IJSS: International Journal of Social Science
Vol. 2 No. 1, February 2026, pp: 55-61
ISSN: 3090-0646
DOI: https://doi.org/10.51805/ijss.v2i1.480

THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP, TRAINING, AND WORK COMMITMENT ON WORK PRODUCTIVITY THROUGH EMPLOYEE CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Kustini[1*], Denok Sunarsi[2], Imas Masriah[3]
Master of Management Study Program, Pamulang University, Indonesia
Email : mariebee999@gmail.com,denoksunarsi@unpam.ac.id,
dosen02036@unpam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the influence of leadership, training, and work commitment on employee work productivity through career development. The research approach employs a quantitative method with Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) analysis. The sample consists of 187 permanent employees. The results indicate that leadership, training, and work commitment have a significant positive effect on career development and work productivity. Career development also mediates the relationship between the independent variables and productivity. The R^2 values show that the model explains 90.7% of the variation in career development and 93.8% of the variation in productivity.

Keywords: leadership; training; work commitment; career development; productivity

INTRODUCTION

As healthcare institutions, hospitals have a strategic responsibility to ensure service quality and patient safety. Within the context of organizational governance, service quality is largely determined by the effectiveness of human resource (HR) management. Based on Law Number 44 of 2009 concerning Hospitals, hospitals are required to manage their HR professionally to ensure the quality and safety of healthcare services. Furthermore, Regulation of the Minister of Health of the Republic of Indonesia Number 40 of 2017 emphasizes the importance of developing healthcare workers' career paths through ongoing training, a merit system, and competency-based placement.

From a human resource management perspective, work productivity is a crucial indicator of organizational success. Productivity not only reflects an individual's ability to produce standard output but also demonstrates the effectiveness of the organization's management system. Theoretically, productivity is influenced by various factors, including leadership, training, and work commitment. Effective leadership creates direction, motivation, and constructive communication. Training enhances employees' technical and non-technical competencies, while work commitment strengthens loyalty and consistency in individual contributions to the organization. These three factors are believed to be closely related to a fair and transparent career development system.

Empirical data at Rumah Indonesia Sehat Hospital in South Tangerang City demonstrates an imbalance between individual potential and organizational

systems. Employee productivity assessment data for the 2022–2024 period shows significant fluctuations. In 2022, 39% of employees were in the "Good" category, 12% were in the "Fair" category, and 49% were in the "Poor" category. In 2023, the "Good" category decreased to 21%, although the "Fair" category increased to 45%. In 2024, the "Good" category increased to 40%, but the "Poor" category also increased to 54%. On average, over three years, 45.6% of employees remained in the "Poor" productivity category. This data indicates that performance improvements are uneven and systemic.

A pre-survey of 30 respondents in 2025 reinforced these findings. Regarding leadership, 60% of respondents stated that their superiors were unable to convey information clearly, and 83.3% stated that their superiors were not open to subordinates' opinions. Although 63.3% of respondents considered their leaders to be firm in addressing mistakes, weaknesses in interpersonal communication have the potential to impact subordinate motivation and trust.

In terms of training, the results indicate relatively good performance. 76.7% of respondents assessed the training as meeting competency needs, 86.7% stated the method was effective, and 90% assessed the instructors' ability to deliver the material clearly. However, active participation in ongoing competency development remains limited, with only 66.7% of employees actively participating in training.

The main problem is seen in the career development aspect. Only 30% of employees feel their company supports their career needs, 16.7% receive regular training to improve their competencies, and only 10% consider the career development system to be fair. Furthermore, only 23% of employees view their organization as a suitable place for long-term career development. This situation indicates a gap between individual abilities and the support of the organization's career system, which has the potential to weaken work commitment and sustainable productivity.

Academically, previous research has shown inconsistent results. Some studies found that leadership and training directly impact productivity, while others showed that the effect was significant only when mediated by variables such as motivation or job satisfaction. Furthermore, most research has been conducted in the manufacturing, education, or government sectors, leaving the context of private hospitals, characterized by high work pressure and strict regulations, relatively underexplored.

Based on this analysis, several research gaps underlie this study. First, conceptually, there is limited research integrating leadership, training, and work commitment into a single structural model with career development as a strategic mediating variable. Second, empirically, there are inconsistencies in research results regarding the strength of these variables' influence on productivity. Third, contextually, research on private hospitals in Indonesia is still limited, particularly that testing a comprehensive model based on Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

This study aims to analyze the impact of leadership, training, and work commitment on employee productivity through career development at Rumah Indonesia Sehat Hospital. Using a quantitative approach and the SEM-PLS method on 187 respondents from a total of 350 permanent employees, this study tested the direct and indirect relationships between variables in an integrative model. The

analysis results showed that leadership, training, and work commitment were able to explain 90.7% of the variation in career development (R^2 = 0.907), and together with mediating variables explained 93.8% of the variation in work productivity (R^2 = 0.938).

This research's contribution lies in strengthening an integrative model of hospital HR management based on career development as a strategic mediation mechanism. Theoretically, this research expands the study of the relationship between leadership, training, and work commitment on productivity in the context of healthcare organizations. Practically, the research findings provide policy recommendations for hospital management to strengthen a fair, transparent, and integrated career development system to sustainably increase work productivity.

METHODS

The research uses an explanatory quantitative approach. According to Sugiono (2019:8), "Quantitative research is a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments, data analysis is quantitative statistical, with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses." The population was 350 permanent employees, a sample of 187 respondents through proportional random sampling. The instrument was a Likert scale questionnaire 1–5. Data analysis using SEM-PLS included outer model tests (validity and reliability) and inner model tests (R-square and hypothesis testing).

RESEARCH RESULT

Measurement Results of the Indicator Reliability Test (Outer Loading Factor)

	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Leadership	0.827	0.838	0.875	0.540
Work Commitment	0.921	0.929	0.934	0.590
Training	0.907	0.918	0.924	0.553
Career Development	0.901	0.906	0.916	0.543
Productivity	0.934	0.940	0.944	0.586

The outer model results showed that all indicators were valid (loading >0.7) and reliable (Cronbach's Alpha >0.7). The R^2 value for career development was 0.907 and for productivity 0.938. Path tests indicated that all hypotheses were accepted.

The test results are good because Construct Reliability using convergent validity shows that the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value for all independent variables is above 0.5.

Testing using Discriminant validity – Forner – Larcker Criterion

	Leadership	Work Commitment	Training	Career Development	Productivity
Leadership	0.735				

Work Commitment	0.728	0.768			
Training	0.721	0.734	0.743		
Career Development	0.711	0.747	0.719	0.737	
Productivity	0.724	0.760	0.716	0.730	0.766

The results of the Discriminant validity test - Forner-Larcker criterion show that the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is greater than the correlation value, so it can be concluded that the requirements for the discriminant validity test have been met.

Measurement Results of the STRUCTURAL MODEL (INNER MODEL) test

Coefficient of Determination Test

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Career Development	0.907	0.906
Productivity	0.938	0.937

Based on the Coefficient of Determination test on the Productivity model, the R-square value is 0.938, which means that the contribution of Leadership, Training, Work Commitment and Career Development to Productivity is 93.8%.

Path Analysis Test

	Leadership	Work Commitment	Training	Career Development	Productivity
Leadership				0.320	0.131
Work Commitment				0.635	0.227
Training				0.334	0.122
Career Development					0.528
Productivity					

	Specific Indirect Effects
Leadership -> Career Development -> Productivity	0.169
Work Commitment -> Career Development -> Productivity	0.335
Training -> Career Development -> Productivity	0.176

1. The value of the indirect influence of Leadership (X1) is (0.169) which is greater than the direct influence of Productivity (Y) which is (0.131), so Career Development is proven to mediate the influence of Leadership on Productivity.

2. The indirect influence value of Work Commitment (X2) through Career Development on Productivity (Y) is (0.335) greater than the direct influence of Work Commitment on Productivity (0.227). Therefore, it is concluded that career development mediates strongly.
3. The indirect influence of training (X3) through career development on productivity (0.176) is more dominant than its direct influence, namely training on productivity (0.122). Therefore, it is concluded that career development mediates training on productivity.

T test - statistics (Bootstrapping)

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values
Leadership -> Career Development	0.320	0.326	0.069	4,443	0,000
Leadership -> Productivity	0.131	0.132	0.074	4,449	0,000
Work Commitment -> Career Development	0.635	0.628	0.066	9,617	0,000
Work Commitment -> Productivity	0.227	0.218	0.085	6,226	0,000
Training -> Career Development	0.334	0.344	0.068	3,458	0.001
Training -> Productivity	0.122	0.124	0.058	2,031	0.041
Career Development -> Productivity	0.528	0.533	0.060	2,142	0.033

Based on the results of the t-statistic and p-value tests, we can see that all paths show a significant positive influence and meet the requirements. In this test, the significance level is with a T-statistic value > 1.96 and a p-value < 0.05.

- Leadership → Career Development ($\beta = 0.320$; $p < 0.001$)
- Training → Career Development ($\beta = 0.334$; $p < 0.01$)
- Work Commitment → Career Development ($\beta = 0.635$; $p < 0.001$)
- Career Development → Productivity ($\beta = 0.528$; $p < 0.05$)

DISCUSSION

- The research results show that leadership has a significant influence on career development and work productivity. This indicates that leadership's role in providing direction, motivation, and career support can sustainably improve employee performance.

- Training has also been shown to positively contribute to improving competency and work effectiveness. Training programs relevant to organizational needs encourage employee readiness to meet job demands.
- Work commitment is a dominant variable influencing career development. High levels of employee loyalty and emotional attachment to the organization encourage a willingness to grow and achieve.
- Career development serves as a partial mediator, strengthening the relationship between leadership, training, and work commitment on productivity. This finding underscores the importance of merit-based career systems as a long-term performance improvement strategy.

CONCLUSION

Leadership, training, and work commitment significantly influence career development and productivity. Career development mediates this relationship. It is recommended that hospitals strengthen merit-based career systems and continuous training. Management needs to increase promotion transparency, expand access to training, and build participatory leadership.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*(1), 1–18.

Armstrong, M. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (13th ed.). Kogan Page.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2019). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Dessler, G. (2017). *Human resource management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.

Ghozali, I. (2021). *Structural equation modeling: Metode alternatif dengan Partial Least Squares (PLS)* (edisi 5). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755–768.

Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2015). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2016). *Human resource management* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Noe, R. A. (2017). *Employee training and development* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Pugu, M. R., Riyanto, S., & Haryadi, R. N. (2024). *Metodologi Penelitian; Konsep, Strategi, dan Aplikasi*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Rivai, V., & Sagala, E. J. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan*. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.

Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Perencanaan dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. Refika Aditama.

Siagian, S. P. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Sunarsi, D., Rohaeni, N., Wulansari, R., Andriani, J., Muslimat, A., Rialmi, Z., ... & Fahlevi, M. (2020). Effect of e-leadership style, organizational commitment and service quality towards indonesian school performance. *Syst. Rev. Pharm*, *11*(10), 472-481.

Sutrisno, E. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Kencana.

Usman, H. M., & Haryadi, R. N. (2023). The effect of transformational leadership and work motivation on teacher performance at Vocational High School Bina Mandiri Cileungsi. *International Journal of Sharia Business Management*, *2*(1), 23-29.

Wibowo. (2017). *Manajemen kinerja* (edisi 5). RajaGrafindo Persada.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Education

.