

Al-Kayyal Rua<sup>1</sup>

# Transformational Leadership and Employee Motivation in Jordan: the Influence of age, Educational Attainment and Work Experience

## SUMMARY

The study titled „Transformational Leadership and Employee Motivation in Jordan: The Influence of Age, Educational Attainment and Work Experience” examines how these demographic factors impact motivation in the context of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership, which includes inspiring employees through a compelling vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support, is seen as key to boosting motivation. The study conducted in private Jordanian organizations used quantitative methods, including surveys and ANOVA tests, to explore whether age, education, and experience significantly affect employee motivation. The findings revealed no significant differences in motivation levels across these demographic groups under transformational leadership, suggesting that other factors may play a larger role in influencing motivation in Jordan’s workplaces.

**Keywords:** *transformational leadership, employee motivation, age, educational attainment, work experience*

**Jel Code:** M50, M54

## INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership is crucial for organizational success, as leaders influence team motivation, engagement, and productivity, impacting overall performance (Meliala et al., 2023). Inspiring leaders enhance individual and organizational outcomes, providing a competitive edge (Putra et al., 2019). Leadership styles vary from transactional, focused on routine tasks, to transformational, emphasizing vision and motivation (Al Khajeh, 2018). Motivation, driven by internal or external factors, fulfills employees’ needs for self-actualization and esteem, leading to greater commitment (Luthans, 2017). Transformational leadership aligns employee goals with organizational objectives, fostering trust, intellectual stimulation, and personal growth (Ghasabeh et al., 2015; Nguyen et al., 2017). Conversely, lack of support from leaders can decrease satisfaction and increase stress (Rachmah et al., 2022). Understanding the role of leadership in motivation is essential for organizational excellence, involving complex dynamics and diverse personalities

(Cekmecelioglu et al., 2023). Transformational leadership effectively motivates employees by creating a valued environment (Udin, 2023). However, individual traits like gender and personality influence how leadership styles are received, indicating that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be effective (Fjendbo, 2020).

## OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS

This study aims to explore how factors such as age, educational attainment, and years of work experience affect employee motivation within the context of transformational leadership in Jordan. The research seeks to offer empirical support for the following hypotheses:

### 1. Age and motivation:

– H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different age groups in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

– H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): Motivation levels differ significantly among different age groups in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

### 2. Level of Education and Motivation:

– H0: There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different educational levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

– H1: Motivation levels differ significantly among different educational levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

### 3. Level of Experience and Motivation:

– H0: There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different experience levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

– H1: Motivation levels differ significantly among different experience levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Transformational Leadership*

Leadership involves inspiring and engaging followers by aligning styles with employee needs and goals (Romli et al., 2022). A leader’s success depends on their ability to adapt to the work environment, which directly affects performance (Karyaningsih et al., 2021). Effective leadership fosters teamwork, commitment, and knowledge sharing, driving organ-

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, Hungarian University of Agricultural and Life Sciences Doctoral School of Economics and Regional Sciences

izational progress (Inang, 2021). Transformational leadership, which empowers and inspires employees, is particularly effective in driving change (Khan et al., 2019; Maskurochman, 2020). Introduced by James MacGregor Burns in the 1970s, this approach shifted focus from traditional models to enhancing motivation and performance (Eaton et al., 2024). Bernard Bass later expanded the theory, defining four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1997). This style fosters innovation, job satisfaction, and productivity by addressing individual needs and reducing turnover (Sukmawati et al., 2023; Marbaniang, 2023). Leaders also act as role models, promoting creative problem-solving and innovation (Bastari et al., 2020). Transformational leadership includes four key dimensions: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration.

### *Employee Motivation*

High job performance is crucial for organizational success and improving service quality requires supporting employee development and coaching (Piedade et al., 2019). Motivation, a key psychological factor, drives performance by influencing attitudes and behavior (Sukmawati et al., 2023). It addresses unmet needs, like self-actualization and esteem, fostering commitment and improved performance (Luthans, 2017). To enhance motivation, leaders must address needs from basic to self-actualization, following Maslow's hierarchy (Masiyono, 2022). While early theories, such as Frederick Taylor's, focused on financial rewards, modern approaches like Maslow's and Herzberg's emphasize intrinsic factors like personal growth and job satisfaction (Dupe et al., 2020). Leadership plays a key role by providing autonomy and empowerment, boosting commitment, productivity, and retention (Khan, Din, & Rehan, 2019). Factors such as leadership, work conditions, and rewards, especially transformational leadership, align with employees' values, enhancing motivation and job satisfaction (Fareed & Su, 2022; Udin et al., 2023).

### *Employee Motivation and Demographics*

Previous research has rarely examined the impact of demographic variables such as age, education, and experience on workplace motivation. Damci (2016) found that these factors shape work motivation, with variances in motivators based on attributes like age and education. Ng and Feldman (2010) noted that older employees tend to exhibit higher intrinsic motivation, while Kanfer and Ackerman (2004) observed that motivational priorities shift with age, focusing on job meaningfulness. Rowold (2011) discovered that educational level affects motivational responses to leadership, and Heijden and Bakker (2011) linked higher education to increased motivation for growth. Gaki et al. (2012) found that employees with postgraduate degrees are generally more motivated. However, research on the interaction between these factors and transformational leadership in Jordan is limited. Understanding motivation among Jordanian employees is crucial for organizational success, as Shurab et al. (2018) found that Jordanian construction managers are motivated by compensation and personal development. Do-

bre et al. (2017) confirmed Herzberg's theory in Jordan, emphasizing the need for a balance of financial and non-financial incentives to enhance motivation, while Ann et al. (2023) highlighted that job satisfaction drives motivation among Jordanian hotel staff, linking dissatisfaction to turnover intention, thereby supporting Herzberg's view that intrinsic factors are key to motivation.

## MATERIAL AND METHOD

### *Research Design*

This study utilizes a quantitative methodology to examine how demographic factors—age, education level, work experience, and gender—affect employee motivation under transformational leadership in Jordan. The goal is to assess the influence of these variables on motivation levels.

### *Participants*

The study sample included employees from diverse private organizations across various industries in Jordan. A convenience sampling method was used to ensure a representative group. Participants were required to be currently employed and have direct experience working with a transformational leader.

### *Data Collection*

Data were collected through a cross-sectional survey using an online questionnaire distributed via email and social media to reach a broad audience. The questionnaire gathered demographic information and measured motivation levels using a 1-5 Likert scale across the four dimensions of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Each dimension was assessed through targeted questions to evaluate its impact on participants' motivation.

### *Data Analysis*

The data were analyzed using SPSS software, beginning with descriptive statistics to summarize participants' demographic profiles and motivation levels. ANOVA was conducted to identify significant differences in motivation among various demographic groups. Post-hoc analyses, including the Bonferroni correction, were then performed to clarify any significant findings.

## RESULTS

### *Descriptive Analysis*

The descriptive analysis details the participants' demographic attributes, such as their age, education level, and years of experience. It provides a comprehensive overview of these characteristics to understand their distribution within the study sample.

### *Age Distribution*

The age distribution among the 104 respondents is as follows:

- **0-29 years old:** This group has the highest number, with 51 respondents, representing 49% of the total sample.
- **30-39 years old:** The second-largest group, with 43 respondents, accounts for 41.3% of the sample.
- **40-49 years old:** This age bracket has one of the smallest rep-

representations, with 5 respondents, making up 4.8% of the total.

- **50 years old and above:** Similarly, this group also has a small representation, with 5 respondents, constituting 4.8% of the sample.

Overall, these figures show that a significant majority of respondents are relatively young, with almost 90% of the participants being under 40 years old, as detailed in Table 1.

**Gender**

The gender distribution of the respondents is quite balanced:

- **Male:** There are 53 male respondents, which constitutes 51% of the total sample.
- **Female:** There are 51 female respondents, representing 49% of the sample.

The small predominance of male respondents suggests that the gender distribution is nearly equal, with males making up a marginally larger segment of the sample, as detailed in Table 2.

**Education Level**

The educational background of the respondents shows considerable diversity:

- **Bachelor’s Degree:** The majority, 68.3% of the respondents, hold a bachelor’s degree, indicating a strong presence of individuals with undergraduate education.
- **Master’s Degree:** A significant 29% of respondents have earned a master’s degree, highlighting a considerable portion with advanced academic qualifications.
- **High School Graduates:** Those with only a high school diploma make up a small but notable 1.9% of the sample.
- **Ph.D. or Higher:** A very small fraction, 1.9%, have achieved a Ph.D. or higher, reflecting a limited number of respondents with the highest level of academic credentials.

Overall, the data demonstrates a highly educated respondent group, with a prominent concentration holding bachelor’s and master’s degrees, as illustrated in Table 3.

**Work Experience**

Table 4 displays the distribution of participants by their level of work experience. Out of the 104 participants:

- **Less than 1 year:** 2.9% of respondents fall into this category.
- **1-4 years:** 18.3% of respondents have this amount of experience.
- **5-10 years:** The majority, 65.4%, report having experience within this range.
- **11 years or more:** 13.5% of participants have this level of experience.

These results indicate that most participants have intermediate levels of experience, with a substantial portion having between 5 and 10 years of experience.

**Table 1.**

Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-29 years old	51	49.0	49.0	49.0
	30-39 years old	43	41.3	41.3	90.4
	40-49 years old	5	4.8	4.8	95.2
	50 years old and above	5	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Source: authors’ own editing, 2024

**Table 2.**

Biological Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	51	49.0	49.0	49.0
	Male	53	51.0	51.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Source: authors’ own editing, 2024

**Table 3.**

Education Level					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school	2	1.9	1.9	1.9
	Bachelor’s Degree	71	68.3	68.3	70.2
	Master’s Degree	29	27.9	27.9	98.1
	Ph.D or higher	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Source: authors’ own editing, 2024

**Table 4.**

Work Experience					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
	1-4 years	19	18.3	18.3	21.2
	5-10 years	68	65.4	65.4	86.5
	11 years and above	14	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Source: authors’ own editing, 2024

**Hypothesis testing**

*Age and motivation*

Hypothesis:

- H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different age groups in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.
- H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): Motivation levels differ significantly among different age groups in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

The results of the ANOVA test and the subsequent Bonferroni correction indicate that age does not significantly im-

pact motivation levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan. The ANOVA analysis produced a significance value (Sig) of 0.975, which is well above the conventional alpha level of 0.05, suggesting no statistically significant differences in motivation across different age groups. Furthermore, the Bonferroni post-hoc test results, with all age group comparisons showing a significance value of 1.00, further support this finding. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis (H0), concluding that age does not influence motivation levels when transformational leadership is present in the Jordanian context as described in table 5 and table 6.

*Level of Education and Motivation*

Hypothesis:

- H0: There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different educational levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.
- H1: Motivation levels differ significantly among different educational levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

The analysis of the effect of educational level on motivation in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan indicates that educational level does not significantly affect motivation. The ANOVA results yielded a significance value (Sig) of 0.889, which is well above the conventional alpha level of 0.05, suggesting no statistically significant differences in motivation among different educational levels. Additionally, the Bonferroni post-hoc test results, with all comparisons showing a significance value of 1.00, further support this finding. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis (H0), concluding that educational level does not influence motivation levels when transformational leadership is present in the Jordanian context. This outcome aligns with the results for age, where the ANOVA (Sig 0.975) and Bonferroni test (Sig 1.00) also indicated no significant differences across age groups, reinforcing the conclusion that neither age nor educational level significantly impacts motivation under transformational leadership in Jordan as shown in Table 7 and Table 8.

*Level of Experience and Motivation*

Hypothesis:

- H0: There is no significant difference in motivation levels among different experience levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.
- H1: Motivation levels differ significantly among different experience levels in the presence of transformational leadership in Jordan.

The analysis of the effect of experience level on motivation, when assessed alongside the effects of age and level of educa-

**Table 5.**

ANOVA					
MotivationAvr					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.227	3	.076	.071	.975
Within Groups	106.243	100	1.062		
Total	106.471	103			

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

**Table 6.**

Multiple Comparisons				
Dependent Variable: MotivationAvr				
Bonferroni				
(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
20-29 years old	30-39 years old	-.037847697218422	.213400577489519	1.000
	40-49 years old	-.071568627450980	.483030887490088	1.000
	50 years old and above	-.214425770308123	.483030887490088	1.000
30-39 years old	20-29 years old	.037847697218422	.213400577489519	1.000
	40-49 years old	-.033720930232558	.487026248245326	1.000
	50 years old and above	-.176578073089701	.487026248245326	1.000
40-49 years old	20-29 years old	.071568627450980	.483030887490088	1.000
	30-39 years old	.033720930232558	.487026248245326	1.000
	50 years old and above	-.142857142857143	.651899991008222	1.000
50 years old and above	20-29 years old	.214425770308123	.483030887490088	1.000
	30-39 years old	.176578073089701	.487026248245326	1.000
	40-49 years old	.142857142857143	.651899991008222	1.000

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

**Table 7.**

ANOVA					
MotivationAvr					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.670	3	.223	.211	.889
Within Groups	105.801	100	1.058		
Total	106.471	103			

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

tion, shows a consistent pattern. For experience level, the ANOVA results yielded a significance value (Sig) of 0.535, indicating no significant differences in motivation levels across different experience levels. The Bonferroni post-hoc tests further confirmed this finding, with all comparisons yielding significance values close to 1.00. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis



**Table 8.**

(I) Education Level	(J) EducationLevel	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
High school	Bachelor's Degree	-.256161971830986	.737499836286492	1.000
	Master's Degree	-.397475369458129	.751989056581197	1.000
	Ph.D or higher	-.500000000000000	1.028595619320373	1.000
Bachelor's Degree	High school	.256161971830986	.737499836286492	1.000
	Master's Degree	-.141313397627143	.226681718838150	1.000
	Ph.D or higher	-.243838028169014	.737499836286492	1.000
Master's Degree	High school	.397475369458129	.751989056581197	1.000
	Bachelor's Degree	.141313397627143	.226681718838150	1.000
	Ph.D or higher	-.102524630541871	.751989056581197	1.000
Ph.D or higher	High school	.500000000000000	1.028595619320373	1.000
	Bachelor's Degree	.243838028169014	.737499836286492	1.000
	Master's Degree	.102524630541871	.751989056581197	1.000

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

**Table 9.**

ANOVA					
MotivationAvr					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.290	3	.763	.733	.535
Within Groups	104.181	100	1.042		
Total	106.471	103			

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

**Table 10.**

(I) Work Experience	(J) Work Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than 1 year	1-4 years	.732456140350878	.634115145638080	1.000
	5-10 years	.865196078431373	.602155010392119	.923
	11 years and above	.812074829931973	.649372703777339	1.000
1-4 years	Less than 1 year	-.732456140350878	.634115145638080	1.000
	5-10 years	.132739938080495	.264863786351130	1.000
	11 years and above	.079618689581095	.359509495272400	1.000
5-10 years	Less than 1 year	-.865196078431373	.602155010392119	.923
	1-4 years	-.132739938080495	.264863786351130	1.000
	11 years and above	-.053121248499400	.299559202502184	1.000
11 years and above	Less than 1 year	-.812074829931973	.649372703777339	1.000
	1-4 years	-.079618689581095	.359509495272400	1.000
	5-10 years	.053121248499400	.299559202502184	1.000

Source: authors' own editing, 2024

(H0) for experience level, concluding that experience level does not significantly influence motivation levels in the presence of transformational leadership as shown in Table 9 and Table 10.

Overall, all three variables—age, level of education, and experience level—show no significant impact on motivation when transformational leadership is present in Jordan. Consequently, we accept the null hypothesis (H0) for each variable, concluding that neither age, educational level, nor experience level significantly influences motivation levels in the context of transformational leadership.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study examined how demographic factors—age, educational attainment, and work experience—impact employee motivation in private organizations across Jordan within the framework of transformational leadership. Using ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc tests, we found no significant differences in motivation levels across various demographics, challenging some prior studies. Our findings indicate that demographic factors alone may not strongly predict motivation under transformational leadership, suggesting other,

more complex influences at play. The results highlight the need for a deeper understanding of motivational dynamics in the workplace. Several limitations exist in our research. The cross-sectional design limits causal conclusions, and self-reported data may introduce response bias, affecting validity. Additionally, focusing solely on private organizations in Jordan may limit generalizability, as previous research indicates that factors like job position and salary also significantly influence motivation. The convenience sampling method used may not accurately represent the broader employee population. Future research should explore a wider range of variables and their interactions to provide a more comprehensive understanding of motivation. For instance, studies suggest that factors such as confidence and contextual support may be better predictors. In summary, while demographic factors like age, education, and experience are relevant, they do not fully explain the complexities of workplace motivation. Other factors, including communication, compensation, employee development, and organizational culture, also play crucial roles. A holistic, context-sensitive approach is essential for effectively fostering motivation. This study underscores the need for further research to unravel the multifaceted nature of motivation and develop strategies to address its diverse influences.

#### REFERENCES

- AL KHAJEH, E. H. (2018): Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance. In: *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2018, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849>
- ANN, S. – Hallab, ZAA. – CHOI, H. – AL MAJTHOUB, U. (2023): Motivating Housekeeping Staff in The Lodging Industry In Jordan. *Tourism And Hospitality Management-Croatia*, 29(1), 103-118. <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.29.1.9>
- BASKORO, B. D. – Sudarmadji, S. – Suherman, S. – Yani, A. & Simanjuntak, R. (2021): Transformational leadership, knowledge management, work motivation, and employee performance among construction employees in Jakarta. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(2), 214. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i2.2339>
- BASS, B. M. (1997): Does the Transactional Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries? In: *American Psychologist*, 52 (2), 130-139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.52.2.130>
- BASTARI, A. – HAMIDAH, & ALI, H. (2020): Determinant service performance through motivation analysis and transformational leadership. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(04), 1355–1372. <https://doi.org/10.37200/ijpr/v24i4/pr201108>
- CEKMECELIOGLU, H. G. – OZCAN, M. & OZBAG, G. K. (2023): Transformational Leadership Behaviors and the Intrinsic Motivation of Employees in Turkey: The Role of Psychological Empowerment and Demographics. In: *ASR Chiang Mai University Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.12982/CMUJASR.2023.018>
- DAMCI, A (2016): Impact of Personal Demographics on Civil Engineers' Motivators: Case Study of Turkey. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 32(2). DOI: 10.1061/(asce)me.1943-5479.0000406
- DAYRIT, R (2021): Nurses' Work Motivation and their Demographics: Basis for Human Resource Management. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 8(1), 170–185. DOI: 10.14738/assrj.81.9575
- DOBRE, I. – DAVIDESCU, AA. – EID, MTI. (2017): Key Factors of Health Employee Motivation In Jordan. Evidence From Dual-Factor Theory Based on Structural Equation Models. *Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies And Research*, 51(2), 39-54.
- DUPE, F. – OEDJOE, M. – TAMUNU, L. & NURSALAM. (2020): The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employee Motivation, Compensation, and Employee Performance of the Kupang District Water Supply Company. In: *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12 (5). <https://doi.org/10.7176/ejbm/12-5-08>
- EATON, L. – BRIDGMAN, T. & CUMMINGS, S. (2024): Advancing the Democratization of Work: A New Intellectual History of Transformational Leadership Theory. In: *Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150241232705>
- FAREED, M. Z. & SU, Q. (2022): Transformational leadership and project success: A mediating role of public service motivation. *Administration & Society*, 54(4), 690–713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00953997211040466>
- FJENDBO, T. H. (2020): Leading Employees of Different Genders: The Importance of Gender for the Leadership-Motivation Relationship. In: *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41 (4), 651-673. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x20925520>
- GAKI, E. – KONTODIMOPOULOS, N. – NIAKAS, D. (2012): Investigating demographic, work-related and job satisfaction variables as predictors of motivation in Greek nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(3), 483–490. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01413.x
- GHASABEH, M. S. – SOOSAY, C. & REAICHE, C. (2015): The Emerging Role of Transformational Leadership. In: *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 49 (6), 459-467. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2015.0090>
- HANSON, J (2017): Exploring Relationships Between K–12 Music Educators' Demographics, Perceptions of Intrapreneuring, and Motivation at Work. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 65(3), 309–327. DOI: 10.1177/0022429417722985
- HARDJADINATA, R. – GINTING, G. & PURNOMO, R. (2022): The impact of organizational culture and transformational leadership style on work motivation to enhance employee performance at PT Kwarsa Indah Murni. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JURKAMI)*, 7(3), 325–338. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jpe.v7i3.1998>
- HEIJDEN, B. – BAKKER, AB. (2011): Toward a Mediation Model of Employability Enhancement: A Study of Employee-Supervisor Pairs in the Building Sector. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 59(3), 232–248. DOI: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2011.tb00066.x
- INANG, N. I. (2021): Effect of Leadership and Work Motivation on Employee Performance Through Knowledge Sharing Behaviour. In: *Archives of Business Research*, 9 (11), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.911.11067>
- KANFER, R. – ACKERMAN, PL. (2004): Aging, Adult Development, and Work Motivation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(3). DOI: 10.2307/20159053

- KARYANINGSIH, P. D. – Syania FURI, A. – CAHYANINGSIH, N. & Anna, P. (2021): The Effect of Transformational Leadership and Work Motivation on Employee Job Satisfaction. In: SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3875056>
- KHAN, M. – DIN, S. & REHAN, M. (2019): An Investigation on the Meditating Role of Motivation in Connecting Transformational Leadership and Employees Commitment. In: International Transaction Journal of Engineering Management & Applied Sciences & Technologies. <https://doi.org/10.14456/ITJEMAST.2019.192>
- LUTHANS, F. (2017): Organizational behavior: Organizational contexts (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- MARBANIANG, C. (2023): Effectiveness of Transformational Leadership in the Classroom. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 12(9), 372–374. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr2383123223>
- MASIYONO, M. & Mei Nur WIDIGDO, A. (2022): The importance of organizational culture as well as transformational leadership towards employee performance at PT. KHMI via motivation as a mediation variable. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, 3(4), 419–429. <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v3i4.1437>
- MASKUROCHMAN, A. – NUGROHO, M. & RIYADI, S. (2020): The Influence of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Support, and Job Satisfaction on Motivation and Employee Performance. In: *Jmm17*, 7 (01). <https://doi.org/10.30996/jmm17.v7i01.3542>
- MELIALA, Y. – HAMIDAH, S. & SAPARUDDIN, M. (2023): The Influence of Organizational Culture and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) Mediated Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. In: *Quality – Access to Success*, 24 (195). <https://doi.org/10.47750/qas/24.195.28>
- MUKLIS, M. – NUGROHO, R. & RIYADI, S. (2022): Transformational leadership, work motivation on job satisfaction, employee performance at National Amil Zakat Institution. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 1(7), 722–736. <https://doi.org/10.55324/ijoms.v1i7.139>
- NG, T. – FELDMAN, DC. (2010): The Relationships of Age with Job Attitudes: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 677–718. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01184.x
- NGUYEN, T. V. – MIA, L. – WINATA, L. & CHONG, V. K. (2017): Effect of Transformational-Leadership Style and Management Control System on Managerial Performance. In: *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 202-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.018>
- PIEDADE, S. D. R. – WARDANA, I. M. – RIANA, G. & DEWI, I. G. A. M. (2019): The role of motivation: The effect of transformational leadership on employee performance. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(6), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n6.803>
- PUTRA, G. N. S. & DEWI, I. G. A. M. (2019): Effect of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture on Employee Performance Mediated by Job Motivation. In: *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6 (6), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n6.778>
- RACHMAH, A. – SUDIRO, A. & JUWITA, H. (2022): The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction. In: *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 11, 102-112. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i8.2134>
- ROMLI, J. I. & INDRAWATI, R. (2022): The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style and Compensation on Employee Performance with Employee Motivation as Intervening Variable. In: *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 7 (5), 208-214. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.5.1584>
- ROWOLD, J (2011): Relationship between leadership behaviors and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(6), 628–647. DOI: 10.1108/01437731111161094
- SHURRAB, M. – ABBASI, G. – AL KHAZALEH, R. (2018): Evaluating the effect of motivational dimensions on the construction project managers in Jordan. *ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION AND ARCHITECTURAL MANAGEMENT*, 25(3), 412-424. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-01-2017-0001>
- SUKMAWATI, M. – MARNIS, & PUTRO, T. S. (2023): The effect of transformational leadership and transactional leadership on work motivation and employee engagement (medical) employee at Zainab childhood hospital Pekanbaru. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (122), 117-130. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.06.122.20>
- UDIN, U. (2023): A Mediation-Moderation Model of Transformational Leadership and Intrinsic Work Motivation for Nurturing Employee Performance. In: *Journal of Social Economics Research*, 10 (2), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.18488/35.v102.3321>