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ABSTRACT

This research aims to empirically determine the effect of servant leadership on job performance mediated by job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well as work behavior such as employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. Descriptive and explanatory surveys were adopted, and this means data were obtained through questionnaires distributed to employees at 13 SOE Hotels. Furthermore, the data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) through LISREL version 8.80 data processing software. The findings showed that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on job attitudes, work behavior, and job performance. Moreover, servant leadership mediated by job attitude and work behavior has a higher effect than its direct influence on job performance. It was also discovered that servant leadership mediated by employee engagement has the most dominant effect on job performance. This shows that job attitude represented by job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well as work behavior proxied by employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior are effective mediators in the relationship between servant leadership and job performance. These results provide both theoretical and managerial implications that can be used to determine factors affecting employee job performance and work attitude. This model can be used as a tool to improve job performance by increasing servant leadership through the enhancement of employee engagement, job satisfaction, organization commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector has the potential to serve as a source of income for the state (Arianti, 2014) because its development is expected to encourage and accelerate economic growth. A report by The World Travel & Tourism Council (Turner, 2015) showed that the role of tourism is increasingly significant in the global economy and the same was observed with the Indonesian economy. This is due to the considerable effect on the contribution made by foreign tourists to Indonesia as indicated by the increase in their arrivals by 3.6% or 10,406,759 foreign tourists in 2015. These include those that entered through 1) 19 points of entry as foreign visitors with a total of 9,729,350 or 93.49%, 2) border gate or cross border posts with 370,869 or 3.56%, and 3) short visits for a year or others in 1 year with 306,540 or 2.95%.

According to Tavitiyaman (2009), the consequences of a competitive and dynamic environment in the hotel industry can be overcome when the leader understands and has the ability to identify leadership skills and concepts to influence employee performance. The ability to compete and respond to consumer
challenges is associated with organizational performance and employee or job performance. Maier (2011) also showed that rapid development and competition can have consequences on organizations by ensuring strong leadership is provided in addition to the appropriate utilization of human, organizational, and management resources according to changing needs.

The leadership in the service industry is more competitive than in other industries and requires more time as well as effort to commit to maintaining its competitiveness. An organization in the hospitality industry needs the ability to adapt and change quickly to improve the process and achieve results and the key component to ensuring this is leadership (Chien, 2004). This simply implies that leadership affects the achievement of performance. Moreover, Maier (2011) reported general similarities and differences in hospitality employees dissatisfied with their job and having the intention to leave their organizations. The research-based hospitality industry leaders recognize that the ability to retain employees for the long term is fundamental to improving customer service and achieving financial returns.

The hotel industry has a unique attribute because it is described as an organization that does not provide space for its employees to socialize because they have long working hours, most are working on a part-time basis, low pay, and the managers’ lack of leadership skills. It was also discovered that these employees are responsible for service quality and guest satisfaction which subsequently affect the achievement of effective performance. This is the reason there is a need for appropriate leadership to influence employee behavior to have greater performance (Tanner et al., 2010). Moreover, Knani (2014), observed that the factors considered critical in the hospitality industry, especially in the field of human resource management, are job performance and job satisfaction. Leadership skill is also important due to the need for friendliness to create a dynamic environment, service orientation, and provide support for the labor-intensive jobs in the industry.

Gangai and Agrawal (2015) indicated the existence of one form of attitude at the level of employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment and this was further confirmed by Adeleye (2015) that employee work behavior based on job attitude reflects in their engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. These two statements showed that attitudes and behaviors affected by leadership in organizations can be measured through factors such as employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. These factors are closely related to job or work attitude and work behavior which ultimately affect job performance in an organization.

Ghahroodi et al. (2013) stated that servant leadership is associated with personal activities and interactive relationships with followers, and this can be observed in the behavior of a leader to promote feedback (reciprocity) patterns through the process of communication, support, and decision-making. Van Dierendonck (2011), and Andersen and Kjeldsen (2010) also reported that the main motivation of servant leadership is the aspiration to serve others with the focus mainly on their followers. These two statements showed the importance of servant leadership due to its focus on individual, organizational, and community development. Moreover, the standards associated with the servant leadership concept are in line with the needs of the companies in the service industry such as hospitality, retail, banking, and others. This was confirmed by Brownell in Zainuddin and Zainal (2012) that servant leadership is effective in the hospitality business context which is driven by high personal interaction and continuous
provision of motivation and support for followers or employees by forming and creating a high level of trust and mutual respect.

Greenleaf and Spears (2002) also showed that servant leadership is considered appropriate to the world of the hospitality service industry due to its philosophical foundation observed to be important to the mental formation of employees and organizations related to service. Moreover, Umar (2014) suggested that organizations need the ability to serve customers effectively and reach a meeting point between their needs and the ability to meet those needs. The organizational leaders are, however, required to first identify and meet the needs of employees to satisfy their customers. Pugh (2001) stated that the ability of a leader to identify employee needs significantly affects the formation of employee engagement. These emotional conditions have a significant influence on the organization with a special focus on productivity, profitability, and retention.

The relationship between employee engagement and leadership models was investigated by Mahembe & Engelbrecht (2013) and supported by the results of Carter et al. (2012). The studies showed that the other factors affecting the employee engagement process in addition to the role of the leader include the role of individuals and their behaviors in the organization. It was also reported that employee engagement ultimately affects job performance, both from an organizational and individual perspective. This was confirmed by Kompaso and Sridevi (2010) that the formation of employee engagement affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These factors are related to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) which focuses on the problems of individual behavior in organizations and how they make commitments, especially those related to work which is known as organizational commitment (OC) as indicated by Ariani (2013). Furthermore, the relationship between the character of a leader and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has also been investigated by Jiratchot (2013).

The background information showed that the performance of the hotel industry can be improved to attract investors. Moreover, the firms operating in the industry need competent and competitive human resources to compete fiercely and provide competitive services. This is generally because business development is faster than management development which is also faster than human resources development in an organization. It is important to note that the development of human resources in organizations is highly dependent on the individual as well as the effectiveness of the leadership. This is associated with the importance of the leader in the formation of the system, organizational character, culture, and behavior of the actors. This is the reason it is interesting to study the effect of servant leadership style on the job performance of employees in the hotel industry owned by SOEs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Servant Leadership

Mahembe and Engelbrecht (2013) identified leadership as an important part of driving employee engagement, team effectiveness, and organizational success. Patterson (2003) also showed that the main activities of a servant leader include vision, empowerment, and service. Whetstone (2002), and Wong and Page (2003) established a relationship between servant leadership and ethics while Spears (2010) indicated that service to followers is the core of leadership. Moreover, Sendjaya and Cooper (2011), and Van Dierendonck (2011) reported servant leadership as a form of contemporary leadership style which involves placing the interests of followers above the personal interests of the leaders. It is believed to have a genuine commitment to followers and serve their needs.
These theories showed that servant leadership emphasizes collaboration, trust, empathy, and the ethical use of power. This is very different from other leadership models which only have a top-down hierarchical approach. It emphasizes developing people more as humans rather than using power and position to ensure the growth of organizational members, develop teamwork, and ensure engagement.

The servant leadership model adopted was used by Laub (2012) with the following six dimensions:

1) Values People: This is associated with the leaders that serve by trusting and serving the needs of others before theirs, being friendly, and listening to others with empathy.
2) Develops People: This is related to leaders that serve with a focus on motivating all the strengths of their members.
3) Build Community: The willingness of leaders to take responsibility for larger institutions and not only focus on control and self-interest.
4) Displays Authenticity: The leaders serve others responsibly and openly with a strong desire to learn, a willingness to accept criticism, maintain integrity, and trustworthiness.
5) Provides Leadership: This involves providing followers with future perspectives, initiating and taking initiatives, as well as clarifying appropriate goals.
6) Shares Leadership: The dimension focuses on a healthy spread of power and relinquishment of control to followers, a humble attitude, status-sharing, and promotion of others based on their achievements and talents.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is defined as an individual's reaction to a work experience (Muindi & K’Obonyo, 2015). It was also explained as the feelings of an individual towards work and related aspects. The concept was further described as the level of favorableness associated with employees’ perception of their work and means how much people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs. Job satisfaction was referred to as the positive feeling employees have about their jobs (Schomerhorn et al., 2002). It is divided into two dimensions which include the intrinsic and extrinsic with the intrinsic considered to be an employee's desire for recognition, acceptance, responsibility, and advancement while the extrinsic aspect focuses on satisfaction with salary, company mission and policies, and working conditions (Lambert et al., 2003).

**Organizational Commitment**

Dessler (2001), and Mowday (1998) used the type of bond between employees and organizations to classify organizational commitment into attitude and behavioral commitment. Nafei (2014) also explained organizational commitment as the result of perceived benefits associated with the perception of an organization. It is a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and most definitely a desire to retain membership of the organization. Moreover, it is an employee's participation or a person's role in the goals and values of the organization for its own sake.

**Employee Engagement**

Zinger (2012) defined employee engagement as the art and science of involving other people, especially employees, to improve, maintain, and turn work into a result. Employee engagement includes strategy, role, performance, organization, community, relationship, customer, development, energy, and happiness. Its attainment is related to external factors such as customer satisfaction. The concept can be
measured using an instrument adapted from Punitha and Rani (2013) which includes being attracted and inspired by work, committed, and fascinated.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**
Organ (1982) defined organizational citizenship behavior as an individual behavior not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system but promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization. It is associated with a functional behavioral perspective oriented towards "citizenship" status in the organization. The two main aspects mentioned in Key Antecedence in Organization Citizenship Behavior (Khurana et al., 2014) include altruism and compliance OCB. The altruism OCB is simply defined as the behavior of a person in assisting certain people while compliance OCB is generally a factor related to the impersonal aspect of one's consciousness.

**Job Performance**
Job performance consists of two dimensions which are the task and contextual performance. The task aspect focuses on the actions and behaviors associated with the production of goods or provision of services and appearances in an employee's formal job. Meanwhile, the contextual aspect is linked to a variety of specific behaviors outside work and also specifically includes a set of interpersonal and volitional behaviors that support a wider social and psychological context to ensure the achievement of the core work in an organization (Podsakoff et al., 2000). According to Zehir et al., (2012) the job performance that interrelates and combines these dimensions is known as overall performance. This concept is measured by an instrument adapted from Schepers (2010) which includes task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships.

**Figure 1: Research Model**

A total of 14 hypotheses were tested in this study.
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Table 1: Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$ Servant Leadership affects Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$ Servant Leadership affects Organizational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$ Servant Leadership affects Employee Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$ Servant Leadership affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$ Servant Leadership affects Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_6$ Job Satisfaction affects Employee Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_7$ Organizational Commitment affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_8$ Job Satisfaction affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_9$ Organizational Commitment affects Employee Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{10}$ Job Satisfaction affects Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{11}$ Organizational Commitment affects Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{12}$ Employee Engagement affects Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{13}$ Organizational Citizenship Behavior affects Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{14}$ Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior simultaneously affect Job Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METHOD

Descriptive and explanatory surveys were employed in this research, and this involved the collection of data through the distribution of questionnaires to employees of 13 SOE Hotels. The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with LISREL version 8.80 data processing software.

The conceptual framework showed the six variables used in this study include 1) Servant Leadership, 2) Job Satisfaction, 3) Organizational Commitment, 4) Employee Engagement, 5) Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and 6) Job Performance. Each variable has its definition and characteristics derived from several previous studies as stated in the following table:

Table 2: Variable Definition Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>THEORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Leaders with a spirit of service and have six dimensions of valuing people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership, and sharing leadership.</td>
<td>Laub (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>The feelings of an individual towards work and its different aspects</td>
<td>Moshoeu and Geldenhuys (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>The type of bond between employees and the organization to classify organizational commitment into attitude and behavioral commitment.</td>
<td>Moshoeu and Geldenhuys (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Employee engagement is related to job performance and positive assessment of the company.</td>
<td>Punitha and Rani (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)</td>
<td>Individual behavior in the organization measured through OCB Organization and OCB Individual dimensions.</td>
<td>Khurana, et. al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>These are actions and behaviors related to the provision of services, the appearance in the formal work of employees, and contextually includes various interpersonal behaviors to achieve the core work in the organization.</td>
<td>Schepers (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The six variables in this research were measured using statement items based on the characteristics of each variable. It is important to note that all the variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale with an interval scale arrangement of 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

The number of research samples was processed using statistical techniques in the form of structural equation modeling (SEM), specifically using the LISREL program. The focus was on the complexity of the four variables and the dimensions of the two intervening variables measured in this research. According to Churchill and Iacobucci (2005), estimated variance can be determined based on the scale, for example, 2.5 – 4.0 when measured on a scale of 1 – 5 or 7. The minimum and maximum number of samples were subsequently determined using the following formula:

\[ n = \left( \frac{z^2}{H^2} \right) \times s^2 \]  

(i)

Where,

- \( n \) = total sample
- \( z \) = z value at 95% confidence interval
- \( H \) = Expected precision
- \( s^2 \) = variant

This means

\[ n = \left( \frac{1.96^2}{0.25^2} \right) \times 2.5 = 154 \]
\[ n = \left( \frac{1.96^2}{0.25^2} \right) \times 4 = 249 \]

Therefore, the total number of samples was based on the maximum number of 249 people.

The respondents were selected using a purposive sampling technique based on certain characteristics (Berg, 2007). This main consideration in using this method is believed by Kumar (1999) to be its ability to select the respondents that can serve as the best data sources to achieve research objectives. The criteria used in this study include employees in the government-owned hotel industry (State-Owned Enterprises), especially in the Hotel Indonesia Natour Group, with more than five years of experience and an understanding of the leadership style in the organization.

The validity test was used to determine the accuracy of an instrument in performing its size function. An instrument with high validity is expected to have a small error variance and this implies the data collected is more reliable while those with low validity usually have a large error variance and less reliable data.

Decisions on consumer validity test using a significance level of 5% are as follows:
1) Question items/questionnaires are said to be valid if the \( t_{\text{count}} \) is greater than or equal to the \( t_{\text{table}} \).
2) Question items/questionnaires are invalid if the \( t_{\text{count}} \) is less than \( t_{\text{table}} \).

According to Hair et al. (2010), reliability tests are usually conducted to examine the consistency of respondents' answers. This is because some measuring instruments have consistency when applied repeatedly. Therefore, each construct was tested for reliability using the Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha method in the SPSS 17 software. This method has the ability to show the level of positive correlation between the items in a collection and a value higher than 0.60 is considered quite acceptable (Sekaran, 2006). The criteria used in this study are stated as follows:
1) If Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha \( \geq 0.60 \) then the statement in the questionnaire is suitable to use (reliable).
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2) If Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha < 0.60 then the statement in the questionnaire is not suitable for use (unreliable).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Marginal Fit indicates the suitability of the measurement model for absolute fit and incremental fit but can still be continued in further analysis because it is close to the good fit criterion (Hair et al, 2010). Table 3 (below) shows that almost all of the indicators have a good model suitability index (good fit) except for the GFI and AGFI which are below but within the scope of marginal fit.

Table 3: Model Fit Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOF Indicator</th>
<th>Expected size</th>
<th>Estimated Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Fit Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>GFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Marginal Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>RMSEA &lt; 0.08</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Fit Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>NNFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>NFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>AGFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Marginal Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>RFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>IFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>CFI &gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processing Results with LISREL 8.80

Moreover, the full model equation (Full Model) SEM applied using the LISREL 8.80 program produced two path diagram models which include the standardized and the t-values model with each presented in the following figure:

Figure 2: Covariance Matrix of Latent Variables

The next step was to analyze the hybrid measurement model (full model) of each variable as shown in the following table.
Table 4: Measurement Model Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variable</th>
<th>Var. Manifest</th>
<th>Std. Loading Factor</th>
<th>Std. Error (SE)</th>
<th>t_count</th>
<th>Construct Reliability (CR)</th>
<th>Extract Variance (VE)</th>
<th>Test results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership (SL)</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>0.9560</td>
<td>0.7959</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (JS)</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9679</td>
<td>0.9382</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9608</td>
<td>0.8943</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement (EE)</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9646</td>
<td>0.9025</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)</td>
<td>Y9</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9761</td>
<td>0.9541</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance (JP)</td>
<td>Y11</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9515</td>
<td>0.8675</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y12</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y13</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processing results with LISREL 8.80

The table shows that all sub-variables or dimensions used to form the exogenous servant leadership latent variable as well as the endogenous latent variables of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance have good validity. This is indicated by the Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) of 0.5 and/or $t_{count} \geq 1.96$ (at $\alpha = 0.05$) for all the dimensions except X2, X4, X5, and X6 in the servant leadership and X6 variables. Moreover, the Y3 on the employee engagement variable had a value < 0.50 but a $t_{count} \geq 1.96$ and this indicates it has good validity (Hair, et.al., 2010). It was also discovered that both exogenous and endogenous latent variables have good model reliability as indicated by the construct reliability values greater than 0.70 (CR > 0.70) and variance extract values greater than 0.50 (VE > 0.50) for all the indicators.

The results of the tests conducted on the 14 hypotheses developed on the partial and simultaneous effect of servant leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior variables on job performance are presented in the following table and the hypotheses were accepted.
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Table 5: Statistical Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Coef. Path R²</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t value/F value</th>
<th>Test results (t value ≥1.96/ F value ≥3.84)</th>
<th>Statistical Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁ Servant Leadership affects Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ Servant Leadership affects Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃ Servant Leadership affects Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄ Servant Leadership affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅ Servant Leadership affects Job Performance</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆ Job Satisfaction affects Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₇ Organizational Commitment affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₈ Job Satisfaction affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₉ Organizational Commitment affects Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₀ Job Satisfaction affects Job Performance</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₁ Organizational Commitment affects Job Performance</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₂ Employee Engagement affects Job Performance</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₃ Organizational Citizenship Behavior affects Job Performance</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Significant (Partial)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₄ Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior simultaneously affect Job Performance</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>629.55</td>
<td>Significant (Simultaneous)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Servant Leadership Positively and Significantly Affects Job Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis tested indicated that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, and this means servant leadership partially influenced the high job satisfaction of SOE Hotel employees both on the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions. The descriptive analysis conducted on job satisfaction showed that the extrinsic dimension is mostly perceived by the employees while statistical tests indicated that the most dominant servant job satisfaction is the employee's intrinsic dimension. Moreover, better servant leadership at SOE Hotel, especially in the build community dimension, was observed to have provided greater job satisfaction for the employees, mostly in the intrinsic dimension. The result of the hypothesis was found to be in line with Isbijanto and Budiyanto (2014), that job satisfaction has a significant positive impact on organizational performance. The overall model also supports the substantial effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between servant
leadership and organizational performance.

Servant Leadership Positively and Significantly Affects Organizational Commitment
The hypothesis tested indicated that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on
organizational commitment, and this means servant leadership partially influenced the high
organizational commitment of SOE Hotel employees on the normative, affective, and continuance
commitment dimensions. The statistical tests also showed that the dominant servant leadership is the
build community dimension while the most observable employee organizational commitment is the
dimension of employee affective commitment. These results indicated that the existence of better
servant leadership, especially in relation to building community dimension, was able to increase the
organizational commitment of the employees with a greater focus on their affective aspect. The
hypothesis test result was discovered to agree with Olesia et al. (2015), that “servant leadership is
positively correlated to follower satisfaction, their job satisfaction, intrinsic work satisfaction, caring
for the safety of others, and organizational commitment.”

Servant Leadership Positively and Significantly Affect Employee Engagement
The hypothesis tested showed that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee
engagement, and this means servant leadership partially influenced high employee engagement at the
SOE Hotels, both in the dimensions of being attracted and inspired by their work or fascinated. The
descriptive analysis of employee engagement variables also showed that being attracted and inspired
by work are perceived by the employees to be the reason for their high level of engagement. Moreover,
the statistical tests indicated that the dominant servant leadership is the build community dimension
while the most dominant employee engagement is the employee fascinated dimension. These results
showed that better servant leadership, especially in the dimension of building community, was able to
increase the engagement of the employees in SOE Hotel with the focus on their fascination with the
work. These are observed to be in line with the findings of Carter and Baghurst (2014), that servant
leadership positively affects employees’ engagement by increasing their loyalty to the workplace.

Servant Leadership Positively and Significantly Affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior
The hypothesis tested showed that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on
organizational citizenship behavior and this means servant leadership which was measured through
some factors such as valuing people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity,
providing leadership, and shared leadership partially influenced the high organizational citizenship
behavior of SOE Hotel employees both on the Organization and Individual OCB dimensions. This
agrees with the previous observation of Abid et al. (2015), that there is a positive relationship between
servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. It is also important to note that leadership
style plays an important role in improving this relationship.

Servant Leadership Positively and Significantly Affects Job Performance
The hypothesis tested showed that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on job
performance and this means servant leadership partially influenced the high job performance of
employees in the SOE Hotel with a focus on task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships.
This is in line with the findings of Hussain and Ali (2012), that technical management organizations
usually benefit significantly from servant leadership through the increment in the morale of their
employees which subsequently improves job performance.
Job Satisfaction Positively and Significantly Affect Employee Engagement
The test on the hypothesis showed the positive and significant effect of job satisfaction on employee engagement and this means job satisfaction measured through intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions partially influenced the high employee engagement in SOE Hotels in the dimensions of being attracted and inspired by work, committed, and fascinated. The descriptive analysis further showed that the extrinsic dimension is the highest job satisfaction perceived by the employees while being attracted and inspired by work is the highest for engagement. This supports the previous findings of Rani and Samuel (2016), that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of work engagement while hard work engagement predicts employee loyalty.

Organizational Commitment Positively and Significantly Affects Organizational Citizenship Behavior
The hypothesis test showed that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior and this indicates organizational commitment measured through the normative, affective, and continuance commitment dimensions partially influenced high organizational citizenship behavior in the SOE Hotels both on the organization and individual dimensions. This result is in line with Pertiwi (2016), that organizational commitment significantly affects organizational citizen behavior but does not significantly influence employee performance.

Job Satisfaction Positively and Significantly Affect Organizational Citizenship Behavior
The hypothesis tested showed that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior, and this means the job satisfaction measured through the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions partially influenced high organizational citizenship behavior in SOE Hotels in both the organization and individual dimensions. This is also in agreement with the observation of Swaminathan and Jawahar (2013), that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and the factors that shape organizational citizen behavior.

Organizational Commitment Positively and Significantly Affects Employee Engagement
The results of the hypothesis tested also showed the positive and significant effect of organizational commitment on employee engagement and this indicates there is a partial influence of organizational commitment measured through the normative, affective, and continuance dimensions on high employee engagement in the SOE Hotels in relation to the dimensions of being attracted and inspired by work, committed, and fascinated. This is in line with Khalid and Khalid (2015), that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee engagement, especially concerning career satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Positively and Significantly Affect Job Performance
The hypothesis tested also showed that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on job performance and this means job satisfaction measured through the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions partially influenced high job performance of employees in the SOE Hotels concerning task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships. This is in line with Vrinda and Jacob (2015), that some components of job satisfaction such as promotion, work itself, superiors, and co-workers are positively related to employee work performance, but the pay is not.
Organizational Commitment Positively and Significantly Affects Job Performance
The hypothesis tested showed that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on job performance, and this means the normative, affective, and continuance commitment dimensions have a partial influence on the high job performance of employees in SOE Hotels with the focus on the task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships dimensions. This is in line with the findings of Khan et al. (2010), that there is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance with the normative aspect observed to be the most significant.

Employee Engagement Positively and Significantly Affects Job Performance
The hypothesis tested showed the positive and significant effect of employee engagement on job performance and this means the dimensions of being attracted and inspired by work, committed, and fascinated partially influenced the high performance of SOE Hotel employees concerning task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships. This is in line with Dajani (2015), that leadership and organizational justice are the most significant drivers of employee engagement. Furthermore, the mediating effect was also confirmed.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Positively and Significantly Affects Job Performance
The hypothesis tested also showed that organizational citizenship behavior has a positive and significant effect on job performance, and this means the organization and individual dimensions of OCB partially influenced the high job performance of SOE Hotel employees concerning task orientation, creativity, and interpersonal relationships. This agrees with the observation of Singh and Malik (2015), that emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior are positively correlated with job performance.

Servant Leadership, Job Attitude (which includes Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment), Work Behavior (which includes Employee Engagement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior) Simultaneously Affects Job Performance
The hypothesis test also showed the effect of servant leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior on job performance. This means an increase in the build community dimension of servant leadership, intrinsic dimension of job satisfaction, affective dimension in organizational commitment, fascinated dimension in employee engagement, and organization OCB dimension in organizational citizenship behavior can simultaneously improve job performance with the focus on the task orientation.

It was also discovered that shared leadership is the most highly perceived dimension of servant leadership by employees in the SOE Hotels while the extrinsic aspect is for job satisfaction, affective for organizational commitment, being attracted and inspired by work for employee engagement, individual OCB for organizational citizenship behavior, and task orientation for job performance perceived by SOE Hotel employees.

Vrinda and Jacob (2015) reported a positive effect of some components of job satisfaction such as promotion, the work itself, superiors, and co-workers on work performance. Similarly, Khan et al. (2010), showed that there was a positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance. It was also observed by Dajani (2015), that leadership and organizational justice are the most significant motors of employee engagement. Therefore, the mediating effect was
confirmed, and it was concluded that employee engagement has a significant impact on job performance.

**Figure 3: Path Coefficients**

Servant leadership was observed to have a direct and indirect effect on job performance through the mediation of job attitude (job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and work behavior (employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior) as follows:

**Table 6: The Direct and Indirect Effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Effect Magnitude</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Effect Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL → JS</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>SL → JS → JP</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL → OC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>SL → JS → EE → JP</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL → EE</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>SL → JS → OCB → JP</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL → OCB</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>SL → OC → JP</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS → EE</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>SL → OC → EE → JP</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS → OCB</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>SL → OC → OCB → JP</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC → EE</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>SL → EE → JP</td>
<td><strong>0.172</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC → OCB</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>SL → OCB → JP</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL → JP</td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS → JP</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC → JP</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE → JP</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB → JP</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data processing results, 2016*

The results of the hypotheses tested, and the model can be used to improve the job performance of SOE Hotel employees, especially concerning their task orientation (Y11). This means there is a need to improve servant leadership, especially in the build community dimension (X3) mediated directly by an increase in work behavior and employee engagement with a focus on the fascinated dimension (Y8). The novelty of this research is the low task orientation of employees, and this shows there is a high
need for encouragement or supervision to maintain a high work tempo. Therefore, the following aspects need to be improved:

1) Servant leadership, especially the building community aspect which involves having good relations and respecting the differences of others
2) Employee engagement, especially the fascinated employees, by ensuring their attachment to work for a long time in the company.

CONCLUSION
Servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance. The influence on job satisfaction was found to be 0.40 and the strongest indicator was building community which is an intrinsic dimension. The influence on organizational commitment was 0.37 with the highest indicator recorded to be the affective dimension, employee engagement had 0.41 with the fascinated dimension observed to be the strongest indicator, organizational citizenship behavior had 0.28 with organization OCB discovered to be the strongest, and the influence on job performance was 0.12 with task orientation found to be the strongest dimension. The findings also showed that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior at 0.43 and 0.48 respectively. The strongest indicators of employee engagement were found to be the intrinsic and fascinated dimensions while job satisfaction was the intrinsic dimension and organizational citizenship behavior was the OCB organization. Job satisfaction was also observed to have a positive and significant effect on job performance with 0.21 with the strongest indicator discovered to be task orientation. Organizational commitment also has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior, employee engagement, and job performance. The effect on organizational citizenship behavior was 0.24 with the strongest indicators found to be affective commitment and organization OCB. The effect on employee engagement was 0.33 with the strongest indicator recorded to be the fascinated dimension and the effect on job performance was 0.15 with task orientation. Employee engagement has a positive and significant effect on job performance with an effect of 0.42 and the strongest indicators were fascinated and task orientation dimensions respectively. Organizational citizenship behavior is also positively and significantly related to job performance with an effect of 0.35 and the strongest indicators were affective commitment and task orientation dimensions respectively.

Servant leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior simultaneously have a positive and significant influence on job performance with a contribution (determinant coefficient) of 93%. Moreover, servant leadership has a positive and significant indirect effect on job performance mediated directly by job satisfaction and organizational commitment and indirectly through employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. It is important to note that employee engagement is the most powerful factor directly mediating the relationship between servant leadership and job performance.
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