SERVANT LEADERSHIP DIMENSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Tina Melinda (Universitas Ciputra)
Tony Antonio (Universitas Ciputra)
Christina (Universitas Ciputra)

Email: tina.melinda@ciputra.ac.id

Abstract—This study aims to analyze the dimensions of servant leadership in higher education and its differences between state and private universities. Servant leadership dimensions used are six dimensions of SLBS (Servant Leadership Behavior Scale): Voluntary Subordination, Authentic Self, Covenantal Relationship, Responsible Morality, Transcendental Spirituality and Transforming Influence. Samples are taken from tertiary institutions that have a ranking of institution A, thus, in regard to private universities, lecturers of Ciputra University Surabaya were chosen with 61 people from five study programs, namely, International Business Management, Accounting, Master of Management, Marketing Communication and Entrepreneurship and Humanities, while state universities were Sam Ratulangi University Manado with 111 people from four study programs, namely, Accounting, Economics, Economic Development, and Management. The result shows the highest mean private university on the Covenantal Relationship dimension and the lowest on Authentic Self, while the highest public university lies in Responsible Morality and the lowest in Transcendental Spirituality. Following Lavene's Test for Quality of Variances, the result is the same data variant and a t-Test for two independent samples has the result in that there were significant differences in the dimensions of Transcendental Spirituality. For this reason, servant leadership can create a culture that is in accordance with the situation of the workplace through four values, namely transcendental beliefs, interconnectedness, sense of mission and wholeness of members in accordance with the mission to be achieved.

Keywords—servant leadership, covenantal relationship, transcendental spirituality

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's position is ranked 45th out of 140 countries surveyed related to the Global Competitiveness Index in 2018 (World Economic Forum), with one indicator of assessment being the quality of human resources. To increase competitiveness, education must be a top priority and to improve its quality and performance, especially in higher education which will produce "character molding and minds of the young generation" (UNESCO, 1996). The performance of tertiary institutions in Indonesia, which in 2018 consisted of 122 state universities and 3,128 private universities (Directorate of Research and Community Services, 2018), would be indicators of the success of the nation's competitiveness. Indonesian universities are expected to be more relevant (Idrus, 1999) and accountable to the society through their self-evaluation and external accreditations (Ricky, 2017).

According to Greenleaf (1997), one of the determinants of the successes organizational performance, especially in service-based organizations such as educational institutions, is largely determined by the presence of a leader, because it can directly influence individuals and teams. The key to organizational success/performance lies in servant leadership (Blanchard, 2006: 186; Huang, Li, Qiu, Wan, & Yim, 2016); this is supported by Greenleaf (1997), who emphasizes that, for service-based organizations such as educational institutions, the essence of servant leadership is very important to support moral learning. Wheeler (2012) proposed a model of Servant Leadership in tertiary education. A model of top leadership in the institution on the teaching learning process in the university. Wheeler believed that this model is able to bring a long-term commitment to the university, increase the institutions effectiveness in developing their faculties and keep the organization value. On the other hand, in Indonesian context, Ricky (2017) reported a study of leadership style between private and public sectors. The private sector is more transactional and passive while the public sector tends to be transformational.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the dimensions of servant leadership and the differences between private universities and public universities. Knowing the dimensions of servant leadership could help the management to design a contextual training program to equip the university faculty and staff in this competitive era.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of the leadership theory approach took place rapidly and became a hot topic to study. Leaders, according to Hamilton (2005), were someone

who stepped forward giving direction and influencing, always looking for, listening to, and expecting and acting for better future conditions. On the other hand, according to Schimmoeller (2005), a leader is someone who focuses on organizational goals and how to achieve these goals and emphasizes supervisor relationships and subordinates in the long term to maintain the organization's effectiveness in achieving its objectives. The function of a leader (Toor & Ogunlana, 2008; Yukl 2005,) is developing a vision and mission, developing influence through culture, implementing change, innovating and learning in order to achieve organizational goals effectively.

The initial concept of transactional and transformational leadership was further developed by Bass (1985). Transactional leadership is leadership based on transactions or exchanges that occur between leaders and subordinates. This exchange is based on a discussion of leaders with relevant parties to determine needs, specifications, and conditions of rewards or gifts that will be given to subordinates if subordinates meet or achieve the conditions specified by the leader, whereas transformational leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999) is a leader who increases individual and group confidence, arouses awareness and interest in groups and organizations, and tries to move the attention of subordinates to the achievement and leader's development. Transformational leadership is shown through three behaviors, namely charisma, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Taylor (1998) expanded the study and proposed two narratives for educational leadership: (a) Providing firsthand accounts. Servant leaders had to composed educational environment through equality, integrity, and attentiveness to the human spirit, and (b) Facilitating the organizations. Servant Leaders had to share the ownership and responsibility. The two narratives will build a good learning environment and compose a collaborative interaction between the faculties.

Servant leadership is part of the transformation leadership approach that was initiated by Greenleaf. According to Huang et al. (2016), Greenleaf was the first person to propose the concept of servant leadership, which is leadership that starts from a sincere feeling that appears to serve and serve first or a leadership style where leaders recognize their moral responsibility, not only for the success of the company, but also for their subordinates, customers, and shareholders. The concept of servant leadership was developed by Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008, 2014) followed by Megheirkouni (2018) and states that there are three main components, namely, preliminary conditions, servant leader behavior, and leadership results to measure seven main dimensions of servant leadership, namely, conceptualizing, emotional healing, prioritizing followers, helping co-workers to grow, behaving ethically, empowering and creating value for the community.

Sendjaya (2015) developed a working definition of servant leadership as a "holistic approach to leadership that engages both leaders and followers through its (1) service orientation, (2) authenticity focus, (3) relational emphasis, (4) moral courage, (5) spiritual motivation, and (6) transforming influence, such that they are both transformed into what they are capable of becoming". Furthermore, Sendjaya developed six dimensions of Servant Leadership behavior (Sendjaya,2015; Sendajya, Sarros, and Santora. 2008) which are:

1. Voluntary subordination. This is the willingness of leaders to put the need of others beyond their own. The operative word voluntary means that leaders subordinate themselves because they want to, not because they have to. There are two values in this dimension, being a servant and acts of service.
2. Authentic self. Being authentic is about knowing and being who we really are (Autry, 2001) It is the consistent display of humility, integrity, accountability, security, and vulnerability by leaders.
3. Covenantal relationship. This is a relationship of mutual commitment by individuals characterized by shared values, open-ended commitment, mutual trust, and concern for the welfare of the other party. There are four values on this dimension, acceptance, availability, equality, and collaboration.
4. Responsible morality. This is having an ethical predisposition that ensures the ends and the means sought by leaders are morally legitimized, thoughtfully reasoned and ethically justified. Two values in this dimension are moral action and moral reasoning.
5. Transcendental spirituality: According to Krahnke, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz (2003), regarding the definition of transcendental spirituality construct, leaders who foster spirituality in the workplace will create a culture where employees experience three things, a sense of transcendence, interconnectedness, and meaning. Transcendental spirituality is defined as behaviors that manifest an inner conviction that something or someone beyond self and the material world exists and makes life complete and meaningful. There are four values, which are transcendental beliefs, interconnectedness, sense of mission and wholeness.
6. Transforming influence. This is the behaviors of the leader to help an employee to be what they are capable of becoming and how the leaders bring about a sense of change through casting vision, empowering, role modeling, trusting, and mentoring followers.

III. METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach using t-test independent samples with random samples. The

sample of this research consists of the lecturers from a private and public university. Ciputra University is the representative of a private university since it has received "A" institution accreditation. Ciputra University was established in 2006 and now it has seven faculties and 15 academic departments; 61 Ciputra University lecturers filled the questionnaires. Sam Ratulangi University Manado is the representative of a public university since it has received "A" institution accreditation also. Sam Ratulangi University (Unsrat) was established in 1965, there are 12 faculties and about 117 academic departments. There are 111 Unsrat lecturers who filled the questionnaires. The servant leadership scale that is used in this research is the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale-SLBS (Sendjaja, 2008). The SLBS has six dimensions: Voluntary Subordination, Authentic Self, Covenantal Relationship, Responsible Morality, Transcendental Spirituality and Transforming Influence. Validity is tested by using Pearson Correlation and reliability is tested using Cronbach's Alpha. A t-test is carried out to investigate the different servant leadership dimensions of two independent samples.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Most of the respondents from Private University and Public University are 26-35 years old, and the highest percentage of the length of work in Private University is dominated by respondents having worked less than three years. In Public University, the highest percentage of the length of work is dominated by respondents whose length of work ranges from 6.1 years to 9 years. The result of respondents' description can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1. AGE AND LENGTH OF WORK DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS.

	Private University	Public University
Age	percentage	percentage
<25 year	7%	8%
26-35 year	53%	53%
36-45 year	32%	36%
>45 year	8%	3%
Length of Work	percentage	percentage
<3 years	51%	36%
3.1-6 years	28%	15%
6.1-9 years	2%	47%
>9 years	19%	2%

Table 2. Mean of Servant Leadership Dimension

Dimension	Private University Mean	Public University Mean
Voluntary Subordination	4.026	3.878
Authentic Self	**3.782**	3.758
Covenantal Relationship	**4.089**	3.983
Responsible Morality	3.906	**4.08**
Transcendental Spirituality	3.806	**3.025**
Transforming Influence	3.920	3.992

The highest servant leadership dimensions mean of private university respondents are in covenantal relationship, and the lowest mean is in authentic-self dimension. For public university respondents, the highest mean is in the responsible morality dimension and the lowest is in transcendental spirituality.

The validity of the questionnaire was conducted using Pearson Product Moment Correlation or Pearson correlation test. The result showed that the significance of all items is below 0.05, so the instruments are declared valid. The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha. The results of Cronbach's Alpha are greater than 0.6, showing that the instrument is reliable. The result of the reliability test is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. THE RESULT OF CRONBACH'S ALPHA

No.	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	*Voluntary Subordination*	0.841
2.	*Authentic Self*	0.784
3.	*Conventional Relationship*	0.746
4.	*Responsible Morality*	0.773
5.	*Transcendental Spirituality*	0.752
6.	*Transforming Influence*	0.847

TABLE 4. TWO SAMPLE INDEPENDENT T-TEST RESULT

Dimension	Lavene's Test for Quality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	t	df	Sig (2 tail)
Voluntary Subordination	.725	**.396**	-1.440	169	.152
Authentic Self	.584	**.446**	-.149	169	.882
Covenantal Relationship	000	**.987**	-1.143	169	.255
Responsible Morality	.802	**.372**	1.153	169	.251
Transcendental Spirituality	.108	**.743**	2.143	169	**.034**
Transforming Influence	.672	**.413**	.876	169	.382

In Table 4, the result of Lavene's Test for Quality of Variance**s** shows significance > 0.05 for six dimensions of servant leadership. The result shows that the data variances of Private University and Public University are the same. From the t-test for equality of means, only transcendental spirituality dimension has significance <0.05, so there is a significant difference in transcendental spirituality dimension between Private University and Public University.

The authentic self dimension (Sendjaya, 2015) with values of humility, integrity, accountability, security, and vulnerability is more concerned with respondents from private universities, this is because the sample universities are only 13 years old so the composition of the longest working respondents reaches 79%, who have worked less than 6 years, so that respondents put more emphasis on security and vulnerability at work, whereas the culture of a private university prioritizes competition and work results. For public university

respondents, however, the emphasis is on responsibility morality with values of moral reasoning and moral action, because the public university places more emphasis on upholding ethics and morals at work.

The real difference from the two samples lies in the Transcendental Spirituality dimension (Sendjaya, 2015), built from four values, namely transcendental beliefs, interconnectedness, sense of mission and wholeness, which could be because spirituality is the main motivator that serves as a mental framework of one's leadership style. Block (1996), Fairholm (1998) and Northouse (2006) state that spirituality is focused on those who are led rather than those who lead, so they will pay attention to love and affection, patience, tolerance, forgiveness, satisfaction, a sense of responsibility, and a sense of harmony. The results of these data are also related to the sample size chosen, because the larger the organization, it will be difficult for a leader to maintain the harmony of all the followers. This is also in line with Ricky (2017), who states that private universities are more in line with transactional leadership while public universities are more transformation leadership

V. CONCLUSION

Servant leadership is measured from six dimensions, namely: Voluntary Subordination, Authentic Self, Covenantal Relationship, Responsible Morality, Transcendental Spirituality and Transforming Influence by using SLBS (Servant Leadership Behavior Scale). The SLBS (Servant Leadership Behavior Scale) is applied successfully in this study and is able to give a thorough profile of the university's faculty leadership. The two leadership profiles resulted from the study cover all the dimensions of SLBS, which means that the faculties of the two universities have exercised Servant Leadership behavior in their leadership practice. The result also shows the strength and weakness of the behaviors. Management of the university can design a training program to equip the faculty based on the result.

The study shows that the dimension of Servant Leadership in higher education between a state and private university differs in the trends of spirituality. The rank of the dimensions gave a different profile among the two faculties members. The highest rank of the dimension of each profile represents the highest concern of the faculty. The state university faculty has a higher concern on morality while the private university is more concerned about the relationship. These kinds of priority are interesting since they may represent the situation the faculty faces on the campus.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1] Autry, J. A. 2001. The Servant Leader. How to Build a Creative Team, Develop Great Morale, and Improve Bottom-Line Performance. Roseville: Prima Publishing

[2] Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M, & Jung, D.I. 1999. Re-Examining The Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Journal: Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72.

[3] Bass, B.M. 1985. Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

[4] Blanchard, K. 2006. Leading at a higher level: Blanchard on leadership and creating high performing organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: BMC, Blanchard Management Corporation.

[5] Block, P. 1996. Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

[6] Directorate of Research and Community Services. 2018. Jumlah Perguruan Tinggi Negeri (PTN) dan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Indonesia Tahun 2018. Retrieved from https://www.rijal09.com/2018/02/jumlah-perguruan-tinggi-negeri-ptn-dan-perguruan-tinggi-swasta-pts-di-indonesia-tahun-2018.html

[7] Fairholm, G.W. 1998. Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its spiritual heart. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

[8] Greenleaf, R.K. 1977. Servant Leadership: Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness. New York: Paulist Press.

[9] Hamilton, F. 2005 High-Performance Governance: Structure, Leadership, Incentive. Boston. McGraw Hill Irwin.

[10] Huang, J., Li, W., Qiu, C., Wan, J., & Yim, F.H.-K. 2016. The impact of CEO servant leadership on firm performance in the hospitality industry. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28(5), 945-968.

[11] Idrus, N. 1999. Towards quality of higher education in Indonesia. Quality Assurance in Education, 7(3),134-141.

[12] Krahnke, K., Giacalone, R.A., & Jurkiewicz, C.L. 2003. Point-counterpoint: Measuring workplace Spirituality. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 16(4), 396-405.

[13] Liden, R.C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. 2008. Servant Leadership: Development of a Multidimensional Measure and Multi-Level Assessment. The Leadership Quarterly, 19, 161-177.

[14] Megheirkouni, M., Amaugo, A., & Jallo, S. 2018. Transformational and transactional leadership and skills approach Insights on

stadium management. International Journal of Public Leadership, 14(4), 245-259.

[15]Northouse, P. 2006. Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

[16]Ricky. 2017. Servant Leadership in Higher Education: A Case Of Academic Leadership In A Faith-Based University In Indonesia. Retrieved from https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7754/5/Ricky17EdD.pdf

[17]Schimmoeller, L.J. 2005. The Effects of Organizational Culture on the Dominant Style of Leadership in an Organization. School of Business and Economics, Lynchburg College.

[18]Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J.C., & Santora, J.C. 2008. Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership Behaviour in Organizations. Journal of Management Studies, 45, 402-424.

[19]Sendjaya, S. 2015 Personal and Organizational Excellence Through Servant Leadership: Learning to Serve, Serving to Lead, Leading to Transform. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

[20]Taylor, D. 1998. Images of servant leadership in education. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 30522221)

[21]Toor, S.R., & Ogunlana, S.O. 2008. Leadership Skills and Competencies for Crosscultural Construction Projects. International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 8(3), 192-215.

[22]UNESCO. 1996. UNESCO Statistical Year Book 1995. Paris: United Nations Economic and Social Cooperation Organisation and Bernan Press.

[23]Wheeler, D.W. 2012. Servant Leadership for Higher Education. United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[24]Yukl, G.A. 2005. Leadership in organizations, 6th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall