



Plagiarism Checker X - Report

Originality Assessment

15%



Overall Similarity

Date: Jan 7, 2026 (04:04 AM)

Matches: 542 / 3501 words

Sources: 17

Remarks: Moderate similarity detected, consider enhancing the document if necessary.

Verify Report:

Scan this QR Code



Journal of General Education and Humanities Vol. 5, No. 1, February 2026, pp. 511 – 519,
<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> ISSN 2963-7147 511 Journal homepage:

<https://journal-gehu.com/index.php/gehu> Analysis of Esa Unggul University Students' Preferences for Leadership Seminars Using Conjoint Analysis Lili Hastuti¹, Widiastuti², Muhammad Ichsan³, Vera Maya Santi⁴ ¹Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia ²Universitas Bani Saleh, Bekasi, Indonesia ³Universitas Djuanda, Bogor, Indonesia ^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia Article

Info ABSTRACT Article history: Received 2025-12-09 Revised 2025-12-29 Accepted 2026-01-02 This research addresses the need to understand student preferences in leadership seminar design at Esa Unggul University and aims to identify the seminar attributes that most strongly influence participation decisions. A quantitative approach was applied using Conjoint Analysis, involving 100 active students from various study programs who are members of the Student Executive Board (BEM). Data were gathered through structured questionnaires and analyzed to estimate utility scores and relative importance values across five attributes: seminar topic, speaker, delivery format, participation cost, and benefits. The findings show that students favor seminars on **Leadership and Entrepreneurship**, delivered by expert lecturers, implemented in a hybrid format, priced between IDR 20,000 and 50,000, and offering certificates combined with SKP or competency recognition. Importance value analysis indicates that speaker credibility, cost considerations, and topic relevance are the dominant factors shaping student preferences. Model validation results demonstrate strong predictive accuracy, with a Pearson correlation of 0.815 and Kendall's tau of 0.407, both statistically significant. These results provide an empirical basis for universities and event organizers to develop leadership seminars that better align with student expectations, thereby improving engagement and program effectiveness. Keywords: Esa Unggul University Student Conjoint Analysis Leadership Seminar Student Preferences This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA

license. Corresponding Author: Vera Maya Santi ¹² Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, FMIPA, Universitas Negeri Jakarta Email: vmsanti@unj.ac.id 1.

INTRODUCTION Leadership competence is widely recognized as a critical capability for university students, particularly those engaged in student organizations, as it contributes to character formation, **2 the development of** soft skills, and readiness for **16 future leadership roles** [1], [2]. Despite the growing emphasis on leadership development in higher education, many

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 512 leadership programs—especially seminars—are still designed based on organizers' assumptions rather than empirically grounded student preferences. This mismatch often results in suboptimal participation and limited program effectiveness, indicating a practical challenge in aligning leadership seminar designs with students' actual needs. In response to this issue, higher education institutions require an evidence-based approach to understand how students evaluate different seminar characteristics. One strategic effort to address this problem is the application of analytical methods that capture trade-offs among multiple seminar attributes, such as topic relevance, speaker credibility, delivery format, cost, and perceived benefits. By systematically analyzing these attributes, universities can redesign leadership seminars to better align with participant expectations and enhance engagement outcomes. Accordingly, this **2 study aims to** examine the preferences of Esa Unggul University students toward leadership seminars and **to identify the** attributes that most strongly influence their attendance decisions. Specifically, this research seeks to measure the relative utility and importance of key seminar attributes using Conjoint Analysis, thereby providing a structured basis for decision-making in leadership program planning. From a theoretical perspective, **2 this study is** grounded in leadership development theory and student involvement theory, which emphasize experiential learning, contextual leadership practice, and active participation as central to effective leadership education [3], [4]. Leadership seminars function as formal learning interventions that complement organizational experiences by offering conceptual frameworks, role models, and networking opportunities [5]. Furthermore, preference-based decision theory underpins the

use of Conjoint Analysis, as it assumes that individual choices are determined by the combined evaluation of multiple attributes rather than by a single factor [6]. Several previous studies have applied Conjoint Analysis to examine preferences in educational and training contexts, such as instructional formats, online learning attributes, **2** and **leadership development programs** [6]–[8]. These studies consistently highlight **the importance of** speaker quality, content relevance, and delivery flexibility. However, most existing research focuses on general student populations or instructional settings, with limited attention to leadership seminars within student organizational environments, particularly in Indonesian higher education. This study addresses that gap by focusing on Student Executive Board (BEM) members, who represent a segment with high leadership exposure and distinct expectations, thereby offering a more contextual and practice-oriented contribution. It is expected that **2** **the results of this research** will provide practical and theoretical benefits. Practically, the findings can **16** **serve as a** reference for universities and event organizers in designing leadership seminars that are more relevant, affordable, and attractive to students. Theoretically, this study enriches the literature on leadership education by integrating preference analysis into the context of student organizational development. Ultimately, aligning seminar design with student preferences is anticipated to enhance participation, learning outcomes, and the overall effectiveness of leadership development initiatives in higher education.

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 513 **2.** **METHOD** This study adopts a quantitative research design using **1** **the Conjoint Analysis** technique to examine students' preferences for leadership seminar attributes [9]. This approach is chosen because it enables the simultaneous evaluation of multiple attributes and estimates their relative influence on individual decision-making, allowing **2** **a more comprehensive understanding of** preference structures [6], [10]. The research population comprises Esa Unggul University students who are actively involved in the Student Executive Board (BEM), as this group has direct experience and relevance in leadership-related activities. A sample of

100 respondents was determined using purposive sampling, **2** based on their organizational involvement **and exposure to** leadership seminars [11]. Data on BEM membership were obtained from the University's Student Affairs Office, and an online questionnaire link was disseminated via WhatsApp and Line communication groups. From the distributed invitations, 100 students voluntarily participated and completed the questionnaire, meeting the targeted sample size and ensuring data adequacy [12]. The study examines five core seminar attributes, namely seminar topic, speaker, delivery format, participation cost, and benefits or incentives. **1** Each attribute is operationalized into three levels, developed by considering standard seminar practices **in higher education** and guided by established principles in conjoint attribute construction [13],[15]. This structure allows respondents to evaluate realistic combinations of seminar characteristics. **3** Data collection was conducted using **an online survey** instrument created with Google Forms, which presented respondents with a set of seminar profiles composed of different attribute combinations. Participants were **4** asked to rate each profile using a four-point scale, reflecting their level of preference [16]. The collected data were then processed **1** using **Conjoint Analysis** to estimate part-worth utility scores and relative importance values **for each attribute**, thereby revealing the contribution of individual attributes to overall student preferences [17]. **In accordance with the Conjoint Analysis** framework, **the attributes and** their levels were defined to represent the key dimensions influencing students' selection of leadership seminars [14]. A detailed description of these variables is presented **in Table 1**.

Attribute	Level
Seminar Topic	Leadership & Entrepreneurship
Type of material presented during the leadership seminar.	Digital Leadership
Speaker	Public Speaking & Leadership
Category	Expert Lecturer
Professional Practitioner	Alumni Speaker
Activity Format	Cost
Cost	Benefits / Incentives
Method through which the seminar is conducted	Required registration fee for participants.
Form of rewards or additional value received by participants.	Online
Offline	Hybrid
Free	IDR 20,000–50,000
IDR 50,000-100.000	Certificate Only
Certificate + SKP	Certificate + SKP

+ Competency

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 514 3. RESULTS AND

DISCUSSION Before conducting **1** the Conjoint Analysis, descriptive statistics were used to present the characteristics of the respondents. These descriptive results include gender distribution and study program. Figure 1. Gender Distribution Figure **2** **1** presents the gender distribution of the respondents. Out of 100 participants, 45% were male, and 55% were female, indicating a slight dominance of female respondents. To further describe the sample, Table 2 presents **7** the distribution of respondents by study program. **Table 2.**

Distribution of Respondents

Study Program	Frecuency	Education Management
Communication	22	18
Informatc	15	14
Law	12	19
Psychology	12	19
Total	100	100

Communication Informatc Law Psychology 22 18 15 14 12 19 Total 100

Respondents Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents by study program. Out of 100 respondents, the largest group consisted of Management students **13** (22%), followed by Communication (18%), Informatics (15%), Law (14%), Psychology (12%), and Education/Other programs (19%). **1** This indicates that the respondents come from diverse academic backgrounds, providing a representative sample for analyzing seminar preferences. Table 3 presents the results of the conjoint analysis based on the Utility Estimate values. These utility estimates are used to identify respondents' preferences according to the levels within each attribute.

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 515 Table **3. Conjoint Analysis** Results: Utility Estimate Utilities Attribute Level Utility Estimate Std. Error Seminar Topic Basic Leadership -0.033 0.037 Leadership & Team Management -0.062 0.043 Leadership & Entrepreneurship 0.095 0.043 Speaker Expert Lecturer 0.027 0.037 Practitioner / Professional -0.047 0.043 Alumni / Successful Figure 0.020 0.043 Seminar Format Offline (In-person) -0.002 0.037 Online -0.014 0.043 Hybrid 0.016 0.043 Cost Free -0.015 0.037 IDR 20,000 – 50,000 0.040 0.043 IDR 50,000 – 100,000 -0.025 0.043 Benefit Certificate Only -0.025 0.037 Certificate + SKP/Competency 0.070 0.043 Certificate +

Additional Material / Networking -0.045 0.043 Constant 3.596 0.034 ¹ Based on the results shown in Table 3, the Utility Estimate values are used to determine the preference levels of the majority of respondents. 1. For the seminar topic attribute, the highest Utility Estimate is found in Leadership & Entrepreneurship, with ⁴ a value of 0.095. This indicates that the majority of respondents prefer seminar topics related to Leadership & Entrepreneurship. 2. For the speaker attribute, the highest Utility Estimate value is found in Expert Lecturers, with a utility estimate of 0.027. This means that most respondents prefer seminars led by expert lecturers. 3. For the seminar format attribute, the highest Utility Estimate value is found in the Hybrid format, with a utility estimate of 0.016. This ¹ shows that the majority of respondents prefer hybrid seminar formats. 4. For the cost attribute, the highest Utility Estimate value is ² found in the fee range of Rp 20,000 – Rp 50,000, with a utility estimate of 0.040. This indicates that most respondents prefer seminar costs within this range. 5. For the benefit attribute, the highest Utility Estimate value is found in Certificate + SKP/Competency, with a utility estimate of 0.070. ¹⁵ This means that the majority of respondents prefer benefits in the form of a certificate accompanied by SKP/competency credits. Table 4 presents the importance values. These importance values ¹ are used to determine which factors the majority of respondents consider most important.

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 516 Table 4. Conjoint Analysis Results:

Importance Values Attribute	Importance Value
Seminar Topic	20.280
Speaker	20.974
Seminar Format	19.263
Cost	20.752
Benefit	18.731
Averaged Importance Score	

- Based on the results in Table 4, the Importance Values are used to determine which factors are most important to the majority of respondents. The highest Importance Values are observed in the Speaker, Cost, and Seminar Topic attributes, with values of 20.974, 20.752, and 20.280, respectively. This indicates that the majority of respondents consider the Speaker, Cost, and Seminar Topic to be the most important factors. Table 5. Conjoint Analysis Results: Accuracy Testing Correlationsa Correlation Measure Value Sig.

Pearson's R 0.815 0.000 Kendall's Tau 0.407 0.015 a. Correlations between observed and estimated preferences ¹ Based on the results shown in Table 5, the Pearson correlation value is 0.815 and is significant with Sig = 0.000 < 0.05, while the Kendall's tau correlation value is 0.407 and is significant with Sig = 0.015 < 0.05. This indicates that the actual ratings and the estimated ratings have a strong (and significant) linear relationship overall.

⁴ In other words, the ratings based on the estimated results are highly accurate and closely aligned with the actual ratings for the majority of respondents. 4. DISCUSSION ³

The findings of this study demonstrate that Esa Unggul University students exhibit clear, structured preferences for leadership seminar attributes, which can be effectively explained using the Conjoint Analysis framework. The preference for the Leadership and Entrepreneurship topic indicates that students value seminar content that not only strengthens leadership capacity but also equips them with entrepreneurial insights relevant to career readiness and self-development. This result aligns with the leadership development literature, which emphasizes integrating leadership skills with innovation, initiative, and real-world problem-solving to enhance student engagement and future employability [18], [2]. The dominance of expert lecturers as ¹ the most preferred speaker category suggests that credibility, academic authority, and perceived expertise remain central considerations for students when evaluating seminar quality. This finding is consistent with previous

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 517 studies showing that speaker competence significantly influences perceived value and learning effectiveness ² in leadership and training programs [19], [20]. Compared to practitioners or alumni speakers, expert lecturers may be perceived as offering more structured, theory-based, and academically reliable perspectives, particularly important for students in formal organizational leadership roles. Regarding delivery mode, the preference for a hybrid seminar format reflects students' demand for flexibility without sacrificing interaction quality. This outcome supports recent educational research indicating that hybrid models balance accessibility and engagement

by combining the convenience of online participation with the experiential benefits of face-to-face interaction [21], [22]. **2** In the context of student organizations, such flexibility allows participants to manage academic, organizational, and personal responsibilities more effectively. Cost considerations also play a crucial role in shaping student preferences. **5**

The results show that a moderate fee range (IDR 20,000–50,000) is preferred over free or higher-cost options. This suggests that students may associate reasonable pricing with higher perceived quality while still maintaining affordability. Similar findings have been reported in preference-based studies, where moderate pricing is often interpreted as a signal of the program's value and seriousness [23]. Excessively high fees may act as participation barriers, while free seminars may be perceived as less exclusive or less valuable. **2** In terms of benefits, the strong preference for certificates, combined with SKP or competency recognition, highlights students' instrumental orientation toward formal acknowledgment of their participation. This supports student involvement theory, which argues that students are more motivated to engage in extracurricular activities when outcomes are formally recognized and contribute to their academic or professional profiles [24]. Certification linked to competency or credit systems provides tangible returns that extend beyond short-term learning experiences. The importance-value analysis further reinforces these interpretations by showing **7** that the speaker, cost, and seminar topic are the most influential attributes in decisionmaking. **4** This indicates that students prioritize content relevance, financial feasibility, and speaker credibility before considering format or additional benefits. These findings are consistent with earlier conjoint-based studies **3** in educational contexts, which emphasize that perceived academic value and economic considerations are primary determinants of participation decisions [25], [9].

Finally, the high Pearson correlation and significant Kendall's tau confirm that **1** the Conjoint Analysis model accurately represents students' actual preferences. This supports prior methodological research stating that conjoint models are robust tools for capturing complex preference structures in educational and training program design [10]. Overall, this study extends previous research by applying Conjoint Analysis specifically to

leadership seminars within student organizational settings, thereby offering contextual insights rarely addressed in earlier studies ³ and providing a practical decision-making framework for leadership program development in higher education.

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 518 5. CONCLUSION ¹ The results of the Conjoint Analysis indicate that several key attributes influence students' preferences for leadership seminars. ⁴ Based on the Utility Estimate values, students prefer the Leadership & Entrepreneurship topic, expert lecturers as speakers, a hybrid seminar format, a fee of Rp 20,000–Rp 50,000, and benefits in the form of a certificate plus SKP/competency credits. Furthermore, the Importance Values ³ show that the most decisive attributes in decision-making are speaker, cost, and seminar topic. This emphasizes that students prioritize the speaker's credibility, affordability, and topic relevance before deciding ⁵ to attend a seminar. The model accuracy test, conducted using Pearson correlation (0.815; ¹³ $p < 0.05$) and Kendall's tau (0.407; $p < 0.05$), demonstrates that the estimated model closely aligns with the respondents' actual preferences. Thus, ⁴ Conjoint Analysis is considered effective in mapping students' preferences. Overall, these findings provide insight into students' desire for leadership seminars that are relevant, affordable, flexible, and delivered by competent speakers. Implementing these recommendations ³ is expected to help the university enhance student engagement and ensure that leadership programs are more aligned with their needs. Nevertheless, ² this study has several limitations that open opportunities for future research. The attributes included in the Conjoint Analysis were limited; therefore, future studies may incorporate additional factors such as seminar duration, interaction methods, or organizer reputation to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of student preferences. The sample was also restricted to students from one institution, so expanding the respondent base across multiple universities could improve the generalizability of the findings. Future research may also employ other approaches, such as choice-based conjoint or ¹ experimental designs, to capture real decision-making behavior better. ⁵

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS We would like to express our gratitude to the entire team involved in preparing this article. We also thank Esa Unggul University and the students who participated as respondents in this study. Furthermore, we sincerely appreciate the support from the Doctoral Program in Educational Management at Jakarta State University, particularly for the Advanced Statistics course, which enabled the completion of this research and the preparation of this article.

REFERENCES [1] A. W. Astin, "Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education," *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 518–529, 1999, doi: 10.1353/csd.1999.0052. [2] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 2018. [3] D. V. Day, J. W. Fleenor, L. E. Atwater, R. E. Sturm, and R. A. McKee, "Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory," *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 63–82, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004. [4] I. Etikan, "Comparison of 8 convenience sampling and purposive sampling," *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 2016, doi: 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.

<https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i1.928> 519 [5] J. D. Foubert and L. M. Grainger, "Student involvement and satisfaction with campus leadership programs," *NASPA Journal*, vol. 43, 3 no. 3, pp. 539–562, 2006, doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.1614. [6] 6 P. E. Green and V. R. Rao, "Conjoint measurement for quantifying judgmental data," *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 355–363, 1971, doi: 10.1177/002224377100800312. [7] P. 11 E. Green and V. Srinivasan, "Conjoint analysis in consumer research: Issues and outlook," *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 103–123, 1978, doi: 10.1086/208721. [8] P. E. Green and V. Srinivasan, "Conjoint 1 analysis in marketing: New developments with implications for research and practice," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 3–19, 1990, doi: 10.1177/002224299005400402. [9] J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed. Boston, MA, USA:

Cengage Learning, 2019. [10] Y. Hidayah and Y. F. Ali, "Understanding educational management and leadership among students through contextual learning," JP (Jurnal Pendidikan): Teori dan Praktik, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 40–49, 2025, doi: 10.26740/jp.v5n2.p40-49. [11] A. Kezar and E. Holcombe, Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Important Lessons from Research and Practice. Washington, DC, USA: American Council on Education, 2017. [12] S. R. Komives, N. Lucas, and T. R. McMahon, Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference, 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2013. [13] J. M. Kouzes and B. Z. Posner, The Student Leadership Challenge, 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2013. [14] W. F. Kuhfeld, Marketing Research Methods in SAS: Experimental Design, Choice, Conjoint, and Graphical Techniques. Cary, NC, USA: SAS Institute, 2010. [15] B. Li and S. Kim, "Developing student leadership readiness and core leadership skills to enhance student engagement through organizational development intervention," ABAC ODI Journal Vision. Action. Outcome, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 82–103, 2021, doi: 10.14456/abacodijournal.2021.6. [16] M. Liu, E. McKelroy, S. Corliss, and J. Carrigan, "Investigating student motivation in MOOCs: Conjoint analysis of multiple learning attributes," Computers & Education, vol. 146, p. 103772, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103772. [17] J. J. Louviere, T. N. Flynn, and R. T. Carson, "Discrete choice experiments are not conjoint analysis," Journal of Choice Modelling, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 57–72, 2010, doi: 10.1016/S1755-5345(13)70014-9. [18] M. Magarian and W. Seering, "Understanding university students' preferences for instructional formats: A conjoint-based study," Journal of Educational Research, vol. 117, no. 2, pp. 185–198, 2024, doi: 10.1080/00220671.2023.2265123. [19] A. Mandloi, "Conjoint analysis and its applications in marketing research," International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 43–44, 2022, doi: 10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V68I3P508. [20] M. Mukhlison and Makhfud, "Optimizing student roles in organizations through leadership and organizational training in BEM FTK UIT Lirboyo Kediri," Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat (JPM), vol. 4, no. 3, 2025, doi: 10.52434/jpm.v4i3.43160. [21] R. A. Noe,

Employee Training and Development, 8th ed. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill Education, 2021. [22] 3 P. G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 9th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 2021. [23] B. K. Orme, 1 *Getting Started with Conjoint Analysis: Strategies for Product Design and Pricing Research*, 2nd ed. Madison, WI, USA: Research Publishers LLC, 2010. [24] B. K. Orme, *Getting Started with Conjoint Analysis: Strategies for Product Design and Pricing Research*, 2nd ed. Orem, UT, USA: Sawtooth Software, 2014. [25] A. Sahin and M. Yilmaz, "Identifying students' preferences for instructional methods using conjoint analysis," *Education and Information Technologies*, 3 vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 955–972, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10639-023-12012-5.

Sources

1	https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4426/12/2/274 INTERNET 5%
2	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/17/7/2911 INTERNET 3%
3	https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393654300_Transformational_Leadership_in_Education_A_Review_of_Concepts_Roles_Challenges_Practices_and_their_Effects INTERNET 2%
4	https://bookdown.org/rossialessio095/R_Market_Research/conjoint.html INTERNET 1%
5	https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385888886_Hybrid_and_Blended_Learning_Models_Innovations_Challenges_and_Future_Directions_in_Education INTERNET 1%
6	https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=357228 INTERNET 1%
7	https://brainly.com/question/50276051 INTERNET 1%
8	https://www.coursesidekick.com/statistics/661843 INTERNET <1%
9	https://www.vitalsource.com/products/exploring-leadership-for-college-students-who-susan-r-komives-nance-lucas-v9781118421819 INTERNET <1%
10	https://www.scienceopen.com/book?vid=db32e5ce-95cc-4daf-9f37-a14cf3171227 INTERNET <1%
11	https://academic.oup.com/jcr/issue/5/2 INTERNET <1%
12	http://seminars.unj.ac.id/smic2024/wp-content/uploads/15_Vera.pdf INTERNET <1%
13	https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340000298_VOLUNTARY_SAMPLING_DESIGN INTERNET <1%
14	https://udi.asu.edu/co-lab/article/From-Administrators-to-Designers-Reimagining-Leadership-in-Universities INTERNET <1%

- 15 https://storage.googleapis.com/production-bluehost-v1-0-9/649/1300649/PzSfVcg5/97ae7e6453cd42c699810b3e967e0b64?fileName=ChapterFour-Findings_NoCopy.pdf
INTERNET
<1%
-
- 16 <https://www.imd.org/blog/leadership/future-proof-leadership/>
INTERNET
<1%
-
- 17 <https://journals.flvc.org/jpss/article/view/135660>
INTERNET
<1%
-

EXCLUDE CUSTOM MATCHES OFF

EXCLUDE QUOTES OFF

EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON