The Role of Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Performance of Regional Hospital Employees

Muh Mahbub Djunaidi[1], Lilik Kustiani [2], and Maxion Sumtaky[3]

[1]Student Merdeka University

[2,3]Lecturer of Postgraduate Program of University of Merdeka

Malang, East Java 65135, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

A social organization focusing on service will continue interacting with its human members. Hospitals, as organizations specializing in health services, are faced with continuous demands to improve the quality of their services. Based on the statement above, this research aims to describe servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The research sample was civil servants in the Regional General Hospital who represented the respondents. To obtain a minimum sample size from the existing population, the Slovin formula was used, and the number taken was 139. The findings of this research can be a guide for researchers who are interested in similar or related fields. Data analysis techniques using descriptive analysis aim to explain each characteristic or description of the observed variables: servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The analysis technique applied is descriptive statistics, using frequency distribution table analysis. This approach helps provide a detailed description of each variable and its indicators. Servant Leadership in this research was determined successively by persuasive mapping, organizational stewardship, altruistic calling, wisdom, and emotional healing. Persuasive mapping is reflected in Leadership's ability to solve every problem. Job satisfaction is determined by supervision, coworkers, the job, promotion, and salary. Supervision is reflected in superiors often providing both technical and behavioral support. Organizational commitment. It is determined respectively by affective, normative, and sustainable commitment. Theoretically, the results of this research are expected to enrich human resource management literature, particularly human behavior regarding servant Leadership and job satisfaction.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Performance, Servant Leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of humans in current organizational dynamics is crucial in moving steps toward achieving predetermined goals. The key to achieving organizational targets depends significantly on the quality of available human resources who have relevant experience and competence in their respective fields. Individual performance has a significant impact on overall team performance. Optimizing team performance achievement is essential to overall organizational performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004).

A social organization focusing on service will continue interacting with its human members. Hospitals, as organizations specializing in health services, are faced with continuous demands to improve the quality of their services. The background includes the fact that hospitals function as health service institutions for communities with unique characteristics that are influenced by advances in health science, technological developments, and the socio-economic dynamics of society. It is hoped that hospitals will continue to develop better and more affordable health services to achieve optimal levels of public health through comprehensive individual health services, inpatient, outpatient, and emergency care services, and implementing various necessary health measures.

Regional General Hospital Dr. M. Ashari Pemalang is a type C hospital with various medical, paramedical, medical support, non-paramedical, and non-medical employees. Paramedics, who work under the direct supervision of doctors, have a crucial role in supporting medical services, such as nurses. As a service provider, demands for friendliness, speed, effectiveness of actions, and patient comfort are the keys to successful hospital management. Hospital employees are considered the most crucial element apart from infrastructure. The success of hospital services depends

significantly on their efforts to achieve these standards. Therefore, employee behavior is central to providing satisfactory service to the community. Overall, effective integration between paramedic personnel, physical facilities, and employee behavior is the main foundation for achieving the goal of optimal health care in the hospital environment. In carrying out their duties, there are still complaints from the public regarding the slow handling of patients, resulting in long queues, unfriendly staff, and incomplete medical equipment. This is reinforced by the results of the community satisfaction assessment, where there are still parts in the unsatisfactory category.

Recently, research on Leadership has moved away from the well-explored transformational leadership model that focuses exclusively on the leader toward a shared and relational perspective, in which exchange relationships between leaders and followers are the focus (Bass & Avolio, 2004). One such relational, moral, and ethical approach, known as servant leadership, is specifically oriented toward meeting the needs of followers. Extensive research has confirmed that servant Leadership can be effective (Eva et al., 2019).

Based on the problems above, this research aims to describe servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and employee performance.

Theoretically, the results of this research are expected to enrich human resource management literature, particularly human behavior regarding servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The findings of this research can serve as a guide for researchers interested in similar or related fields.

Practically, the research results will benefit hospital directors in terms of efforts to improve the performance of their employees as implementers of public services in the health sector, which will satisfy the community. The empirical results of this research will be helpful as input for hospital directors in making strategic policies to improve the quality of their human resources.

2. THEORETICAL BASIS

2.1 Organization Theory

Organizational theory, explained by Robbins and Judge (2013) and Luthans (2011), is a grand theory that is the basis of this research, which explains that the role of humans in organizations is a critical factor that influences the success of an organization. Organizational productivity is directly related to the performance of the individuals within it. Therefore, efforts to increase organizational productivity must begin with efforts to increase the productivity of organizational members.

In every job, an organization's success is determined by its members' contributions. Productivity improvements can be evaluated and optimized through improving individual performance. Understanding organizational behavior is crucial, providing insight into how individuals interact and contribute to organizational goals. Special efforts are needed to manage the organization and achieve organizational goals. Organizational management covers various aspects, including optimizing individual performance, understanding group dynamics, and managing organizational structures effectively. Therefore, research and in-depth understanding of organizational behavior are essential to improve performance and achieve organizational goals more effectively.

The role of employees as human resources plays a vital role in achieving the success of an organization. Employees act as task executors and as active planners and controllers in achieving organizational goals. Employee performance is influenced by motivation, ability, and conditions in the existing work environment. The match between tasks and individual abilities is critical in achieving optimal performance (Sihombing et al., 2018). Measuring employee performance is essential for evaluating the results of their behavior, including aspects such as empathy in providing services (Salanova et al., 2005). Performance appraisal functions as a management tool in improving the quality of decision-making and ensuring individual accountability in the organization. Furthermore, performance assessment is used to evaluate the achievement of predetermined goals and objectives (Otto, 2018). Thus, attention to employee performance, appropriate measurement, and practical evaluation are an integral part of human resource management in organizations, contributing significantly to overall organizational success.

Servant Leadership, introduced by Greenleaf in 1977, is an ethical concept that has received further development from authors such as Spears (2002). Servant leaders are defined as individuals who prioritize service, starting from a natural urge to serve and giving priority to the needs of others. These leaders make a conscious choice to carry the aspirations and drives that drive Leadership aimed at serving others. The main difference lies in the leader's attitude, where servant leaders first believe that the highest needs of others are met. This concept emphasizes aspects of service and

dedication, which are the basis for a leadership style that is more collaborative and cares about the needs and development of team members or the organization as a whole. The primary mission of a servant leader is to provide service and meet the needs of other parties optimally, as Russell and Stone (2002) explained. Leaders who adopt a service approach will form the same attitude among employees, aiming to be highly committed to providing good service.

The service leadership model introduced by Lantu (2007) emphasizes the importance of employee development as the main priority and the first focus. With this approach, leaders can indirectly guide the organization toward long-term and sustainable success. This model highlights the positive impact of changes in service behavior towards employees, which occurs in sequential phases and continues continuously. By emphasizing employee development, this leadership model recognizes the importance of building the capacity and potential of organizational members. Leaders who apply this principle are expected to be able to create an environment where employees feel supported, develop, and are motivated to make maximum contributions. Therefore, this model brings short-term benefits and provides the basis for long-term success and organizational sustainability.

Job satisfaction is related to employees' emotional reactions to their work, which is determined by the extent of the difference between what individuals get from work and what they get from their jobs. Luthans (2011) explains that job satisfaction is defined as a description of the extent to which individuals view their work as a whole.

Involving job satisfaction is relevant to improving employee welfare and its positive contribution to productivity or organizational performance. On the other hand, dissatisfaction can hurt organizational functioning, such as low employee commitment, poor performance, and high employee turnover (Na-Nan et al., 2020).

Robbins and Judge (2013) explain that job satisfaction is an individual's attitude towards work. Individuals who feel high job satisfaction show a positive attitude towards their work, while those who are dissatisfied show a negative attitude. This definition reflects the view that individuals' perceptions and evaluations of their work can provide an idea of their job satisfaction level. Positive or negative perceptions of work can influence motivation, engagement, and individual performance in the work environment.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research design

The technique used in this research is quantitative. This type of technique in research will use deductive-inductive techniques. This technique is built on expert theories, concepts, and researchers' knowledge based on their experience. It is then developed into recommended conditions for seeking justification (verification) or rejection in the form of documentary and field empirical data. Quantitative methods will then attempt to test the proposed hypothesis by establishing facts, demonstrating qualitative correlations, offering statistical descriptions, and estimating and anticipating results.

The study will be carried out on the performance of all civil servants (PNS) within the Dr. Regional General Hospital. M.Ashari Pemalang, who comes from medical and non-medical backgrounds, provides health services to patients directly and indirectly. Increasing the performance of hospital employees will impact the improvement of the complex services needed by patients, which require quick and precise action and will have implications for public services in the health sector.

3.2 Population and Sample

PopulationThose used in this research were all 436 Civil Servants (PNS) in the Regional General Hospital, consisting of 312 medical and 124 non-medical employees.

The research sample was civil servants in the Regional General Hospital who represented the respondents. To obtain a minimum sample size from the existing population, using the Slovin formula, 139 people were taken, with the following details:

Table 1 Population and Research Sample

No	Civil servants	Population	Sample
1	Medical employee	316	99
2	Non-medical employees	124	40
	Amount	436	139

Source: RSUD Dr. M. Ashari Pemalang, 2023.

3.3   Data collection technique

The data collection technique in this research was carried out using a questionnaire, which was delivered directly to respondents containing statements and alternative measuring scales to obtain respondents' responses regarding the variables studied, namely employee performance in public services, servant Leadership, job satisfaction,

3.4   Data Analysis Techniques

Descriptive analysis aims to explain each characteristic or description of the observed variables: servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The analysis technique applied is descriptive statistics, using frequency distribution table analysis. This approach helps provide a detailed description of each variable and its indicators.

In this analysis, a frequency distribution is used to present data regarding the frequency or number of occurrences of each value in the observed variable. Apart from that, the median is also used as a middle measure to show the middle value of the data. This approach provides a clear and concise picture of the data distribution, facilitating understanding each research variable's characteristics.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive analysis describes employee assessment tendencies toward research variables: servant Leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee performance. This process involves calculating the frequency distribution and average (mean) of the responses given by employees.

Based on the analysis results, from the distribution of answers, Leadership prioritizes the interests of subordinates. The majority of responses were from 71 employees (51.1%), then 60 employees (43.2%) said they strongly agreed, eight employees (5.8%) stated neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that Leadership prioritizes the interests of subordinates.

Distribution of employee answers about leaders working hard to meet the needs of their subordinates. The majority of responses were that they strongly agreed, namely 64 employees (46%), then 63 employees (45.3%) said they agreed, ten employees (7.2%) said they were neutral, two employees (1.4%) said they did not agree, and there were no employees who said they strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.35 indicates that leaders work hard to meet the needs of their subordinates.

The mean score of the Altruistic calling indicator is 4.37, meaning that employees agree that Altruistic calling contributes to Servant Leadership. The statement that the leader prioritizes the interests of subordinates is given the highest appreciation when describing servant Leadership.

The distribution of employee answers about leaders encouraging subordinates who are suffering found the most responses saying they agreed, 70 employees (50.4%), then 60 employees (43.2%) said they strongly agreed, nine employees (6.5%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that leaders encourage suffering subordinates.

Distribution of employee answers about leaders being able to restore subordinates from trauma in life. The majority of respondents agreed, namely 70 employees (50.4%), then 60 employees (43.2%) said they strongly agreed, nine employees (6.5%) said neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that leaders can recover subordinates from trauma in life.

The average score for the Emotional healing indicator is 4.36, meaning that employees agree that Emotional healing contributes to servant Leadership. The leader's statement encouraging subordinates who are suffering is most appreciated when describing servant Leadership.

Distribution of employee answers Leader sensitive to what is happening around their work environment, the most significant response was 77 employees (55.4%), then 54 employees (38.8%) said they strongly agreed, eight employees (5.8%) said they were neutral, and neither some employees said they did not agree and strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.33 indicates that employees agree that Leaders are sensitive to what is happening around the work environment.

Distribution of employee answers regarding the Leadership trying to restore the situation to be conducive. The majority of respondents agreed, namely 68 employees (48.9%), then 64 employees (46%) said they strongly agreed, seven employees (5%) said they were neutral, and no employees said they disagreed and strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.41 indicates that employees agree that the Leadership is trying to return the situation to a conducive state.

The Wisdom indicator mean score of 4.37 means that employees agree that Wisdom contributes to servant Leadership. The Leadership's statement of trying to return the situation to a conducive state is most appreciated when describing servant Leadership.

The distribution of employee answers regarding leaders having the skills to map problems found that the majority of responses, 75 employees (54%), then 59 employees (42.4%) said they strongly agreed, five employees (3.6%) said they were neutral, and none employees who said they disagreed and strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.39 indicates that employees agree that the leader has the skills to map problems.

The distribution of employee answers regarding the Leadership having the ability to resolve any problems found that the majority of respondents agreed, namely 69 employees (49.6%), then 65 employees (46.8%) said they strongly agreed, five employees (3.6%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.43 indicates that employees agree that the Leadership supports their professional development.

The average score for the Persuasive mapping indicator is 4.41, indicating that employees agree that Persuasive mapping contributes to servant Leadership. The statement that leaders can resolve problems is most appreciated when illustrating organizational commitment.

The distribution of employee answers regarding leaders carrying out community service activities found that 70 employees (50.4%) said they agreed, then 59 employees (42.4%) said they strongly agreed, 10 employees (7.2%) said they were neutral, and neither some employees said they did not agree and strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.35 indicates that employees agree that the Leadership conducts community service activities.

In the distribution of employee answers regarding the Leadership collaborating with other related parties, most respondents strongly agree and agree, respectively, 66 employees (47.5%). Seven employees (7.5%) said they were neutral, and none—employees who stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.42 indicates that employees agree that the Management collaborates with other related parties.

The average score for the Organizational Stewardship indicator is 4.39, indicating that employees agree that Organizational Stewardship contributes to servant Leadership. The statement that the Leadership collaborates with other related parties is most appreciated in illustrating the organization's commitment.

Overall, the average servant leadership score is 4.38, meaning that employees agree that servant Leadership is formed from Altruistic calling, Emotional healing, Wisdom, Persuasive mapping, and Organizational stewardship. The most significant contribution to the formation of servant Leadership is persuasive mapping, reflected in Leadership's ability to solve every problem.

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be seen that from the distribution of job answers in line with employee abilities, the most significant response was 74 employees (53.2%), then 61 employees (43.9%) said they strongly agreed, four employees (2.9%) stated neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.41 indicates that employees agree that the work is in line with the employee's abilities.

The distribution of employee answers about work reflects the employee's personality characteristics. The majority of respondents agreed, namely 76 employees (54.7%), then 54 employees (38.8%) said they strongly agreed, eight employees (5.8%) said neutral, one employee (0.7%) said they did not agree, and there were no employees who said they strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.32 indicates that employees agree that work reflects the employee's personality characteristics.

The indicator average scoreWorkitself is 4.36, meaning that employees agreeWorkitself contributes to job satisfaction. The Job Statement aligns with the employee's most appreciated abilities in describing job satisfaction.

The distribution of employee answers regarding the salary received being equal to what is done was found to be the most significant response saying strongly agree, 64 employees (46%), then 59 employees (42.4%) said they agreed, 13 employees (9.4%) said they were neutral, two employees said they did not agree, and one employee (0.7%) said they strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.32 indicates that employees agree that their salary is equivalent to what they do.

In the distribution of employee answers regarding salary being able to meet basic needs, the majority of responses were 63 employees (45.3%), then 58 employees (41.7%) said they strongly agreed, and 14 employees (10.1%) said they were neutral. , three employees (2.2%) said they did not agree, and one employee (0.7%) said they strongly disagreed. A mean score of 4.25 indicates that employees agree that their salary can meet their basic needs.

The average score for the salary indicator is 4.28, meaning that employees agree that salary contributes to job satisfaction. The statement that the salary received is equivalent to what is done is most appreciated when describing servant Leadership.

The distribution of employees' answers about the organization providing opportunities to advance in their careers found that the majority of responses, 69 employees (49.7%), then 59 employees (42.4%) said they strongly agreed, 11 employees (7.9%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. A mean score of 4.35 indicates that employees agree that the organization provides opportunities to advance in their careers.

Distribution of employee answers about the organization directs employees in developing their careers. The majority of responses were from 73 employees (52.5%): 51 employees (36.7%) said they strongly agreed, 15 employees (10.8%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.26 indicates that employees agree that the organization directs employees in ways to develop their careers.

An average score indicator promotion of 4.30 means that employees agree that promotion contributes to job satisfaction. The statement that the organization provides opportunities to advance in a career is most appreciated when describing job satisfaction.

Distribution of employees' answers about their superiors often provides technical and behavioral support. The majority of responses were from 66 employees (47.5%), then 68 employees (48.9%) said they strongly agreed, and 5 employees (3.6%) said they were neutral. , and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.45 indicates that employees agree that their superiors often provide technical and behavioral support.

Distribution of employee answers regarding superiors always caring about their subordinates personally. The majority of responses were that 67 employees (48.2%) strongly agreed, then 59 employees (42.4%) said they agreed, 12 employees (8.6%) said they were neutral, one employee (0.7%) said they did not agree, and no employees said they strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.38 indicates that employees agree that their superiors always care about their subordinates personally.

The average score of the supervision indicator is 4.42, meaning that employees agree that supervision contributes to job satisfaction. Statements from superiors who often provide both technical and behavioral support are most appreciated when describing job satisfaction.

Distribution of employee answers regarding co-workers always being cooperative in carrying out work. The majority of responses agreed, namely 72 employees (51.8%), then 60 employees (43.2%) said they strongly agreed, six employees (4.3%) said they were neutral, one employee (0.7%) said they did not agree, and no employees said they strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that their colleagues are always cooperative.

The distribution of employee answers about co-workers providing comfort at work found that the majority of respondents agreed, 72 employees (51.8%), then 61 employees (43.9%) said they strongly agreed, six employees (4.3%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.40 indicates that employees agree that their coworkers provide comfort at work.

The average score of the coworker indicator is 4.38, meaning that employees agree that coworkers contribute to job satisfaction. Statements from colleagues that provide comfort at work are most appreciated when describing job satisfaction.

Overall, the average job satisfaction score is 4.35, meaning that employees agree that job satisfaction is formed from work itself, salary, promotions, supervision, and coworkers. The most significant contribution to the formation of job satisfaction is supervision, reflected by superiors who often provide both technical and behavioral support.

Based on Table 13, it can be seen that from the distribution of employee answers regarding the inspection being carried out carefully, the most significant response was that 110 employees (79.1%) said they strongly agreed, then 28 employees (20.1%) said they agreed, one employee (0.7%)) stated neutral, and no employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.78 indicates that employees strongly agree that the inspection was carried out carefully.

Distribution of employee answers regarding Completing work tasks without errors. The majority of responses were strongly agreed, namely 73 employees (52.5%), then 54 employees (38.8%) said they agreed, eight employees (5.8%) said they disagreed, and 2 employees (1.4%) each said they were neutral and strongly disagreed. The average score of

4.35 indicates that employees agree that employees complete work tasks without errors.

The average quality indicator score of 4.57 means that employees agree that quality contributes to employee performance. The statement that the inspection was carried out carefully received the highest appreciation in describing employee performance.

Distribute employee answers regarding the number of tasks given to me that have been completed. The most significant response was that 71 employees (51.1%) strongly agreed, then 66 employees (47.5%) said they agreed, and two employees (1.4%) said they were neutral. , and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. A mean score of 4.50 indicates that employees strongly agree that the many tasks given to them have been completed.

The distribution of employee answers regarding the amount of work I do is based on what should be obtained. The majority of respondents agreed, namely 67 employees (48.2%), then 65 employees (46.8%) said they strongly agreed, seven employees (5%) said they were neutral, and no one mentioned disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The average score of 4.42 indicates that employees agree that the work is as it should be.

The quantity indicator mean score of 4.46 means that employees agree that quantity contributes to employee performance. The statement that the number of tasks given to employees is carried out well is most appreciated when describing employee performance.

The distribution of employee answers about using the working time to focus on work found that the most responses were from 79 employees (56.8%) who strongly agreed, then 60 employees (43.2%) said they agreed. No employees said they were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.57 indicates that employees strongly agree that they use work time to focus on work.

The distribution of employee answers regarding being able to complete work on time found that the majority of responses stated that they strongly agreed, namely 72 employees (51.8%), then 63 employees (45.3%) said they agreed, four employees (2.9%) said they were neutral, and no employee stated that they did not agree or strongly disagree. The average score of 4.49 indicates that employees agree they can complete work on time.

The average score for the punctuality indicator is 4.53, meaning that employees agree that punctuality contributes to employee performance. The statement that employees use work time to focus on work received the highest appreciation when describing employee performance.

The distribution of employee answers about having a high level of attendance found that the majority of responses were from 77 employees (56.4%) who strongly agreed, then 59 employees (42.4%) said they agreed. Two employees (1.4%) said they were neutral. One employee (0.7%) said they did not agree, and no employees said they strongly disagreed. A mean score of 4.53 indicates that employees strongly agree that they have a high level of attendance.

The distribution of employee answers regarding using the specified rest time showed that the majority of respondents agreed, namely 66 employees (47.5%), then 61 employees (43.9%) said they strongly agreed, ten employees (7.2%) said they were neutral, one employee (0.7%) each said they did not agree and strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.33 indicates that employees agree to use the specified rest time.

The average score for the effectiveness indicator is 4.43, meaning that employees agree that effectiveness contributes to employee performance. The statement of having a high level of attendance received the highest appreciation when describing employee performance.

The average employee performance score is 4.50, meaning that employees agree that performance is determined by quality, quality, timeliness, and effectiveness. The quality reflected by careful inspections is the most significant contribution to employee performance.

5. CONCLUSION

Servant Leadership in this research was determined successively by persuasive mapping, organizational stewardship, altruistic calling, wisdom, and emotional healing. *Persuasive* mapping is reflected in leadership's ability to solve every problem. Job satisfaction is determined by supervision, coworkers, the job, promotion, and salary. Supervision is reflected in superiors often providing both technical and behavioral support—organizational commitment determined respectively by affective, normative, and sustainable commitment.

Based on the research results and conclusions that have been put forward, servant Leadership, job satisfaction, and employee performance, theoretically

The research results can be used to develop knowledge that enriches human resource management and human behavior, especially regarding servant leadership, job satisfaction, and performance. Leaders can hold emotional

management skills training for managers and employees. Employee job satisfaction related to salary can meet basic needs so that employee job satisfaction increases; the hospital should give bonuses to employees if they succeed in achieving or even exceeding the targets that have been set.

REFERENCE

Aisy, I. R., Tulhusnah, L., & Pramesthi, R. A. (2022). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Aparatur Sipil Negara Melalui Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi pada Badan Kepegawaian dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Kabupaten Situbondo). *Jurnal Mahasiswa Entrepreneurship (JME)*, *1*(1), 18-33.

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, Michael. (2016). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 10th Edition. London: Kogan Page.

Ashraf, M. A. (2020). Demographic factors, compensation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in private university: an analysis using SEM. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, *11*(4), 407–436. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-01-2020-0010

Aurora. (2009). *Model kepemimpinan servant leadership pada Institut Pertanian Bogor*. Library of IPB University.

Barbuto, J.E.& Wheeler, D. W. . (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant Leadership [Electronic Version]. *Group and Organization Management. 31*(3), 300-326.

Bass B.M, & Avolio BJ, Berson Y., J. D. . (2004). Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *88*(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Basu, E., Pradhan, R. K., & Tewari, H. R. (2017). Impact of *organizational citizenship behavior* on job performance in Indian healthcare industries: The mediating role of social capital. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *66*(6), 780–796. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2016-0048

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, *26(4)*, 587–595.

Bernard C. Renyut, H. Basri Modding, & Jobhar Bima. (2017). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi, kompetensi pada Kepuasan kerja dan kinerja karyawan di Maluku Kantor Gubernur. *OSR Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen (IOSR-JBM)*, *19*(III), 18–29. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1911031829

Blanchard, O. and Perotti R. (2002). An empirical characterization of the dynamic effects of changes in government spending on output. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *(117)4*, 1329–1368.

Bolino, Mark C., dan William H. Turnley. 2003. Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. *(17)* 3, 60-71.

Chughtai, A. (2019). Servant leadership and perceived employability: proactive career behaviors as mediators. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *40*(2), 213–229. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2018-0281

Dessler, G. 2000. *Human Resource Management.* 8th edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Drucker, Peter F. 2006. *The Effecive Executive.* New York: HarperCollins.

Dunlop, & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace Deviance, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Business Unit Performance: The Bad Apples Do Spoil the Whole Barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 67–80.

Dyne, Van & Graham, J. . (2005). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. *Academic Management Journal*. *37*(4), 765-802.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Fatril, R., Putra, R. B., Dewi, R. C., & Fitri, H. (2022). Pengaruh Servant Leadership dan Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja Terhadap *Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (OCB) dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening pada Dinas Pendidikan Kota Padang. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *1*(1), 21-31.

Gnankob, R. I., Ansong, A., & Issau, K. (2022). Servant Leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour: the role of public service motivation and length of time spent with the leader. *International Journal of Public Sector*

Management, *35*(2), 236-253.

Golbasi, Z., Kelleci, M., & Dogan, S. (2008). Relationships Between Coping Strategies, Individual Characteristics And Kepuasan kerjaIn A Sample Of Hospital Nurses: Cross-Sectional Questionnaire Survey. *International Journal Of Nursing Studies*, *45(12): 18*.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press.

Griffin, R.W. (2004). *Management*, 7th edition. Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gunawan, A. (2020). Pengaruh Pelatihan dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Yi Shen Industrial. *Business Management Analysis Journal (BMAJ)*, *3*(1), 72–83.

Hendri, M. I. (2019). The mediation effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on the organizational learning effect of the employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *68*(7), 1208–1234. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0174

Indarti, S., Fernandes, A. A. R., & Hakim, W. (2017). The effect of OCB in relationship between personality, organizational commitment and job satisfaction on performance. *Journal of Management Development*, *36*(10), 1283-1293.

Idris, AS, N., Soetjipto, B. E., & Supriyanto, A. S. (2021). Predicting factors of *organizational citizenship behavior* in Indonesian nurses. *Heliyon*, *7*(12), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08652

Jin, M., McDonald, B., & Park, J. (2016). Followership and job satisfaction in the public sector: The moderating role of perceived supervisor support and performance-oriented culture. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(3), 218-237.

Kambu, Arius., E.A. Troena, Surachman, dan M. S. (2012). Pengaruh Leader-Member Exchange, Persepsi Dukungan Organisasional, Budaya Etnis Papua dan *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Sekda Provinsi Papua. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, *Vol. 10, N*, 262–272.

Kaplan, M, and Kaplan, A, (2018). The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Work Performance: a Case of Industrial Enterprises, *Journal of Economic and Social Development (JESD)*, 5(1), 46-50.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: Part II. *Accounting Horizons*, *15*(2), 147–160.

Kaur, N., & Kang, L. S. (2021). Person-organization fit, person-job fit and *organizational citizenship behavior*: An examination of the mediating role of job satisfaction. *IIMB Management Review*, *33*(4), 347–359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2021.12.003

Khattak, M. N., & O'Connor, P. (2021). The interplay between servant Leadership and organizational politics. *Personnel Review*, *50*(3), 985–1002. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2020-0131

Lantu. (2007). *Servant Leadership: The Ultimate Calling to Fulfill Your Life's Greatness* (Cetakan pe). Gradien Books.

Leephaijaroen, S. (2016). Effects of the big-five personality traits and organizational commitments on *organizational citizenship behavior* of support staff at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University, Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, *37*(2), 104–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2015.03.002

Luthans, F. (2008). *Organizational behavior*. New York : The Mc Grow – Hill Companies, Inc

Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior : An Envidence – Based Approach 12 th Edition*. New York : The Mc Grow – Hill Companies, Inc

Madura, J. D. 2007. *International Financial Management.* 13th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Mathis, L. Robert dan Jackson. H. John. (2001). *Human Resource Management.* Australia : Thomson.

McCann, J. T., Graves, D., & Cox, L. (2014). Servant Leadership, Employee Satisfaction, and Organizational Performance in Rural Community Hospitals. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *9*(10), 28–38. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v9n10p28

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. 1993. Commitment to Organizations and Occupations : Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 78(4), 538-551.

Neuschel, Richard F. 1960. *Management By System*. McGraw Hill , New York.

Ningrum, N. R., & Mayalangi, R. F. (2022). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Komitmen Organisasi, dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap *Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (OCB). *UPY Business and Management Journal (UMBJ)*, *1*(2),

27-34.

Obedgiu, V., Bagire, V., & Mafabi, S. (2017). Examination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour among local government civil servants in Uganda. *Journal of Management Development*, *36*(10), 1304-1316.

Organ, D. W., P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. M. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Otto, O. (2015). Moderating effect of *organizational citizenship behavior* on the effect of organizational commitment, transformational Leadership and work motivation on employee performance. *International Journal of Law and Management*. *60*(4), 953-964.

Pablo, Ruiz-Palomino, Santiago Guti´errez-Broncano, Pedro Jim´enez-Est´evez, Felipe Hernandez-Perlines. (2021). CEO servant leadership and strategic service differentiation: The role of high-performance work systems and innovativeness. *Tourism Management Perspectives. 40,* 1-14 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100891

Peng, J. C., & Chen, S. W. (2021). Servant Leadership and Service Performance: A Multilevel Mediation Model. *Psychological Reports*, *124*(4), 1738–1760. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294120950302

Puspasari, R. (2023). Pengaruh Servant Leadership terhadap *Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (OCB) melalui Kepuasan Kerja pada Pegawai Badan Pengelola Pajak dan Retribusi Daerah (BPPRD) Kota Jambi. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen dan Sains)*, *8*(1), 331-340.

Robbins, Stephen P. & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior* (Edition 15). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Russell, R.F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23(3)*, 145–157.

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro - , JM (2005). Linking Organizational Resources and Work Engagement to Employee Performance and Customer Loyalty: The Mediation of Service Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,   *90*(6), 1217–1227.

Sihombing, S., Astuti, E. S., Al Musadieq, M., Hamied, D., & Rahardjo, K. (2018). The effect of servant Leadership on rewards, organizational culture and its implication for employee's performance. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *60*(2), 505–516. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-12-2016-0174

Silaban, B. E., & Nastiti, N. (2021). Pengaruh Servant Leadership, Motivasi Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pns Pada Kota Administrasi Jakarta Pusat. *ESENSI: Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, *24*(3), 306-326.

Spears, Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant-Leadership: A Journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (Anniversary). New York: Paulist Press.

Spector, P. (2008). *Industrial and Organizational Behavior* (5th Edition). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Suhardi, A., Ismilasari, I., & Jasman, J. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Loyalitas dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah)*, *4*(2), 1117–1124. https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v4i2.421

Utomo, D., Subiyanto, D., & Septyarini, E. (2022). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja, Loyalitas, dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Karyawan* PT. Hari Mukti Teknik. *JPEKBM (Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, Kewirausahaan, Bisnis dan Manajemen)*, *6*(1), 232-245.

Weiss, H. M., & Merlo, K. L. (2015). *Job Satisfaction. In International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., p). Elsevier Ltd.

Wert, J. S. and K. Jennings. (2004). *The Serving Leader*. Oakland: Berret-Koehler Publisher.

Widyawati, C., Wijaya, V., Hendra, H., Adityaji, R., & Soeparto, W. H. (2022). Pengaruh Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Investigasi Empiris Pada Karyawan Hotel Di Surabaya. *JMBI UNSRAT (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis dan Inovasi Universitas Sam Ratulangi). 9*(3), 1721-1736.

Wong, P. T. dan D. P. (2003). *Servant Leadership: An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile : Wong and Page – Servant Leadership: An Opponent Process Model.* Trinity Western University.

Yukl, G. (2017). *Leadership In Organizations.* England : Pearson Education Limited.

Yulianto, N. A. B. (2021). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja *terhadap organizational citizenship behavior* (OCB) islam. *Perwira Journal of Economics & Business, 1(2),* 41-47.

Zhong, L., Qian, Z., & Wang, D. (2020). How does the servant supervisor influence the employability of postgraduates? Exploring the mechanisms of self-efficacy and academic engagement. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, *14*, 1-20.