

Servant Leadership's Contribution to Organizational Culture-Mediated Job-Related Outcomes and Leader-Related Outcomes

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study aims to examine the contribution of Servant Leadership to psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, and leader effectiveness with corporate cultural moderation in officials in the Mimika District Government of Papua Province, Indonesia.

Study design: Hypothesis testing

Place and Duration of Study: 120 respondents who were third-echelon officials in Mimika District from November 2021 to January 2022.

Methodology: Partial Least Square with Structural Equation Modeling

Results: The results of this study are Servant Leadership has a positive and significant effect on four job-related outcomes, namely psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. Meanwhile, corporate culture only significantly modifies the relationship between Servant Leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction.

Conclusion: The practical implications of the research are that the most robust dimensions of servant leadership are listening, persuasion, visionary and capable. For organizational culture, the dimensions of Uncertainty avoidance, especially those related to complex monitoring systems, need to be simplified. And for the psychological empowerment variable, third echelon officials expect self-determination to choose to initiate and manage actions as leaders.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction & leader effectiveness.

1. INTRODUCTION

Servant leadership is a type or model of leadership developed to overcome the leadership crisis experienced by a society or nation. Servant leadership tends to prioritize the needs, interests, and aspirations of the people they lead above themselves (Beck, 2014). Its orientation is to serve; its a holistic perspective and operates with spiritual and moral standards. At this level, echelon III officials are usually those who directly deal with customers and stakeholders and must be able to provide excellent service to ensure customer satisfaction.

Every servant leader always acts with love that empowers followers or subordinates, visionary but humble because, based on that, earns the trust of the organization and the followers. This type of leader can listen and empathize with others. (Long et al., 2012). Servant leadership can think conceptually and act empathically while persuading others for the organization's or institution's benefit.

Servant leadership refers to a leadership style in which leaders prioritize meeting the needs of followers/workers (Zhang et al., 2021) (Liden et al., 2008). Over the years, servant leadership has received increasing research attention since (Liden et al., 2008) developed it as a multidimensional measure (Parris & Peachey, 2013). The core idea underlying servant leadership is that servant leaders behave in a moral or virtuous manner to develop the full potential of their followers and put the interests of their followers above their own (Zhang et al., 2021) (Liden et al., 2008) (Van Dierendonck, 2011).

Researchers have paid increasing attention to discussing how servant leaders motivate employees to improve their work attitudes and performance (e.g., (Hsiao et al., 2015) (Ling et al., 2016) (Testa & Sipe, 2012). Empirical research on servant leadership has mainly focused on examining its consequences, including individual outcomes such as employee job engagement (Clercq et al., 2014), trust in leaders (Shah et al., 2015) (Chan & Mak, 2014), service performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Liden et al., 2014) (Van Dierendonck, 2011), as well as the level of group outcomes such as service climate (Z. Chen et al., 2015), group service performance and group OCB (Hu & Liden, 2011).

Despite the increasing number of servant leadership studies, a critical omission in the literature is that the limited studies to date have attempted to summarize empirical research on servant leadership systematically. Theoretically, although Servant Leadership has attracted considerable interest from scholars, there are few narrative reviews of servant leadership (Parris & Peachey, 2013) (Van Dierendonck, 2011), which cannot offer an adequate retrospective analysis of leadership research. Waiter. A critical meta-analytic study (Hoch et al., 2018) compared three emerging forms of positive leadership (i.e., authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and servant leadership) with transformational leadership in terms of their association with relevant organizational outcomes. Due to the relatively small number of studies using estimates, in their review, the authors call for more research that conducts meta-analyses concentrating on servant leadership to draw conclusions based on larger populations. Thus, there is a need for a more focused and systematic summary of the existing empirical research on servant leadership. To address this gap, in this paper, we apply social exchange theory (Zhang et al., 2021), conduct a meta-analytic review, and provide strong evidence demonstrating measurable effect sizes of Servant Leaders on relevant outcomes.

Practically speaking, understanding the effectiveness of servant leaders can provide many benefits to companies by giving direction for the training and selecting future approaches. Therefore, using a meta-analytic method, our research aims to provide a systematic and holistic review that summarizes the effectiveness of servant leadership concerning three significant consequences: work-related outcomes, leader-related outcomes, and related outcomes. Moreover, although most of the research on Servant Leaders is based on Western Contexts (Liden et al., 2008) (Parris & Peachey, 2013), more research is interested in exploring servant leadership in Asian contexts (Hale & Fields, 2007) (Han et al., 2010) (Ling et al., 2016) (Miao et al., 2014).

Several studies have suggested that servant leadership is considered culturally universal (Parris & Peachey, 2013), while others have described the cultural impact of servant

leadership and have indicated that servant leadership can be implemented differently in collectivistic and different power distance cultural contexts. higher (Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010) (Sun & Wang, 2009) (Trompenaars & Voerman, 2010). Therefore, scholars have called for more research to verify the cultural features in studies of servant leadership (e.g. (Han et al., 2010) (Sun & Wang, 2009). To fill this gap, the current study offers a cultural framework. By examining the moderating effects of four critical cultural dimensions—traditionality, masculinity, individualism, and power distance, we thus provide strong empirical evidence on the impact of culture on leadership which serves to help resolve inconsistencies in the literature.

In summary, the meta-analysis offers four contributions to servant leadership research. First, although previous research has revealed many positive effects of servant leadership, the magnitude and consistency of these effects across studies remain an open question. This lesson builds on a meta-analysis (Hoch et al., 2018), systematically examines previous research, and comprehensively examines the consequences of servant leadership. Second, this study compares the meta-analytic magnitude of the relationship between servant leadership and its results, advancing an understanding of the predictive power of servant leaders in terms of attitude-based outcomes and performance-based outcomes.

Moreover, servant leadership's individual and group outcomes emphasize the need to examine the multilevel effects of servant leadership from both top-down and bottom-up directions. Servant leadership is a different construction compared to other correlated leadership styles. Finally, this study introduces a cultural perspective for interpreting the effectiveness of servant leadership. Existing reviews or meta-analyses focus on investigating how servant leaders impact employee or group outcomes. However, it has been argued that values and views that reflect social norms determine followers' responses to leadership (Hu & Judge, 2017).

Donia Rajab, Panaccioc, and Wang (2016) explained that servant leadership positively influences job satisfaction, but it is not significant with employee performance related to OCB. But for, employee motivation has a moderating function on servant leadership and job outcomes. Especially for employees with a strong impression of management, job satisfaction is low. So they state that servant leadership is not always beneficial for all subordinates.

Prasetyo, Yuniarsih, and Ahman (2017) state that the need to improve organizational capabilities can be done with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are essential parts of influencing OCB. Their study shows direct and indirect effects between job satisfaction and OCB, but organizational commitment also has a mediating function. Organizational commitment contributes as a mediator between job satisfaction and OCB.

Guia, Zhanga, Zoub, and Xi Ouyang (2020) conducted an in-depth study of servant leadership using a meta-analysis, which was still limited to the relationship between servant leadership and outcomes in the service industry context. The study's results explain that the most decisive impact of servant leadership is on satisfaction, followed by organizational commitment, service quality, work engagement, service climate, creativity, psychological capital, OCB, and performance.

After identifying the ideal leadership characteristics as described above, the researcher felt compelled to explore and explore leadership practices in the Papua district because Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 9 of 2020 concerning the Acceleration of Welfare Development in Papua and West Papua became the foundation of the government's

commitment to resolving the root cause of the problem. The Papuan people experience them. "A comprehensive strategy for Papua has been carried out from various perspectives since the era of special autonomy (otsus) in 2001, both adopted by the central government and regional governments. Some steps in the grand design have been made for Papua and West Papua. Significant changes are reflected in the decrease in the percentage of the poor, from 54.75 percent in March 1999 to 26.55 percent in September 2019.

This research on servant leaders is certainly not the only one that has ever been done. Novelty in this research argues that the same leadership practice in other places may have similarities with what the Papuan Regency Government practices. The added value of this research is that the servant leadership model is run by the regional head and the head of the Papua Regency office. Thus, the study based on Mimika's local wisdom can be a model or guide for the practice of leaders serving in other districts/cities in Papua. Papua must stand on par with other regions in Indonesia regarding leadership qualities to influence people to have a quality way of life and living.

Hypothesis Development:

The widely recognized attitudes and intentions to investigate Servant Leaders in the management literature are examining the relationship between Servant Leaders and employee work attitudes, such as work motivation and organizational attachment (Chen et al., 2013) (Donia et al., 2016) (Hu & Liden, 2011). The effectiveness of servant leadership has been explained from a social exchange perspective, which proposes that the norm of reciprocity motivates an employee to reciprocate in social relationships. Instead of being self-serving or purely result-oriented, servant leaders help followers fulfill their needs, wants, and interests and build interpersonal relationships with followers (Bedi et al., 2016) (Hu & Liden, 2011). Employees perceive the leader as supportive and remain highly motivated when these needs and interests are met. For example, servant leadership positively relates to employees' sense of empowerment (Van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Similarly, service leadership can encourage restaurant worker engagement (Carter & Baghurst, 2014) (Clercq et al., 2014) (Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017). In the context of private service firms, servant leadership has also been revealed to increase employees' levels of intrinsic motivation (C. Y. Chen et al., 2013). Based on the existing results in the literature suggest, several attitude variables as essential outcomes of servant leadership, including psychological empowerment, engagement, and intrinsic motivation.

Hypothesis 1: Servant leaders have a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment

Servant leadership can facilitate efficient organizational functioning by maintaining high employee trust. This proposition has received solid empirical support showing a positive relationship between servant leadership and employee trust in the organization (Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010) (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Servant leaders who genuinely consider their employees can increase employee engagement and cohesiveness in organizational processes. In such situations, servant leaders can promote employee acceptance of company values and norms and increase organizational commitment (Van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Relatedly, servant leaders can also reinforce the importance of serving others, reflecting the organization's positive image. Thus, servant leaders can actively outperform the collective consciousness. Concepts among employees and form a high level of social

identification with the organization (Zhang et al., 2021). For example, (Zhang et al., 2021) found a positive relationship between servant leadership and organizational identification.

Hypothesis 2: Servant leaders have a positive effect on organizational commitment

Positive social exchanges with employees initiated by servant leaders can create a supportive social context in which employees are strongly encouraged to reciprocate with prosocial behaviors that support a positive environment, such as interpersonally directed OCB (OCBI) and organizationally directed OCB (OCBO). (Walumbwa et al., 2010). In addition, servant leaders can encourage employees to express diverse ideas and adopt innovative ways of performing tasks (Liden et al., 2008).

creative ideas in his work (Liden et al., 2014) (Neubert et al., 2008). Similarly, (Yoshida et al., 2014) found that servant leaders can encourage employees to develop a strong attitude of relational identification with the leader by providing a strong sense of psychological security so that employees are more willing to take risks and invest in ideas. New.

Hypothesis 3: Servant leaders have a positive effect on OCB

According to (Liden et al., 2008), in the original servant leadership model, genuine concern and providing support to employees are essential features of servant leaders. That is, when servant leaders are sensitive to the needs of their employees, they effectively offer genuine support to them, and that support helps improve employee well-being. Previous research has considered perceived organizational support as the organization expresses concern about employee well-being (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000) and has suggested that feeling supported at work and being satisfied with one's job are two essential aspects of employee well-being. According to our model, empirical research has also supported the positive relationship between servant leadership and employee perceived work support (Zhou & Miao, 2014). Servant leaders prioritize the satisfaction of followers' needs (Liden et al., 2008), and followers tend to feel supported and are subsequently more satisfied with the job. The positive relationship between servant leaders and job satisfaction is also well supported in the existing literature (Hebert & Sherri, 2003) (Schneider & George, 2011) (Thompson, 2002).

Hypothesis 4: Servant Leadership has positive effLeadership satisfaction.

As mentioned earlier, servant leadership effectively generates high-quality exchanges between a leader and employees in the workplace. According to Ng et al. (2008), social exchange theory is a fundamental relationship-based approach to understanding the relational dynamics between servant leaders and employees. Previous research has adopted this perception of social exchange to explain the effects of servant leadership on leader-related outcomes, including leader effectiveness. One distinct feature of servant leadership in organizations is that leaders appear friendly and approachable when interacting with employees (Henderson et al., 2009) (Ling et al., 2016). Other studies have found that followers' perceptions of leaders possessing servant-oriented behavioral attributes give rise to favorable perceptions of leadership, an essential antecedent of followers' perceptions of servant leadership effectiveness.

Hypothesis 5: Servant leaders are positively related to leadership effectiveness.

Servant leaders integrate participatory management, team building, total quality, and service orientation ideals into their leadership philosophy (Dutta & Khatri, 2017). SL presents an efficient leadership approach built on ethical-moral values and empowerment (Boyum, 2006)

and focuses on the importance of rewarding, valorizing, and empowering people. The empowerment process aims to develop a proactive attitude and self-confidence among followers and give them a sense of personal power (van Dierendonck, 2011). This sense of control is practically transmitted to followers by the servant leader. SL behavior does not increase members' competence and skill level but strengthens their perception due to their subjective evaluation of the organizational environment. As mentioned above, PE is a process of enhancing and changing inner beliefs (Avan et al., 2019) and consists of intrinsic motives that occur in an individual through the motivational process of the individual's feeling experience being activated (Avan et al., 2019). Thus, it can be said that servant leaders play an essential role in improving the quality of life of individuals and organizations

In the literature, there are several studies discussing that empowerment is one of the most critical dimensions of SL (Greasley and Bocarnea, 2014; Jaiswal and Dhar, 2017; Liden et al., 2008; Page and Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Russell and Stone, 2002). ; van Dierendonck 2011; van Dierendonck C Nuijten 2011). Although the existence of various studies directly shows the effect of SL on PE or the relationship between them (Baykal et al., 2018; etinkaya & Yildiz, 2018; Sousa and van Dierendonck, 2017; van der Hoven, 2014; Van Winkle et al., 2014), it is also possible to find several studies assessing the mediating role of PE in terms of the effect of SL on organizational outcomes (Allen et al., 2018; Asag-Gau & van Dierendonck, 2011; Khajehpour et al., 2016a; Khajehpour et al., 2016b; Newman et al., 2017). Van der Hoven (2014) and Van Winkle et al. (2014) confirmed that followers' perceptions of being empowered were positively related to servant-supervisor leadership behavior. Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017) found that underestimation was the most vital determinant of the servant leader effect on PE. AsagGau and van Dierendonck (2011) also find that SL empowerment creates an additional difference in PE and is the most critical dimension in OC. Ashgar and Naseer (2017) found that psychological empowerment mediates servant leadership and positive work behavior.

OI, described as the relationship between organizational identity and self-concept, is the perception of congruence between an individual's self-identity traits and specific traits that express the organization (Avan et al., 2019). However, SL's effect on perception is not widely discussed in the literature. Along with limited studies that directly examine the impact of SL on OI, few studies address the mediating or moderating role of OI between the relationship with SL and some organizational behaviors such as OCB, employee voice behavior, work-to-family enrichment (Chughtai, 2016; Vodely, 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). In addition, the relationship of certain variables influenced by SL (job commitment, extra-role behavior, OCB) with OI was also discussed in the literature (Riketta & Dick, 2005; Farrell & Czekowski, 2012; Qi & Ming-Xia, 2014).

Hypothesis 6: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership in the psychological environment

Michel & Tews (2016) observed the behavior of leaders who are task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and change-oriented and have a positive influence on OCB and obtained the formula that employees are interested in responding to relationships and leaders who have a transformation orientation. Leadership has been considered very important in many fields and organizations regarding OCB (Bottomley et al., 2016). Leadership style serves to influence OCB. Work involvement can provide organizational commitment (Abdullahi et al., 2020). Leaders are role models for employees; when employees see leaders in informal conditions and can see the leader's good intentions, this will influence employees to be more oriented toward the common good (Lofquist & Matthiesen, 2018). Newman et al. (2017)

believe that servant leadership positively correlates with OCB. Aprilida et al. (2019) revealed that servant leadership has a significant role in influencing others because this leader is highly respected and trusted. This can affect increasing OCB and achieving organizational goals effectively and efficiently.

Empirical studies in the OCB, SL, and OC pay attention to the relationship between SL and OC (Bobbio et al., 2012; Lapointe and Vandenberghe, 2018; Newman et al., 2018). Many studies reveal that SL has a positive influence on OCB and OC. No studies have demonstrated the mediating effect of OC on the relationship between SL and OCB. Walumbwa et al. (2010) showed that employees' commitment to their superiors mediates the relationship between SL and OCB. Since SL can positively affect OC and OCB, and OC is one of the antecedents of OCB (Lawrence et al. 2012; Najafi et al. 2011; Ng and Feldman 2011; D. W. Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie 2005), it can be assumed that culture organizations can mediate the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Therefore, the hypothesis can be developed as follows:

Hypothesis 7: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational commitment

Michel & Tews (2016) observed the behavior of leaders who are task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and change-oriented and have a positive influence on OCB and obtained the formula that employees are interested in responding to relationships and leaders who have a transformation orientation. Leadership has been considered very important in many fields and organizations regarding OCB (Bottomley et al., 2016). Leadership style serves to influence OCB. Work involvement can provide organizational commitment (Abdullahi et al., 2020). Leaders are role models for employees; when employees see leaders in informal conditions and can see the leader's good intentions, this will influence employees to be more oriented toward the common good (Lofquist & Matthiesen, 2018). Newman et al. (2017) believe that servant leadership positively correlates with OCB. Aprilida et al. (2019) revealed that servant leadership has a significant role in influencing others because this leader is highly respected and trusted, which can affect increasing OCB and achieving organizational goals effectively and efficiently.

Hypothesis 8: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior

According to Akdol & Arikboga (2017), the company stated that servant leadership has a relationship with job satisfaction mediated by LMX (Leader-Member Exchange), then Mahdy, Harthi & Din (2016) noted that servant leadership has a relationship with job satisfaction. Then Farman, Afridi & Haider (2019) state that servant leadership has a positive and significant relationship with employee loyalty; this is also expressed by Mitterer (2017) at the hospital, saying that servant leadership influences job satisfaction. Onsardi, Asmawi & Abdullah (2017) state that there is a positive influence of compensation, empowerment, and job satisfaction on employee loyalty, a positive impact of balance and empowerment on employee loyalty, and a positive effect of harmony and empowerment on employee loyalty influence on compensation for assignment. According to Frempong, Agbenyo & Darko (2018), job satisfaction has a significant impact on loyalty and commitment, and according to Guillaume, Honeycutt & Austin (2013), research conducted at one university said that servant leadership affects job satisfaction.

Eskiler et al. (2016) revealed that organizational culture is one of the substantial determinants of innovative work behavior and enables leaders in organizations to gain a competitive advantage. Because of the above, Rabbani et al. (2014) argue that organizational culture has a role in increasing innovative work behavior. The literature emphasizes conducting a more in-depth study of several variables such as leadership style, corporate culture, and innovative work behavior. Servant leadership is strongly associated with certain types of culture, such as being creative and supportive. Naqshbandi & Tabche (2018) say that some research supports the concept that leadership promotes innovation and creativity. However, some literature reviews show that not much has been explored about the role of leadership style in advancing innovation and organizational culture.

Hypothesis 9: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on job satisfaction

An innovative work attitude in modern companies is required, recognized, and is part of effective leadership. Creative work attitudes can also generate new knowledge, skills, and technologies (Jung et al., 2003). Stoffer et al. (2015) describe the ability to solve problems by providing innovative solutions, basically by using the knowledge and experience of one or several people and maximizing the use of their skills and expertise in solving the latest problems. Naqshbandi & Tabche (2018) argue that to get innovation, an employee must be able to have various skills and understand creative innovation. Calabr et al. (2021) say that today there is an extreme need for companies to promote innovative work attitudes. Servant leadership will motivate employees to self-development; this role will increase the desire of employees to develop their cognitive abilities and have more opportunities to have creative ideas. This is in line with some findings from previous studies that servant leadership is related to innovative work behavior (M. Khan et al., 2021; Iqbal et al., 2020; MM Khan et al., 2020).

The leadership style applied will depend on the situation of the organization. In this regard, traditional leadership styles and their relationship to innovation remain the attention of various studies (Naqshbandi & Tabche, 2018). Cai et al. (2018) research on servant leadership shows that the servant leadership style can motivate subordinates and increase innovative work attitudes. Servant leadership can also increase employee psychological empowerment and proactive work behavior (Khan et al., 2020).

Hypothesis 10: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on leader effectiveness

2. METHODS

Data collection in this study was carried out by distributing questionnaires to third echelon officials in Mimika district, Papua province, with the results of 120 questionnaires that were feasible to be processed. The data collection period is from November 2021 to January 2022 from various offices, agencies, and sections of the Mimika district government.

The results of the instrument test are 19 indicators of the Servant leadership variable, eight hands of the organizational culture variable, eight indicators of the psychological empowerment variable, six indicators of the corporate commitment variable, ten indicators of the managerial citizenship behavior variable, ten hands of the job satisfaction variable which has a correlation coefficient value. With a probability value less than 0.05, it can be stated that all indicators of these variables meet the criteria as valid research instruments.

Table 1. Reliability test

Variable	Numberof Items	Cronbach'sAlpha	Result
<i>Servant Leadership</i>	10	.758	Reliable

<i>Leadership culture</i>	8	.603	Reliable
<i>Psychological empowerment</i>	8	.686	Reliable
<i>Organizational commitment</i>	6	.584	Reliable
<i>Organizational citizenship behavior</i>	10	.660	Reliable
<i>Job satisfaction</i>	10	.750	Reliable
<i>Leadership effectiveness</i>	10	.758	Reliable

Table 1 shows that all variables indicate that Cronbach's Alpha is more significant than 0.6, so it is stated as reliable.

Based on the value of outer loading shows, SL10 serves SL14 careful planning OC2 complex OC3 show off PE2 work requirements PE7 work strategy PE7 work strategy has a value of more than 0.6 valid.

Table 2. Quality Criteria

Variable	AVE	Composite Reliability	R-Square	Cronbach Alpha
<i>Psychological Empowerment</i>				
OC	0.782	0.877	0.296	0.732
PE	0.563	0.794		0.616
SL	0.849	0.919		0.825
SL*OC	0.649	0.880		0.823
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>				
OC	0.623	0.768	0.398	0.695
OCM	0.689	0.867		0.766
SL	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL*OC	0.416	0.192		0.656
<i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</i>				
OC	0.591	0.812	0.435	0.668
OCB	0.620	0.830		0.695
SL	0.646	0.842		0.716
SL*OC	0.576	0.924		0.910
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>				
JS	0.622	0.868	0.321	0.798
OC	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL	0.665	0.772		0.675
SL*OC	0.542	0.815		0.712
<i>Leadership Effectiveness</i>				
LE	0.652	0.827	0.314	0.721
OC	0.637	0.686		0.660
SL	1.000	1.000		1.000
SL*OC	0.608	0.671		0.628

Based on table 2 showed all of the variables are reliable, with a Cronbach alpha of more than 0.6.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Sampling was done using a non-probability sample. The characteristics of 120 respondents, in summary, from the majority's perspective, are men, with a total of 18 people (56.7%). Of the most ages, 56 people, or 46.7%, are 41-50 years old. The most education is S1 or equivalent, as many as 73 people or 60.8%, while the length of work is between 12 to 20 years, as many as 54 people or 45%. For services, the number is relatively well distributed between 4 to 6 echelon officials from the service up to the body. Finally, the number of subordinates led by third echelon officials is more than 21 (78.3%).

Table 3. Path Coefficients (Mean, STDEV, T-Values)

Hypothesis	Original Sample	T-Statistics	Decision
H1: Servant leaders have a positive effect on the level of individual psychological empowerment	0.239	3.126	Supported
H2: Servant leaders have a positive effect on organizational commitment	0.221	2.437	Supported
H3: Servant leaders have a positive effect on OCB	0.192	2.356	Supported
H4: Servant Leadership has positive effLeadership satisfaction.	0.357	3.211	Supported
H5: Servant leaders are positively related to leadership effectiveness.	0.017	0.170	Not Supported
H6: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership in the psychological environment	-0.021	0.131	Not Supported
H7: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational commitment	0.019	0.190	Not Supported
H8: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior	0.148	2.891	Supported
H9: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on job satisfaction	0.229	2.084	Supported
H10: Organizational culture moderates servant leadership on leader effectiveness	-0.198	1.243	Not Supported

Discussion

Based on statistical calculations, it shows the positive influence of servant leadership on psychological empowerment. It is supported by servant leadership trying to convince others rather than forcing obedience, and leaders can carefully plan future anticipatory steps for the organization. This research supports (Chen et al. 2013) (Chen et al., 2013) (Donia et al., 2016) (Hu & Liden, 2011). (Bedi et al., 2016) (Van Dierendonck et al., 2014) (Carter & Baghurst, 2014) (Clercq et al., 2014) (Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017).

A widely recognized approach to investigating servant leadership in the management literature is examining the relationship between servant leadership and employee work attitudes, such as work motivation and organizational engagement. The effectiveness of servant leadership has been explained from a social exchange perspective, which proposes that the norm of reciprocity motivates an employee to reciprocate in social relationships. Instead of being self-absorbed or purely results-oriented, servant leaders help followers fulfill

their needs, wants, and interests and build interpersonal relationships with followers. Employees perceive the leader as supportive and remain highly motivated when these needs and interests are met. Servant leadership is positively related to employee sense of empowerment and thus encourages employee engagement.

The results of the study show that servant leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment; this shows that leaders must be able to listen to others with complete sincerity and will be able to increase organizational commitment (Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010) (Joseph & Winston, 2005) (Van Dierendonck et al., 2014) (Zhang et al., 2021)

According to social exchange theory, servant leaders expect to lead employees to reciprocate in the form of increased levels of attachment to the organization, including organizational commitment and identification and reduced turnover intentions. For example, early studies proposed that servant leadership can facilitate efficient executive functioning by maintaining high employee commitment.

The results of the servant leadership research have a positive effect on OCB by 0.228 with a t stat of $2.396 > 1.96$, which indicates that the higher the servant leadership, the OCB will increase because leaders must be able to listen to others sincerely SL1 Servant leaders try to convince others rather than forcing compliance SL 10 and Leaders can carefully plan anticipatory organizational steps in the future (SL14) then OCB will increase (Walumbwa et al., 2010) (Liden et al., 2014) (Neubert et al., 2008) (Yoshida et al., 2014)

Positive social exchanges with employees initiated by servant leaders can create a supportive social context in which employees are strongly encouraged to reciprocate with prosocial behaviors that support a positive environment, such as interpersonally directed OCB and organizationally directed OCB. In addition, servant leaders can encourage employees to express diverse ideas and adopt innovative ways of performing tasks. In this case, the servant leader can provide psychological security to the employee environment where employees are willing to take risks and propose and apply creative ideas in their work. Servant leaders can encourage employees to develop a strong attitude of relational identification with the leader by providing a strong sense of psychological security so that employees are more willing to take risks and invest in new ideas.

The results show that servant leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction; this indicates that the leader must be able to listen to others with sincerity, the servant leader tries to convince others rather than forcing obedience, and the leader can carefully plan anticipatory steps for the organization in the future. So that it will increase job satisfaction. The results of this study support the opinion (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000) (Zhou & Miao, 2014). (Liden et al., 2008), (Hebert & Sherri, 2003) (Schneider & George, 2011) (Thompson, 2002)

Servant leadership does not affect leadership effectiveness because the leader must be able to listen to others with complete sincerity and will not be able to support leadership effectiveness.

Organizational culture cannot moderate the influence of servant leadership on Psychological Empowerment, so corporate culture is only a predictor of restraint. This means that this moderating variable only acts as a predictor variable (independent) in the relationship model formed

This study proves that the absence of support for the opinion (Koo & Park, 2018) (Atwater et al., 2009) emphasizes that the uniqueness of culture and traditional philosophies in Asia makes certain leadership styles more or less prominent in this region. This research shows that investigating the impact of cultural factors in the Asian context is essential to provide a comprehensive understanding of the leadership process in organizations worldwide. This is because the organization has a complex monitoring system that is carried out carefully and the dominant values of the organization are to show off, perform, achieve, and make money will not moderate the influence of servant leadership on Psychological Empowerment.

Moderation of organizational culture cannot moderate the influence of servant leadership on organizational commitment, so corporate culture is only a predictor of restraint. This means that this moderating variable only acts as a predictor variable (independent) in the relationship model that is formed so that the moderation of the listening and monitoring complex cannot moderate organizational commitment; this shows that this study does not support the opinion (Smith et al., 2004) (Van Dierendonck, 2011)

The results of this study indicate that organizational culture moderation will strengthen the influence of servant leadership on OCB because individual organizations prioritize group interests, managerial decision-making will be centralized, and supervision and corporate subordinates acting interdependently will increase the power of servant leadership on OCB.

The results show that moderation of organizational culture will increase the influence of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction because there is personal moderation in listening to oneself SL10OC5, biased moderation in serving SL10OC5, and subjective moderation in careful planning, which will increase job satisfaction. This study supports this opinion (Van Dierendonck, 2011). (Liden et al., 2008), (Hebert & Sherri, 2003)

High levels of employee individualism reinforce the positive impact of servant leaders on employee outcomes. This occurs because individualists consider personal interests more than group interests, especially when the two types of claims clash. Servant leadership promotes personal growth and emphasizes the satisfaction of employees' individual needs. Individualism-oriented employees are more likely to favor such behavior because this behavior provides more opportunities for personal development. In this situation, individualism-oriented employees are more likely to feel satisfied and stay engaged in their work. In contrast, employees with low individualism focus less on themselves and consider group benefits than individual ones. In this sense, these employees may care less about their self-interest and be less reactive to personal support from the servant leader than their peers.

Organizational culture moderation has no effect on servant leadership on OCB because corporate individuals are concerned with group interests and cannot moderate. Leaders must be able to listen to others with complete sincerity and will not be able to leadership effectiveness

The journey of implementing Otsus Papua for more than eight years has not shown the maximum results expected by all parties, giving the impression as if the central and provincial, and district/city governments and their entire staff, including the TNI and Polri apparatus, have not shown a solid commitment to consistently implement mandate of the Special Autonomy law in a practical, honest and comprehensive manner. Some central government policies are considered to deny the results of the compromise. Suppose the government and state administrators, including provinces and districts/cities, show their sincerity in implementing the mandate of the Special Autonomy Law. In that case, there will be a significant change toward progress and improvement of the quality of life of the Papuan

people in various aspects of life towards achieving an atmosphere of shared life. That is safe, peaceful, prosperous, and just as mandated by the State Constitution. RI will also make a significant contribution to the integration of the nation and state, which is becoming increasingly prominent.

4. CONCLUSION

The results showed that servant leadership on job-related outcomes (psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction) and leader-related outcomes (leader effectiveness) with moderating corporate culture in echelon three officials in Papua Province; the results showed that servant leadership had a positive and significant effect on four job-related outcomes, namely psychological empowerment; organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. Meanwhile, corporate culture only has a significant moderating contribution to the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction.

For bureaucratic officials, leadership that serves inevitably must be balanced with a firm and straightforward attitude in carrying out their duties, otherwise, the effectiveness of leadership will be weak in terms of leader-related outcomes. Servant Leadership is a holistic concept in which correlated dimensions must be used together. It makes no sense for someone to claim to be running a Servant Leader by being so authentic and yet immoral at the same time.

The limitation is that only one variable serves leadership, while many factors affect the organization, such as policy formulation and implementation. Aspects of appreciation and appreciation, as well as a career path, also influence the organization. So, for further research, variables such as planning, rewards, gratitude, and career path need to be considered in testing organizational performance. And, of course, the sample coverage could be broader in Papua and other provinces in Indonesia so that generalizations are better and unbiased.

REFERENCES

Atwater, L., Wang, M., Smither, J. W., & Fleenor, J. W. (2009). Are Cultural Characteristics Associated With the Relationship Between Self and Others' Leadership Ratings? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 876–886. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014561>

Avan, A., Baytok, A., & Zorlu, Ö. (2019). The Effect of Servant Leadership on Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Identification. *Journal of Business Research - Turk*, 11(1), 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2019.600>

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>

- Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C. M., & Green, S. (2016). A Meta-analytic Review of Ethical Leadership Outcomes and Moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 517–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2625-1>
- Buijs, T. op den, Broesder, W., Goldenberg, I., Resteigne, D., & Kivirähk, J. (2019). Warrior and peacekeeper role identities: associations with self-esteem, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Military Studies*, 8(2019), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jms-2019-0002>
- Burton, L. J., Peachey, J. W., & Wells, J. E. (2016). Note : This article will be published in a The Role of Servant Leadership in Developing an Ethical Climate in Sport Organizations. *Journal of Activity & Health*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2016-0047>
- Carter, D., & Baghurst, T. (2014). The Influence of Servant Leadership on Restaurant Employee Engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(3), 453–464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1882-0>
- Chan, S. C. H., & Mak, W. ming. (2014). The impact of Servant Leadership and subordinates' Leadership on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 272–287. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2011-0125>
- Chen, C. Y., Chen, C. H. V., & Li, C. I. (2013). The Influence of Leader's Spiritual Values of Servant Leadership on Employee Motivational Autonomy and Eudaemonic Well-Being. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 52(2), 418–438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-011-9479-3>
- Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a Servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 511–521. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038036>
- Clercq, D. De, Bouckennooghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014). Servant Leadership and Work Engagement: The Contingency Effects of Leader–Follower Social Capital. *HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT QUARTERLY*, 25(2), 183–212. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq>
- Donia, M. B. L., Raja, U., Panaccio, A., & Wang, Z. (2016). Servant Leadership and employee outcomes: Moderating role of subordinates' motives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(5), 722–734. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1149471>
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x>
- Elenkov, D. S., & Manev, I. M. (2005). Top management leadership and influence on innovation: The role of sociocultural context. *Journal of Management*, 31(3), 381–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304272151>
- Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715–729. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.25530866>

Ferdus, Z., & Kabir, T. (2018). Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on OCB: Study on Private Banks in Bangladesh. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 57–69.

Gui, C., Zhang, P., Zou, R., & Ouyang, X. (2021). Servant Leadership in hospitality: a Leadership review. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 30(4), 438–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1852641>

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring Servant Leadership across cultures: A Leadership followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 397–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715007082964>

Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant Leadership in the People's ReLeadership China: A case study of the public sector. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(3), 265–281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711011025786>

Harwiki, W. (2013). The Influence of Servant Leadership on Organization Culture, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employees' 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/jeb.v5i12.460>

Haven-Tang, C., & Jones, E. (2012). Local Leadership for rural tourism Leadership: A case study of Adventa, Monmouthshire, UK. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4, 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2012.04.006>

Hebert, S. C., & Sherri, C. (2003). the Relationship of Perceived Servant Leadership and Job. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database.

Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Glibkowski, B. C., & Chaudhry, A. (2009). LMX differentiation: A multilevel review and examination of its antecedents and outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 517–534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.04.003>

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership Explain Variance Above and Beyond Transformational Leadership? A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context), 1–26. <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=orpc>

Howladar, M. H. R., & Rahman, M. S. (2021). The Influence of Servant Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 16(1), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jeb-2021-0006>

Hsiao, C., Lee, Y. H., & Chen, W. J. (2015). The effect of Servant Leadership on customer value Leadership: A cross-level analysis of key mediating roles. *Tourism Management*, 49, 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.02.012>

Hu, J., & Judge, T. A. (2017). Leader-team complementarity: Exploring the interactive effects of leader personality traits and team power distance values on team processes and

performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(6), 935–955.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000203>

Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of Team Potency and Team Effectiveness: An Examination of Goal and Process Clarity and Servant Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 851–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022465>

Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Employment relationships in China: Do workers relate to the organization or to people? *Organization Science*, 15(2), 232–240. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0050>

Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D., Chonko, L., & Roberts, J. (2009). Examining the impact of Servant Leadership on salesperson's Leadership intention. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 29(4), 351–365. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PSS0885-3134290404>

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of Servant Leadership, leader trust, and Leadership trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510575552>

Kirkman, B. L., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance and follower reaction to transformational leaders: a cross-level, cross cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744–764.

Koo, H., & Park, C. (2018). Foundation of Leadership in Asia: Leaderships and leadership styles review and research agenda. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 35(3), 697–718. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-017-9548-6>

Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the Relationships Between Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Voice and Antisocial Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(1), 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-3002-9>

Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2020). Servant Leadership: A meta-analytic Leadership of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12265>

Li, Y., & Xie, W. (2022). Linking Change-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior to Turnover Intention: Effects of Servant Leadership and Career Commitment. *Public Personnel Management*, 51(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026020985907>

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does Power Distance Exacerbate or Mitigate the Effects of Abusive Supervision? It Depends on the Outcome. 97(1), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024610>

Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., & Wayne, S. J. (2014). Servant Leadership: Antecedents, Leadership outcomes. *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, August, 357–379. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.013.018>

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant Leadership: Development of a Leadership measure and multilevel assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>

Ling, Q., Lin, M., & Wu, X. (2016). The trickle-down effect of Servant Leadership on frontline employee behaviors and performance: A multilevel study of Chinese hotels. *Tourism Management*, 52, 341–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.008>

Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Xu, L. (2014). Servant Leadership, trust, and the organizational commitment of public sector employees in China. *Public Administration*, 92(3), 727–743. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12091>

Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory Focus as a Mediator of the Influence of Initiating Structure and Servant Leadership on Employee Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012695>

Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How Servant Leadership Influences Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Roles of LMX, Empowerment, and Proactive Personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6>

Ng, X. Le, Choi, S. L., & Soehod, K. (2016). The effects of Servant Leadership on employee's job Leadership intention. *Asian Social Science*, 12(2), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n2p99>

Öner, Z. H. (2012). Servant Leadership and paternalistic Leadership styles in the Turkish business context: A comparative empirical study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 33(3), 300–316. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731211216489>

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>

Partono Prasetio, A., Yuniarsih, T., & Ahman, E. (2017). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in State-owned Banking. *Universal Journal of Management*, 5(1), 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujm.2017.050104>

Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. (2010). Exploring Servant Leadership across cultures: A Leadership study in Australia and Indonesia. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(5), 754–780. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003658920>

Pooja, A. A., De Clercq, D., & Belausteguigoitia, I. (2016). Job Stressors and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Roles of Organizational Commitment and Social Interaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 27(3), 373–405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21258>

Reed, L. (2015). Servant Leadership, Followership, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in 9-1-1 Emergency Communications Centers: Implications of a National Study. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 2(1), 71–94.

Reynolds, K. (2011). Servant-Leadership as Gender-Integrative Leadership: Paving a Path for More Gender-Integrative Organizations through Leadership Education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10(2), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.12806/V10/I2/RF8>

Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011). Servant Leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 32(1), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111099283>

Setyaningrum, R. P. (2017). Relationship between Servant Leadership in organizational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and customer satisfaction. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(3), 554–569.

Shah, S. J. A., Richards, T., Torbert, W., Das, G., Duncan, J., Landen, R., Van Quaquebeke, N., Felps, W., MacLeod, L., Armstrong, D. E., Nixon, C., Srader, D. W., Enright, S. M., Raso, R., Xu, Y., Yap, S. F. C., Hyde, K. F., Cunha, J. A. C. da, Santos, M. G. Dos, ... Bocârnea, M. C. (2015). *The Leader as a Shepherd: A Case Study of Ecclesiastic, Business, and Education Leaders Submitted by Ernest Frank Brodie, Jr. A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctorate of Education Grand Canyon Unive. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(2), 1–10. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042814020023%5Cnhttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815031535%5Cnhttp://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042815003511%5Cnhttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.044%5Cnwww.s>

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and Servant Leadership: Content and Contextual Comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190401000406>

Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Well-being at work: a cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29(6), 597–599. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-5357\(00\)00084-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-5357(00)00084-6)

Sousa, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2017). Servant Leadership and the Effect of the Interaction Between Humility, Action, and Hierarchical Power on Follower Engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y>

Sun, J. M., & Wang, B. (2009). Servant Leadership in China: Conceptualization and measurement. In *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 5, Issue 2009). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203\(2009\)0000005017](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203(2009)0000005017)

Tafzal Haque, A. K. M., Uddin, M. A., Easmin, R., & Sohel, S. M. (2019). Job Satisfaction and Citizenship Behavior: A Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment. *Organizacija*, 52(3), 236–249. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2019-0015>

Testa, M. R., & Sipe, L. (2012). Service-leadership competencies for hospitality and tourism management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(3), 648–658. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.08.009>

Thompson, R. S. (2002). The perception of Servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. 119. <http://scholars.indstate.edu/xmlui/handle/10484/8123>

Trompenaars, F., & Voerman, E. (2010). Harnessing the Strength of the World's Most Powerful Management Philosophy. Servant Leadership Across Cultures. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant Leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>

Van Dierendonck, D., Sousa, M., Gunnarsdóttir, S., Bobbio, A., Hakanen, J., Pircher Verdorfer, A., Duyan, E. C., & Rodriguez-Carvajal, R. (2017). The cross-cultural invariance of the Servant leadership survey: A comparative study across eight countries. *Administrative Sciences*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7020008>

Van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking Servant Leadership and transformational Leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 544–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014>

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant Leadership, Procedural Justice Climate, Service Climate, Employee Attitudes, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Cross-Level Investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 517–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018867>

Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does Servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multilevel mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(7), 1395–1404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.08.013>

Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Zhang, L., Xu, S., Liu, X., & Chen, W. (2021). A meta-analytic review of the consequences of Servant Leadership: The moderating role of cultural factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 38(1), 371–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-018-9639-z>

Zhou, Y., & Miao, Q. (2014). Servant Leadership and affective commitment in the Chinese public sector: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Psychological Reports*, 115(2), 381–395. <https://doi.org/10.2466/01.21.PR0.115c23z4>