

## **Servant Leadership in Educational Environment toward Employee Performance: A Case of Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia**

**Benedict Feliks Hatam<sup>1</sup> & Kadek Rihendra Dantes<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus, Indonesia,

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia

\*Corresponding email: [felikshatambennydik.0992@gmail.com](mailto:felikshatambennydik.0992@gmail.com)

*Received: 25 December 2023*

*Accepted: 10 March 2024*

*Published: 25 April 2024*

**Abstract: Servant Leadership in Educational Environment toward Employee Performance: A Case of Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia Kasus Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia.** Contribution of Servant Leadership to Individual Performance in the Flores Islands, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT), Indonesia. **Objective :** This research aims to determine the contribution of servant leadership to individual performance. This includes stating the most prominent indicators for each variable based on the research subject. **Method :** This research uses quantitative methods with an ex-post facto or non-experimental design. The population in this study was 66 educational staff at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng, and sampling was carried out using saturated samples. **Findings :** Servant leadership contributes to employee performance. Apart from that, there are indicators of servant leadership and performance which are very influential in improving individual performance on the Flores Islands, NTT. **Conclusion :** Servant leadership contributes to individual performance in ex-post facto research using linear regression analysis methods.

**Keywords:** servant leadership, employee performance.

### ***To cite this article:***

Hatam, B. F., & Dantes, K. R. (2024). Servant Leadership in Educational Environment toward Employee Performance: A Case of Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 14(1), 89-104. doi: 10.23960/jpp.v14.i1.202407.

### **■ INTRODUCTION**

Leaders of organizations, companies or institutions in various forms have a central role and are the main agents in creating internal organizational change (Vogel, 2022). The privilege of a leader in formulating policies, encouraging and influencing others to realize organizational goals internally and externally is determining the progress or decline of the organization. Organizational goals are achieved through the performance of each individual.

Performance in the context of educational institutions, one of which is higher education

institutions, is to show the quality of the institution as an institution. Achieving good institutional performance is a moral, professional, competitive and accountable obligation for educational institutions (Sallis, 2002). The performance of higher education as a knowledge-intensive academic organization depends on the commitment and participation of internal human resources, namely education staff and lecturers, so that prioritization of education staff and lecturers becomes a fundamental choice (Dahleez & Hamad, 2023; Simmons, 2002; Dasanayaka et al., 2021)

Prioritization or focus on individuals as human resources (HR) to maintain the existence of an organization through creative and innovative work requires a leadership style that can balance the implementation of Human Resource Management (HRM) with organizational goals (Gore & Kanyangale, 2022). This balance can unite organizational expectations with employee expectations (Bombiak, 2017; Mirzapour et al., 2019; Khalifa et al., 2022). In response to this, this research seeks to find the contribution of servant leadership to individual performance. Servant leadership that focuses on employees creates psychological safety (Zada et al., 2022), and increasing commitment to the organization (eq Aboramadan et al., 2020; Su et al., 2019) and impact on employee success in the workplace (e.g. Muis et al., 2018; Monika et al., 2019; Su et al., 2019; Utami et al., 2019; Laksmi et al., 2019; Sudarmo, 2022; Zada et al., 2022; Kartono et al., 2023)

The combination of servant leadership which focuses on serving the needs of organizational members with HRM as a system that supports employees to ensure each individual can improve performance are two concepts that can be applied today (Andre & Lantu, 2015; Ludwikowska, 2023). By heeding Peter's advice in Senge (Spears, 1995: 145), that in building an understanding of servant leadership it is very important to refer to the thoughts of Robert K. Greenleaf. According to Greenleaf (1977) a leader is a servant, the main servant, and a servant leader is a leader who serves by placing other people first, fulfilling other people's needs, comforting other people as the main priority, or focusing on the interests of employees by building dialogue full of love and upholding feelings. mutual respect (Spears, 1995: 15)

Focus on serving others or prioritizing others beyond personal interests is a key and central characteristic of servant leadership (Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011). Based on McGee et al., (

2002 : 144) servant leadership is a strong leadership strategy in offering ways new to use employee knowledge and wisdom in achieving organizational goals

Serving with a focus on organizational members based on virtue or high moral standards as an internal and spiritual qualitative characteristic underlies ethical and superior characteristics, practicing honesty, caring, and prioritizing employee needs in building work relationships (Patterson, 2003; Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). Based on Wallace (2012) Servant leadership is a leader who has holistic moral awareness to build emotional working relationships and has a calling to empower all components of the organization by committing to improving a culture of individual and collective responsibility, positive and effective working relationships based on strong ethics in understanding and identifying people's needs. others (individuals) and prioritize other people's needs as a service priority.

Eva et al. (2019) define servant leadership as a leadership approach that is other-oriented, realized through prioritizing the needs and interests of individuals as followers one on one with and reorienting from self-interest to concern for others in the organization and community. greater one.

Servant leaders in creating independent individuals in work are carried out by serving, sincere love, commitment to individual development through empowerment, building a shared vision, humility, high trust in colleagues (Greenleaf 1977; Russell & Stone, 2002; Peterson, 2003) is persuasive in mobilizing employees, has courage, shares responsibility, is committed to building a harmonious organization, and is an authentic person with integrity, honesty and ethics (Greenleaf 1977; Barburto & Weler, 2006; van Dierendonck, 2011) Dierendonck, 2010; Patterson, 2003; Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005; Franco & Antunes, 2020)

The substance is that servant leadership focuses on individual needs and in different ways

develops individuals to become independent individuals in achieving organizational goals. This differentiates it from other types of leadership. Servant leadership theory is different from other leadership. Servant leadership is different from transformational leadership.

Servant leadership is more focused and prioritizes developing individuals with different dimensions, while transformational leadership tends to develop individuals to achieve organizational goals (Stone et al., 2003 ; van Dierendonck, 2011; Ludwikowska, 2023 ). The substance of the difference is that the highest priority among various other priorities is developing employees as a whole, while individual development from a transformational leadership perspective is based on organizational goals.

*Servant leadership* in this research is a leadership style that in a balanced, fair and ethical manner applies a *bottom-up system* in duties and responsibilities that goes beyond personal interests to focus on other people (organization members) as the main priority by building virtue or high moral standards as a quality characteristic which is internal and spiritual, manifested as ethical and superior qualities to show honesty, care, trust in the abilities of others, protect others (employees), prioritize employee needs in building work relationships, prioritize persuasion in inviting others along with humility and love. sincerely to work together to achieve goals, as well as organize and create opportunities to help members of the organization or other people to grow and develop harmoniously in all aspects so that they can jointly achieve the expected goals and jointly realize excellent service (*together achieve the goal, and together to create excellent service* ).

It is believed that the implementation of servant leadership characteristics (Table 2) is in accordance with Greenleaf's theory (1977 and 1998) ; Spears (1995; 2002; 2010); McGee et al., (2002); Patterson (2003); Dennis &

Bocarnea (2003; Dennis (2004); Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011); Russel and Stone (2002); (Barbuto & Wheeler (2006); Franco & Antunes (2020) indicated an increase in employee performance.

Previous studies have found empirical evidence that servant leadership has an influence on individual performance. For example, Robbins et al., ( 2017 : 347) stated that the impact of servant leadership is an increase in higher commitment, *self-efficacy* and perceptions of justice, psychological safety, increased potential, and increased creative performance . Servant leadership roles can increasing employee affective well-being both directly and by increasing employee personal growth (Estévez et al., 2023) , there is a positive relationship between servant leadership on psychological resilience and positive responses to challenges that occur thereby increasing employee work resilience (Cai et al. al., 2023) , and improve individual employee performance (Aboramadan et al, 2021; Maalouf, 2023; Aboramadan et al., 2020; Melinda et al., 2019; Subhaktiyasa et al, 2023; Dami et al., 2023)

Servant leadership with the power of faith and love becomes the basis for sacrifice to continue to serve others better even in difficult situations, and servant leadership represents the highest ideals for realizing moral leadership and selflessly providing greater good to employees in achieving meaningful work ( Wong et al., 2023 )

Work is a collection of tasks which constitute the entire work assignment from a superior or organization to be carried out and completed, while the work *process* is the activity of carrying out work to produce *output* (performance) according to standards by efficiently using time, money, materials or human energy ( Hale, 2004) . In another explanation, performance is the result of the process of doing work , by knowing the work that must be done

and knowing how to do or complete it (Wibowo (2012 : 7)

Employee performance is the result achieved by employees as a combination of the use of skills and competencies to carry out job duties and responsibilities efficiently and effectively so as to contribute to achieving organizational goals (Robbins & Judge, 2017)

Based on opinion Mangkunegara (2005 : 9), that work performance or achievement is the result of work in terms of quality and quantity, which is achieved by a person in carrying out his work in accordance with the duties and responsibilities assigned to him . According to Judith Hale (2004), performance is a series of measures of achievement of the work process and the value of the results achieved with the integrity of the behavior used to do the work . Bernardin and Russell (1998) expressed the same thing, that performance is a record of *outcomes* resulting from the function of a particular job or a particular activity over a certain period of time (Adamy, 2016 : 108; Muizu et al., 2019 : 69)

Performance in this research is the result of work, namely the output and outcomes achieved by individuals or groups in quality and quantity in accordance with internal and external performance standards of the organization within a certain period of time as a simultaneous accumulation of psychological dimensions, work context and work behavior. In line with this synthesis, work commitment, moral and social responsibility, positive work behavior or work ethic are based on certain values, competencies and skills ( *hard skills* and *soft skills* ) to carry out and complete the work given by the employer (organization). according to job characteristics, level of job requirements and performance standards is a form of loyalty and contribution to achieving organizational goals.

This description has three different but related keywords and cannot be separated,

namely performance, human resources (employees or employees) and organization. Human resource performance as an important element in organizational management determines the progress or decline of an organization, and organizational effectiveness originates from the extent of HR competencies and skills possessed by the organization to create improvements through performance (Timpe, 1992, Owens, 1987).

Consequently, organizationally it is necessary to pay serious attention to the availability and readiness of human resources (employees) in order to continue to increase competitive advantage in achieving organizational goals in a sustainable manner, through education and development, and training to increase skills ( eq: Timpe, 1992; Guest, 1977; Armstrong, 1992:54; Dessler, 1988:45; Juniarti et al 2021:9)

Affirming the description above with Dale Timpe's ( 1992a:33 ) idea that employee performance is caused by (1) internal factors within the employee himself, such as ability, motivation, perseverance (effort) and initiative, task complexity, luck, etc. others; (2) external factors which include organizational atmosphere such as a bad work environment, unproductive co-workers, unsympathetic attitudes and actions of leaders, lack of human resources, the economy, etc. Henry Simamora (1995) mentions several factors that influence performance ( Mangkunegara, 2012 : 14), namely (1) Individual factors, including: abilities and skills, background, and demographics; (2) Psychological factors, including: perception, attitude, personality, learning, and motivation, (3) Organizational factors, including: resources, leadership, rewards, structure and job design. In this research, servant leadership is an external factor that is predicted to contribute to individual performance. The aim of this research is to examine the contribution of servant leadership to individual performance in

the Flores Islands, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT), Indonesia.

The uniqueness of this research lies in the region, sample and agency. In fact, servant leadership research in higher education is still rare, although most of it is linked to lecturer performance (eq: Handoyo, 2010 ; Aboramadan et al, 2021; Maalouf, 2023; Aboramadan et al., 2020; (Melinda et al., 2019). ; Subhaktiyasa et al, 2023; (Dami et al., 2023) On the other hand, the influence of servant leadership on the performance from the perspective of the respective educational staff (administrative staff) is rarely carried out. Apart from that there has been no similar research at Unika Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng.

The importance of conducting this research is to fill the gap in the impact of servant leadership on the performance of educational staff in private universities. At the same time, to confirm the research results of Aboramadan et al., (2020) which found that the relationship between servant leadership and work engagement is not clear, and the relationship between the two variables studied is not direct.

## ■ METHODS

### Participants

The population in the study was 66 educational staff at Indonesian Catholic University of Santu Paulus Ruteng (Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng). Sampling was carried out using a total sampling technique. The total sampling technique was used because this research was conducted on a population of less than 100 (Sugiyono . & Setiyawami, 2022: 190). So in this study the entire population was sampled, namely 66 people. Thus, the number of respondents to this study was 66 people.

### Research Design

This research uses ex-post facto or non-experimental research with correlational

techniques, because it does not manipulate the symptoms studied and the symptoms naturally already exist in the field. This research was conducted over four months, starting from September to December 2023. The research location was at the Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng, with a total of 66 respondents.

### Instruments

Instruments are tools used to collect research data. The instrument in this research is a questionnaire containing a list of statements which are then distributed directly by the researcher to respondents. The list of statements (questionnaire) used in this research was compiled by the researcher himself based on indicators developed for each research variable, namely the servant leadership variable (X) and the employee performance variable (Y).

Conceptually, servant leadership in this research is defined as a leadership style that prioritizes serving others sincerely, lovingly and ethically, is responsible for the encouragement of conscience to prioritize employee needs beyond personal interests, moves persuasively to involve employees to achieve common goals, has courage and authentic personality to be followed by employees in providing excellent service. Both the meaning and dimensions of servant leadership are based on the ideas of previous researchers (i.e. Greenleaf, (1977, 1988); Spears,1995; 2002; 2010; McGee., Cooper & Trammell, 2002; Patterson 2003; Dennis & Bocarnea 2003; Dennis, 2004; Dierendonck dan Nuijten,2011; Russel & Stone, 2002;Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Franco & Antunes, 2020).From this theory, the ten dimensions used in this research are, First, the dimensions pure love and sincerity, measured by indicators (a) respect and respect, (c) empathy and listening, and (d) serving; Both dimensions prioritize employee empowerment, measured by indicators (a) communication to identify employee problems and needs, ( b) have a willingness to

share responsibility with subordinates, and (c) facilitate employee self-development such as training and development; The three dimensions of vision, measured by indicators of socialization and collaboration in achieving the goals and future of the institution; The four dimensions of humility are measured by indicators (a) self-acceptance and not exaggerating one's own abilities or refusing to promote (glorify) one's abilities excessively, (b) recognizing success or success as a result of joint contributions, and (c) being open to criticism and opinions of other people; The five dimensions stand again, measured by indicators (a) the existence of encouragement to work according to standards and procedures, and (b) the existence of individual and team responsibility, by providing boundaries about what should be done and what should not be done; The six dimensions of authenticity/authenticity and trust, measured by indicators (a) can be an example for employees in terms of loyalty, integrity, discipline and consistency, as well as in providing services, and (b) have a sense of trust in employees; The seven dimensions of awareness and courage are measured by indicators (a) being able to realize changes in needs, and (b) daring to take risks regarding a choice to improve employee performance and organizational development; The eight dimensions of accountability are measured by indicators (a) There is encouragement to work according to standards and procedures, and (b) There is individual and team responsibility, by providing limits on what should and should not be done; The nine dimensions of persuasiveness in mobilizing and involving employees are measured by indicators (a) mobilizing and directing employees to jointly achieve goals, and (b) persuasive work control, work evaluation and preventive action; tenth, the dimension of healing and building harmony is measured by indicators (a) providing motivation to employees, (b) helping to provide solutions to problems faced by

employees, (c) providing health insurance and social support to employees, and (4) commitment to creating harmony.

Meanwhile, employee performance in research is the result of work, namely the output and outcomes achieved by individuals or groups in terms of quality and quantity within a certain period of time as a simultaneous accumulation of psychological dimensions, work context and work behavior. Both the understanding and dimensions of employee performance are based on the ideas of previous researchers or experts (i.e: Bernardin & Russell (1998; Timpe, 1992; Mathis & Jackson, 2002; Hale, 2004; Mangkunegara, 2005; Guritno & Waridin, 2005; Guritno & Waridin, 2005; Wibowo, 2012; Robbins & Judge, 2013). From this theory, the three dimensions of employee performance used in this research are, First, the psychological dimension, measured by indicators (a) the presence of work commitment, and (b) the presence of competence; Second job contest dimension, measured by indicators (a) quantity of work, (b) quality of work, (c) cooperation, (d) communication, and (d) work facilities, and the third dimension of work behavior, measured by indicator (a) attendance, and (b) timeliness.

### **Instrument Validation**

Testing the validity of research instruments was carried out through consultation with two experts in their respective fields. The two validators are lecturers in the Educational Administration study program, Ganesha Education University Postgraduate Program, Indonesia. The expert validation results were then analyzed using the Gregory Technique with a scale of 1 and 2 being declared less relevant, and 3 and 4 being declared very relevant. From the internal validity calculation, the instrument coefficient for each variable is 1, so it is in the very high category. Coefficient 1 shows that both experts both stated that there were no statement

items that were less relevant, on the other hand, each expert stated that all statement items from each variable were very relevant to the measurement dimensions and indicators. Based on internal validation, the instruments used in this research are declared valid and can be used in research.

Testing the external validity of the instruments used in this research was carried out using trials. Used trials are carried out simultaneously with the actual research. According to Hadi (2000), try outs are used and the results of these trials will be used directly to test research hypotheses. Of course, only data from valid items are analyzed to answer research problems. So used testing is a method for testing external validity and reliability by collecting data only once and the test results are immediately used to test the hypothesis.

Researchers in this study analyzed the results of trials using the saturated sample technique first, then invalid items were discarded and valid items were analyzed further to test the research hypothesis. Based on the results of the analysis using Microsoft Excel, it shows that of the 58 statements of the servant leadership variable, 1 item was declared invalid, so that 57 statements were for hypothesis testing, of the 48 statements of the performance variable, 1 item was declared invalid, so that 47 statements were for hypothesis testing.

### **Instrument Reliability**

Reliability testing using Crombach's Alpha formula (Arikunto, 1997). The results of the calculations using the computer program Microsoft Excel 2007 and SPSS for Windows version 26.00 show that all instruments in this study have a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient between 0.800-0.100. This shows that the level of reliability of the instruments for each variable is very high and can be used to carry out further analysis, namely hypothesis testing.

### **Data Collection**

Data were collected using non-test instruments, namely a questionnaire in the form of a Likert Scale with five alternative answer choices, namely Strongly Agree (SS) with a score of 5; Agree (S) with Score 4; Disagree (KS) with a score of 3; Disagree (TS) with a score of 2; Strongly Disagree (STS) with core 1. The questionnaire was distributed to 66 respondents.

The number of statement items used in this research was 58 statements of the servant leadership variable and 48 statements of the performance variable. Each statement item is formulated based on research indicators. The number of statement items for each indicator is different. As previously explained, this research used a pilot test. The trial was carried out simultaneously with the actual research. The emphasis is that before testing the hypothesis, it is necessary to test the validity of the instrument. Based on the results of the analysis using Microsoft Excel, it shows that of the 58 statements on the servant leadership variable, 1 item was declared invalid, so that 57 statements were used for hypothesis testing; Of the 58 cultural variable statements, of the 48 performance variable statements, 1 item was declared invalid, so 47 statements were used for hypothesis testing.

### **Data Analysis**

All data was analyzed statistically using a simple linear regression test with the help of Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) 26.0 for Windows. The hypothesis (Ha) developed in this research is: How big is the contribution of Servant Leadership to employee performance at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng. This hypothesis is assessed using a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.05. This is to interpret the average score for each dimension of the research variable using the Weight Means Score (WMS) formula, with the provisions of the Interpretation Score Category Range (1) 1.00 – 1.79 Very Poor /

Very Low; 1.80 – 2.59 Not Good / Low; 2.60 – 3.39 Fair / Moderate; 3.40 – 4.19 Good / High, and 4.20 – 5.00 Very Good / Very High (Arikunto, 2009)

## ■ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research is to determine the contribution of servant leadership to employee performance at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng. Before testing the hypothesis, the researcher first reviews the average score for each dimension of

the research variable according to predetermined conditions. Based on the interpretation of dimensions and indicators, in general the statement items for each dimension and indicator of the servant leadership variable are in the score interval of 3.40-4.19 (Good). So it can be interpreted that the dimensions and indicators of servant leadership at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng are in the good category. The average score for each dimension and indicator is mentioned in table 1 below.

**Table 1.** Interpretation of score assessment for each dimension and indicator of servant leadership variables (N=66)

No	Dimensions	Indicator	Jl. Item	Average Score	Category
1	Pure love and sincerity	1. Appreciate and respect	3	3.85	Good
		2. Empathy and listening	3	3.70	Good
		3. Serve	3	3.81	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>9</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>Good</b>
2	Prioritize employee empowerment	1. Communication for identification	2	3.89	Good
		2. Have a willingness to share responsibilities with subordinates	2	3.69	Good
		3. Facilitate employee self-development such as training and development	2	3.65	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>6</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>Good</b>
3	Vision	There is socialization and collaboration in achieving the goals and future of the institution	3	3.72	Good
4	Modesty	1. Self-acceptance and not exaggerating one's own abilities or refusing to promote (glorify) one's abilities excessively	3	4.02	Good
		2. Acknowledging success or success as a result of shared contributions	3	3.73	Good
		3. Be open to criticism and other people's opinions.	2	3.69	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>8</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>Good</b>
5	Stand back up	1. Being fair and honest provides appreciation and recognition for employees	2	3.55	Good
		2. Putting other people's interests first without needing praise	2	4.11	Good
		3. Providing support for meeting employee needs other than salary	2	3.70	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>6</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>Good</b>
6	Authenticity and Trust	1. Can be an example for employees in terms of loyalty, integrity, discipline and consistency, as well as in providing service	2	3.70	Good
		2. Putting trust in employees	3	3.70	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>Good</b>
7	Awareness and Courage	1. Able to recognize changing needs	2	3.63	Good
		2. Dare to take risks on a choice to improve employee performance and organizational development	2	4.25	Very good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>Good</b>
8	Accountability	1. There is encouragement to work according to standards and procedures	2	3.93	Good
		2. There is individual and team responsibility, by providing limits on what to do and not to do	2	3.71	Good
<b>Amount</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>Good</b>
9	Persuasive in mobilizing and	1. Motivate and direct employees to work together to achieve goals	2	3.74	Good



	involving employees	2. There is work control, work evaluation and persuasive preventive action	2	3.73	Good
	<b>Amount</b>			3.74	Good
10	Healing and Building harmony.	1. Provide motivation to employees	2	3.89	Good
		2. Help provide solutions to problems faced by employees	2	4.19	Very good
		3. Providing health insurance and social support to employees	3	4.29	Very good
		4. Commitment creates harmony	2	4.45	Very good
	<b>Amount</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>Very good</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>57</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>Good</b>

Based on Table 1, of the 10 dimensions of servant leadership in this study, one of the indicators is the dimension of awareness and courage, namely daring to take risks regarding a choice to improving employee performance and organizational development, and three indicators of the healing dimension and building harmony, namely indicators (1) help provide solutions to problems faced by employees; (2) providing health insurance and social support to employees, (3) commitment to creating harmony is in the very good category with a score interval of 4.20-5.00 (Very Good).

From the results of this interpretation, it can be concluded that the dimensions with their respective indicators that are most dominant in servant leadership at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng are the dimensions of awareness and courage in servant leadership with indicators of daring to take risks regarding a choice to improve employee performance and organizational development, the healing dimension. and building harmony, with indicators (1) helping to provide solutions to problems faced by employees; (2)

providing health insurance and social support to employees, (3) commitment to creating harmony. Apart from that, servant leadership in the very good category encourages employees to always foster a friendly and family atmosphere among employees. The existence of servant leadership dimensions that are in the good and very good categories can be claimed that the implementation of servant leadership can encourage increased innovation in higher education (Maalouf, 2023). This is confirmed by the interpretation of employee performance dimensions which are in the very good category.

It is the result of an assessment based on the interpretation of dimensions and indicators of employee performance variables that all statement items for each dimension and indicator are in the interval 4.20-5.00 (Very Good/Very High). So it can be interpreted that the statement items for each dimension and performance indicator with the employee research locus at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng are in the very high category. The average score for each dimension and indicator is mentioned in table 2 below

**Table 2.** Interpretation of score assessment for each dimension and indicator of employee performance variables (N=66)

No	Dimensions	Indicator	Jl. Item	Average Score	Category
1	Psychological Dimensions	1. Commitment	4	4.53	Very high
		2. Competence	5	4.42	Very high
	<b>Amount</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.47</b>	Very high	
		1. Quantity of work	6	4.36	Very high
		2. Quality of work	5	4.31	Very high

2	Job Contest Dimensions	3. Cooperation	4	4.34	Very high
		4. Communication	7	4.33	Very high
		5. Work facilities.	5	4.38	Very high
		<b>Amount</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4.35</b>	Very high
3	Dimensions of Work Behavior	1. Presence	6	4.41	Very high
		2. Punctuality	5	4.42	Very high
		<b>Amount</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.42</b>	Very high
<b>Total</b>			47	4.39	Very high

Based on Table 2, overall the dimensions and their respective indicators are in the interval 4.20-5.00 (Very Good/Very High). So it can be interpreted that the dimensions with their respective indicators used in this research to measure employee performance at Unika Santu Santu Paulus Ruteng are in the very high category or employee performance is in the very high category.

Between the score interval of 4.20-5.00 (Very High), if you look at the score which is close to 5.00 (for example between 4.35-5.00) then, the psychological dimension with indicators (1) work commitment, and (2) competency, work quantity indicators and work facility indicators from

the work context dimension, and work behavior dimensions with indicators (1) attendance, and (2) punctuality are the most dominant performance dimensions and indicators at Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng. It can be concluded that all dimensions with their respective indicators in this research are important aspects in improving individual performance on the Flores Islands.

The next step is to find suggestions for the contribution of servant leadership variables to employee performance. Based on statistical tests with the help of Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) 26.0 for Windows, it is stated as follows Solution (SPSS) 26.0 for Windows, it is stated as follows.

**Table 3.** Contribution of servant leadership to performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					EC	RC
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change		
1	.496 <sup>a</sup>	.246	.234	17.787	.246	20.863	1	64	.000	14.17%	28.51%

a. Predictors: (Constant), Servant Leadership

The decision criteria for accepting/rejecting the hypothesis are as follows:  $F_{count} > F_{table}$  at the 95% confidence level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ), then  $H_0$  is rejected. On the other hand,  $F_{count} < F_{table}$  at the 95% confidence level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ), then  $H_0$  is accepted. From these criteria, referring to the statistical test results in table 1, it is clear that: *First*, from the simple regression test, the regression equation  $Y=132,160 + 0.337X_1$  is obtained with a significance value of 0.000, which means that servant leadership determines employee performance; *Second*, the F-count

value is greater than the F-table ( $20.836 > 3.991$ ) which means that servant leadership determines employee performance. *Third*, the magnitude of servant leadership's determination of employee performance is 0.246 times 100% to 24.6%. This means that the servant leadership variable contributes 24.6% to employee performance with an *Effective Contribution* (EC) of 14.17% and a *Relative Contribution* (RC) of 28.51%.

Based on this empirical evidence it can be concluded that servant leadership contributes to individual performance. The contribution of

servant leadership to employee performance illustrates the existence of a relationship between leaders and those they lead (followers) *in an effort* to improve performance. This is different from the research results of Aboramadan et al., (2020) which found that there was no clear relationship between servant leadership and work engagement. On the other hand, this research found a clear relationship between servant leadership and individual performance, and servant leadership contributed directly to employee performance.

The strong relationship between servant leadership and work in improving performance is an important consideration in the context of employee-oriented human resources policies, because servant leadership and human resources are balanced domains and are important for understanding how people should be managed in organizations (Ludwikowska, 2022). The consequence is that weak implementation of servant leadership dimensions results in decreased employee performance. On the other hand, if the better and stronger the implementation of the dimensions of servant leadership, it will have an impact on higher working relationships within the organization which in turn will result in higher individual performance.

Organizational leaders have a strategic and very important role in efforts to improve employee performance. Individual employee performance is the foundation of organizational performance (Gibson et al., 2012), and leaders are at the forefront of improving organizational performance (Timpe, 1991). Leaders in leadership functions cannot exist without the full involvement, initiative and cooperation of employees, and one cannot be a great leader without great followers (Luthans, 2011: 413). To recognize the existence of great followers, leadership is needed that focuses on the needs of other people (organization members). Leaders

who focus on individual needs know directly the needs of each individual, listen attentively to employee complaints, serve lovingly with high empathy, and persuasively involve employees in achieving organizational goals are the fundamental essence of servant leadership. Thus, a leader can be well involved in encouraging employee work involvement to achieve better performance (Jorge Correia de Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2014)

Leaders with a servant leadership model believe every employee has the ability and wisdom to advance the organization and with a strategy that focuses on employees to listen, understand, identify needs and problems and empower employees, so that each employee can collaboratively and participatively achieve effective and creative work results (Spears, 1995; McGee et al., 2002). Servant leadership that focuses on employee needs and has a *bottom-up attitude* is indicative of increasing employee work motivation.

The results of this research are compared with previous research (eq: Dahleez & Hamad, 2022; Maalouf, 2023; Subhaktiyasa et al, 2023; that servant leadership can be applied in non-profit organizations, one of which is higher education. Educational institutions as non-profit organizations prioritize Excellent servants require a servant leadership style. Servant leaders as employee *role models* need to exemplify service characters so that employees can follow them in carrying out their work (Sendjaya & Pekerti, 2010; Franco & Antunes, 2020). This is based on the concept that leadership style can not only shapes employee behavior by influencing employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, commitment and well-being, but can also influence performance such as work engagement by creating motivation and in this context, service leadership has a relationship and positively influences employee performance (Gunawan et al., 2022).

Servant leadership is a movement ( Bass, 2000) , so that the existence of servant leadership creates excellent servant-oriented individuals in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, and ultimately creates a superior organization that prioritizes service. The further impact is, through moving a service orientation with a focus on the needs of others and ensuring individual needs are met, it becomes a characteristic that differentiates the organization from other organizations.

High awareness and courage in servant leadership, being able to realize changes in needs and being brave enough to take risks on choices to improve employee performance and organizational development, is a dimension to direct educational organizations to processes according to external needs, namely users of educational services. However, it should be noted that, quite a few people experience discouragement, lack of motivation, are less comfortable working in groups and this situation causes individuals to suffer from emotional pain (Greenleaf, 1977 ; Greenleaf, 1998). So the dimension of healing and the leader's commitment to building harmony is important in providing motivation to employees, helping provide solutions to problems faced by employees, and providing health insurance and social support to employees ( Franco & Antunes, 2020) .

Increasing work motivation can be done in various ways, one of which is through briefings, praise and so on. Social support for employees by attending religious and cultural activities organized by kraywan, allows the families of employees to take part in activities carried out by the organization. Providing solutions to employee problems does not mean providing financial assistance to every employee who experiences problems. On the other hand, psychological strengthening, listening wisely, and if possible selflessly helping to find a solution is a form of support that is of infinite value for employees. In this way, the healing process is not

carried out medical in nature , whereas healing is emotional or psychological and spiritual between each individual and the individual who has relationships from all aspects, more specifically work relationships . Because two important sides of building motivation that leaders must know are ways to change behavior and movement towards certain goals (Timpe, 1992). So that these two efforts have an impact To increase motivation, HR policies are needed which encourages employees to be more productive .

HR policy is a system of coordinated and long-term activities that aims to form highly capable employees to achieve organizational goals, and through HR policy provides general guidelines for leaders to understand problems that occur and know how to solve them (Ludwikowska, 2023). The keywords of HR policy are organizational policies that prioritize employees and this is related to servant leadership. Servant leadership that openly prioritizes employee growth has been proven to create psychological well-being, which in turn influences performance (Franco & Antunes, 2020; Estévez et al., 2023 ) .

A servant leadership style with a human resource management approach that equally focuses on employees ensures that higher education organizations achieve internal goals and are able to answer external needs (Jawaad et al., 2019) . “ Because the secret of building an institution is being able to unite teams and individuals with any performance results, by trying to elevate individuals to grow higher than they should” (Greenleaf, 1970 : 22) . In line with this, psychological dimensions, work context and work behavior need to be integrated to improve performance.

The psychological dimensions highlighted in this research to improve individual performance are commitment and competence. These two aspects illustrate the existence of a psychological contract between individuals as workers and

organizational goals. This psychological contract emphasizes the organization's agreement with employees and the employee's attitude in reaching this agreement which is manifested in work motivation, hard work, productivity, job satisfaction and involvement, as well as human resource management (Timpe, 1992 : 109). Individual work commitment is described by hard work and high effort to work according to organizational goals, upholding honesty in achieving quality performance, prioritizing the interests of the organization and carrying out all duties and responsibilities wholeheartedly. Work commitment values as a manifestation of efforts to achieve performance through work involvement. As a consequence, individuals who are committed to improving performance through work involvement will increase their performance, preferably low work commitment and work involvement will cause performance to not be optimal (Nella et al., 2022) . Apart from work commitment, individual competence is an important factor in achieving maximum performance. The consequence is that there is a clear formulation of objectives, division and description of tasks, and performance standards that must be achieved, and strategies for increasing employee competency.

The dimensions of the work context are an important aspect in improving performance. That, the quantity of work and the quality of work cannot be separated from the support of human resources. The perspective that is emphasized is that the availability of human resources needs to be adjusted to the amount of work and the quality of the expected results, not the other way around.

The consequence is that organizations need to carry out continuous evaluation and development of human resources so that the type and amount of work gets maximum results. Apart from that, a cooperative climate for a particular context and type of work is important in achieving the expected performance. Another important

aspect is the existence of a good communication climate between parties in the organization. Including work facilities that support performance achievement. High work standards and results orientation need to be balanced with a commitment to providing work facilities. The work behavior dimension aspect highlights the importance of attendance and punctuality in completing work.

## ■ CONCLUSIONS

This research concludes that the dimensions with indicators for each variable are generally appropriate and function well (highly) in improving individual performance. Apart from that, there are indicators of servant leadership that are very prominent or very high in improving employee performance. Meanwhile, all performance indicators in this research are empirically criteria that have a very high influence in improving individual performance.

Overall, this research concludes that servant leadership contributes to individual performance in the Flores Islands, NTT, Indonesia. These findings prove that servant leadership is one of the key factors that determines employee performance, and that there is a relationship between servant leadership and individual performance.

The results of this study not only enrich the literature and support servant leadership theory, on the contrary they are encouraging confidence For implement leadership waiter with new ways of improving individual performance,

Even though this research is original, there are several limitations in this research, namely that the respondents for this research were taken from one of the universities in Flores, NTT, Indonesia. Therefore, these findings apply in the context of Unika Santu Paulus Ruteng, Manggarai, NTT, Indonesia. Based on this, future research is expected to expand the study in terms of study subjects with a larger sample size; adding

variables such as work ethic, organizational culture, organizational commitment, work motivation and other variables ; and the use of different methods to this research; and if possible, to test the model of the dimensions with each indicator in this research

## ■ REFERENCES

- Aboramadan, M., Dahleez, K., & Hamad, M. (2020). Servant leadership and academics' engagement in higher education: mediation analysis. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(6), 617–633.
- Adamy, M. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: teori, praktik dan penelitian* (Vol. 106). Aceh: Universitas Malikussaleh.
- Andre, & Lantu, D. C. (2015). Servant leadership and human capital management: case study in citibank indonesia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 169, 303–311.
- Anselmus Dami, Z., Imron, A., Burhanuddin, B., & Supriyanto, A. (2023). Predicting the outcomes of servant leadership in Indonesian Christian higher education: Direct and indirect effects. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*.
- Arikunto, S. (2009). *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(3), 300–326.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18–40.
- Bombiak, E. (2017). Human resources risk as an aspect of human resources management in turbulent environments. *Strategica: Shift! Major Challenges of Today'S Economy*, (October), 121–132.
- Cai, Z., Mao, Y., Gong, T., Xin, Y., & Lou, J. (2023). The effect of servant leadership on work resilience: evidence from the hospitality industry during the covid-19 period. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(2), 1322.
- Dasanayaka, C. H., Abeykoon, C., Ranaweera, R. A. A. S., & Koswatte, I. (2021). The impact of the performance appraisal process on job satisfaction of the academic staff in higher educational Institutions. *Education Sciences*, 11(10), 1–20.
- Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), 600–615.
- Estévez, J., Pedro, Benito, Y.-A., Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Gutiérrez-Broncano, S. (2023). Personal growth or servant leader: What do hotel employees need most to be affectively well amidst the turbulent COVID-19 times? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 190, 122410.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: a systematic review and call for future research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132.
- Franco, M., & Antunes, A. (2020). Understanding servant leadership dimensions: theoretical and empirical extensions in the portuguese context. *Nankai Business Review International*, 11(3), 345–
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., James H. Donnelly, J., & Konopaske, R. (2012). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes* (14 Edition). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Gore, S., & Kanyangale, M. I. (2022). Strategic

- leadership for a Zimbabwean University in turbulent times: Literature analysis. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 11(10), 375–385.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership/: essays by robert k. greenleaf* (E. L. C. Spears, Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center. [Awalnya diterbitkan pada tahun 1970, oleh Robert K. Greenleaf, dan Cetakan Revisi 1991; 2008].
- Greenleaf, Robert K. (1977). *Servant leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Gunawan, A., Sutawidjaya, A. H., & Tjhin, I. (2022). *Servant leadership, spiritualitas tempat kerja, dan employee engagement di fakultas liberal arts universitas x* [servant leadership, workplace spirituality and employee engagement in the faculty of liberal arts, university x]. *Polyglot: Jurnal Ilmiah*, 18(1), 151.
- Handoyo, S. (2010). *Pengukuran servant leadership sebagai alternatif kepemimpinan di institusi pendidikan tinggi pada masa perubahan organisasi*. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 14(2), 130.
- Jawaad, M., Amir, A., Bashir, A., & Hasan, T. (2019). Human resource practices and organizational commitment: the mediating role of job satisfaction in emerging economy. *Cogent Business and Management*, 6(1).
- Jorge Correia de Sousa, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2014). Servant leadership and engagement in a merge process under high uncertainty. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(6), 877–899. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-07-2013-0133>
- Khalifa, M., Al Baz, M., & Muttar, A. K. (2022). The impact of applying artificial intelligence on human resources crisis management: an analytical study on covid19. *Information Sciences Letters*, 11(1), 269–276.
- Ludwikowska, K. (2023). Employee-oriented human resource policy as a factor shaping the influence of servant leadership on job performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(8), 2335–2348.
- Maalouf, G. Y. (2023). The role of servant leadership style in improving innovation in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 8(9), e01787.
- Mangkunegara, A. . A. P. (2005). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia. perusahaan*. Bandung/ : PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2012). *Evaluasi Kinerja SDM (Edisi ke-6)*. Bandung/ : PT. Refika Aditama.
- McGee, A., Cooper., & Trammell, D. (2002). From Hero-As-Leader To Servant-As-Leader. In Larry C. Spears and Michele Lawren (Ed.), *Focus on Leadership: Servant-Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Melinda, T., Antonio, T., & Christina. (2019). Servant Leadership Dimension in Higher Education. *Proceedings of the 2019 international conference on organizational innovation (ICOI 2019)*. Paris, France: Atlantis Press.
- Mirzapour, M., Toutian, S. S., Mehrara, A., & Khorrampour, S. (2019). The strategic role of human resource management in crisis management considering the mediating role of organizational culture.

- International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management (IJHCUM)*, 4(1), 43–50.
- Muizu, W. O. Z., Kaltum, U., & Sule, E. T. (2019). *Pengaruh kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan. Perwira - Jurnal Pendidikan Kewirausahaan Indonesia*, 2(1), 70–78.
- Nella, N. ., Sufyarma, M., & Sulastri.S. (2022). *Work efforts in the context of improving the performance of education personnel at Universitas Negeri Padang*. 5(1), 53–59.
- Robbins, S. P., A.Judge., T., & T.Campbell, T. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Sallis, E. (2002). Total quality management in education (3rd ed.). In *Developing quality systems in education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(7), 643–663.
- Simmons, J. (2002). An “expert witness” perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations*, 24(1), 86–100.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). Introduction: servant-leadership and the greenleaf legacy. in larry c. spears (ed.), *reflections on leadership how robert k. greenleaf’s theory of servant-leadership influenced today’s top management thinkers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stone, A. G., Russell, Robert F., & Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349–361.
- Sugiyono ., & Setiyawami. (2022). *Metode Penelitian sumber daya manusia (kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan studi kasus)*. Bandung/ : Alfabeta.: Bandung/ : Alfabeta.
- Timpe, A. D. (1991). *Kepemimpinan: seri manajemen sumber daya manusia (Seri 2)*. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Timpe, A. D. (1992). *Kinerja: seri manajemen sumber daya manusia (Seri 6)*. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Komputindo.
- VanDierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: a review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Vogel, S. (2022). Shared leadership in higher education: an exploration of the composition of school leadership teams and school performance. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 44(5), 486–497.
- Wallace, R. (2012). *Servant leadership: leaving a legacy*. United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Wibowo. (2012). *Manajemen kinerja* (6th ed.). Jakarta/ : Rajawali Pers,.
- Wong, P. T. P., Page, D., & Cheung, T. C. K. (2023). A self-transcendence model of servant leadership. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Servant Leadership* (pp. 997–1022). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Zada, M., Zada, S., Ali, M., Jun, Z. Y., Contreras-Barraza, N., & Castillo, D. (2022). How classy servant leader at workplace? linking servant leadership and task performance during the covid-19 crisis: a moderation and mediation approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.



