Work Engagement as A Mediator of Service Leadership to Lecturers' Performance

Endah Kurniawati Purwaningtyas[1][0000-0002-4225-9219]

[1] Faculty of Psychology Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang, Indonesia
endahkurniawati@psi.uin-malang.ac.id

Abstract. Performance is one of the important things in achieving organizational goals. The performance of lecturers in universities is different from performance in business-oriented organizations. The performance of lecturers in higher education aims to achieve organizational goals through the elements regulated in Law No. 14 of 2005. These elements include educational and teaching activities, research, community service, and other support.
This research aims to analyze the influence of perceptions of service leadership on lecturer performance through work engagement as a mediating variable. This research used a quantitative approach and survey method, conducted on 148 civil servants (*ASN*) lecturers who had lecturer certification status (lecturer certification) from two A-accredited state Islamic religious universities in East Java. The data collection tools are four questionnaires and one recap of lecturer performance scores. The results of this research show that the theoretical model of lecturer performance consisting of perceptions of service leadership and work engagement contributes to lecturer performance and is supported by empirical data.
This research found that to improve lecturer performance, it is necessary to pay attention to the work engagement factor which is the strongest and most significant antecedent as a real mediator of service leadership perceptions of lecturer performance.

Keywords: perception of service leadership, work engagement, lecturer performance.

1 Introduction

Higher education as an organization shows performance through its academic community activities. The educational community includes lecturers, administrative employees, and students. The three of them work together to achieve goals according to the

vision and mission of the university. Universities and other higher education institutions should collaborate on an ongoing basis to develop values and practices in teaching and research activities, institutional management, and operational systems.

Lecturers as part of the academic community have an important role in the progress of a university. In this regard, universities are not only required to produce graduates who are compatible and can be immediately absorbed by the market but must also have superior quality. Developing a university of superior quality is not an easy matter. It requires hard, comprehensive struggle and touches all aspects, both materials, intellectual, and especially spiritual aspects. The material aspect is important for the development of higher education institutions, especially in an era like today where nothing is given for free. However, the material aspect is not everything. Two other aspects are very important to pay attention to, namely the intellectual and spiritual aspects [1].

Robert K. Greenleaf [2], firstly coined the term servant as a leader in an essay and later became known as servant leadership, explaining that a leader will be effective if he prioritizes service and always wants to serve. The characteristics of servant leadership (SL) are formulated in 10 things, namely (1) being able to hear well what followers want and feel, (2) empathy, (3) healing, (4) self-awareness, (5) persuasiveness, (6)) able to conceptualize things well, (7) far-sighted by adhering to the wisdom of past events, current realities and the consequences of a decision in the future, (8) stewardship, (9) commitment to individual growth (tangible and intangibles) and (10) building community.

The Greenleaf characteristics above were further developed by Patterson et al. [3], thus giving rise to additional characteristics such as love, humanity, altruism, having a vision, being trusted, being able to empower, and prioritizing servants.

In line with that Laub [4]; Patterson et al. [3]; Miers [5] argues that SL is very focused on serving others and is often accompanied by sacrificing oneself so that SL behavior will lead a leader to go against his individual desires and prioritize the interests of his followers.

The objectives of higher education as stated in Republic of Indonesia Law no. 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education [6],

namely developing the potential of students to become human beings who believe and are devoted to God Almighty and have noble morals, will be achieved one of the ways through State Islamic Religious Universities. Through leadership support that is in accordance with Service leadership principles and supported by work engagement from both lecturers and staff.

As Kahn [7] defines employee work engagement, it relates to how their psychological experiences at work and the work context are formed from the process of their own presence and absence during their performance (on duty/work).

Work engagement according to Schaufeli & Bakker [8], is positive behavior, fulfillment of tasks and willingness to be attached to work. Bakker & Demerouti [9], explained that employees who have good engagement can display better performance too. This is because emotionally they are happier, enjoy their work, are enthusiastic about their work, and enjoy better health. This is where it is important to know employee (lecturer) engagement because it will be able to predict their performance.

2 Method

This research uses a quantitative research design with a correlational pattern that uses scientific principles, namely empirical, objective, measurable, rational, and systematic. Quantitative research data is in the form of numbers and uses statistical analysis with a deductive to inductive thinking process [10]. In this study, several subjects were examined who were representatives of the population. The population is lecturers who have civil servant (*ASN*) status at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The research sample consisted of 148 lecturers and data collection used servant leadership questionnaires and work engagement questionnaires as well as documentation data in the form of lecturer performance scores.

3 Result

3.1 Evaluation of Measurement Models

This measurement model evaluation aims to test the validity and reliability of the measuring instrument. The validity test uses loading factor parameters, AVE (Average Variance Extracted), and communality values, as in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Measurement model test results

Parameter	*Rule Of Thumb*	Test results	Information
Loading Factor	>0.6	>0.6	valid
AVE	>0.5	>0.6	valid
Communality	>0.5	>0.6	valid

Source: [11][14] and the data results are processed

The measurement model test results for each endogenous variable for the lecturer performance model are as in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Reflective Variable *Loading Factor* Value

Variable	Indicator Code	*Loading Factor*	Information
Perceptions of Service Leadership	Xa	0.90	valid
	Xb	0.97	valid
	Xc	0.95	valid
	Xd	0.95	valid
	Xe	0.92	valid
	Xf	0.93	valid
Work Engagement	Za	0.89	valid
	Zb	0.81	valid
	Zc	0.84	valid

In Table 2 it can be seen that all indicators have loading factor values bigger than 0.6 so it can be interpreted that each statement item in the research variable is valid.

The reliability test uses composite reliability parameters. Composite reliability measures the true value of the reliability of a construct. Using the rule of thumb > 0.7 even though a value of 0.6 is still acceptable [12]. Based on calculations using PLS version 2.0, composite reliability results were obtained as in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Composite Reliability Value of Each Variable

Variable	*composite reliability* (CR)	Information
Leadership Perception. Service (X2)	0.98	Good Reliability

Work Engagement (Y1)	0.88	Good Reliability

Based on the data in Table 3, it can be seen that the Composite Reliability value for all reflective variables is above 0.7. This shows that all construct variables have good reliability.

For the formative variable, namely lecturer performance, the T (Tolerance) and VIF (variance inflation) values were calculated to determine whether the regression model found a correlation between the independent variables. A good regression will not occur in multicollinearity. The rule of thumb for Tolerance (T) and VIF values is as in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Multicollinearity test results for Lecturer Performance Variables

Parameter	***Rule Of Thumb***		**Test results**	**Information**
	Multicollinearity	No *Multicollinearity*		
Tolerance	<0.10	>0.10	0.8	Not *Multicollinearity*
VIF	> 10	<10	1.1	Not *Multicollinearity*

Source: [11][14] and the data results are processed

multicollinearity test calculation on the formative variable Lecturer Performance is in Table 5 below:

Table 5. VIF Value for Formative Variables of Lecturer Performance

Model	***Collinearity Statistics***		**Information**
	***Tolerance* (T)**	**VIF**	
Education	,880	1,136	Not *multicollinearity*
Study	,840	1,191	Not *multicollinearity*
Devotion	,810	1,235	Not *multicollinearity*
Support	,888	1,127	Not *multicollinearity*

Table 5 shows that the education, research, service and other supporting indicators have a T value > 0.10 and a VIF value < 10

so that in the performance variables of each indicator there is no correlation and no multicollinearity.

3.2. R^2 Value Test

Structural model testing with PLS is carried out by looking at the R^2 value for each endogenous latent variable as the predictive power of the model. According to Chin [13] in Ghozali [12] the R *squares* value criteria can be divided into three categories, namely 0.67 as strong, 0.33 as moderate, and 0.19 for the weak category. Meanwhile, according to Hair [14], in Ghozali [12], the R criterion ^{2} is divided into three criteria, namely 0.75 as strong, 0.50 as moderate, and 0.25 indicating a weak model. Based on the ^{R2} value test in this research as shown in Table 6:

Table 6. R^2 value or R Squares

Variable	R^2 value or R Squares	Information
Lecturer performance	0.283	Moderate
Work Engagement	0.223	Weak

Judging from Table 6, the R2 value is 0.283 for the lecturer performance variable. This means that the influence of the Islamic leadership perception variable and perception of service leadership, on lecturer performance is 0.283. It can be concluded that the variability of endogenous variables that can be shown by exogenous variables is 28.3% and the remaining 71.7% is influenced by other factors.

The work engagement variable has an R2 value of 0.223, meaning that the influence of the service leadership perception variable on work engagement of 0.223. This shows that the variability of endogenous variables that can be shown by exogenous variables is 22.3% and the remaining 77.7% is influenced by other factors.

From the proposed theoretical model, several things can be seen as follows:

1) The lecturer performance variable can be explained by the service leadership perception variable of 28.2%. The remaining 71.8% is influenced by other variables outside this research.

Work engagement variable, can be explained by the service leadership perception variable of 22.3%, while the remaining 77.7% is influenced by other variables outside those studied.

3.3. Test the Significance of Relationships Between Variables

In PLS, the significance test of the relationship between variables can be seen from the path coefficient that connects the variables. The path coefficient is obtained through the weight of the inner model, the T-statistic value must first be found through the standard error bootstrap procedure, with the results of software calculations Smart PLS version 2.0.

If in the test the statistical t value is > 1.96 (t count > 1.96) with an α value of 5%, it means the test is significant, meaning there is a significant influence between one latent variable and another.

The results of calculating t-statistical values through the standard error bootstrap procedure (M=250) using Smart PLS software, can be seen in Table 7 below:

Table 7. Path Coefficient calculation results with Smart PLS

Variable	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	Standard Error (STERR)	t -Statistics (|O/STERR|)	Information
Perception of service leadership -> Lecturer Performance	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.90	Not significant
Perception of service leadership -> work engagement	0.34	0.35	0.08	0.08	4.24	Significant
Work Engagement -> Lecturer Performance	0.38	0.39	0.06	0.06	5.82	Significant

According to Babin, et.al [15], *the path* or *inner model* coefficient value indicated by the t- *statistic* must be above 1.96 for minor hypothesis testing at α 5% (α = 0.05) and *power* 80%. Based on these guidelines, the results in Table 3 can be explained as follows:

1. Influence of variables Service leadership perceptions of lecturer performance variables can be seen from the beta coefficient value of 0.09 and the t-statistic value of 0.896, which is smaller than 1.96. This means that there is no influence between perceptions of service leadership and lecturer performance, or in other words, increasing perceptions of service leadership does not have a direct contribution to increasing lecturer performance.
2. The influence of the service leadership perception variable on work engagement can be seen from the beta coefficient value of 0.34 and the t-statistic value of 4.24 which is greater than 1.96. This means that there is a significant influence between perceptions of service leadership on work engagement, or in other words, the stronger the perception of service leadership, the higher the contribution to increasing work engagement.

The influence of work engagement variables on lecturer performance variables is seen from the beta coefficient value of 0.38 and the T-statistic value of 5.82 which is greater than 1.96. This means that there is a significant influence between work engagement on lecturer performance, or in other words, the higher the work engagement will make a real contribution to improving lecturer performance.

4 Discussion

Lecturer performance is defined as the level of lecturer performance which includes education, teaching, research and community service, which is a specific measure to determine lecturer performance. Each of these measures is not related to the other as has been analyzed and proven in the multicollinearity test. For example, lecturers who have good teaching skills may not necessarily be able to do research well either.

This research further strengthens the major hypothesis that lecturer performance can increase if lecturers have strong work engagement. Strong work engagement can emerge if supported by leadership that prioritizes belief in monotheism, justice, deliberation, respect for human rights, responsible freedom, and *ulul albab* as well as prioritizing service, developing employees, building communities, and showing leadership.

This research also found the fact that perceptions of service leadership influence performance through work engagement. These results indicate that leadership that is well-perceived by lecturers will increase work engagement and commitment to the organization.

This proves that lecturers who have good work engagement will involve their affection so they can work with high totality. This high level of totality can be seen from his great energy in completing work, always being fully involved in tasks and always focused on completing his tasks. This good work engagement will then improve performance both in terms of education and teaching, research, and community service.

However, the overall modeling results prove that performance is an important factor for higher education institutions which can be predicted through external factors in the form of leadership and internal factors in the form of work engagement. Leadership is a strategic factor for predicting performance as explained by Luthans [16], that a certain ability, certain behavior, and a skill are needed from the leader so that as a leader he can motivate and inspire his subordinates.

The results of this research support the research of Graham [17] , which says that performance can be driven by moral factors and also supports the opinion of Timpe [18] that performance can be influenced by internal and external factors of employees. The internal factor in this research is work engagement, while the external factor is the perception of service leadership.

From this explanation, it can be understood that lecturer performance can increase if lecturers have strong work engagement. Strong work engagement can emerge if supported by leadership that prioritizes service.

5 Conclusion and Limitation

Perceptions of service leadership have a significant contribution to work engagement. Based on the results of the significance test of the relationship between variables using inter-path analysis, it is known that increasing perceptions of service leadership influence increasing aspects of work engagement. However, service leadership perception (Servant leadership perception) does not directly influence performance. Based on the results of this analysis,

work engagement is an internal factor that has an important role in spurring improvements in lecturer performance.

The aspect that most strongly shapes perceptions of service leadership is developing others. This aspect arises by providing mutual support to fellow lecturers, guiding them to make important decisions, having a positive perspective, and being open and understanding between lecturers. If these methods are implemented then service leadership will be well-perceived by lecturers.

This research would be more comprehensive if it paid attention to other factors that might influence performance either directly or through mediating variables. Involves other variables that influence lecturer performance such as emotional intelligence, spiritual intelligence, and job satisfaction. In this research, the generalization is only for civil servant lecturers who have lecturer certification status, not for lecturers as a whole.

References

[1] I. Suprayogo, Memelihara sangkar ilmu: Refleksi pemikiran dan pengembangan UIN Malang. Malang: UIN Maliki Press, 2006.

[2] R. K. Greenleaf, A life of servant leadership. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

[3] K. Patterson, T. A. O. Redmer, and G. Stone, "Transformational Leaders to Servant Leaders versus Level 4 Leaders to Level 5 Leaders—The Move from Good to Great," in CBFA Annual Conference, 2003.

[4] J. Laub, "Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument," Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, 1999.

[5] S. Miers, "Slavery: A question of definition," Slavery Abol, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1–16, 2003, doi: 10.1080/0144039308559152/ASSET//CMS/ASSET/8E48BC72-4D52-491F-B3C6-06DA7FA4126F/0144039308559152.FP.PNG.

[6] Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Tentang Pendidikan Tinggi. Indonesia, 2012.

[7] W. A. Kahn, "Psychological Conditions Of Personal Engagement And Disengagement At Work.," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 692–724, Dec. 1990, doi: 10.2307/256287.

[8] W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker, "Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study," J Organ Behav, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 293–315, May 2004, doi: 10.1002/JOB.248.

[9] A. B. Bakker and E. Demerouti, "Towards a model of work engagement," Career Development International, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 209–223, May 2008, doi: 10.1108/13620430810870476/FULL/XML.

[10] W. R. Borg and M. D. Gall, "Educational research: An introduction," British Journal of Educational Studies, vol. 32, no. 3, 1984.

[11] W. W. Chin, “The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling,” Modern methods for business research, vol. 295, no. 2, pp. 295–336, 1998.
[12] I. Ghozali, Aplikasi analisis multivariete dengan program IBM SPSS 23. Semarang: Univ. Diponegoro Press, 2016.
[13] W. W. Chin, “The partial least squares approach for structural equation modeling,” in Modern methods for business research, G. A. Marcoulides, Ed., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1998, pp. 295–336.
[14] J. F. Hair, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, “PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet,” Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 139–152, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202.
[15] B. J. Babin, J. F. Hair, and J. S. Boles, “Publishing Research in Marketing Journals Using Structural Equation Modeling Author (s): Barry J . Babin , Joseph F . Hair , Jr . and James S . Boles Source : Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice , Vol . 16 , No . 4 , Structural Equation Stable URL,” vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 279–285, 2008.
[16] F. Luthans, “The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior,” J Organ Behav, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 695–706, Sep. 2002, doi: 10.1002/JOB.165.
[17] J. W. Graham, “Leadership, Moral Development, and Citizenship Behavior,” Business Ethics Quarterly, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 43–54, Jan. 1995, doi: 10.2307/3857271.
[18] A. D. Timpe, Kinerja Performance. Jakarta: PT. Media Elex Komputindo, 2002.