Asean International Journal of Business

How does servant leadership influence managerial performance through public service motivation?

Ahmad Rifa'i [1], Syamsurijal Tan [2], Edward [3], Zulfina Adriani[4]
[1,] Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Islam Indragiri, Indonesia
[2,3,4,] Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
Email: [1]Rifaisulasin@gmail.com, [2]Syamsurijal_tan@unja.ac.id, [3]edwardlempo@gmail.com,
[4]zulfina_adriani@unja.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Research Paper

ABSTRACT

Purpose – This paper trying to test whether public service motivation is able to mediate the influence of servant leadership on managerial performance
Methodology/approach – This research using quantitative methods. Data processing and hypothesis testing using WarPLS version 7.0. This research was conducted at the Government of Indragiri Hilir Regency, Riau Province, Indonesia. The sampling technique used is probability sampling with proportionate stratified random sampling. The sample was calculated using Herry King's Nomogram Table with an error rate of 5% where 135 respondents were selected.
Findings – It was found that. Public Service Motivation is able to mediate the influence of servant leadership on managerial performance. The direct influence of Servant leadership on public service motivation is greater than the direct influence of servant leadership on managerial performance, the effect of public service motivation on managerial performance is the lowest.
Novelty/value – Because public service motivation has become an important factor that is able to mediate the influence of servant leadership on managerial performance, it is very important to understand how to maintain managerial performance by looking at indicators of public service motivation.

INTRODUCTION

Study with multilevel analysis of three waves of multi-source data from Chinese government agencies, the direct influence of public service motivation on job performance is significant, Leadership has a strong positive relationship to public service motivation, leaders should encourage employees to maintain contacts outside the organization in order to be able to access relevant information and resources that are not available in the organization (Schwarz et al., 2016). Independent Assessment of the Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform (PMPRB) by the Kemenpan-RB, the Indragiri Hilir Regency Bureaucratic Reform Index of 60.05, The quality of public services in Indragiri Hilir Regency can also be seen from the results of the evaluation of the implementation of public services conducted by the Kemenpan RB in 2018 and 2019. Of the 3 (three) regional apparatuses that became the survey locations in 2018, namely the Office of Investment and One Stop Integrated Services, the Department of Population and Civil Registry and RSUD Puri Husada Tembilahan, the results of the evaluation were 2 (two) regional apparatus with category B- (Good with Notes) and 1 (one) regional apparatus with category D (Guidance Priority). Meanwhile, based on

the results of the evaluation in 2019, the results of the evaluation were 1 (one) regional apparatus with the "GOOD" category,

Issues of Servant Leadership and Managerial Performance Harwiki,(2013), Sihombing et al.,(2018), Alafeshat & Aboud,(2019), Alafeshat & Tanova,(2019), Schwarz et al.,(2016), Newman et al.,(2017), Choudhary et al.,(2013), Saleem et al.,(2020), Tomigolung,(2015), Ratnasari et al.,(2020), Lisbijanto,(2014). Servant leadership affects employee performance, OCB, organizational performance, sales performance, employee performance Harwiki,(2013), Saleem et al.,(2020), Revelation et al.,(2019), Alafeshat & Tanova,(2019), Choudhary et al.,(2013), Cahyono et al.,(2020), Tomigolung,(2015), Ratnasari et al.,(2020). But there are research results that there is no effect of servant leadership on employee performance, employee work performance Sihombing et al.,(2018). The direct effect of servant leadership on job performance is not significant (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Servant leadership issues and public service motivation Kim et al.,(2013), Wright et al.,(2013), Christensen et al.,(2017), Schwarz et al.,(2016). Leadership behavior is often studied as a cause of motivation for public service employees Christensen et al.,(2017). Leadership has a strong positive relationship to public service motivation, leaders must encourage employees to maintain contacts outside the organization in order to be able to access relevant information and resources that are not available in the organization Newman et al.,(2017). Servant leadership will increase public service motivation by emphasizing the importance of serving the public at large (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Issues of public service motivation and managerial performance Kim et al.,(2013), Park & Rainey, (2008). It was found that leadership behavior is often studied as a cause of motivation for public service employees Schwarz et al.,(2016). Public service motivation was found to have a significant direct effect on organizational citizenship behavior, but it was also found to be a mediating variable that influenced job satisfaction and leadership on organizational citizenship behavior and clarity of goals on organizational citizenship behavior Kim et al.,(2013). Also found a strong relationship between public service motivation with job satisfaction and job quality variables, public service motivation affects good organizational personnel and affects organizational behavior of members of the company, good organizational persons are able to mediate the relationship between public service motivation and stress and intensity of employees leaving the company (Park & Rainey, 2008).

Based on this description, there are differences of opinion regarding the direct effects of servant leadership on employee, organizational performance, job performance, task and individual performance, sales performance and OCB. There are not many supporting studies to prove it empirically. The results of research on servant leadership on employee performance and work performance are not significant. There are not many supporting studies to prove it empirically. Issues: public service motivation and managerial performance. There are different findings from the direct effect of public service motivation on performance, work performance and behavior of organizational members. There are not many supporting studies to prove it empirically.

Based on theory, research gaps and factual conditions, a very interesting question arises about the objective condition of human resources. Furthermore, it is also interesting to ask questions about How servant leadership affects managerial performance through public service motivation.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Servant leadership affects employee performance, OCB, organizational performance, sales performance, employee performance Harwiki,(2013), Saleem et al.,(2020), Alafeshat & Tanova, (2019), Choudhary et al.,(2013), Cahyono et al.,(2020), Tomigolung, (2015), Ratnasari et al.,(2020). But there are research results that there is no effect of servant leadership on employee performance, employee work performance Sihombing et al.,(2018). The direct effect of servant leadership on job performance is not significant (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Public service motivation was found to have a direct significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior, besides that it was also found to be a mediating variable that influenced job satisfaction and

leadership on organizational citizenship behavior and clarity of goals on citizenship behavior Kim et al.,(2013). A strong relationship between public service motivation with job satisfaction and job quality variables, public service motivation affects good organizational persons and affects organizational behavior of company members, good organizational persons are able to mediate the relationship between public service motivation and stress and intensity of employees leaving the company (Park & Rainey, 2008).

Study by stratified analysis of three waves of multi-source data from Chinese government agencies, the direct effect of public service motivation on job performance is significant (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Leadership behavior is often studied as a cause of motivation for public service employees Christensen et al.,(2017). Leadership has a strong positive relationship to public service motivation, leaders must encourage employees to maintain contacts outside the organization in order to be able to access relevant information and resources that are not. available in the organization Newman et al.,(2017). Servant leadership will increase public service motivation by emphasizing to employees the importance of serving the wider community (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Study by stratified analysis of three waves of multi-source data from Chinese government agencies, the direct effect of Servant Leadership on job performance is not statistically significant but is fully mediated through public service motivation (Schwarz et al., 2016).

Servant Leadership
From the concept of servant leadership above, the researcher defines servant leadership as leadership that places goodness in the people it leads by respecting people, developing people, building community, showing authenticity, providing leadership, and sharing leadership. Dimensions and Indicators of Servant Leadership In this study the researcher used the dimensions of servant leadership that were used Laub, (1999) as follows: (Respect people), (Develop people), (Build community), (Display authenticity), (Provide leadership), (Provide leadership), (Sharing leadership).

Managerial Performance
From various managerial performance concepts, researchers define managerial performance as an outcome resulting from a managerial function and role. In this study, researchers used 2 dimensions of managerial performance based on the roles and functions of managers:
1. Manager function of Mintzbergh, (1989) planning (planning), organizing (organizing), directing (actuating) and monitoring (controlling). The manager's function has the following indicators: Planning, (setting goals, achieving goals, anticipating future conditions, alternative actions carrying out plans and evaluating results) Organizing, (organizational structure, division of work, HR placement, reporting relationships, communication linkages) Actuating (Creation of business inspiration, Achievement of work enthusiasm, Communication of vision) Controling (Confidence in achieving results, Performance measurement, Corrective action)
2. Manager Role Mintzbergh, (2010), John R. Schemerhorn, (2012) Interpersonal roles, Informational roles, Decisional roles. The Manager's role has the following indicators: Interpersonal role (There are people who are assigned, The creation of work motivation, The creation of working relationships). Informational roles (Monitoring, Mentioning information, Implementing communication). Decisional roles (Have an entrepreneurial spirit, Ability to overcome difficulties, Negotiation skills)

Public Service Motivation
In this study, the author defines Public Service Motivation is "individual orientation to provide services to people with the aim of doing good for others and society". The dimensions and indicators of this public service motivation variable are the dimensions and indicators of (Gould-Williams et al.,

2015) simplify Dimensions and indicators of Perry, (1996) with: (Self sacrifice), (Compassion) (Commitment to the public interest) (Public policy making)

METHOD

This research uses quantitative methods. Data processing and hypothesis testing using WarPLS version 7.0. This research was conducted at the Government of Indragiri Hilir Regency, Riau Province, Indonesia. The sampling technique used was probability sampling with proportionate stratified random sampling. The sample was calculated using the Herry King Nomogram Table with an error rate of 5% where 135 respondents were selected.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Respondents

Samplein this study were 135 people who became respondents in this study. The sample in this study were echelon II and III officials at the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government, Riau Province, Indonesia. In this study, respondents were divided into several characteristics, the characteristics of respondents were dominated by men, namely 102 people with a percentage of 75.5%, while women were 33 people with a percentage of 24.4%. the age of respondents is 34 - 38 years, namely 35 people with a percentage of 25.9%, then respondents aged 39 - 43 years as many as 40 people with a percentage of 29.7%, then respondents aged 44 - 48 years as many as 20 people with a percentage of 14.8% , then respondents aged 49 - 53 years as many as 25 people with a percentage of 18.5%, then respondents aged 54 - 58 years as many as 15 people with a percentage of 11, 1%, there are no respondents over 59 years. Then the category of years of work 12-18 years as many as 45 people with a percentage of 33.3%, working years of 19-25 years totaling 35 people with a percentage of 25.9%, working years of 26-32 years as many as 30 people with a percentage of 22.3%, length of work 33 - 39 years amounted to 25 people with a percentage of 18.5%, there are no respondents with a length of work over 40 years.

Outer Model Evaluation (Measurement Model)

Outer model or measurement model that defines how each indicator block relates to its latent variable. The design of the measurement model by drawing latent variables and filling them with indicators of each latent variable (reflective or formative) based on the operational definition of the variable. The assessment of the outer model uses three methods, namely convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability. The results of the assessment of the outer model are the results of validity and reliability tests for each variable.

Convergent Validity

The first step is to test the indicators in the model to meet convergent validity. According to Hair in the book Sholihin & Ratmono (2021), the condition for meeting convergent validity is that the loading value of each construct is > 0.70 and a significant p < 0.05. However, in some cases, loading requirements > 0.70 are not met, especially for newly developed questionnaires. Therefore, if the loading value is above 0.40-0.60, it is necessary to consider whether to maintain it or not. In most references a factor weight of 0.50 or more is considered to have strong enough validation to explain latent constructs (Hair et al, 2010; Ghozali, 2008). Although some other references (Ferdinand, 2000) explain that the weakest loading that can be accepted is 0,40.

Table 1. Convergent validity which can be seen in the combined loadings and cross loadings output after several statements have been issued / deleted

Items	Y	M	X	Type (as defined	SE	P Value	Information
KM1	0.648	-0.190	-0.105	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KM2	0.509	0.105	-0.180	Reflect	0.076	<0.001	Valid
KM3	0.600	0.008	0.207	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KM4	0.617	0.012	0.159	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KM5	0.750	-0.261	0.114	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KM6	0.615	0.026	-0.034	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KM9	0.535	0.251	0.057	Reflect	0.076	<0.001	Valid

KM10	0.629	-0.163	0.148	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KM11	0.707	-0.033	-0.154	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KM12	0.636	0.039	-0.193	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KM13	0.752	-0.118	-0.013	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KM14	0.729	-0.094	-0.059	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KM15	0.485	-0.067	0.198	Reflect	0.077	<0.001	Valid
KM16	0.745	-0.283	0.197	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KM17	0.737	0.148	-0.241	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KM18	0.681	0.240	-0.087	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KM19	0.438	0.390	-0.268	Reflect	0.078	<0.001	Valid
KM20	0.532	0.184	-0.008	Reflect	0.076	<0.001	Valid
KM21	0.754	-0.021	0.067	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KM23	0.572	0.139	0.173	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KYM1	0.330	0.778	-0.128	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KYM2	-0.017	0.700	0.096	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KYM3	0.223	0.709	-0.190	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KYM4	0.203	0.700	-0.228	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KYM5	-0.043	0.625	0.010	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KYM6	-0.188	0.698	0.279	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KYM7	-0.233	0.710	0.088	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
KYM8	0.050	0.592	0.065	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KYM9	0.289	0.611	-0.020	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KYM10	-0.175	0.776	0.045	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
KYM11	-0.069	0.616	-0.033	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
KYM12	-0.000	0.546	-0.122	Reflect	0.076	<0.001	Valid
KYM13	0.024	0.659	0.118	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KYM14	-0.134	0.661	-0.065	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KYM15	-0.143	0.637	-0.002	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KYM16	-0.138	0.654	0.037	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	Valid
KYM18	0.011	0.550	0.056	Reflect	0.076	<0.001	Valid
MPP1	-0.041	-0.068	0.775	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	Valid
MPP2	-0.124	0.075	0.806	Reflect	0.071	<0.001	Valid
MPP3	-0.075	0.062	0.857	Reflect	0.070	<0.001	Valid
MPP4	0.085	0.050	0.729	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
MPP5	0.104	0.007	0.731	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
MPP6	0.269	-0.207	0.712	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
MPP7	0.090	-0.033	0.688	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	Valid
MPP8	-0.248	0.074	0.595	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid
MPP10	-0.077	0.038	0.616	Reflect	0.075	<0.001	Valid

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that there are nine statements with a loading value of less than 0.40, namely KM.7. KM.8, KM22, KM.24, and KYM17, MPP 9, MPP 11, MPP12, MPP 13 so they need to be removed/removed. Based on Table 1, it can be seen that there are no statements with loadings less than 0.40 after the KM.7 statement is deleted. KM.8, KM22, KM.24, and KYM17, MPP 9, MPP 11, MPP12, MPP 13 so that based on the table the indicators listed can be used. Furthermore, to further prove and convince again, it can be seen in the Output values of AVE and Composite Reliability. Based on the table, it can be seen that there is no correlation with indicators whose value is smaller than the correlation of variables with other indicators.

Discriminant Validity
The discriminant validity test can be seen from the Average Variant Extracted (AVE) > 0.5, then the Average Variant Extracted (AVE) value can be seen in table 2. The output of the latent variable coefficient is as follows:

Table.2. Output Latent Variable coefficient

	Y	X	M
R-squared coefficients	0.649		0.361
Adjusted R-squared coefficients	0.644		0.356
Composite reliability coefficients	0.932	0.930	0.909
Cronbach's alpha coefficient	0.922	0.919	0.886
Average variances extracted	0.410	0.440	0.529
Full collinearity VIFs	2,612	2.254	1,873
Q-squared coefficients	0.644		0.364

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that not all AVE values are above 0.50. The minimum recommended AVE value is 0.5 (Fornell and Lacker, 1981 in Sholihin and Ratmono, 2013:73). The variables whose values are below 0.50 are Managerial performance, managerial performance, and Servant leadership, while Political will perception is already above 0.50, but in the case of AVE it is less than 0.5 but composite reliability (CR) is higher than 0. ,6 which is 0,900, then the convergent validity of the construct is still adequate(Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Composite Reliability
Composite Reliability Values for Variables The variables in this study can be calculated based on the results of the calculation of the Latent Output Variable coefficient, Composite Reliability Testing can be seen from the Composite Reliability (AVC) value and Cronbach's alpha coefficient > 0.7

Table 3 Latent Variable Coefficient

	Y	X	M
Composite reliability coefficients	0.932	0.930	0.909
Cronbach's alpha coefficient	0.922	0.919	0.886

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha for each variable are already greater than 0.70. This shows that all variables are reliable or can be relied upon as variables. It can be concluded that all construct variables meet the reliability requirements, and can be analyzed further.

Evaluation of the Structural Model (Inner Model)Coefficient Determination
Based on Table 4, it is known that the fit and quality indices model for all criteria meets the requirements so that the research model can be used as an analysis.

Table 4: Test Results of Fit and Quality Indices Model

No	Model Fit and Quality Indices	Fit Criteria
1	Average path coefficient (APC)=0.499, P<0.001	P<0.05
2	Average R-squared (ARS)=0.505, P<0.001	P<0.05
3	Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)=0.500, P<0.001	P=0.14
4	Average block VIF (AVIF)=1.566, acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3	Acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3
5	Average full collinearity VIF (AFVIF)=2.246, acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3	Acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3
6	Tenenhaus GoF (GoF)=0.482, small >= 0.1, medium >= 0.25, large >= 0.36	small >= 0.1, medium >= 0.25, large >= 0.36
7	Sympson's paradox ratio (SPR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1	Acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1
8	R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)=1,000, acceptable if >= 0.9, ideally = 1	Acceptable if >= 0.9, ideally = 1
9	Statistical suppression ratio (SSR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7	Acceptable if >= 0.7
10	Nonlinear bivariate causality direction ratio (NLBCDR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7	Acceptable if >= 0.7

Hypothesis testing
To find out whether there is a significant (significant) relationship or influence between exogenous variables directly on endogenous variables, it can be seen in table 5 path coefficient & P Value

Table 5 Path Coefficient & P Value

Path Coefficient			
	Y	X	M
Y		0.541	0.355
M		0.601	
P Values			
	Y	X	M
Y		<0.001	<0.001
M		<0.001	

The Influence of Servant Leadership on Managerial Performance
Based on the test results in Table 5, it is known that the estimated parameter for testing the influence of Servant leadership on managerial performance has a beta coefficient of 0.541 and a p value of <0.001. The beta coefficient value of 0.541 indicates a positive direction with a P-value of <0.001 which is smaller than the sig level of 0.05 (significant). Thus, it can be concluded that servant leadership has a positive effect on managerial performance (Hypothesis 1 is accepted).

The Effect of Public Service Motivation on Managerial Performance
Based on the test results in Table 5, it is known that the estimated parameter for testing the influence of Public Service Motivation on Managerial Performance has a beta coefficient of 0.355 and a p value of <0.001. The beta coefficient value of 0.355 indicates a positive direction with a P-value of <0.001 which is smaller than the sig level of 0.05 (significant). Thus, it can be concluded that Public Service Motivation has a positive effect on Managerial Performance (Hypothesis 2 is accepted).

The Influence of Servant Leadership on Public Service Motivation
Based on the test results in Table 5, it is known that the estimated parameter for testing the influence of Servant Leadership on Public Service Motivation has a beta coefficient of 0.601 and a p value of <0.001. The beta coefficient value of 0.601 indicates a positive direction with a P-value of <0.001 which is smaller than the sig level of 0.05 (significant). Thus it can be concluded that Servant Leadership has a positive effect on Public Service Motivation (Hypothesis 3 is accepted).

To find out whether there is a significant (significant) relationship or influence between exogenous variables indirectly on endogenous variables, it can be seen in table 6 indirect and total effect.

Table. 6 Indirect and total Effect

Indirect effects for paths with 2 segments			
	Y	X	M
Y		0.213	
Number of paths with 2 segments			
	Y	X	M
Y		1	
P values of indirect effects for paths with 2 segments			
	Y	X	M
Y		<0.001	

The Influence of Servant Leadership on Managerial Performance Through Public Service Motivation

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that the indirect effect of X Servant Leadership (X) on Managerial Performance (Y) through Public Service Motivation (M) has a beta coefficient of 0.213 with a p value <0.001 which is smaller than the sig level of 0.05. A positive beta coefficient with a significance level of less than 0.05 indicates that Servant Leadership increases Managerial Performance through Public Service Motivation and the effect is significant. Thus, it can be concluded that Public Service Motivation can mediate the influence of Servant Leadership on Managerial Performance

CONCLUSION

Servant Leadership has a positive effect on managerial performance. To improve managerial performance, a leader can choose how to lead with Servant Leadership, because this has proven to be significant. Public Service Motivation has a positive effect on Managerial Performance, so it can be concluded that to improve managerial performance one's Public Service Motivation must be considered. Servant Leadership has a positive effect on Public Service Motivation, meaning that to increase Public Service motivation, how to lead with Servant Leadership is recommended. Public Service Motivation can mediate the influence of Servant Leadership on Managerial Performance, meaning that if there is a weak influence between servant leadership and managerial performance, one can first see how the Public Service Motivation of organizational members. Suggestions for regional heads who are leading and have echelon II and III officials and the average employee is a bachelor, a servant leadership style is recommended because it can affect public service motivation and managerial performance. Suggestions for further research related to the same research idea to be able to take a larger sample with a different object.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Alafeshat, R., & Aboud, F. (2019). Servant Leadership Impact on Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement. *International Journal of Human Resource …*, *9*(3), 85–100. https://ideas.repec.org/a/mth/ijhr88/v9y2019i3p85-100.html

Alafeshat, R., & Tanova, C. (2019). Servant leadership style and high-performance work system practices: Pathway to a sustainable jordanian airline industry. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *11*(22). https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226191

Cahyono, Y., Jihadi, M., Arifin, Z., Purnamasari, W., Musnaini, Wijoyo, H., Fitriaty, Putra, R. S., Putri, R. A., Muliansyah, D., Suryani, P., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Do servant leadership influence market performance? evidence from indonesian pharmacy industries. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, *11*(9), 439–451. https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.9.62

Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-012-1470-8

Christensen, R. K., Paarlberg, L., & Perry, J. L. (2017). Public Service Motivation Research: Lessons for Practice. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(4), 529–542. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12796

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). SEM with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error: Algebra and Statistics. In *Journal of Marketing Research* (Vol. 18, Issue 3, pp. 1–16).

Gould-Williams, J. S., Mostafa, A. M. S., & Bottomley, P. (2015). Public service motivation and employee outcomes in the egyptian public sector: Testing the mediating effect of person-

organization fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *25*(2), 597–622. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut053

Harwiki, W. (2013). The Influence of Servant Leadership on Organization Culture, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employeesâ€™ Performance (Study of Outstanding Cooperatives in East Java Province, Indonesia). *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, *5*(12), 876–885. https://doi.org/10.22610/jebs.v5i12.460

jhon R. Schemerhorn, J. (2012). *EXPLORING MANAGEMENT*. Jhon Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Wright, B. E., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R. K., Desmarais, C., Koumenta, M., Leisink, P., Liu, B., Palidauskaite, J., Pedersen, L. H., Perry, J. L., Ritz, A., Taylor, J., & de Vivo, P. (2013). Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *23*(1), 79–102. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus027

Laub, J. A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. *ProQuest Dissertations and These*, *April 1999*, 1–166. http://www.olagroup.com/Display.asp?page=dissertations_theses

Lisbijanto, H. (2014). Influence of Servant Leadership on Organization Performance Through Job Satisfaction In Employees' Cooperatives Surabaya. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention ISSN (Online*, *3*(4), 2319–8028. www.ijbmi.org

Mintzbergh, H. (1989). *Management Inside Our Strange world of organizations*. The Free Press.

Mintzbergh, H. (2010). *SIMPLY MANAGING*. Berrett-Koehler Publisher.

Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & … (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6

Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2008). Leadership and public service motivation in U.S. federal agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, *11*(1), 109–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967490801887954

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *6*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303

Ratnasari, S. L., Sutjahjo, G., & Adam. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction, organizational culture and leadership on employee performance. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, *23*(13 A). https://doi.org/10.36295/ASRO.2020.231329

Saleem, F., Zhang, Y. Z., Gopinath, C., & Adeel, A. (2020). Impact of Servant Leadership on Performance: The Mediating Role of Affective and Cognitive Trust. *SAGE Open*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900562

Schwarz, G., Newman, A., Cooper, B., & Eva, N. (2016). Servant Leadership and Follower Job Performance: the Mediating Effect of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration*, *94*(4), 1025–1041. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12266

Sihombing, S., Astuti, E. S., Musadieq, M. al, & … (2018). The effect of servant leadership on rewards, organizational culture and its implication for employee's performance. *… Journal of Law and ….* https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJLMA-12-2016-0174/full/html

Tomigolung, H. N. (2015). *THE EFFECTS OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OFFICE SOUTHEAST MINAHASA*. *3*(1), 2015. http://weekly.cnbnews.com/news/article.html?no=124000

Wahyu, A., Tentama, F., & Sari, E. Y. D. (2019). The role of servant leadership and organizational climate on organizational citizenship behavior with job satisfaction as mediator. *… Journal of Scientific and ….* http://eprints.uad.ac.id/20122/

Wright, B. E., Christensen, R. K., & Pandey, S. K. (2013). Measuring Public Service Motivation: Exploring the Equivalence of Existing Global Measures. *International Public Management Journal*, *16*(2), 197–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.817242