
THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP STYLE AND WORKLOAD IN IMPROVING EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

Farah Fadillah Amru¹

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Cirebon, Indonesia
farahfadillah32@gmail.com

Maya²

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Cirebon, Indonesia
Ditamaya90@gmail.com

Noveria Susijawati³

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Cirebon, Indonesia
noveriasusijawati71@gmail.com



Abstract

Employee labor productivity is a key component of organizational success, especially in manufacturing. This study aims to analyze the impact of leadership style and workload on employee labor productivity at PT Balagi. The research method used is quantitative with a survey approach by distributing questionnaires to 134. The results of multiple regression analysis show that leadership style and workload have a significant effect on employee productivity. Effective leadership styles, especially transformational and participative leadership, can increase employee participation and productivity. Conversely, high workloads can reduce work efficiency if not managed properly. This realization suggests that businesses must optimize management strategies and workload management to improve employee productivity and good attendance.

Keywords: Leadership Style, Workload, Employee Productivity

INTRODUCTION

Employee productivity is a crucial aspect in human resource management and organizational operations (Mutegi et al., 2023). In the context of increasingly competitive global competition, increasing productivity is one of the main strategies for achieving competitive advantage (Vuong & Nguyen, 2022). Research conducted in India by (Vadrare & Katti, 2019) shows that work productivity has an impact on individual performance and overall organizational success. In line with that (Abane et al., 2022) emphasizes that companies that are able to increase employee productivity will be more adaptive to change and have stronger competitiveness. In Indonesia itself, employee work productivity is considered the key to organizational success in various industrial sectors (Ouanhlee, 2024).

Employee productivity can be influenced by two significant factors, namely leadership style and workload.(Bharthvajan & Fabiyola Kavitha, 2019). Leadership style plays a role in creating a work climate that supports and motivates employees to achieve their best performance.(Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020). Effective leaders are able to build a work environment that is inspiring, collaborative, and oriented towards human resource development.(Shan et al., 2022). Transformational leadership style, for example, has been shown to motivate employees to exceed expectations by providing a clear vision, internal motivation, and recognition for contributions.(Klasmeier & Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2024).

Manufacturing sector, as happened at PT Balagi Rattan, participative leadership style increases employee involvement in the decision-making process and fosters a sense of ownership towards the company's goals (Ariussanto et al., 2020). Through effective communication and recognition of achievements, this leadership style is believed to increase employee productivity (Maidin et al., 2024).

Employee workload is one of the important factors that affect productivity and job satisfaction. A balanced workload allows employees to work optimally without experiencing excessive pressure.(Zydziumaite et al., 2020). The results of interviews with HRD PT Balagi Rattan revealed that challenges such as uneven division of tasks, high production targets, and tight work schedules can disrupt work-life balance and reduce employee morale. This is in line with Niere's findings(Niere (Mecon) et al., 2024), which states that excessive work pressure can cause stress and reduce job satisfaction. Therefore, strategies such as implementing flexible work schedules, fair task distribution, and the use of technology to automate repetitive work are needed to support employee well-being (Rožman et al., 2023).

PT Balagi Rattan has implemented various initiatives, including sustainable development and knowledge sharing programs, to increase productivity (Oktafiany et al., 2023). However, the extent to which leadership style and workload contribute to productivity and job satisfaction in these companies has not been studied empirically.(Abd et al., 2023). Most previous studies still focus on one aspect, such as productivity alone, without simultaneously linking it to job satisfaction as a variable that is interrelated and influences organizational performance as a whole (Performance, 2024). Therefore, this study aims to answer the following questions: 1. How does leadership style affect employee productivity and workload at PT Balagi Rattan, 2. How does workload affect employee productivity and workload at PT Balagi Rattan. In addition, this study also aims to provide recommendations for managerial strategies in managing leadership style and workload in order to improve employee productivity and welfare in the company.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Employee Productivity

Employee work productivity is a crucial element in determining the success of an organization, especially amidst increasingly tight global competition.(Top et al., 2020). High levels of productivity enable organizations to increase efficiency, optimize resource use, and achieve business targets effectively.(Hana & Dewi, 2020).

Productivity impacts employee well-being and customer satisfaction. To achieve this, organizations need to manage human resources optimally, utilize supporting technology, and create a conducive work environment. The employee productivity indicators in this study refer to (Soetrisno, 2019): Ability, Work spirit, Self-development, Quality and Efficiency.

Leadership Style

Leadership style is one of the main factors that influence employee productivity. According to(Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020), the leadership style applied by the leader has a big impact on motivation and employee performance. Effective leaders can create a positive work environment, encourage participation, and provide inspiration of employees to give their best performance(Jundulloh & Nasution, 2024).

Transformational leadership is often considered the most effective leadership style in increasing employee productivity (Kelly & Hearld, 2020). According to(Shan et al., 2022), disclosure that transformational leaders are able to provide a clear vision, inspire employees, and provide recognition for their contributions. Thus, employees feel more motivated and encouraged to achieve higher targets. In addition,Yu & Xiang, (2025), emphasize that transformational leadership style not only improves performance but also spurs creativity and innovation.

Research in Nigeria conducted by (Chukwunonso, 2023), found that participative leadership style, which involves employees in decision making, can increase the sense of ownership and involvement in organizational goals. Employees who feel involved tend to have a sense of ownership in the company's goals, which ultimately leads to better engagement and performance. The leadership style indicators in this study refer to (riinawati, 2019), namely authoritarian, pseudo democratic, free, democratic, and charismatic.

The interaction between leadership style and workload plays a significant role in determining employee productivity. Leaders who adopt supportive leadership styles, such as transformational or participative leadership styles, can help alleviate the stress caused by high workloads.(Chen et al., 2021). Leaders who care about employee well-being are also more likely to take necessary steps, such as redistributing tasks or setting more flexible schedules, to ensure productivity is maintained. Conversely, leadership that is less sensitive to employee workload can worsen the situation, ultimately decreasing employee performance. An authoritarian or laissez-faire leadership style, which tends to pay little attention to workload management, can lead to decreased productivity.(Vuong & Nguyen, 2022). According to(Vuong & Nguyen, 2022)states that an authoritarian or laissez-faire leadership style, which tends not to pay attention to workload management, can lead to decreased productivity. Therefore, the hypothesis proposed in this study is:

H1: The better the leadership style, the higher the employee productivity.

Workload

Workload is another significant factor in influencing employee productivity (Susijawati et al., 2023). A well-managed workload allows employees to complete tasks efficiently without excessive stress (Zydzianaite et al., 2020). On the other hand, an unbalanced workload can cause stress, fatigue, and decreased employee productivity.

Workload imbalances, such as targets that are too high or unfair distribution of tasks, can disrupt the balance between employees' work and personal lives, which ultimately affects their productivity (Niere et al., 2024). Therefore, management needs to ensure that there is a fair division of tasks and the implementation of strategies that support employee welfare, such as flexibility in work schedules. The workload indicators in this study refer to (Manuaba, 2020), namely work attitude, work organization, work environment, physical condition, and psychological well-being.

Rożman et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of using technology and automation to reduce repetitive workloads, which are often the main cause of employee burnout. This can help reduce mental and physical burden, so that employees can focus on more valuable tasks. Therefore, the hypothesis proposed in this study is:

H2: The lower the workload, the higher employee productivity.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method to measure the relationship between leadership style (X1), workload (X2), and employee productivity (Y) at PT. Balagi. According to (Sugiono & Rachmawati, 2019) Survey research is conducted using a questionnaire as a data collection tool that is carried out on large and small populations. The measurement scale in this study uses a Likert scale. The indicator is then used as a starting point for compiling instrument items that can be in the form of statements or questions. This instrument is designed to measure three main variables in the study, namely leadership style, workload, and employee productivity, with a Likert scale of 1-5 from (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), which includes indicators of each variable.

The population of the study was all employees at PT. Balagi Rattan totaling 134. This technique was used because the population was relatively small and all members of the population were considered to have homogeneous characteristics. The data collection technique in this study used a Likert scale-based questionnaire compiled based on indicators of leadership style variables, workload, and employee productivity. The analysis model used was multiple linear regression with the help of SPSS software. Data processing was carried out through several stages, namely validity testing to measure the accuracy of items in representing variables, reliability testing to test the consistency of the instrument, and classical assumption testing which included normality testing to see data distribution, multicollinearity testing to ensure there was no high linear relationship between independent variables, and heteroscedasticity testing to test the similarity of residual variances. After the classical assumptions were met, a regression test was carried out consisting of an F test to test the significance of the model simultaneously, and a t test to test the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable partially.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PT. Balagi Rattan is a company that specializes in manufacturing. The population in this study is PT. Balagi Rattan. With the number of samples obtained, as many as 134 respondents.

Respondent characteristics based on gender, age, education, and length of service can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1.
Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	Amount	Percentage (%)
Gender		
a. Man	105	78.4%
b. Woman	29	21.6%
Age		
a. < 25 Years	14	10.4%
b. 26 – 35 Years	39	29.1%
c. 36 – 45 Years	60	44.8%
d. > 46 Years	21	15.7%
Education		
a. SD	88	65.2%
b. Junior High School	25	18.5%
c. High School	21	15.6%
Length of work		
a. < 5 Years	29	21.5%
b. 6 – 10 Years	56	41.5%
c. > 15 Years	49	36.3%

Source: Data processed in 2025

The number of respondents seen from gender, the largest is male with 105 respondents or 78.4%, based on age, the largest is 36-45 years old with 60 respondents or 44.8%, the largest education of respondents is elementary school with 88 respondents or 65.2% and the longest working period of respondents is 6-10 years with 56 respondents or 41.5% based on the characteristics of the respondents, it can be said that the respondents in this study can be categorized as unproductive and have insufficient education.

Test results of the validity of the research instrument can be seen in Table 2 below:

Table 2.
Instrument Validity Test Results

Number Item	r count Leadership Style	r count Workload	r count Employee Productivity	r table
1.	0.293	0.479	0.334	0.1684
2.	0.262	0.437	0.379	0.1684
3.	0.404	0.404	0.394	0.1684

4.	0.381	0.410	0.342	0.1684
5.	0.325	0.437	0.312	0.1684
6.	0.437	0.389	0.334	0.1684
7.	0.346	0.397	0.266	0.1684
8.	0.373	0.382	0.373	0.1684
9.	0.407	0.446	0.489	0.1684
10.	0.282	0.478	0.312	0.1684
11.	0.308		0.388	0.1684
12.	0.386		0.348	0.1684

Source: Data processed in 2025

r value the table used based on the table with a sample size of 134 respondents is 0.1684 with a correlation error rate of 0.05. Based on table 2, all research variable instruments have a calculated r value > r table so that all research instruments are said to be valid. While the results of the instrument reliability test can be seen in table 3 below:

Table 3.
Reliability Test Results

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Productivity (Y)	0.722	12
Leadership Style (X1)	0.716	12
Workload (X2)	0.763	10

Source: Data processed in 2025

Table 3 above shows that the Cronbach's alpha value for each variable is 0.722 for the productivity variable, 0.716 for the leadership style variable, and 0.763 for the workload variable. The classical assumption test, namely the multicollinearity test and the normality test, obtained results that can be seen in table 4 below:

Table 4.
Multicollinearity Test Results

Variables	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Leadership Style	0.967	1,034
Workload	0.967	1,034

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Sig, (2-tailed) Sig 0.140
99% confidence interval

Source: Data processed in 2025

Based on the calculation results in Table 4, all variables in the study have a tolerance value > 0.01 and a VIF value < 10, so it can be concluded that there is no indication of multicollinearity. The data normality test showed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov value of 0.098 with a significance level of 0.140 > 0.05, which means the data is normally distributed.

The results of the multiple regression equation calculations are shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5.
Multiple Linear Regression Results

Model	B	T	Sig
(Constant)	89,290	18,625	0.000
Leadership Style	-0.355	-4.968	0.000
Workload	-0.456	-6.652	0.000
N = 134			
Adjusted R Square = 0.844			
F count = 361.975			
Sig. F count = 0.000			

Source: Data processed in 2025

Based on table 5, the calculation results for the calculated F value of 361.975 or sig. value of 0.000 <0.05, it can be concluded that the regression model is quite effective in explaining the variance of employee productivity in this study. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.844 indicates that the leadership style variable and workload variable affect employee productivity by 84.40%, while 15.60% is influenced by other variables outside the model studied.

The multiple regression equation model is: $Y = 89.290 - 0.355 X_1 - 0.456 X_2$. The constant value in the multiple regression equation of 89.290 indicates that employee productivity will remain even though the leadership style variable and workload variable are 0 because there are other factors that affect employee productivity besides the leadership style variable and workload variable.

The first hypothesis test shows that the t-value is -4.968 or a significance value of 0.000 <0.005 indicating that leadership style has a significant effect on employee productivity. The explanation of the results of the first hypothesis test is that when a problem or conflict occurs between leaders and employees in the company, it can be resolved well, then the problem or conflict will decrease and employee productivity will increase. The implication of the results of this study is that leadership style is a determining factor in the high and low levels of employee productivity.(Coal, 2020). These results support research by(Wuryaningrat et al., 2024) which reveals that leadership style influences employee performance. Therefore, the first hypothesis stating that the better the leadership style, the higher the employee productivity is accepted.

The second hypothesis test shows that the t-value is -6.652 or a significance value of 0.000 <0.05. This means that the workload variable has a negative and significant effect on the employee productivity variable. The explanation of the results of the second hypothesis test is that when the workload felt by employees in the company decreases, employee productivity will increase.(Trisnawaty & Parwoto, 2021). The results of this study are in line with research(Manoppo et al., 2021), with research results showing that workload has a significant effect on employee productivity. Thus, the second hypothesis, which states that the lower the workload, the higher employee productivity, is accepted.

The results of the regression analysis show that the coefficient value for the leadership style variable is -0.355, while the coefficient value for the workload variable is -0.456. Negative coefficients on both variables indicate a negative relationship to employee productivity. This means that the worse the leadership style or the higher the workload felt by employees, the productivity tends to decrease. Conversely, the better the leadership style, which is characterized by lower problems in leadership and a lighter workload, the employee productivity will be. In this case, although the workload coefficient is greater in absolute

terms (-0.456), the influence of leadership style remains significantly negative on productivity, indicating that ineffective leadership has a major impact on decreasing employee productivity. This interpretation is in line with the direction of the questionnaire scoring, where higher values reflect fewer ideal conditions in both variables.

CONCLUSION

Research on leadership style on employee work productivity at PT Balagi Rattan shows that leadership style has a significant influence on employee productivity. Unbalanced or excessive leadership style can reduce work effectiveness and trigger a decline in performance. Ineffective leadership, such as lack of clear communication, lack of appreciation, lack of democracy, lack of freedom, or an overly authoritarian approach, can reduce employee motivation and work enthusiasm. Various factors, such as lack of support from superiors, mismatch between leadership style and team needs, and a less conducive work environment, can further worsen working conditions and reduce employee productivity. Therefore, it is important for companies to manage leadership styles well, provide training, and create a healthy work environment to support employee well-being and productivity.

Research on workload on employee work productivity at PT Balagi Rattan shows that a balanced workload has a positive effect on employee work productivity, while excessive workload can cause...work attitude, work organization, work environment, physical condition, and psychological well-being too light can reduce motivation. Therefore, companies need to manage workloads well, ensure work targets and standards are in accordance with employee capabilities, and conduct regular performance evaluations. Good workload management will increase efficiency, prevent errors, and support the company's competitiveness and sustainability.

The results of the study at PT Balagi Rattan showed that leadership style has a negative but significant effect on company performance. An effective leadership style can increase employee motivation and productivity, supporting the achievement of company goals. When leadership is aligned with employee capacity and needs, they work more efficiently, innovate, and achieve optimal results. The findings of this study also show that excessive workload has a negative impact on productivity, reducing work quality, creativity, and inhibiting task completion.

Therefore, management needs to design policies that support employee welfare and organizational performance by ensuring a fair distribution of workload according to capacity and skills. Social support from coworkers and superiors, an open work environment, skills training, and recognition for employee achievements can help reduce the negative impacts of workload. Effective management in managing leadership and workload will increase employee creativity, satisfaction, and productivity, as well as strengthen company loyalty and competitiveness.

REFERENCES

Abane, J. A., Adamtey, R., & Ayim, V. O. (2022). Does organizational culture influence employee productivity at the local level? A test of Denison's culture model in Ghana's

- local government sector. *Future Business Journal*, 8(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-022-00145-5>
- Abd, IM, Zuhairi, MMK, & Kamil, GH (2023). The Mediating Role of the Participatory Leadership Style on the Effect of Job Stress on Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Business and Technology*, 4(3), 260–270. <https://doi.org/10.35145/jabt.v4i3.139>
- Anjarsabda Wira Buana, Miftahal., Moh. Subhan ZA, Akmalur Rijal, Mohammad Toha, Sherif Juniar Aryanto. (2023). Strategi Entrepreneur KH Abdullah Mujib Hasan dalam Meningkatkan Value Santri. *Akademika*, 17(2), 114-125. <https://doi.org/10.30736/adk.v17i2.1835>
- Ariussanto, KAP, Tarigan, ZJH, Sitepu, RB, & Singh, SK (2020). Leadership Style, Employee Engagement, and Work Environment to Employee Performance in Manufacturing Companies. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 76, Issue 01020).
- Batubara, SS (2020). The Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance in the Procurement Department of PT INALUM (Persero). *Liabilities (Journal of Accounting Education)*, 3(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.30596/liabilities.v3i1.4581>
- Bharthvajan, R., & Fabiyola Kavitha, S. (2019). Impact of training on employee productivity. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3), 5338–5341. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.C6880.098319>
- Chen, CL, Lin, YC, Chen, WH, Chao, CF, & Pandia, H. (2021). Role of government to enhance digital transformation in small service businesses. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(3), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031028>
- Chukwunonso, N. (2023). Participative Leadership Style and Employee Productivity in Pharmaceutical Companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research Publications and Reviews*, 4(1), 1059–1064. www.ijrpr.com
- Jundulloh, R., & Nasution, Y. (2024). The Influence of Entrepreneurial Leadership, Entrepreneurship Competence on Sustainable Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Innovation Capability in MSME. 18(2), 158–192.
- Kelly, R. J., & Hearld, L. R. (2020). Burnout and Leadership Style in Behavioral Health Care: a Literature Review. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*, 47(4), 581–600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-019-09679-z>
- Klasmeier, K. N., & Lehmann-Willenbrock, N. (2024). Temporal dynamics of shared leadership, team workload, and collective team member well-being: a daily diary study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(3), 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2023.2263200>
- Maidin, AMR, Rajamemang, Putera, W., Maidin, MS, & Saripuddin. (2024). Leadership Communication in Increasing Employee Work Productivity. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 585–594. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2\(4\).50](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(4).50)
- Manoppo, PKP, Tewal, B., & Trang, I. (2021). The Influence of Workload, Work Environment and Integrity on Employee Productivity at PT. Empat Saudara Manado. *EMBA Journal*, 9(4), 773–781. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/emba/article/view/36595%0A>
- Manuaba. (2020). The relationship between workload and work capacity.
- Mutegi, T.M., Joshua, P.M., & Maina, J.K. (2023). Workplace safety, employee safety attitudes and employee productivity of manufacturing firms. *SA Journal of Human*

- Resource Management, 21(2019), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.1989>
- Niere (Mecon), MIE, Narsico, LO, & Narsico, P.G. (2024). Work Training, Workplace Relationships, Workload and Job Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2), 664–680. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.02.26>
- Oktafiany, A., Zainal, VR, & Hakim, A. (2023). Mc Kinsey 7s Frame Work Approach Method To The Effectiveness Of Organizational Performance In The Directorate Of Preschool Teachers And Community Education Ministry Of Education, Culture, Research And Technology. *UBS Journal of Economics and Business*, 12(6), 3463–3476.
- Ouanhlee, T. (2024). The Influence of the Manufacturing Industry Environment, Organizational Structures, and Economic Trends on Employee Responsibilities in the Manufacturing Industry. *Technology and Investment*, 15(01), 39–76. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ti.2024.151004>
- Paais, M., & Pattiruhu, J.R. (2020). Effect of Motivation, Leadership, and Organizational Culture on Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 577–588. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO8.577>
- Performance, E. (2024). This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-NC) 4.0 license 1299. 1299–1310.
- riinawati. (2019). Introduction to communication and organizational management theory.
- Rožman, M., Oreški, D., & Tominc, P. (2023). Artificial-Intelligence-Supported Reduction of Employees' Workload to Increase the Company's Performance in Today's VUCA Environment. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065019>
- Salsabila Putri Hana, Trirahayu Dewi, HW (2020). On Employee Work Productivity at Singaraja Hotel. *Journal of Management and Business*, 2(1), 11–20.
- Shan, G., Wang, W., Wang, S., Zhang, Y., Guo, S., & Li, Y. (2022). Authoritarian leadership and nurse presenteeism: the role of workload and leader identification. *BMC Nursing*, 21(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-022-01119-2>
- Soetrisno, E. (2019). human resource management.
- Sugiono, E., & Rachmawati, W. (2019). The Influence of Transformational Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Extrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance at PT Semen Padang, South Jakarta. *Oikonomia: Journal of Management*, 15(1), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.47313/oikonomia.v15i1.644>
- Susijawati, N., Maryam, S., & Sulistiowati, LH (2023). The Effect Of Workload And Competence On Performance With Motivation As A Mediating Variable In Elementary School Teachers In Cirebon City. *The Seybold Report Journal*, 18(05), 1935–1947. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/K69US>
- Top, C., Mohammad, B., Abdullah, S., Hemn, A., & Faraj, M. (2020). Transformational Leadership Impact on Employees Performance. *Eurasian Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 1(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ejmss.v1i1p49>
- Trisnawaty, M., & Parwoto, P. (2021). THE EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND WORKLOAD ON EMPLOYEE WORK PRODUCTIVITY (Case Study in Production Department 1 PT JS Jakarta). *Journal of Competitive Management*, 22(2),

- 84–92. <https://doi.org/10.23917/dayasaing.v22i2.12361>
- Vadrale, K., & Katti, V. (2019). a Comparative Study of Employee Productivity Analysis of Public a Comparative Study of Employee Productivity Analysis of. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, March 2018.
- Vuong, TDN, & Nguyen, L.T. (2022). The Key Strategies for Measuring Employee Performance in Companies: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 14017. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114017>
- Wuryaningrat, NF, Hidayat, N., & Kumajas, ML (2024). The Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Employee Performance. *Klabat Journal of Management*, 5(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MANM-03-2024-0022>
- Yu, J., & Xiang, K. (2025). behavioral sciences Team Innovation Performance: A Model for Testing Moderation and Mediation Effects.
- Zydzianaite, V., Kontrimiene, S., Ponomarenko, T., & Kaminskiene, L. (2020). Challenges in Teacher Leadership: Workload, Time Allocation, and Self-Esteem. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 9(4), 948–962. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2020.4.948>