THE EFFECT OF HEADMASTER LEADERSHIP STYLE TOWARDS VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' WORK SATISFACTION, WORK MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE IN EAST KALIMANTAN, INDONESIA

Palinggi Yonathan*, Mawardi

Kutai Kartanegara University, Indonesia

*E-mail: mawardi@unikarta.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The results of this study examined the influence of leadership style on job satisfaction, motivation and teacher performance in East Kalimantan. The analytical tool used to estimate data was structural equation modeling with a sample size of 147. The study results showed that transformational leadership style has a significant effect on job satisfaction. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences job satisfaction. Transactional leadership style has a significant and positive effect on work motivation. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences work motivation. Transactional leadership style has no significant effect on teacher performance. Transformational leadership style has a significant and positive effect on teacher performance. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences teacher performance. Job satisfaction has a significant and positive effect on performance. Job satisfaction has a significant and positive effect on work motivation. Work motivation has a significant and positive effect on performance.

KEY WORDS

Leadership style, job satisfaction, motivation, performance.

Charisma often occurs when there is a social crisis, a leader comes up with a radical vision that offers a solution to the crisis, and the leader attracts followers who believe in that vision. They experienced some successes that made the vision seem achievable, and followers could trust the leader as an extraordinary person. Charismatic leadership style is causality between a leader and his subordinates with all the attributes that are liked and imitated by the followers (Shamir, 1991). Meanwhile the term job satisfaction refers to the general attitude of an individual who assesses the difference between the amount of rewards received and those he believes should be received. Individuals who have high job satisfaction have a positive attitude towards the work; individuals who are not satisfied with work have a negative attitude toward the job (Robbins, 1989: 139). Motivation can be interpreted as progress / encouragement or someone's puller to willing to carry out their duties properly. Teacher motivation is actually teacher achievement motivation or can be defined as an element that awakens, directs and encourages a teacher to take action and overcome all challenges and obstacles in an effort to achieve educational goals.

Teachers' performance can be interpreted as an achievement agreed upon by the teachers after carrying out their duties as a teacher. Optimal teachers' performance will be supported if they have high achievement motivation at work. Without the achievement motivation arising from within the teachers themselves, it is impossible for the teachers to achieve the good performance; because of this achievement motivation will encourage a teacher to improve achievement as a result of creating pride and career advancement.

Preliminary observations show that, the leadership style applied by principals in Private Vocational High Schools in East Kalimantan uses three leadership styles, namely transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style and charismatic leadership style in order to improve work motivation and teachers' performance.

From the results of the description above, it is important to conduct research to find out how much these three leadership styles affect work motivation, satisfaction and performance of vocational high school teachers in East Kalimantan Indonesia.

Figure 1 – Conceptual Framework

Burns (1978: 162) defines transactional leadership as a form of relationship that exchanges certain positions or tasks if employees are able to properly complete the task. Thus, transactional leadership emphasizes the process of exchange relationships that are economically valuable to meet biological and psychological needs in accordance with the contract they have agreed upon. Transactional leaders are leadership who put more emphasis on "interpersonal transactions" between leaders and employees that involve exchange relations. Employees get immediate and tangible rewards if they fulfill the leader's orders (Lockwood, 1997: 202). According to Burns (1978: 129), transactional leaders motivate their employees through contingent compensation and management through exceptions.

Job satisfaction is a happy emotional state or positive emotion that comes from one's job evaluation or work experience. In this case job satisfaction is the employee's perception of how big and good their work provides what is considered important (Locke in Luthans, 2006: 243). Conceptually, transformational leadership is defined by (Bass, 1985: 140) as the ability of leaders to change the work environment, work motivation, work patterns, and work values perceived by employees so that they are better able to optimize performance to achieve organizational goals. Bass in Natsir (2004: 32) argues that transformational leadership is the influence of leaders or superiors on subordinates.

Research conducted by Masi and Cooke (2000), aims to see the effect of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowerment of norms and organizational productivity. The results of this study indicate that there is a significant correlation between transformational leadership and subordinate motivation, in other hand there is a negative correlation between transactional leadership and commitment to quality and organizational productivity. Furthermore, research conducted by Bass (1990), aims to see how the influence of transformational leadership on subordinate satisfaction, extra efforts made by subordinates and manager's effectiveness ranking in the subordinates's point of view. The results found that there is an influence between transformational leadership on satisfaction of the subordinates

Flippo (1992: 98) argues, five (5) dimensions to measure employee job satisfaction, they are: first, the job itself, as the main source of employee satisfaction. In this case the form of work that is interesting and challenging. Second is Salary / Wage, it is a multidimensional factor in job satisfaction, in this case the employee views salary / wages as a reflection of the management party to employee contributions. Third one is promotion, as

an appreciation of employee performance. In this case the promotional opportunities that employees receive in relation to achieving their performance. Fourth is Supervision, as employee satisfaction towards supervisory activities and the supervision done by the supervisors. This is related to supervisors' concern toward employees. The fifth is work group, it is employee job satisfaction obtained from relationships with co-workers.

Meanwhile in other aspects, motivation is a complex problem in the organization, because the needs and desires of each member of the organization differ from one to another. This is different because each member of an organization is biologically or psychologically unique, and develops on the basis of different learning processes (Suprihanto, 2003: 41). While Herzberg et al. (1989) in his research said that one of the factors that cause job satisfaction is motivation. Furthermore, it is mentioned that the motivational factor is related to the aspects contained in the work itself. So it relates to job content or also called intrinsic aspects or motivation which comes from the work itself. The factors included are: 1. Achievement; 2. Recognition; 3. Work itself; 4. Responsibility.

Suprihanto in Srimulyo (1999: 33) said that an employee's performance or work performance is basically the work of an employee during a certain period, for example standards, targets or performance that have been determined in advance and have been agreed upon together. Meanwhile according to Simamora (1995: 79) mentioned that performance measures generally include: 1. quality of work; 2. the quantity of work; 3. knowledge of work; 4. timeliness; 5. opinions or statements submitted; 6. decisions taken; 7. work planning; 8. work organization area. Furthermore Simamora (1995: 415) stated that performance appraisal is a useful tool not only for evaluating the work of employees, but also for developing and motivating employees.

Natsir (2004), the results showed that the factors that influence employee performance are leadership styles. Research conducted by Waldman and Yammarino (2001), aimed to examine the influence of transactional leadership and charismatic leadership on uncertain environmental conditions. The results of this study indicated that charismatic leadership only predicts performance in uncertain environmental conditions and not in certain environmental conditions.

Research conducted by Smith and Rupp (2000) aimed to examine the effect of motivation on marketing performance. The results of this study indicated that a leader must be able to create an environment that makes employees feel trusted and empowered in decision making.

Through the theoretical foundation and the results of the empirical study above, they can be used as the basis for preparing the hypotheses as follows:

1. Transformational leadership has a significant effect on job satisfaction;
2. Charismatic leadership has a significant effect on job satisfaction;
3. Transactional leadership has a significant effect on work motivation;
4. Charismatic leadership has a significant effect on work motivation;
5. Transactional leadership has a significant effect on performance;
6. Transformational leadership has a significant effect on performance;
7. Charismatic leadership significantly influences performance;
8. Teacher job satisfaction has a significant effect on performance;
9. Teacher job satisfaction significantly influences work motivation;
10. Teacher work motivation has significant effect on performance.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

The data analysis technique used to test the hypotheses in this study was *Structural Equation Modeling* (SEM), which was operated through a program namely the *Analysis of Moment Structure* (AMOS).

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is considered appropriate for this kind of analysis because it is able to provide a comprehensive mindset that simultaneously has measurements and structural relationships between variables in the model (Dillon et al,

1997: 123). SEM is also assessed as a collection of statistical techniques that allow the testing of a series of relatively complex relationships simultaneously (Ferdinand, 2001: 80).

Furthermore, the population in this study was all State Vocational School teachers in East Kalimantan who had become Civil Apparatus, with a total of 1007 teachers, 147 teachers were chosen as the respondents of the population group. This number was obtained from the indicator of 21 times 7 observations.

RESULTS OF STUDY

The hypothetical model on the conceptual agreement of the study was approved accordingly if supported by empirical data. Goodness of fit test results of the overall model are supported to find out whether the hypothetical model is supported by empirical data and the following is the result of data estimation.

Table 1 – Results of the Early Stage Goodness of Fit Overall Model Test

Criteria	Cut-of value	Model Result	Remarks
Chi-Square Statistic	Kecil	178,786	Good Model
p-value	$\geq 0,05$	0,123	
CMIN/DF	$\leq 2,00$	1,132	Good Model
GFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,890	Poor Model
AGFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,854	Poor Model
TLI	$\geq 0,95$	0,981	Good Model
CFI	$\geq 0,95$	0,977	Good Model
RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$	0,030	Good Model

Source: Output PLS 2020.

Goodness of Fit Overall test results in the initial stages based on Table 1, it can be concluded that the model is quite good, especially if it is seen from the Chi-Square Statistical Test, TLI, CFI, and RMSEA. However, GFI and AGFI criteria show that the model is not good enough. Therefore reevaluated needed to be done by taking into account of the modification index, and the results of the final model analysis can be seen as follows.

Table 2 – Results of the Final Stage Goodness Of Fit Overall Model Test

Criteria	Cut-of value	Model Result	Remarks
Chi-Square Statistic	Kecil	172,757	Good Model
p-value	$\geq 0,05$	0,184	
CMIN/DF	$\leq 2,00$	1,100	Good Model
GFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,895	Poor Model
AGFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,859	Poor Model
TLI	$\geq 0,95$	0,986	Good Model
CFI	$\geq 0,95$	0,986	Good Model
RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$	0,026	Good Model

Source: Output PLS 2020.

Based on Table 2, it can be concluded that from the seven criteria mentioned above, almost all criteria showed satisfactory results (good). Even though the GFI and AGFI scores are still in not good remarks, but the p-value from Chi-Square Statistics is good already. So the model can be considered to be good and can properly used for hypothesis testing.

The next test is to conduct an assessment of the hypothesis that is by *t test* on each path of direct influence partially. Based on the results of the complete analysis, there are SEM results as follows in Table 3.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between transformational leadership variables on job satisfaction obtained a value of 1.142 with p-value < 0.001 then it was decided significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (1,142), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, in other words, the better the transformational leadership, the higher job satisfaction. The results of this study

support the theories that have been put forward by Bass and Avolio in Yukl (2005), about transformational leaders who will increase emotions in the form of motivation and satisfaction from followers to leaders. Burn in Pawar and Eastman (1997); Fiedler (1990), which is based on Maslow's hierarchical theory of needs, it is about the relation of employee and job satisfaction. Furthermore, from the results of research conducted by Bass (1990b), transformational leadership contributes to the satisfaction of subordinates. The results of research conducted by Deluga (1988), states that Transformational leadership is significantly more effective and satisfying employees than transactional leadership. Podsakoff et al. in Suharto (2005), also mention that transformational leadership has a significant relationship with overall job satisfaction.

Table 3 – Hypothesis Testing Results of Influence between Variables

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	coefficient Path	C.R	p-value	Remarks
Transformational leadership (X ₂)	Job Satisfaction (Y ₁)	1,142	4,878	***	Significant
Charismatic Leadership (X ₃)	Job Satisfaction (Y ₁)	1,142	5,398	***	Significant
Transactional Leadership (X ₁)	Work Motivation (Y ₂)	0,347	4,231	***	Significant
Charismatic Leadership (X ₃)	Work Motivation (Y ₂)	0,376	4,410	***	Significant
Transactional Leadership (X ₁)	Peformance (Y ₃)	0,019	0,262	0,793	Not Significant
Transformational leadership (X ₂)	Peformance (Y ₃)	0,362	3,921	***	Significant
Charismatic Leadership (X ₃)	Peformance (Y ₃)	0,319	3,834	***	Significant
Job Satisfaction (Y ₁)	Peformance (Y ₃)	0,300	5,619	***	Significant
Job Satisfaction (Y ₁)	Work Motivation (Y ₂)	0,590	6,931	***	Significant
Work Motivation (Y ₂)	Peformance (Y ₃)	0,453	6,214	***	Significant

Source: *Output PLS 2020.*

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between charismatic leadership variables on job satisfaction obtained a value of 1.142 with a p-value <0.0001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (1,142), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, which means the better charismatic leadership, the higher the job satisfaction of employees. The findings of this study, are in support of the theory proposed by Howel (1988), Conger and Kanungo in Safaria (2004) about charismatic leaders basing themselves on internal moral values to satisfy the interests of organizations and society.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct effect between the transactional leadership variables on work motivation obtained a value of 0.347 with a p-value <0.0001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.347), it means the relationship between these two variables is positive, and this also means that the better the transactional leadership, the higher the employee's work motivation. This finding supports the theories that have been put forward by House in Rivai (2007) about the goal-path model which states, the transactional leader (path goal model) will be effective because of the influence of their positive motivation, the ability to carry out the task and satisfaction of followers.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between charismatic leadership variables on work motivation obtained a value of 0.376 with a p-value <0.001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.376), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, this shows that the better charismatic leadership, the higher the work motivation. This finding supports the opinion of Conger and Kanungo in Safaria (2004) that mention, charismatic leaders will train, develop and motivate followers.

The results of the analysis of the direct path coefficient between the transactional leadership variables on performance obtained a value of 0.019 with a p-value = 0.793. Thus there is not enough evidence to accept hypothesis 7, which is "transactional leadership significantly influences the performance". Or in the other words, it can be said that transactional leadership has non-significance influences toward employee performance. As a finding of the results of this study, it supports the opinion of Podsakoff et al. (1982) and

Komaki (1986), who doubt the success of transactional leadership to work in accordance with organizational goals. The results of this study contradict the opinion of Luthan et al. (1981), which states that transactional leadership will have an impact on employee performance.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between transformational leadership variables on performance obtained a value of 0.362 with a p-value <0.001 then it was decided significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.362), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, it shows that the better the transformational leadership, the higher the employee's work performance. As a finding of the results of this study, it supports the theories that have been advanced by Bass (1985), the effect of transformational leadership, which is the ability of leaders to change the work environment; work patterns, work motivation, and work values perceived by subordinates, so that they are better able optimize performance to achieve organizational goals. It means that transformational processes occur in leadership relationships, when leaders build subordinate awareness of the importance of work values.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between charismatic leadership variables on performance obtained a value of 0.319 with a p-value <0.001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.319), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, which means the better charismatic leadership, the higher the employee's work performance. As a finding of the results of this study, it supports the opinion expressed by Wahjosumidjo (2007), that subordinates involve themselves emotionally in carrying out organizational missions and enhance the skills of subordinates in carrying out their duties. The results of research conducted by Waldman and Yammarino (2001), that charismatic leadership is significantly correlated to performance, and charismatic leadership is a key variable in predicting performance.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between the variables of job satisfaction on performance obtained a value of 0.300 with a p-value <0.001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.300), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, it shows that the more job satisfaction increases, the higher the teacher's performance. As a finding of the results of this study, it supports the theory that was put forward by Ostroff (1995) which states, that employee job satisfaction and good working conditions have a significant relationship with employee performance. Gibson et al. (1991) states, individuals who have high job satisfaction will be positive about their work. The results of research conducted by Koesmono (2005), that job satisfaction directly has a positive and significant effect towards performance.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct effect between the variables of job satisfaction on work motivation obtained a value of 0.590 with a p-value <0.001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.590), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, it shows that the more job satisfaction increases, the higher the work motivation of teachers. The results of this study supports the theory that was put forward by Davis and Newstrom (1999) which states, employees who are not satisfied will be motivated to be absent from work and employees who get job satisfaction will be motivated to continue working in the company. Bussing et al. (1999) states, employees who are dissatisfied will appear to decrease passion or motivation in carrying out tasks. The results of research conducted by Koesmono (2005) shows that there is a significant influence between satisfaction and motivation.

The results of the path coefficient analysis of the direct influence between the variables of work motivation on performance obtained a value of 0.453 with a p-value <0.0001 then it was decided to be significant. Because the path coefficient is positive (0.453), it means that the relationship between these two variables is positive, in other words it means that the more work motivation is, the higher the performance of the employees. The findings from the results of this study are supportive of Maslow's need theory (Ishak and Hendri, 2003), that a person will be motivated to achieve better performance, after his needs are met.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Transformational leadership style has a significant and positive effect on teacher job satisfaction. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences job satisfaction. Transactional leadership style has a significant and positive effect on work motivation. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences work motivation. Transactional leadership style has no significant effect on teacher performance. Transformational leadership style has a significant and positive effect on teacher performance. Charismatic leadership style significantly and positively influences teacher performance. Job satisfaction has a significant and positive effect on performance. Job satisfaction has a significant and positive effect on work motivation. Work motivation has a significant and positive effect on performance.

Through the conclusions above, the researcher can provide recommendations to several parties; first of all to other reseearchers who will conduct similar research, it is hoped that the results of this study can be used as a reference and it is recommended to add intervening variables to teacher commitment or loyalty. Furthermore, for the heads of State Vocational High Schools in East Kalimantan in particular, through the results of this study, it is found that increasing teacher job satisfaction is necessary, so that work motivation and teacher performance can be also improved. For the Provincial and District Governments and the City Government in East Kalimantan in the era of regional autonomy, it is necessary to provide additional income for teachers of State Vocational High Schools in East Kalimantan, because if job satisfaction of teachers increases, it will also eventually improve the peformance of the teachers. For the Ministry of Education and Culture, it is important to properly socialize Vocational High School (SMK) as a secondary education level where the graduates are widely needed by the community. So that the interest to study in vocational high schools will be positive and it will be the main choice. For the Provincial and Regency Regional Governments as well as the City Government, through the local National Education Office, in order to select the headmasters of vocational high shcools, it is necessary to be done by the selection (Fit and Proper Test).

REFERENCES

1. Arep Ishak and Tanjung Hendri, 2003. *Manajemen Motivasi*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
2. BASS, 1985. *Leadership and peformance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press.
3. 1990b. *Transformational Leadership Development Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Quastionnaire*. Palo Alto: California Consulting Pscycolgist Press, Inc.
4. Burns. J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
5. Bussing Andre, Bissils Thomas, Fuchs Vera and Perrar Klaus M, 1994, *A Dynamic Model of Work Satisfaction: Qualitative Approachs*, Human Relations, Vol. 52, No. 8.
6. Davis, Keith, and John W. Newstron. 1999. *Perilaku dalam Organisasi*, Edisi Ketujuh terjemahan, Jakarta: Erlangga.
7. Dillon R. William, White B. John, Rao R. Vithala and Filak Doug, 1997. *Good Science*, Marketing Research Forum, Winter.
8. Ferdinand, Augusty. 2001. *Structural Equation Modeling Dalam Penelitian Manajemen*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
9. Fiedler, F. E. 1990. *A Theory of Leadership Effectieness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
10. Flippo, Edwin.B, 1992. *Principles of Personnel Management*, 4th edition, South Western Publishing Co.
11. Herzberg. F, Mausner, B, and Snyderman, B.B. 1989. *The Motivation To work*. New York, Willey Internasional
12. Howell, J.M. 1988. Two faces of charisma; socialized and personalized leadership in organization. In J.A. Conger and R.N. Kanungo (Eds.). *Charismatics leadership: The exclusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp: 213-236.

13. Koesmono, Teman, 2005, Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi terhadap Motivasi and Kepuasan Kerja Serta Kinerja Karyawan pada Sub Sektor Industri Pengolahan Kayu ekspor di Jawa Timur, Disertai tidak diterbitkan, Surabaya: Program Pascasarjana Ilmu Ekonomi Universitas Airlangga.
14. Komaki, J.L. 1986. Toward Effective Supervision: An Operant Analysis and Comparison of Managers at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychologi*. 71: pp. 270-279
15. Lockwood, D, 1997, How to Manage Your, Firt Edition, PT. Gunung Agung, Jakarta
16. Luthans, F, Paul, R, and Baker, D. 1981. An Experimental Analysis of the Impact of Contingent Reinforcement on Salesperson Performance Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 66: pp. 314-323
17. Luthans, Fred, 2006. *Perilaku Organisasi*, edisi 10, Yogyakarta: Andi.
18. Masi, J. Rapph and Robert A. Cooke, 2000 Effects of Transformational Leadership on Subordinate Motivation, Empowering Norms, and Organizational Productivity, *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol 8. No. 1: pp. 16-47
19. Natsir, Syaril, 2004. Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Perilaku Kerja and Kinerja Karyawan Perbankan di Sulawesi Tengah. Disertasi tidak diterbitkan, Surabaya: Program Pascasarjana Ilmu Ekonomi Universitas Airlangga
20. Ostroff, C. 1995. The Relationship between Satisfaction, Attitudes, and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (6): pp.963-974.
21. Pawar, B.S, and Eastmen, K.K. 1997. The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership. A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review*. 22: pp. 80-109.
22. Podsakoff, P.M, et al. 1996. Transformational Leader Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 22(22), pp. 259-298.
23. Podsakoff, P.M, Todor, W.D., Skov, R, 1982. Effects of Leader Contingent Reward and Punishment Behavior on Subordinate Performance and Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*. 25: pp. 810-821.
24. Rivai, Veithzal. 2007. *Kepemimpinan and Perilaku Organisasi*, Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
25. Robbins, SP. 1989. *Organization Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
26. Safaria, T (2004). *Kepemimpinan*, Edisi Pertama, cetakan kelima, Graha Ilmu.
27. Shamir, B. 1991. The charismatic relationship. Alternative explanations and predictions. *Leadership Quarterly*. 2: pp. 81-104.
28. Simamora, Henry, 1995. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Yogyakarta: STIE YKPN.
29. Smith D Alan, 2000. *An Examination of Emerging Strategy and Sales Performance; motivation, chaostic change and organizational structure*, Pittsburgh, Pensylvania USA, Roberth Morris University, Department of Management and Marketing.
30. Srimulyo Koko. 1999. Analisis Pengaruh Faktor-faktor Terhadap Kinerja Perpustakaan di Kota Madya Surabaya. Tesis, Program Pascasarjana Universitas Airlangga Surabaya
31. Stinson, J.E, and Johnson, T.W. 1975. The path goal theory of leadership. A partial test and suggested refinement. *Academy of Management Journal*. 18: pp. 242-252.
32. Suharto, Babun, 2005. Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transaksional and Transformasional Terhadap Kepuasan and Kinerja Bawahan pada Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri di Jawa Timur, Disertasi tidak diterbitkan, Surabaya: Program Pascasarjana Ilmu Ekonomi Universitas Airlangga.
33. Suprihanto, John, 2003. *Perilaku Organisasi: Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YKPN*.
34. Wahjosumidjo, 2007. *Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah, tinjauan teoritik and permasalahannya*, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.
35. Waldman, D.A, and Yammarino, F.J. (2001), Does Leadership Matter? CEO Leadership Attributes and profitability under Conditions of perceived Environmental Uncertainty. *Journal the Academy of Management*, 44: pp. 134-143.
36. Yukl, G.A. 2005. *Kepemimpinan dalam organisasi (Terjemahan Budi Supriyanto)*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.