated and both can influence the frequency of direct interactions between leaders and followers (Napier & Ferris). As previously explained, the Distance Structure is not clear enough to moderate Supervisor/Secretary Support for Organizational Commitment. So the 10th hypothesis, "Secretary Support for Employee Organizational Commitment through Structural Distance Moderation" is rejected.

## 11. The Influence of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Organizational Commitment Through Structural Distance Moderation

The effect of the interaction of structural distance with psychological empowerment on organizational commitment produces a path coefficient of 0.065 with a p-value of 0.028. The test results show that there is an interaction effect of structural distance with psychological empowerment on organizational commitment. Thus, it can be said that structural distance can strengthen the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment. Where structural distance is a pure moderation variable for the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment.

Empowerment is an increase in motivation within a person which is reflected in behavior, namely increased competence, impact in completing tasks and achievements compared to others in organizational results and in carrying out their work the individual gives meaning to the work they do. While KO is the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization' (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 27). This means that X3 will clearly affect KO as explained above.

While Structural Distance is the physical structure in an organization (for example, the physical distance between leaders and followers), the organizational structure (for example, hierarchical level, span of management control, and management centralization), and the supervisory structure (for example, the frequency of leader-follower interactions) (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002). Logically automatic and supported by several studies such as (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Waldman & Yammarino, 1999; Yammarino, 1994) that Distance Structure can have a moderating effect on the relationship between X3 (Psychological Empowerment) and the result in the form of Y (Organizational Commitment). Several studies that provide support for this effect include (Antonakis and Atwater, 2002; Chen & Bliese, 2002; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997).

Here it can be seen that the Distance Structure can provide a moderating effect on psychological empowerment and commitment. So Hypothesis 11, "Psychological Empowerment of Employees' Organizational Commitment through Structural Distance Moderation in Bintan Regency" is accepted

## 4. Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion that have been described, the conclusions of this research are formulated as follows:

1. The first aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of transformational leadership on the psychological empowerment of employees in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. From the statistical results of the research, a coefficient value of 0.327 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.030 were obtained. The research results show that transformational leadership can significantly increase the psychological empowerment of OPD employees in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
2. The second aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of the Secretary's support on the psychological empowerment of employees in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. From the statistical results of the research, a coefficient value of 0.585 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.000 were obtained. The research results show that the Secretary's support directly has a significant effect on the psychological empowerment of OPD employees in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
3. The third aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of transformational leadership on employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. From the statistical results of the research, the coefficient value is 0.416 and the significant value (p-value) is 0.018. This means that transformational leadership has a significant effect on the organizational commitment of OPD employees, Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
4. The fourth aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of the Secretary's support on the organizational commitment of employees in the Bintan Regency OPD, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.234

and a significant value (p-value) of 0.152. The research results showed that the Secretary's direct support did not have a significant effect on the psychological empowerment of OPD employees in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.

5. The fifth aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of psychological empowerment on employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.254 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.000. This means that transformational leadership has a significant effect on the organizational commitment of OPD employees of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
6. The six aim of this research is to identify and determine the direct influence of Structure Distance on employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.004 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.375. This means that Structural Distance does not directly have a significant effect on the organizational commitment of OPD employees of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
7. The seventh aim of this research is to identify and determine the indirect influence of transformational leadership on employee organizational commitment through psychological empowerment as an intervening variable in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.116 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.019. This means that the role of psychological empowerment can mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment of OPD employees, Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
8. The eighth aim of this research is to identify and determine the indirect influence of Secretary support on employee organizational commitment through psychological empowerment as an intervening variable in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.207 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.009, this means that the role of psychological empowerment can act as an intermediary in mediating the influence of the Secretary's support on the organizational commitment of OPD employees, Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
9. The ninth objective of this research is to identify and determine the moderating influence of Disruption Structure on the relationship between transformational leadership and employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.247 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.020. The research results show that the structural distance variable moderates the influence of transformational leadership on the organizational commitment of OPD employees in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
10. The tenth aim of this research is to identify and determine the moderating influence of Disruption Structure on the relationship between Secretary/Supervisor Support and employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.041 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.395. The research results show that the structural distance variable does not moderate the influence of Secretary/Supervisor Support on the organizational commitment of OPD employees, Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province.
11. The eleventh aim of this research is to identify and determine the moderating influence of Structural Distance on the relationship between Psychological Empowerment and employee organizational commitment in the OPD of Bintan Regency, Riau Islands. The statistical results of the research obtained a coefficient value of 0.065 and a significant value (p-value) of 0.028. The results of the research show that the structural distance variable moderates the influence of psychological empowerment on the organizational commitment of OPD employees in Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province

### Acknowledgment

The authors extend their sincere appreciation to all individuals who have contributed to this research through their assistance in the execution of the study.

## Declarations

**Author contribution.** All authors contributed to the completion of this study.

**Funding statement.** Funding The research was independent, no one provided grant funding for this research.

**Conflict of interest.** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Additional information.** No additional information is available for this paper.

## Data and Software Availability Statements

This paper provides data and software in support of the results reported in the article that were analyzed and generated during the research.

## References

- [1] Albrecht, Simon L, and Manuela Andreetta. "The Influence of Empowering Leadership, Empowerment and Engagement on Affective Commitment and Turnover Intentions in Community Health Service Workers: Test of a Model." *Leadership in Health Services*, 2011.
- [2] Allameh, Sayyed Mohsen, Marzieh Heydari, and Sayyed Mohammad Reza Davoodi. "Studying the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Psychological Empowerment of Teachers in Abade Township." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 31 (2012): 224–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.046>.
- [3] Allen, Natalie J., and John P. Meyer. "Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1996. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>.
- [4] Anderson, Stella E, Betty S Coffey, and Robin T Byerly. "Formal Organizational Initiatives and Informal Workplace Practices: Links to Work-Family Conflict and Job-Related Outcomes." *Journal of Management* 28, no. 6 (2002): 787–810.
- [5] Antonakis, John, and Leanne Atwater. "Leader Distance: A Review and a Proposed Theory." *The Leadership Quarterly* 13, no. 6 (2002): 673–704. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00155-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00155-8).
- [6] Armstrong, Michael. *Human Resource Management Practice*. Kogan page limited, 2020.
- [7] Arthur, Michael B. "Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life." *JSTOR*, 1985.
- [8] Aydogmus, Ceren, Selin Metin Camgoz, Azize Egeneli, and Ozge Tayfur Ekmekci. "Perceptions of Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction: The Roles of Personality Traits and Psychological Empowerment §." *Journal of Management & Organization* 24, no. 1 (2018): 81–107.
- [9] Azman Ismail, Hasan Al-Banna Mohamed, Ahmad Zaidi Sulaiman, Mohd Hamran Mohamad & Munirah Hanim Yusuf. "An Empirical Study of The Relationship Between Transformational Leadership, Empowerment and Organizational Commitment." *Business and Economics Research Journal (BERj)*, Turkey, 2011.
- [10] Barroso Castro, Carmen, Ma Mar Villegas Perinan, and Jose Carlos Casillas Bueno. "Transformational Leadership and Followers' Attitudes: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19, no. 10 (2008): 1842–63.
- [11] Bass, Bernard M, Bruce J Avolio, and Laurie Goodheim. "Biography and the Assessment of Transformational Leadership at the World-Class Level." *Journal of Management* 13, no. 1 (1987): 7–19.
- [12] Bass, Bernard M., and Bruce J. Avolio. "Developing Transformational Leadership: 1992 and Beyond." *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 1990. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090599010135122>.
- [13] Becker, Thomas, Robert Billings, Daniel Eveleth, and Nicole Gilbert. "Foci and Bases of Employee Commitment: Implications for Job Performance." *Academy of Management Journal* 39 (April 1, 1996). <https://doi.org/10.2307/256788>.
- [14] Boon, Corine, Deanne N. Den Hartog, and David P. Lepak. "A Systematic Review of Human Resource Management Systems and Their Measurement." *Journal of Management*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318818718>.
- [15] Brief, Arthur P, and Walter R Nord. "Work and Meaning: Definitions and Interpretations." *Meanings of Occupational Work: A Collection of Essays. Issues in Organization and Management Series*. Lexington, MA, England: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com, 1990.

[16] Burke, Ronald J, and Esther R Greenglass. "Work–Family Conflict, Spouse Support, and Nursing Staff Well-Being during Organizational Restructuring." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 4, no. 4 (1999): 327–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.4.4.327>.

[17] Burns, James MacGregor. "Leadership." *Leadership* 1, no. 1 (2005): 11–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715005049347>.

[18] Cho, Seonghee, Misty M Johanson, and Priyanko Guchait. "Employees Intent to Leave: A Comparison of Determinants of Intent to Leave versus Intent to Stay." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Cho, Seonghee: Hotel & Restaurant Management, College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources, University of Missouri, 222 Eckles Hall, Columbia, MO, US, 65211, choseo@missouri.edu: Elsevier Science, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.10.007>.

[19] Collings, David G, Hugh Scullion, and Peter J Dowling. "Global Staffing: A Review and Thematic Research Agenda." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 20, no. 6 (2019): 1253–72.

[20] Day, David V., and Robert G. Lord. "Executive Leadership and Organizational Performance: Suggestions for a New Theory and Methodology." *Journal of Management*, 1988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638801400308>.

[21] Demir, Cesim, Bayram Sahin, Kadir Tekef, Muharrem Ucar, and Olcay Kursun. "Organizational Commitment of Military Physicians." *Military Medicine*, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.7205/MILMED-D-01-7808>.

[22] Dhawan, Vaibhav, and Zubin Mulla. "The Role of Pay and Leadership in Developing Organizational Commitment." *South Asian Journal of Management*, 2011.

[23] Freyermuth, T. "Retaining Employees in a Tightening Labor Market." RSM: McGladrey, USA, 2007.

[24] Greenhaus, Jeffrey H, and Nicholas J Beutell. "Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles." *Academy of Management Review* 10, no. 1 (1985): 76–88.

[25] Greenhaus, Jeffrey H, Arthur G Bedeian, and Kevin W Mossholder. "Work Experiences, Job Performance, and Feelings of Personal and Family Well-Being." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 31, no. 2 (1987): 200–215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(87\)90057-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90057-1).

[26] Greenhaus, Jeffrey H, Jonathan C Ziegert, and Tammy D Allen. "When Family-Supportive Supervision Matters: Relations between Multiple Sources of Support and Work-Family Balance." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 80, no. 2 (2012): 266–75.

[27] Greenhaus, Jeffrey, Saroj Parasuraman, and Wayne Wormley. "Effects of Race on Organizational Experiences, Job Performance Evaluations, and Career Outcomes." *Academy of Management Journal* 33 (March 1, 1990): 64–86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256352>.

[28] Hammer, Leslie, Ellen Kossek, Nanette Yragui, Todd Bodner, and Ginger Hanson. "Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Family Supportive Sekretaris Behaviors (FSSB)." *Journal of Management* 35 (August 1, 2009): 837–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328510>.

[29] Hanaysha, Jalal. "Examining the Effects of Employee Empowerment, Teamwork, and Employee Training on Organizational Commitment." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.140>.

[30] Hasibuan, Malayu S P, and H Malayu S P Hasibuan. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bumi Aksara, 2016.

[31] Hempel, Paul, Zhi-Xue Zhang, and Yulan Han. "Team Empowerment and the Organizational Context: Decentralization and the Contrasting Effects of Formalization." *Journal of Management - J MANAGE* 38 (March 1, 2012): 475–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309342891>.

[32] Jauhari, Hemang, Shailendra Singh, and Manish Kumar. "How Does Transformational Leadership Influence Proactive Customer Service Behavior of Frontline Service Employees? Examining the Mediating Roles of Psychological Empowerment and Affective Commitment." *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 2017.

[33] Joo, Baek-Kyoo Brian, Hea Jun Yoon, and Chang-Wook Jeung. "The Effects of Core Self-evaluations and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 2012.

[34] Joo, Baek-Kyoo, and Taejo Lim. "Transformational Leadership and Career Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment." *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 20, no. 3 (2013): 316–26.

[35] Jose, Geetha, and Sebastian Rupert Mampilly. "Relationships among Perceived Sekretaris Support, Psychological Empowerment and Employee Engagement in Indian Workplaces." *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health* 30, no. 3 (2015): 231–50.

[36] Keskes, Imen. "Relationship between Leadership Styles and Dimensions of Employee Organizational Commitment: A Critical Review and Discussion of Future Directions." *Intangible Capital*, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.476>.

[37] Khalil, Usman, Javed Iqbal, and Abida Khan. "Exploring Leadership Styles of School Administrators in Pakistan." *FWU JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES*, 2016.

[38] Khan Mohammadi Otaghara, M, and A Mohseni. "Exploring the Effect of Leadership Styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez Fair) on Employee's Psychological Empowerment." In 24th Electrical International Conference, 1–10, 2009.

[39] Khan, Sajjad Rashid, Mohsin Bashir, Shahnawaz Saqib, Ghulam Abbas, and Nadeem Nazir. "Impact of Sekretaris Support on Organizational Commitment in the Presence of Power Distance: A Quantitative Study of Textile Sector of Faisalabad, Pakistan." *International Journal of Information, Business and Management* 7, no. 4 (2015): 259.

[40] Khanmohammadi, O M, and Abbas Mohseni. "Studying the Impact of Leadership Styles (Transformational, Transactional, Non-Interference) on Psychological Empowerment." In

[41] Kirkman, B L, B Rosen, P E Tesluk, and C B Gibson. "The Impact of Tam Empowerment on Virtual Team Performance: The Moderating Role of Face-to-Face Interaction." *Academy of Management Journal* 47, no. 2 (2004): 175–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159571>.

[42] Kirkman, Bradley L, and Benson Rosen. "Beyond Self-Management: Antecedents and Consequences of Team Empowerment." *Academy of Management Journal* 42, no. 1 (1999): 58–74.

[43] Koh, William L, Richard M Steers, and James R Terborg. "The Effects of Transformation Leadership on Teacher Attitudes and Student Performance in Singapore." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. US: John Wiley & Sons, 1995. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160404>.

[44] Kottke, Janet L, and Clare E Sharafinski. "Measuring Perceived Sekretaris and Organizational Support." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 48, no. 4 (1988): 1075–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164488484024>.

[45] Kraimer, Maria L, Scott E Seibert, and Robert C Liden. "Psychological Empowerment as a Multidimensional Construct: A Test of Construct Validity." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. US: Sage Publications, 1999. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131649921969785>.

[46] Kraimer, Maria L, Scott E Seibert, and Robert C Liden. "Psychological Empowerment as a Multidimensional Construct: A Test of Construct Validity." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. US: Sage Publications, 1999. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131649921969785>.

[47] Lowe, Kevin B, Bruce J Avolio, and Uldarico Rex Dumdadum. "Addendum: Don't You Love It When a Plan Comes Together? Update on Meta-Analytic Findings for Transformational and Transactional Leadership." In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead* 10th Anniversary Edition. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2013.

[48] Lowe, Kevin B., K. Galen Kroek, and Nagaraj Sivasubramaniam. "Effectiveness Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Mlq Literature." *Leadership Quarterly*, 1996. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2).

[49] Luthans, Fred, and Bruce J Avolio. "Authentic Leadership Development." *Positive Organizational Scholarship* 241 (2003): 258.

[50] Luthans, Fred. "The Need for and Meaning of Positive Organizational Behavior." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.165>.

[51] Marks, Michelle A, Stephen J Zaccaro, John E Mathieu, Dore Gessner, Richard Klimoski, Juan Sanchez, and Chockalingam Vi-. "Performance Implications of Leader Briefings and Team-Interaction Training." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2000.

[52] Mathias, Peter. *The First Industrial Nation: The Economic History of Britain 1700–1914*. Routledge, 2013.

[53] Mathis, Robert L, and John H Jackson. *Human Resource Management = Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Salemba Empat, 2009.

[54] Mauludin, Hanif, and E Sulistyorini. "The Influence of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Justice, Trust and Organizational Commitment Toward Employees' Performance." *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences* 82 (October 30, 2018): 118–31. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2018-10.13>.

[55] Niehoff, Brian P, Cathy A Enz, and Richard A Grover. "The Impact of Top-Management Actions on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions." *Group & Organization Studies*. US: Sage Publications, 1990. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960119001500307>.

[56] Notoatmodjo, Soekidjo. "Metode Penelitian Kesehatan, Cetakan Ke Tiga." Pt Rineka. Jakarta, 2018.

[57] Obedgiu, Vincent. "Human Resource Management, Historical Perspectives, Evolution and Professional Development." *Journal of Management Development*, 2017.

[58] Özkaralli, Nurdan. "Effects of Transformational Leadership on Empowerment and Team Effectiveness." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 24, no. 6 (January 1, 2003): 335–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730310494301>.

[59] Paauwe, Jaap, and Corine Boon. "Strategic HRM: A Critical Review." *Human Resource Management*, 2018, 49–73.

[60] Rawat, Preeti S. "Effect of Psychological Empowerment on Commitment of Employees: An Empirical Study." In 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences, 17:143–47, 2011.

[61] Rhoades, Linda, Robert Eisenberger, and Stephen Armeli. "Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825>.

[62] Robbins, Stephen P, and Timothy A Judge. "Organizational Behavior: Student Value Edition." EE. UU.: Prentice Hall, 2014.

[63] Robbins, Stephen P. *Organizational Behavior*, 2010.

[64] Rotich, Kipkemboi Jacob. "History, Evolution and Development of Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Perspective." *Global Journal of Human Resource Management* 3, no. 3 (2017): 58–73.

[65] Ryan, Timothy, Aaron Clopton, and Richard Irwin. "Super Support. A Supportive Sekretaris, Life Satisfaction, and the Mediating Presence of Coaching Satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93 (2008): 120–30.

[66] Salehi, Azam. "Strategic Human Resource Management." *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 2013. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27325-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27325-6_2).

[67] Schuler, Randall S, and Susan E Jackson. "Linking Competitive Strategies with Human Resource Management Practices." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 1, no. 3 (1987): 207–19. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1987.4275740>.

[68] Shamir, Boas. "Social Distance and Charisma: Theoretical Notes and an Exploratory Study." *The Leadership Quarterly*. Netherlands: Elsevier Science, 1995. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90003-9).

[69] Shanock, Linda Rhoades, and Robert Eisenberger. "When Sekretariss Feel Supported: Relationships with Subordinates' Perceived Sekretaris Support, Perceived Organizational Support, and Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91, no. 3 (2006): 689.

[70] Sharma, Neenu. "Organization Behaviour: Challenges and Opportunities." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 2018.

[71] Shore, Lynn M, and Sandy J Wayne. "Commitment and Employee Behavior: Comparison of Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment with Perceived Organizational Support." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. US: American Psychological Association, 1993. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.774>.

[72] Silbert, Lisa. "The Effect of Tangible Rewards on Perceived Organizational Support." University of Waterloo, 2005.

[73] Sosik, John J, Bruce J Avolio, and Surinder S Kahai. "Effects of Leadership Style and Anonymity on Group Potency and Effectiveness in a Group Decision Support System Environment." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82, no. 1 (1997): 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.89>.

[74] Sousa, Carlos M., and Filipe Coelho. "From Personal Values to Creativity: Evidence from Frontline Service Employees." *European Journal of Marketing*, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0309056111137598>.

[75] Spreitzer, Gretchen M, Mark A Kizilos, and Stephen W Nason. "A Dimensional Analysis of the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Effectiveness Satisfaction, and Strain." *Journal of Management* 23, no. 5 (1997): 679–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300504>.

[76] Spreitzer, Gretchen M. "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation." *Academy of Management Journal* 38, no. 5 (1995):

[77] Thomas, Linda, and Daniel Ganster. "Impact of Family-Supportive Work Variables on Work–Family Conflict and Strain: A Control Perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80 (February 1, 1995): 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6>.

[78] Usman, Muhammad, Mirza Ahmed, and Shaista Khalid. "Empowering Leadership and Proactive Behavior: Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment and Moderating Role of Leader-Follower Distance." *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences* 12 (June 30, 2019). <https://doi.org/10.34091/AJSS.12.1.05>.

[79] Walumbwa, Fred O., Bani Onva, Peng Wang, and John J. Lawler. "Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Kenyan and U.S. Financial Firms." *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1135>.

[80] Walumbwa, Fred Ochieng, and John J Lawler. "Building Effective Organizations: Transformational Leadership, Collectivist Orientation, Work-Related Attitudes and Withdrawal Behaviours in Three Emerging Economies." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Walumbwa, Fred Ochieng: University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Department of Management, Lincoln, NE, US, 68588-0491, fwalumbwa@unlnotes.unl.edu: Taylor & Francis, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000114219>.

[81] Walumbwa, Fred, Bruce Avolio, William Gardner, Tara Wernsing, and Suzanne Peterson. "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure†." *Journal of Management* 34 (March 1, 2008): 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>.

[82] Watson, Tony. *Management Organization and Employment Strategy (RLE: Organizations): New Directions in Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2013.

[83] Wiley, Dina M. *Impact of Locus of Control and Empowerment on Organizational Commitment*. United States International University, 1999.

[84] Yukl, Gary. "An Evaluation of Conceptual Weaknesses in Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Theories." *The Leadership Quarterly* 10, no. 2 (1999): 285–305.