



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31933/dijemss.v5i3>

Received: 05 February 2024, Revised: 24 February 2024, Publish: 12 March 2024

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Determination of Employee Engagement: Analysis of Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Compensation and Career Development in Middle-Class College

Yosi Pahala<sup>1\*</sup>, Lira Agusinta<sup>2</sup>, Nursery Alfarizi Nasution<sup>3</sup>, Esternilus Edwin Lermatan<sup>4</sup>, Reni Dian Octaviani<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>5</sup>Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [lir4agusinta@gmail.com](mailto:lir4agusinta@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The study aims to investigate the factors influencing employee engagement in these institutions, with a particular focus on servant leadership, organizational commitment, compensation, and career development. Using a mixed method approach, data will be collected through surveys and interviews from faculty and staff members at a secondary education institution representing the middle class. The method used in this scientific article is quantitative, with the population coming from employees of a campus with various faculties where the distribution of questionnaires is carried out online and in person, dissemination is carried out for one month and returns the results of questionnaires received as many as 37 answers, then this data is processed with the help of SPSS 24. Data analysis with the results of analysis and interpretation is conveyed in the results of this scientific article as a form of answer from the data that has been entered. Organizational Commitment has a significant correlation with employee engagement and employee engagement. This shows the importance of organizational commitment in influencing employee engagement and engagement levels. The correlation between Servant Leadership, Compensation, and Career Development with other variables tends to be weak and not statistically significant. This suggests the need for further research to understand the relationship between these factors and employee engagement and employee engagement. Institutional recommendations can improve employee engagement and their engagement, which in turn can improve overall organizational performance and success.

**Keywords:** Employee Engagement, Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Compensation, Career Development

### INTRODUCTION

Based on research and analysis, there are several factors that can cause low employee engagement in Indonesia, including lack of servant and inspiring leadership, low sense of

ownership and employee loyalty to the company (Yusuf et al., 2023), salary and benefits packages that are not competitive and not comparable to performance, lack of learning opportunities and self-development for employees (Hung & Wang, 2017). There is a gap between employee expectations and what the company offers (Arfandi et al., 2023). Employees want servant and inspiring leaders, a strong sense of belonging and loyalty to the company, competitive pay and benefits packages, and adequate learning and development opportunities (Lui et al., 2023). Employee engagement is an important aspect of organizational success, especially in the context of educational institutions at the secondary level where employees play an important role in student development and overall institutional growth (Prentice, 2022). The study aims to investigate the factors influencing employee engagement in these institutions, with a particular focus on servant leadership, organizational commitment, compensation, and career development. Using a mixed method approach, data will be collected through surveys and interviews from faculty and staff members at a secondary education institution representing the middle class.

## **METHOD**

The method used in this scientific article is quantitative, with the population coming from employees of a campus with various faculties where the distribution of questionnaires is carried out online and in person, dissemination is carried out for one month and returns the results of questionnaires received as many as 37 answers, then this data is processed with the help of SPSS 24. Data analysis with the results of analysis and interpretation is conveyed in the results of this scientific article as a form of answer from the data that has been entered.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Results**

#### **Servant Leadership on Employee Engagement**

Servant leadership demonstrates a leadership philosophy and approach that prioritizes the well-being and development of team members rather than exclusively focusing on meeting organizational goals (Susanto et al., 2024). The concept of servant leadership applies in various sectors, including higher education institutions such as colleges (Susanto, Agusinta, et al., 2023). It promotes employee engagement, motivation, and overall organizational performance. However, it requires a shift away from traditional hierarchies and power structures, instead in favor of a more collaborative and supportive leadership style (Nabawi et al., 2023). In relation to previous research between servant leadership variables and Employee Engagement, there are several research results displayed as follows: research results from (Chuah et al., 2023) stated that studies show the positive role of craft as a mediator between servant leadership and employee engagement in the Malaysian service industry, showing that servant leadership leads to increased employee engagement through craft work.

The results of the study from (Dalain, 2023) stated an investigation into the moderate effects of servant leadership on employee engagement and organizational innovation in Saudi manufacturing organizations supports the idea that servant leadership contributes to employee engagement and organizational innovation. study investigates the relationships between servant leadership, human capital, employee engagement, and job satisfaction in an Indonesian company, providing evidence that servant leadership impacts employee engagement positively (Aziez & Nugroho, 2023). Based on previous research, the hypotheses formed are:

H1: It is suspected that there is a significant and positive influence between Servant Leadership and Employee Engagement.

### **Organizational Commitment on Employee Engagement**

Organizational commitment refers to an individual's psychological attachment and engagement with the organization they work for. This includes employees' loyalty to the organization, their belief in its values and goals, and their willingness to exert efforts on behalf of the organization. (Bar-Haim, 2019). Organizational commitment is a crucial factor in determining an employee's intention to stay with the organization and their overall engagement and performance (Susanto, Ali, et al., 2023). It is influenced by various factors such as job involvement, perceived organizational support, and identity enactment (Hngoi et al., 2023).

Previous research related to variables in this scientific article there are several research results in scientific articles owned (Jones, 2018) stating the Relationship between Employee Engagement and Employee Job Satisfaction with Organizational Commitment shows that there is a significant relationship between employee engagement and organizational commitment. Factors Influencing Employee Engagement Levels with Reference to Selected Organizations highlights the importance of employee engagement in improving productivity and daily performance (Gade & K, 2019).

From some previous research results, the proposed hypotheses are: H2: It is suspected that there is a significant and positive influence between Organizational Commitment and Employee Engagement.

### **Compensation on Employee Engagement**

Compensation, in the context of employment, refers to monetary rewards and benefits offered to employees in return for their labor and services. This includes wages, salaries, bonuses, commissions, and benefits such as health insurance, retirement plans, vacation time, and sick leave. Compensation packages aim to attract, retain and motivate employees by ensuring fair pay and competitive benefits. (Brudner, 2017). Compensation is an important component of any employer-employee relationship, affecting employee morale, job satisfaction, and overall performance. A well-designed compensation package should reflect market trends, internal equity, and external competitiveness. In addition, compensation policies must comply with legal requirements and best practices to ensure fairness and transparency (Al-Nussairi et al., 2017).

The results of previous studies that support this variable where the results of studies from (Banu & Fiverose, 2016) state that employee performance is often directly related to work quality, student satisfaction, and improvement of teaching methods, even the reputation of an institution. On the other hand, the same is often indirectly related to co-worker and staff satisfaction, effective succession planning, and deeply integrated organizational knowledge and learning.

The hypothesis in this study after looking at previous research is as follows: H3: It is suspected that there is a significant and positive influence between Compensation and Employee Engagement.

### **Career Development on Employee Engagement**

Career development refers to the process of acquiring and enhancing skills, knowledge, and experience that enable individuals to achieve their career goals (Susanto, Soehaditama, et al., 2023). It involves a variety of activities, including training, education, mentoring, and networking, aimed at helping individuals identify and pursue career opportunities (Mok et al., 2021). In the context of higher education, career development is essential for faculty and staff to stay current with the latest teaching methods, research techniques, and administrative practices (Susanto, Sawitri, et al., 2023). It can also help employees identify opportunities for advancement within the institution and develop the skills necessary to pursue those opportunities (Susanto, Maharani, et al., 2023). Career development programs may include

workshops, training sessions, mentoring programs, and professional development opportunities (Ran & Cinamon, 2022).

Previous research related to this variable starting from studies belonging to career development has a significant positive impact on employee engagement, mediated by organizational commitment (Ramli et al., 2022). Education and career development have a significant influence on employee engagement (Susanto & Amanda, 2023). The implication is that this study model can predict the effect of training and career development on engaged employees of non-academic staff surveyed at universities (Nasidi et al., 2020). Then the hypothesis offered as follows: H<sub>4</sub>: It is suspected that there is a significant and positive influence between career development with employee engagement.

**Validity Test**

Data collected from various faculties in one college institution with the number of answers from returning respondents is only 37 respondents from various faculties, after being assisted by SPSS 24, it will be described the results that have been obtained from the research time for two months in 2024 carried out.

**Table 1. Servant Leadership Variable Validity Test**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	41	2	5.4	5.4
	42	5	13.5	18.9
	43	12	32.4	51.4
	44	2	5.4	56.8
	45	3	8.1	64.9
	46	9	24.3	89.2
	47	4	10.8	100.0
	Total	37	100.0	100.0

Source: SPSS data processing results 24, 2024

Based on the results above, the questionnaire questions are tested and declared valid and used in the next stage in the next test.

**Table 2. Organizational Commitment Variable Validity Test**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	36	2	5.4	5.4
	37	2	5.4	10.8
	38	5	13.5	24.3
	39	8	21.6	45.9
	40	4	10.8	56.8
	41	6	16.2	73.0
	42	7	18.9	91.9
	43	3	8.1	100.0
	Total	37	100.0	100.0

Source: SPSS data processing results 24, 2024

Based on the results above, the questionnaire questions are tested and declared valid and used in the next stage in the next test.

**Table 3. Compensation**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	39	1	2.7	2.7
	40	6	16.2	18.9
	41	2	5.4	24.3
	42	4	10.8	35.1

43	7	18.9	18.9	54.1
44	4	10.8	10.8	64.9
45	6	16.2	16.2	81.1
46	2	5.4	5.4	86.5
47	2	5.4	5.4	91.9
48	1	2.7	2.7	94.6
49	2	5.4	5.4	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS data processing results 24, 2024

Based on the results above, the questionnaire questions are tested and declared valid and used in the next stage in the next test.

**Table 4. Career Development**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 41	7	18.9	18.9	18.9
42	4	10.8	10.8	29.7
43	3	8.1	8.1	37.8
44	8	21.6	21.6	59.5
45	6	16.2	16.2	75.7
46	6	16.2	16.2	91.9
47	3	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS data processing results 24, 2024

Based on the results above, the questionnaire questions are tested and declared valid and used in the next stage in the next test.

**Table 5. Employee Engagement**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 36	2	5.4	5.4	5.4
38	6	16.2	16.2	21.6
39	10	27.0	27.0	48.6
40	4	10.8	10.8	59.5
41	8	21.6	21.6	81.1
42	4	10.8	10.8	91.9
43	2	5.4	5.4	97.3
44	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS data processing results 24, 2024

Based on the results above, the questionnaire questions are tested and declared valid and used in the next stage in the next test.

**Coefficients**

**Table 6. Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.517 <sup>a</sup>	.267	.175	1.682

a. Predictors: (Constant), career development, organizational commitment, servant leadership, compensation

Results table 6. The Summary Model states that this Model has a moderate positive relationship between the predicted value and the actual value of the dependent variable (R = 0.517). However, the values of R Square and Adjusted R Square are relatively low (0.267 and 0.175, respectively), which suggests that the model explains only a small to moderate fraction

of the variance of the dependent variable. In addition, the standard error of that estimate is 1.682, which may be high depending on the context and scale of your data.

Overall, this model may not be a strong predictor of the dependent variable based on the information provided in the Model Summary table alone. It is important to consider other information, such as the coefficients of individual variables and its significance level, as well as diagnostic tests, to fully understand the performance and limitations of the model.

**F Test**

<b>Table 7. ANOVA<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.004	4	8.251	2.915	.037 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	90.563	32	2.830		
	Total	123.568	36			

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), career development, organizational commitment, servant leadership, compensation

The table above summarizes the results of linear regression analysis and helps assess whether the model as a whole is suitable for the data. Here's a breakdown of what each section of the table means:

**Sum of Squares**

**Regression:** Represents the variability of the bound variable (Y) described by the independent variable (X1, X2, X3, X4) in the model. In this case, 33,004.

**Residual:** It represents the variability of the dependent variable that is not described by the model. In this case, the value is 90.563. **Total:** This is the sum of regressions and the sum of residual squares, which represent the total variability in the dependent variable. In this case it is 123,568.

**df:** **Regression:** This represents the degrees of freedom associated with the sum of squared regression, which is equal to the sum of the independent variables in the model.

**Residual:** It represents the degree of freedom associated with the sum of the remaining squares, which is usually calculated as the total number of observations minus the number of independent variables.

**Mean Square:** This is calculated by dividing the sum of squares by their degrees of freedom. It represents the average variability described by each source (regression or residue).

Average square of regression: 8.251, Average square of remainder: 2.830

**F:** These are test statistics used to assess the significance of the model as a whole. It is calculated by dividing the mean square of the regression by the mean square of the remainder.

**F:** 2.915. **Sig.:** This is the p value associated with the F statistic. It represents the extreme probability of statistical observation F as calculated, assuming the null hypothesis (the model does not explain the data better than random chance) is true.

The sum of the squares of the regression (33.004) is greater than the sum of the remaining squares (90.563), which suggests that the model partially explains the variability of the dependent variable.

The F statistic (2.915) is greater than 1, and the p value (0.037) is less than the commonly used significance level of 0.05. That is, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the model is statistically significant at the level of 5%. In other words, the model as a whole provides a statistically significant fit of data, meaning that the independent variables together account for most of the variance of the dependent variable.

However, it is important to remember that the anova table only tells you whether the model as a whole is significant. The model doesn't tell you which individual variables are important predictors or how well the model fits the data in other ways. You need to look at other tests and diagnostics to get a more complete picture of model performance.

**Tabel 8. Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	23.279	9.429		2.469	.019
	Servant leadership	.152	.160	.153	.954	.347
	Organizational commitment	.309	.152	.328	2.041	.050
	Compensation	.179	.114	.254	1.570	.126
	Career development	-.233	.153	-.247	-1.530	.136

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement

**Non-Standardized Coefficient (B):** It represents the change in the predicted value of Y (bound variable) for increments of one unit on the related independent variable (X), assuming all other variables are constant. For example, a coefficient of 0.152 for servant leadership means that for every one unit increase in the servant leadership variable, the predicted employee engagement value increases by an average of 0.152 units, assuming all other employee engagement variables are constant. **Standard Coefficient (Beta):** This represents the change in predicted value in the form of standard deviation, when the corresponding independent variable changes by one standard deviation. They allow easier comparison of the relative importance of various predictors, even if they are measured at different scales. A larger absolute value of t generally indicates the stronger the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

**Sig.:** This is the p-value associated with the t-statistic. It represents the probability of observing t-statistics as extreme as calculated, assuming the null hypothesis (no relationship between the variable and Y) is correct. A smaller p-value indicates stronger evidence against the null hypothesis.

The constant term (23.279) represents the predicted value Y when all independent variables are zero. Servant leadership has a positive coefficient but is not statistically significant (0.152, p = 0.347). This means that as servant leadership increases, employee engagement tends to increase as well, but the relationship is not statistically significant at the conventional level of 5%. Organizational commitment has a positive and statistically significant coefficient (0.309, p = 0.050). This means greater organizational commitment, employee engagement tends to increase as well, and the relationship is statistically significant. Compensation has a positive and statistically significant coefficient (0.179, p = 0.126). This means that the greater the compensation, the employee engagement tends to increase as well, and the relationship is statistically significant.

Career development has a negative coefficient and is not statistically significant (-0.233, p = 0.136). This means that as compensation increases, employee engagement tends to decrease, but the relationship is not statistically significant at the conventional level of 5%.

This model shows that organizational commitment and compensation are statistically significant predictors of employee engagement, while servant leadership dan career development is not a significant predictor at the level of 5%. However, it is important to consider the context and potential limitations of this model before drawing conclusions.

**Table 9. Correlations**

		Servant Leadership	Organizational Commitment	Compensation	Career Development	Employee Engagement
Servant Leadership	Pearson Correlation	1	.186	.084	.280	.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.271	.623	.094	.327
	N	37	37	37	37	37
Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.186	1	.292	.084	.410*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.271		.079	.622	.012
	N	37	37	37	37	37
Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.084	.292	1	.228	.307
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.623	.079		.175	.065
	N	37	37	37	37	37
Compensation	Pearson Correlation	.280	.084	.228	1	-.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.094	.622	.175		.483
	N	37	37	37	37	37
Employee Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.166	.410*	.307	-.119	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.327	.012	.065	.483	
	N	37	37	37	37	37

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Servant leadership has a weak positive correlation with organizational commitment ( $r = 0.186$ ) and employee engagement ( $r = 0.166$ ), but not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), servant leadership also has a moderate positive correlation with career development ( $r = 0.280$ ), but also not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). There was no significant correlation between Servant Leadership and Compensation ( $p > 0.05$ ). Correlation between Organizational Commitment and other variables: Organizational Commitment had weak positive correlations with Servant Leadership ( $r = 0.186$ ), Compensation ( $r = 0.084$ ), and employee attachment ( $r = 0.410$ ), but only correlation with employee attachment was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). Organizational Commitment also had a moderate positive correlation with Career Development ( $r = 0.292$ ), but was not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Correlation between Compensation and other variables: There is no significant correlation between Compensation and other variables ( $p > 0.05$ ). Correlation between Career Development and other variables: Career Development had weak positive correlations with Servant Leadership ( $r = 0.280$ ), Organizational Commitment ( $r = 0.292$ ), and employee attachment ( $r = 0.307$ ), but was not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). Correlation between Employee Engagement and other variables: Employee Engagement has a strong positive correlation with Organizational Commitment ( $r = 0.410$ ), but only this correlation is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). There was no significant correlation between employee engagement and other variables ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Organizational Commitment have a relationship significant with attachment Employee and Employee Engagement. Correlation between Servant Leadership, Compensation, and Career Development with other variables tends to be weak and not statistically significant, except for the relationship between Career Development and Organizational Commitment which shows a weak positive correlation but is not statistically significant.

## CONCLUSION

Organizational commitment has a significant correlation with employee engagement and employee engagement. This shows the importance of organizational commitment in



influencing employee engagement and engagement levels. The correlation between Servant Leadership, Compensation, and Career Development with other variables tends to be weak and not statistically significant. This suggests the need for more research to understand the relationship between these factors and employee attachment.

With employee attachment, the Company will get optimal work results from its employees, employee attachment at the beginning of high productivity increases, in line with previous research (Susanto et al., 2022), (Susanto, Syailendra, et al., 2023), (Susanto, 2022), (Henokh Parmenas, 2022), (Wahdiniawati et al., 2023).

Institutional recommendations can improve employee engagement and their engagement, which in turn can improve overall organizational performance and success.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Nussairi, M. K., Bayindir, R., Padmanaban, S., Mihet-Popa, L., & Siano, P. (2017). Constant power loads (CPL) with microgrids: problem definition, stability analysis and compensation techniques. *Energies*, *10*, 1656.
- Arfandi, Y., Amri, & Nizam, A. (2023). The Influence of Work Engagement and Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance at The Aceh One Stop Investment and Services Office (DPMPTSP) With Leader-Member Exchange as A Mediation. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*.
- Aziez, M. S., & Nugroho, S. P. (2023). Pengaruh Servant Leadership dan Human Capital Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dengan Employee Engagement Sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *VALUE*.
- Banu, M. A. S., & Fiverose, N. (2016). A Study on Employee Engagement With Reference to Faculty Members of Aiman College of Arts & Science for Women in Trichy District. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, *5*.
- Bar-Haim, A. (2019). Empirical Study III of BOC: Further Tests of the New Concept of Organizational Commitment. *Organizational Commitment*.
- Brudner, A. (2017). *Workers Compensation Definition*.
- Chuah, S. C., Rahim, A. R. A., Cheam, C. L., & Zulkefle, N. M. (2023). The Role of Job Crafting in mediating the effect of servant leadership and employee engagement: An Empirical Study of the Service Sector in Malaysia. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*.
- Dalain, A. F. (2023). Nurturing Employee Engagement at Workplace and Organizational Innovation in Time of Crisis With Moderating Effect of Servant Leadership. *SAGE Open*.
- Gade, D. S., & K, L. (2019). An empirical study on factors influencing level of employee engagement with reference to select organization. *GIS Business*.
- Henokh Parmenas, N. (2022). Employee Engagement: Turn Over Prevention Strategies and the Key To Improving Performance Management in a Multinational Company. *Journal of Economics, Management, Entrepreneurship, and Business (JEMEB)*, *2*(1), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jemeb.v2i1.70>
- Hngoi, C. L., Abdullah, N.-A., Wan Sulaiman, W. S., & Zaiedy Nor, N. I. (2023). Relationship between job involvement, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment with job insecurity: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1066734.
- Hung, E., & Wang, K. (2017). *What are the Best in Class Non-Monetary (e.g. Non-Bonus, Non-Stock, or Non-Salary) Benefits for Innovation Based Companies?*
- Jones, B. L. (2018). *The Relationship of Employee Engagement and Employee Job Satisfaction to Organizational Commitment*.
- Lui, J. Y., Voong, E. A. L., Voon, M. L., & Lim, T.-Y. (2023). The Dance of Leadership: Unravelling the Impact of Leadership Styles on Employee Engagement in Malaysia's

- Private Sector. *E-Academia Journal*.
- Mok, I., Mackenzie, L., & Thomson, K. E. (2021). Career development and human resource management of older workers: A scoping review. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 30*, 226–239.
- Nabawi, A., Eliyana, A., & Sridadi, A. R. (2023). IMPLEMENTASI SERVANT LEADERSHIP DALAM ORGANISASI: PENDEKATAN SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW. *BISMA: Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen*.
- Nasidi, Y., Waziri, A. G., Sunday, A. A., & Halim, B. Y. (2020). Influence of Training and Career Development on Employee Engagement among nonacademic staff of University. *International Journal of Intellectual Discourse (IJID), 3*(2), 383–395.
- Prentice, S. B. (2022). Job Satisfaction or Employee Engagement: Regardless of Which Comes First, Supportive Leadership Improves Them Both. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 24*, 275–285.
- Ramli, I., Darsono, N., & Chan, S. (2022). THE EFFECT OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITH ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE AT PT. BANK ACEH SYARIAH HEAD OFFICE. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Review*.
- Ran, G., & Cinamon, R. G. (2022). Career Self-Efficacy, Future Perceptions, and Life Satisfaction: Investigating Two Adolescent Career Development Models. *Journal of Career Development, 50*, 764–784.
- Susanto, P. C. (2022). Employee Engagement Strategy: Analysis Of Organizational Commitment , Compensation , Career Development. *International Conference Of Humanities And Social Science (ICHSS), 1*(1), 96–103.
- Susanto, P. C., Agusinta, L., & Setyawati, A. (2023). Determinant Organization Commitment and Development Organization: Analysis Servant Leadership , Transformational Leadership , Transactional Leadership. *Formosa Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (FJMR), 2*(3), 541–558. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55927/fjmr.v2i3.3356>
- Susanto, P. C., Ali, H., Sawitri, N. N., & Widyastuti, T. (2023). Strategic Management : Concept , Implementation , and Indicators of Success ( Literature Review ). *Siber Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary, 1*(2), 1–11.
- Susanto, P. C., & Amanda, A. P. (2023). Analysis of Recruitment , Performance Evaluation , and Career Planning to Support Employee Performance. *Greenation International Journal of Law and Social Sciences, 1*(2), 81–90.
- Susanto, P. C., Maharani, A., & Suroso, S. (2023). Determinasi Budaya Organisasi , Pengembangan Karir dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Keterikatan Karyawan : Studi Empiris. *Jurnal Siber Multi Disiplin, 1*(2), 93–101.
- Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N., & Jaya, U. B. (2022). Coaching , Mentoring , Leadership Transformation and Employee Engagement : A Review of the Literature Employee engagement has been widely discussed in the study of human resource management in an effort to reduce turnover rates in a company . This article. *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*.
- Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N., & Susita, D. (2023). Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover : Analysis Recruitment , Career Development , Organizational Culture. *Dinasti International Journal Of Digital Business Management, 4*(3), 619–629. <https://doi.org/10.31933/dijdbm.v4i2>
- Susanto, P. C., Setiawan, H. A., Yandi, A., & Putri, A. (2024). Analysis Servant Leadership , Competence , and Motivation on Performance Employee : Study Literature Review. *Greenation International Journal of Law Social Sciences, 1*(3), 114–123.
- Susanto, P. C., Soehaditama, J. P., & Benned, M. (2023). Determination of Motivation and Career Development : Analysis of Training , Competence. *Proceeding International*

- Conference on Religion, Science and Education*, 2, 273–279.
- Susanto, P. C., Syailendra, S., & Suryawan, R. F. (2023). Determination of Motivation and Performance : Analysis of Job Satisfaction , Employee Engagement and Leadership. *International Journal of Business and Applied Economics (IJBAE)*, 2(2), 59–68.
- Wahdiniawati, S. A., Parmenas, N. H., & Sulisty, S. (2023). Mengukur konsep keterlibatan karyawan : Implementasi Utrecht Work Engagement Scale ( UWES ) 9S. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Nusantara*, 1(2), 51–58.
- Yusuf, M., Febrian, W. D., Sinta, A. K., Juminawati, S., Kutoyo, M. S., Simbolon, E., Jumawan, J., Widjaja, A., Zen, A., Rajab, M., Supardi, S., Soesilo, R., Nuraeni, N., Susanto, P. C., Prayoga, R., Tahir, A. M. S., Irzani, I., Suryawan, R. F., Pratikno, Y., & Safariningsih, R. T. H. (2023). Manajemen (Teori & Aplikasi). In S. S. Atmodjo (Ed.), *Eureka Media Aksara*. Eureka Media Aksara.