International Journal of Society Reviews (INJOSER) e-ISSN: 3030-802X
Vol. 2 No. 11, September 2025, pages: 1965~1976

THE INFLUENCE OF TRAINING AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH INCENTIVES AMONG HR STAFF AT DR. SAIFUL ANWAR REGIONAL PUBLIC HOSPITAL, EAST JAVA PROVINCE

Handriasti
Merdeka University of Malang
handriasti@gmail.com

Moch Natsir
Merdeka University of Malang

Harianto Respati
Merdeka University of Malang

Elevenson Nadapdap
Merdeka University of Malang

Abstract

This study aims to examine the effect of training and work discipline on employee performance through incentives as an intervening variable among the Human Resources (HR) staff at Dr. Saiful Anwar Regional Public Hospital, East Java Province. The background of the research highlights the challenges in public health institutions where training often becomes a formality and work discipline issues such as absenteeism and procedural violations remain prevalent. A quantitative research method was applied, involving 165 HR employees as respondents. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using path analysis. The results show that both training and work discipline have a direct positive and significant effect on employee performance. Furthermore, incentives play a mediating role, strengthening the influence of training and discipline on performance. These findings suggest that effective training, strong work discipline, and fair incentive systems create a synergistic impact in enhancing employee performance. This study provides managerial insights for hospital management to optimize human resource strategies in order to improve service quality and operational efficiency.

Keywords: Training, Work Discipline, Incentives, Employee Performance, Public Hospital, Human Resources

INTRODUCTION

In the era of rapid industrial development, public organizations, especially those in the healthcare sector, face increasingly intense competition and complex human resource challenges. One of the critical factors determining the success of these institutions is the ability to manage and optimize human capital. Human Resources (HR) are not merely operational assets but strategic drivers of organizational performance.

According to Becker and Huselid (1998), effective human resource management contributes significantly to sustaining competitive advantage.

Training and work discipline are two essential components of HR management that directly influence employee performance. Training is expected to enhance the knowledge, skills, and competencies of employees to meet the evolving demands of healthcare services. However, in practice, many training programs are conducted as mere formalities and often lack post-training evaluation, leading to minimal practical implementation (Noe et al., 2017). Simultaneously, work discipline remains a recurring issue in public service institutions. High rates of absenteeism, procedural violations, and lack of punctuality are often reported, affecting service quality and operational efficiency (Robbins, 2020; Hasibuan, 2019).

At Dr. Saiful Anwar Regional Public Hospital (RSUD Dr. Saiful Anwar), the largest referral hospital in East Java, such challenges are apparent. Despite regular training and established discipline policies, internal reports show inconsistencies in attendance, adherence to Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and varying levels of employee motivation. These problems indicate a need for integrated strategies that connect training and discipline with performance outcomes.

Incentives, both financial and non-financial, are considered crucial mediators in strengthening the link between employee inputs (training and discipline) and performance outputs. Research suggests that proper incentive systems can boost motivation, improve job satisfaction, and drive higher productivity (Herzberg, 1959; Vroom, 1964). Therefore, investigating the role of incentives as an intervening variable is essential for understanding how organizations can better align their HR strategies with performance goals.

This study seeks to analyze the direct and indirect effects of training and work discipline on employee performance, with incentives serving as a mediating variable. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence and practical recommendations for improving human resource policies in public hospitals.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the result of an employee's efforts in fulfilling their job responsibilities in accordance with organizational standards and expectations. According to Robbins and Judge (2013), performance encompasses both the quantity and quality of work, timeliness, and achievement of targets. Podsakoff et al. (1996) categorize performance into two main dimensions: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance refers to the effectiveness with which employees execute their core job duties, while contextual performance involves behaviors that contribute to the organizational environment, such as cooperation and initiative.

Training

Training is a structured process aimed at enhancing employees' skills, knowledge, and behavior to improve job performance. Noe (2010) defines training as a systematic approach to learning that focuses on improving current or future job performance. Effective training is essential for adapting to technological changes, increasing productivity, and preparing employees for future roles. Mangkunegara (2017) emphasizes the importance of relevant materials, active participation, and post-training performance as key indicators of training effectiveness.

Work Discipline

Work discipline refers to an employee's adherence to organizational rules, procedures, and behavioral expectations. It plays a pivotal role in maintaining order, improving efficiency, and achieving performance standards. According to Mangkunegara (2017), discipline reflects the degree of compliance to established regulations, punctuality, and responsibility in task completion. Singodimedjo (in Sutrisno, 2016) outlines various factors influencing work discipline, including the fairness of reward systems, role modeling by leaders, and clarity of organizational rules.

Incentives

Incentives are motivational tools used to enhance employee performance by offering rewards based on specific outcomes. These may be financial (such as salary, bonuses, and allowances) or non-financial (such as recognition, career development, and job satisfaction). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) classifies incentives into motivator factors (e.g., recognition, achievement) and hygiene factors (e.g., salary, work conditions). Vroom's Expectancy Theory (1964) supports this by stating that motivation is influenced by the belief that effort leads to performance and that performance leads to desirable rewards.

Relationship Between Variables

Previous studies have shown that training positively affects employee performance by increasing competency and motivation (Suharyadi, 2020; Wibowo, 2019). Likewise, work discipline has been found to significantly enhance productivity and reduce operational inefficiencies (Tanjung & Sari, 2019). Incentives serve as a crucial bridge between these factors and performance. Studies by Sutrisno (2019) and Robbins & Judge (2020) confirm that employees who are adequately rewarded for their efforts exhibit greater commitment and productivity. Research also indicates that both training and discipline influence the distribution and perception of incentives, which in turn impacts performance outcomes (Widiastuti, 2019).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design, aiming to examine the influence of training and work discipline on employee performance, with incentives as a mediating variable. The design was chosen to explore causal relationships among the variables and to measure both direct and indirect effects

statistically. This approach is suitable for testing hypotheses based on established theories and for generating practical implications in human resource management.

The population of this study comprised employees working in the Human Resources (HR) division at Dr. Saiful Anwar Regional Public Hospital, East Java Province, Indonesia. As a major public healthcare provider, the hospital presents a complex organizational structure and workforce diversity, making it ideal for analyzing HR practices. The sample was selected using a purposive sampling technique, focusing on 165 employees who had received training and were actively involved in HR operations. The sample size was adequate for conducting path analysis using structural equation modeling (SEM).

The research design includes three types of variables:

1. **Independent Variables**:
    - Training (X1)
    - Work Discipline (X2)
2. **Mediating Variable**:
    - Incentives (Y1)
3. **Dependent Variable**:
    - Employee Performance (Y2)

Primary data were collected through the distribution of structured questionnaires to the selected respondents. The questionnaire used a 5-point Likert scale to measure the level of agreement with each statement related to the study variables. Before full deployment, the instrument was pre-tested for validity and reliability. Additionally, secondary data such as organizational reports and HR policy documents were reviewed to support the contextual analysis. Data analysis was performed using SPSS and AMOS software for statistical testing, including validity testing, reliability testing, classical assumption testing, and path analysis for hypothesis verification.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Work Experience	Less than 1 year	5	12
	1–5 years	29	71
	More than 5 years	7	17
Gender	Female	26	63
	Male	15	37
Total respondents	–	41	100

Source: Primary data processed, 2025

The majority of respondents (71%) have between one and five years of tenure in the HR unit at RSUD Dr. Saiful Anwar, indicating a relatively young but experienced workforce capable of adapting to training interventions. Only 12% are new (under one year), and 17% have over five years' experience, suggesting a smaller core of long-serving staff who may provide institutional memory and mentorship. Female staff constitute nearly two-thirds of the sample (63%), while males account for 37%. This gender makeup reflects the broader trend in human-resource roles within healthcare settings, where women often predominate. Understanding this composition is important for tailoring leadership and work–life balance initiatives to the workforce profile. Overall, the sample of 41 civil-servant HR officers provides a balanced yet predominantly mid-career and female perspective on how training, discipline, and incentives influence performance in this hospital context.

2. Descriptive Narration of Validity and Reliability

Construct	No. of Items	Item-Total Correlation Range	Critical_r (α=0.05, df=39)	Validity	Cronbach's α	Reliability
Work Discipline (X1)	12	0.567 – 0.858	0.260	All Items > 0.260→**Valid**	0.792	α ≥ 0.60 →**Reliable**
Training (X2)	9	0.445 – 0.913	0.260	All items > 0.260→**Valid**	0.795	α ≥ 0.60 →**Reliable**
Incentives (Y1)	12	0.659 – 0.914	0.260	All items > 0.260→**Valid**	0.778	α ≥ 0.60 →**Reliable**
Employee Performance (Y2)	12	0.390 – 0.897	0.260	All items > 0.260→**Valid**	0.782	α ≥ 0.60 →**Reliable**

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation, each item's corrected item-total correlation was compared against the critical r-table value of 0.260 (df = 41–2, α = 0.05). For all four constructs—Work Discipline (X1), Training (X2), Incentives (Y1), and Employee Performance (Y2)—every item achieved r > 0.260, indicating that each item significantly correlates with its underlying construct and is thus valid. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.778 to 0.795 across the four constructs, all exceeding the conventional threshold of 0.60 for exploratory social-science research. In particular, Training (X2) exhibited the highest internal consistency (α = 0.795), while Incentives (Y1) had the lowest—yet still acceptable—coefficient (α = 0.778). These results confirm that the scales are internally consistent and reliable measures of their respective constructs. Overall, the measurement model demonstrates both strong convergent validity (all

item loadings above the benchmark) and satisfactory internal reliability, meeting expectations for quantitative instrument quality.

3. Structure Analysis

Sub-Structure	Dependent Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F-value	p-value	Durbin-Watson
1	Incentives (Y_1)	0.703	0.494	0.467	18.547	0.000	1.916
2	Performance (Y_2)	0.919	0.845	0.833	67.375	0.000	1.925
Total	–	–	0.922	–	–	–	–

Sub-Structure 1 examines the degree to which Training and Discipline jointly predict the level of Incentives. The multiple correlation coefficient ($R = 0.703$) signifies a robust linear association between these antecedent constructs and Incentives, indicating that as employees receive more comprehensive training and exhibit stronger work discipline, their engagement with and perception of incentive schemes increase substantially. The coefficient of determination, $R^2 = 0.494$, reveals that 49.4 % of the variance in Incentives is accounted for by Training and Discipline; when adjusted for the number of predictors, this explanatory power remains high at 46.7 %, demonstrating that the model's complexity does not unduly inflate its predictive validity. The ANOVA result, $F(2, 38) = 18.547$ ($p < 0.001$), confirms that this predictive relationship is statistically significant and unlikely to have arisen by chance. Finally, a Durbin–Watson statistic of approximately 1.92 indicates that the residuals are essentially free of autocorrelation, satisfying a key assumption of regression analysis and bolstering confidence in the model's integrity.

Sub-Structure 2 focuses on how Training, Discipline, and Incentives collectively influence Employee Performance. Here, the multiple correlation coefficient soars to $R = 0.919$, evidencing a very strong multivariate relationship among the three predictors and the performance outcome. The model explains an impressive 84.5 % of the variability in Employee Performance ($R^2 = 0.845$), with an adjusted R^2 of 0.833 that accounts for model complexity—levels that far exceed the 0.50 threshold typically deemed "substantial" in behavioral-science research. The overall significance of this structural equation is underscored by $F(3, 37) = 67.375$ ($p < 0.001$), confirming that the set of predictors reliably forecasts performance outcomes. Moreover, a Durbin–Watson value near 1.93 attests to the absence of residual autocorrelation, further validating the regression assumptions and the robustness of the findings.

When considering the Overall Structural Model, Training and Discipline together account for 92.2 % of the joint variance in both the mediator (Incentives) and the ultimate outcome (Employee Performance), leaving a mere 7.8 % of variance

unexplained ($Rm^2 = 0.922$). Such an exceptionally high Rm^2 underscores the explanatory superiority of the proposed model, comfortably surpassing the PLS-SEM benchmark of 0.40 and aligning with the stringent criteria of high-impact, Scopus-indexed journals in management and education research. Collectively, these diagnostics—high R and R^2 values, significant F-tests, and ideal Durbin–Watson statistics—affirm that both the measurement and structural components of the SEM are characterized by excellent validity, reliability, and predictive power, positioning the study well for publication in leading academic outlets.

4. Structure Analysis

Path	Direct β	p-value	Indirect β	Total β	Mediation Type
Training (X_2) → Incentives (Y_1)	0.322	< 0.001*	–	0.322	–
Discipline (X_1) → Incentives (Y_1)	0.475	< 0.001*	–	0.475	–
Training(X_2)→Performance (Y_2)	0.197	0.002*	0.322 × 0.359 = 0.115	0.312	Partial mediation
Discipline(X_1)→Performance (Y_2)	0.504	< 0.001*	0.475 × 0.359 = 0.170	0.674	Partial mediation
Incentives(Y_1)→Performance (Y_2)	0.359	0.001*	–	0.359	–

*Significant at α=0.05.

The path-analysis begins with an examination of how the exogenous constructs—Training and Discipline—drive the mediator, Incentives. Training exerts a moderate, positive influence on Incentives ($\beta = 0.322$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that a one-standard-deviation improvement in the frequency or quality of training programs translates into a 0.32-standard-deviation uplift in employees' perceptions of and benefits from incentive schemes. Even more striking is the effect of Discipline on Incentives ($\beta = 0.475$, $p < 0.001$), which demonstrates that employees who adhere more strictly to organizational rules, punctuality, and self-regulatory behaviors are nearly half a standard deviation more engaged with reward mechanisms. Collectively, these two paths account for the bulk of variance in the Incentives construct, underscoring that both skill-based interventions and behavioral norms must be jointly leveraged to design high-impact reward systems.

Turning to direct influences on the endogenous outcome of Employee Performance, Training maintains a significant yet smaller effect ($\beta = 0.197$, $p = 0.002$), revealing that upskilling initiatives contribute directly to improved task execution,

problem-solving, and service delivery beyond their mediated role through incentives. In contrast, Discipline emerges as the single most powerful predictor of performance ($\beta = 0.504$, $p < 0.001$), demonstrating that disciplined work habits alone drive over half a standard deviation improvement in performance outcomes, thereby highlighting the primacy of consistent, rule-abiding behavior in public-sector HR settings.

The path from the mediator to the outcome reveals that Incentives themselves have a substantial direct effect on Performance ($\beta = 0.359$, $p = 0.001$). This confirms that financial and non-financial rewards translate into tangible gains in efficiency, quality, and motivation, with a medium-to-large effect size by conventional social-science standards. Incentives thus function not only as an output of formative factors but also as a key lever for elevating employee productivity.

When evaluating indirect, or mediated, effects, the interplay between Training and Incentives yields an indirect effect of 0.115 (0.322 × 0.359), which, combined with the direct effect of 0.197, produces a total effect of 0.312. Approximately 37% of Training's overall impact on Performance is transmitted through Incentives, indicating **partial mediation** and reflecting that training programs enhance performance both by skill development and by unlocking reward structures. Similarly, Discipline's indirect effect via Incentives is 0.170 (0.475 × 0.359), and when added to its direct effect of 0.504 yields a total effect of 0.674—about 25% of Discipline's overall influence on Performance operates through incentive pathways, again demonstrating **partial mediation** but underscoring that discipline primarily drives performance directly.

Assessing the model's explanatory power, Sub-Structure 1 (Incentives) achieves an R of 0.703 and R^2 of 0.494 (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.467$), indicating that nearly half of the variability in incentives is explained by Training and Discipline, with an ANOVA of $F(2, 38) = 18.547$ ($p < 0.001$) and a Durbin–Watson statistic of approximately 1.92 confirming statistical significance and no autocorrelation. Sub-Structure 2 (Performance) delivers an even higher R of 0.919 and R^2 of 0.845 (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.833$), meaning that 84.5% of the variability in employee performance is captured by the combined effects of Training, Discipline, and Incentives, supported by $F(3, 37) = 67.375$ ($p < 0.001$) and a Durbin–Watson near 1.93. Altogether, the Overall Structural Model attains an Rm^2

5. Hypothesis Analysis Results

Hypothesis	Path	β	p-value	Decision
H1	Training → Incentives	0.322	< 0.001*	Accepted
H2	Discipline → Incentives	0.475	< 0.001*	Accepted
H3	Training → Performance (direct)	0.197	0.002*	Accepted
H4	Discipline → Performance (direct)	0.504	< 0.001*	Accepted
H5	Incentives → Performance	0.359	0.001*	Accepted

*Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Interpretation:

All five hypothesized relationships are supported:

1. **H1 (Training → Incentives):**
   A medium-sized effect ($\beta = 0.322$) with $p < 0.001$ indicates that enhanced training programs significantly boost employees' engagement with incentive schemes. This confirms that skills development is a key driver of reward uptake.
2. **H2 (Discipline → Incentives):**
   The strongest effect on incentives ($\beta = 0.475$, $p < 0.001$) demonstrates that work discipline is the dominant antecedent of incentive mechanisms, underscoring the importance of behavioral norms in reward systems.
3. **H3 (Training → Performance):**
   Training's direct effect on performance ($\beta = 0.197$, $p = 0.002$) shows that upskilling contributes to better job outcomes independently of incentives, albeit to a lesser extent than discipline.
4. **H4 (Discipline → Performance):**
   The largest direct path in the model ($\beta = 0.504$, $p < 0.001$) confirms that disciplined work behavior is the single most powerful predictor of performance in this context.
5. **H5 (Incentives → Performance):**
   Incentives themselves significantly improve performance ($\beta = 0.359$, $p = 0.001$), validating the mediating role of reward structures in translating training and discipline into productivity gains.

All five hypotheses were supported, revealing a coherent picture in which both training and discipline play vital roles in shaping employees' incentive engagement and performance outcomes. Specifically, enhanced training programs exert a moderate yet significant effect on incentive uptake and directly improve job performance, while disciplined work behavior emerges as the strongest driver of both incentives and performance. Moreover, the positive influence of incentives on performance confirms that reward systems effectively translate skill development and behavioral norms into productivity gains. Together, these findings underscore that disciplined adherence to organizational standards, bolstered by targeted training, not only enhances employees' receptivity to incentives but also drives superior performance in a complementary and mutually reinforcing manner.

Analysis/Discussion

The present study's findings illuminate the dual pathways through which human-resource interventions translate into enhanced employee motivation and performance. Consistent with expectancy-theory assertions that skill-development fosters reward expectation, our results demonstrate that comprehensive training programs exert a moderate, yet statistically significant, effect on incentive uptake and

also contribute directly to performance improvements. Equally, and in line with behavioral-norm frameworks, work discipline emerged as the most potent antecedent of both incentives and performance, underscoring the critical role of self-regulatory behaviors in public-sector contexts. The significant path from incentives to performance further validates the mediating function of reward structures in converting both skill-based and behavioral inputs into tangible productivity gains, thereby confirming a complementary and reinforcing network of relationships.

From a practical standpoint, these results suggest that policymakers and HR practitioners in educational and healthcare institutions should prioritize not only the provision of technical upskilling but also the cultivation of disciplined work cultures to maximize the effectiveness of incentive schemes. Partial mediation by incentives indicates that training and discipline independently bolster performance, yet their full potential is realized when integrated with robust reward mechanisms. Nevertheless, the cross-sectional nature of our data and reliance on self-report measures may introduce common-method bias, and future research would benefit from longitudinal designs and multi-source performance indicators. Moreover, exploring contextual moderators—such as organizational climate or leadership style—could further refine our understanding of when and how these antecedents most powerfully interact. By addressing these avenues, subsequent studies can build upon our high-explanatory-power model and offer even more nuanced guidance for strengthening workforce productivity in Scopus-level scholarship.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to analyze the influence of training and work discipline on employee performance, with incentives as a mediating variable among HR staff at Dr. Saiful Anwar Regional Public Hospital, East Java. The findings confirm that training and work discipline both have direct and significant effects on employee performance. Moreover, incentives play a critical mediating role, strengthening the impact of training and discipline on performance outcomes. The research supports existing theories, including Vroom's Expectancy Theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, and highlights the importance of aligning employee development efforts with effective reward systems. These results underscore the value of integrating training, discipline, and incentives as a strategic approach to improving performance in public healthcare institutions.

Recommendation

Based on the findings, several recommendations can be proposed:

1. **Enhance the quality and relevance of training programs** by aligning them with actual job requirements and following up with performance evaluations to ensure effective application in the workplace.

2. **Strengthen work discipline** through clear policies, consistent enforcement, and leadership that models disciplined behavior to foster a culture of accountability and professionalism.
3. **Develop a transparent and fair incentive system** that reflects individual and team performance, combining financial rewards with recognition and career advancement opportunities to sustain motivation.
4. **Integrate training, discipline, and incentive policies** into a cohesive human resource strategy that supports long-term organizational goals, especially in service-driven sectors like healthcare.
5. **Encourage continuous feedback and employee engagement**, ensuring that HR practices remain responsive to employee needs and organizational changes.

By implementing these recommendations, the hospital can optimize its human resource management practices and achieve higher levels of employee performance, service quality, and institutional efficiency.

REFERENCES

Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377901600110

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25* (9th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.

Wong, K. K. K. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using SmartPLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24, 1–32.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Sage Publications.