

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1

Hypothesis Bartsch et al.

Structural path	Hypothesis	β	<i>t</i> -value
<i>Hypothesized effects</i>			
Enabler → individual job autonomy	H1a	0.789**	8.937
Enabler → team cohesiveness	H1b	0.327**	2.855
Enabler → individual work tension	H2a	-0.086	0.728
Enabler → teamwork tension	H2b	-0.257*	2.091
Manager → individual job autonomy	H3a	-0.262**	3.382
Manager → team cohesiveness	H3b	0.172 [†]	1.891
Manager → individual work tension	H4a	0.095	0.850
Manager → teamwork tension	H4b	0.086	0.860
Individual job autonomy → individual work performance	H5a	0.174*	2.050
Team cohesiveness → individual work performance	H5b	0.375**	3.122
Individual work tension → individual work performance	H6a	0.111	1.141
Teamwork tension → individual work performance	H6b	0.103	0.739

Sumber: (Bartsch et al., 2021)

Lampiran 2

Hypothesis Irfan et al.

Associations	β Value	SE	p-value
EL → OT	0.58	0.035	0.00
EL → WE	0.47	0.054	0.00
EL → JRAW	0.36	0.056	0.00
OT → WE	0.61	0.037	0.00
OT → JRAW	0.54	0.048	0.00

Note: "EL" = ethical leadership, OT = Organizational trust, WE = Work engagement, JRAW = Job-related affective wellbeing

Sumber: (Irfan et al., 2022)



Lampiran 3

Hypothesis Koo et al.

Paths	Beta-Coeff	t-Values	p-Values	Results
Toxic leadership → Employee resilience	-0.19	6.29	0.001	H1 Supported
Toxic leadership → Crisis communication	-0.27	4.84	0.001	H2 Supported
Crisis communication → Employee resilience	0.41	3.72	0.001	H3 Supported
Toxic leadership → Crisis communication → Employee resilience (indirect effect)	0.21	2.69	0.026	H4 Supported

Sumber: (Koo et al., 2022)

Lampiran 4

Hypothesis Yücel

Path/Effect	Standardized		
	β	SE	p
c Total Effect of Transformational Leadership on Turnover Intention	-0.05	0.01	<0.001
a Transformational Leadership → Employee Performance	0.09	0.05	<0.001
b Employee Performance → Turnover Intention	-0.23	0.08	<0.001
c' Transformational Leadership → Turnover Intention	-0.07	0.01	<0.001
Indirect Effect			
TL → EP → TI	-0.02	0.03	<0.001

Notes: Bias corrected confidence intervals: transformational leadership employee performance turnover intention = -0.05 to -0.01 bootstrap re-samples = 5.000. The 95% confidence interval for the standardized result was produced with bias corrected option in the bootstrap dialogue box in PROCESS procedures (Hayes 2017).

Sumber: (Yücel, 2021)



1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik dan tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar IBIKKG.
2. Dilarang mengemukakan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin IBIKKG.

Lampiran 5

Hypothesis Bibi & Khan

Hypotheses	Std Beta	Standard Deviation	T Statistics	P Values	CI LL	CI UL
APL -> EPW	0.419	0.097	4.378	0.000	0.221	0.593
BPL -> EPW	-0.204	0.076	2.8	0.005	-0.346	-0.055
MPL -> EPW	0.449	0.145	2.935	0.003	0.188	0.758

Note: "APL = Authoritarian Style of Paternalistic Leadership, BPL = Benevolent Style of Paternalistic Leadership, MPL = Moral Style of Paternalistic Leadership, EPW = Employee Psychological Wellbeing"

Moderation Analysis

Relationship	Std Beta	Standard Deviation	T Statistics	CI LL	CI UL
APL -> EPW	0.425	0.101	4.24	0.232	0.628
APL -> SHRP-> EPW	0.048	0.041	1.306	-0.041	0.12
SHRP -> EPW	0.009	0.141	0.176	-0.305	0.244

Note: "APL = Authoritarian Style of Paternalistic Leadership, BPL = Benevolent Style of Paternalistic Leadership, MPL = Moral Style of Paternalistic Leadership, EPW = Employee Psychological Wellbeing"

Sumber: (Bibi & Khan, 2022)

Lampiran 6

Hypothesis Ingsih et al.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std.Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.520	0.340		1.528	0.128		
II	0.177	0.110	0.139	1.612	0.109	0.438	2.284
IS	-0.154	0.088	-0.144	-1.753	0.081	0.479	2.089
IM	0.535	0.089	0.484	6.011	0.000	0.499	2.003
IC	0.264	0.083	0.219	3.185	0.002	0.684	1.461

Dependent Variable : OC

Note: " : II = idealized influence variable, IS = intellectual stimulation variable, IM = inspirational motivation variable, IC = individualized consideration variable, OC = organizational commitment variable"

Sumber: (Ingsih et al., 2021)

Lampiran 7

Hypothesis Zaman et al.

Hypotheses	Relationship	Beta	SE	T Statistics	P-Values	Decision
H1	TL -> WP	-0.094	0.101	0.930	0.353	<i>Not Supported</i>
H2	TL -> RTC	0.790	0.032	24.999	0.000	<i>Supported</i>
H3	RTC -> WP	0.580	0.088	6.566	0.000	<i>Supported</i>
H4	TL -> RTC -> WP	0.458	0.078	5.894	0.000	<i>Supported</i>

Note: "TL = Transformational Leadership, RTC = Readiness To Change, WP = Worker's Performance"

Sumber: (Zaman et al., 2020)

Lampiran 8

Hypothesis Basuki et al.

Hypothesis	Relationship	Beta	SE	T Statistics	P-Values	Decision
H1	TL ->EP	-0.084	0.035	2.419	0.016	<i>Supported</i>
H2	TL ->RFC	0.416	0.040	10.387	0.000	<i>Supported</i>
H3	RFC ->EP	0.874	0.027	32.283	0.000	<i>Supported</i>
H4	TL ->RFC ->EP	0.364	0.039	9.387	0.000	<i>Supported</i>

Note: "RFC =readiness for change, TL = transformational leadership, EP = employee performance"

Sumber: (Basuki et al., 2020)



Lampiran 9

Hypothesis Dewi & Sjabadhyni

Variable	Psychological Well-Being (High=1, Low=0)				
	β	OR	P	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Digital Leadership	0.169	1.184	0.542	0.000	1.103 - 1.272
Digital Leadership - Attitudes, competencies, and behaviour	0.006	1.006	0.502	0.950	0.845 - 1.197
Digital Leadership-Skills	0.292	1.339	0.573	0.000	1.166 - 1.539
Cox & Snell R Square	0.011				
Nagelkerke's pseudo-R Square	0.042				
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	$\chi^2 = 6.113, df = 7, p = 0.527$				

Sumber: (Dewi & Sjabadhyni, 2021)

Lampiran 10

Hypothesis AlAjmi

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	p-value
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	40.570	5.244		7.736	.000
Digital Leadership	.195	.057	.309	3.425	.001

Dependent Variable: teachers' technology integration.

Sumber: (AlAjmi, 2022)

© Hak cipta milik Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie

Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie



1. Dilarang menyalin atau mengutip seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa menuliskan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik dan tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar IBIKKG.
2. Dilarang mengemukakan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin IBIKKG.



© Hak cipta milik IBIKKG (Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie)

Lampiran 11 Hypothesis Samreen et al.

1. Dilarang mengutip atau menyalin sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin IBIKKG.

	COV-DS → JUSS → ACS		CI _{95%}
	B(SE)	t	
Direct effects			
Path a ₁ (Direct effect of COV-DS on JUSS)	0.64(0.05)	11.84***	
Path a ₂ (Direct effect of COV-DS on OIS)	-0.15(0.05)	-2.53*	
Path b ₁ (Direct effect of JUSS on ACS)	-0.28(0.05)	-5.02***	
Path b ₂ (Direct effect of OIS on ACS)	0.35(0.05)	6.20***	
H1 Path c (Total effect of COV-DS on ACS)	-0.30(0.05)	-5.35***	
Path c (Total effect of COV-DS on ACS, controlling for JUSS)	-0.13(0.05)	-2.28***	
Path c' (Total effect of COV-DS on ACS, controlling for OIS)	-0.32(0.05)	-5.58***	
Indirect effects			
H2 M1 (COV-DS → JUSS → ACS)	-0.17(0.07)		[-0.32; -0.03]
H2 M2 (COV-DS → OIS → ACS)	-0.01(0.01)		[-0.05; 0.011]
Moderated mediation			
H3 TL (COV-DS → JUSS → ACS)	-0.21(0.05)	-3.65***	[-0.32; -0.09]
H3 TL (COV-DS → OIS → ACS)	-0.18(0.05)	-3.20***	[-0.30; -0.07]

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ns, not significant, N = 274, CI_{95%}, Confidence Interval at 95%; COV-DS, Downsizing due to COVID-19; JUSS, Job Uncertainty Stress in Survivors; OIS, Organizational Identification of Survivors; ACS, Affective Commitment of Survivors; TL, Transformational Leadership.

Sumber: (Samreen et al., 2022)

Lampiran 12 Hypothesis Rivaldo

	Beta	Sig.	Direct	Indirect
X ₁ → Z	0,253	0,082	0,253	
X ₂ → Z	0,574	0,000	0,574	
X ₁ → Y	0,632	0,000	0,632	
X ₂ → Y	0,213	0,009	0,213	
Z → Y	0,200	0,008	0,200	
X ₁ → Z → Y				0,050
X ₂ → Z → Y				0,114

Note: "X₁ = Kepemimpinan (Leadership), X₂ = Motivasi (Motivation), Y = Performa (Performance), Z = Kepuasan Kerja (Job Satisfaction)"

Sumber: (Rivaldo, 2021)

Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie

Lampiran 13

Hypothesis Grobler & Flotman

Unique contributions of predictors to variance in hope and optimism (Only standardised coefficients are presented).

Factor	Private sector		Public sector		Combined sample	
	β	<i>t</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Constant	-	17.59	-	26.31	-	31.33
SL	0.05	1.14	0.23	5.89	0.17	5.87
TBL	0.54	12.94	0.28	7.36	0.39	13.79

Note: Independent variables: (constant) Dependent variable: H&O; all $p \leq 0.001$.

SL, Servant leadership; TBL, Team-based learning.

Sumber: (Grobler & Flotman, 2021)

Lampiran 14

Hypothesis Meiryani et al.

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	Std. error	Beta		
(Constant)	18.102	3.088		5.861	0.000
TL	0.142	0.090	0.134	1.581	0.116
RW	0.421	0.095	0.377	4.449	0.000

Dependent Variable: Employee Performance.

Note: "TL = Transformational Leadership, RW = Remote Working"

Sumber: (Meiryani et al., 2022)

