

# The Influence of Servant Leadership and Motivation on the Service of Health Care Units in Way Kanan Regency

Eko Agus Fitrianto Samah

Former Student of Sriwijaya University, Public Health Department, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

The results of evaluation program by The Way Kanan Health Department in late 2013 shows 47 cases of death among toddlers, 7 cases of malnutrition, 2 cases of paralysis with withered body. This might have been an indication of the presence of under-performing servants in health care units. Two of the many factors influencing their performance are leadership and motivation. This study aims to analyse the influence of servant leadership and motivation on the general performance of a health care unit in Way Kanan Regency, Lampung, Indonesia. Cross sectional approach and survey analysis method were used. 122 officers of Baradatu Health Care Unit and Pisang Baru Health Care Unit 122 people were taken as the population. The result shows significant relationship between servant leadership and motivation to the performance ( $p < 0.05$ ). The servant leadership variable has got the greatest influence on the accuracy of clinical decision making than the professional knowledge and behaviour with  $OR = 4,476$ . It is suggested that the District Health Office of Way Kanan Regency create: a model of servant leadership as an alternative to the existing leadership models, tighten the control on the program, and conduct more training to improve the quality of human resources and their performance at the health care units.

**Keywords:** *servant leadership, motivation, performance.*

## INTRODUCTION

Health care unit is a first level facility serving the society in health matters. The Health Department uses the minimum standard for service (MSS) in evaluating the

performance of health care units. The performance level of health care units under the patronage of The Health Department of Way Kanan Regency can be seen from some indicators like: 47 cases of death among toddlers with 41 cases of death among newborn babies aged 0-28 days, 5 cases of death among toddlers aged 0-11 months, and 1 case of death among toddlers aged 12-59 months; 73 persons with dengue fever; 2 cases of acute failure paralysis (AFP); and 7 cases of malnutrition. From the preliminary interview and observation, it was found that the heads of the units did not optimally maintain the working atmosphere that it resulted in disharmony among the servants. The lack of synergy was also found as the programme designer tends to care less about other programmes. The social gap between groups, senior servants and junior servants, was also found. Communication was also poor as the heads of the units rarely conduct direct supervisions to any activities that servants' performances were not evaluated optimally. The role of the heads of units as leaders did not significantly affect the servants' performance as the servants were not given enough chance to share their ideas for improvements. This affected the less-experienced personnel more severely especially in performance and motivation.

Performance is measured through several activities with many affecting factors like leadership and motivation. Wiwiek (2013) suggests that servant leadership influences performance.

Furthermore, Zulya (2010) claims that leadership and motivation to work significantly influences performance in a positive sense. Novitasari & Wahyudin (2012) found that leadership significantly affected performance among teachers. Studies on servant leadership and motivation have been done in profit-oriented settings in private sectors. Similar studies conducted in government-owned organisations, which are mostly not profit-oriented, could rarely be found. Therefore, this study aims to provide more insights into how servant leadership and motivation influence performance in Baradatu and Pisang Baru health care units in Way Kanan regency, Lampung, Indonesia. This study aims to analyse: 1) the influence of servant leadership and motivation on performance; 2) which variable is more influential. It is expected that this study would enrich the existing body of research on the area of servant leadership as well as providing the stakeholders with new perspectives and more comprehensive information that might assist them in making decisions.

## **MATERIALS**

The term 'servant leadership' was first coined by Greenleaf (1970). This field was then expanded by the addition of dimensions of coverage like: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, organisational stewardship, humility, vision, and service proposed by Wong & Page (2003) and Barbuto & Wheeler (2006). Dessler (2015) uses an example from an excerpt of a study from a group of experts analysing the accidents at work in a petrol mine owned by British Petroleum to show the impact of the top management's failure to practice effective leadership in safety measure. Wiwiek (2013) suggest that servant leadership should be given attention for leaders aiming to improve employees' performance. In her study, it was also found that servant leadership influences motivation, organisational culture, and employees' performance. In addition,

Riyadi (2011) analysed the influence of financial compensation, leadership style, and motivation on the performance of employees in a manufacturing company in East Java by using structural equation modelling (SEM) and found that all those factors could positively influence employees' performance. James, et.al. (2014) suggest that transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership are strongly related to the performance of the employees. Roni, et.al. (2015) conducted a descriptive quantitative study on the performance of civil servants in doing their public service. The result shows that there is a significant impact of servant leadership on the performance of civil servants working in public service area. In line with the previous studies, Mondiani (2012) found that the influence of transformational leadership and simultaneous compensation could significantly affect the performance of the employees of PT. PLN UPJ Semarang. In contrary to the previous studies, Arfindy, Adolfini, and Peggy (2014) found that compensation did not significantly affect the performance of civil servants working in Environmental Department of North Sulawesi Province. Wiratana & Asih (2013) investigated the influence of leadership, workshop, and discipline on employees' performance and found that simultaneous leadership was the most influential factor. Robert & Angelo (2014) found that compensation is able to enhance performance in profit-oriented organisations and companies. Therefore, it is interesting to find out which factor actually plays the most influential role in service-oriented and government-owned organisations like health care units (PusKesMas/Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat).

## **METHOD**

This study is a cross-sectional survey aiming for identifying the influence of two independent variables, servant leadership and motivation, on performance. In a period of six months, from January to

June 2016, surveys, interviews, and observations were conducted at Baradatu and Pisang Baru Health Care Units, involving the total personnel of 122. The secondary data were obtained from the monthly report of each unit and some documents from Way Kanan Health Department. Logistic regression in real life at 95% ( $p < 0,05$ ) was used for analysing the data.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The first survey shows the characteristics of the respondents seen from their age, gender, working period, and education level. There are 68 persons (55.7%) aged 20-35 and 54 persons (44.3%) above 35. Among them, there are 18 (14.8%) male respondents and 104 (85.2%) female respondents. The duration of their stay in their position varies. There are 19 respondents (15.6%) who have worked for 0-5 years, 56 respondents (45.9%) who have worked for 5-10 years, 18 respondents (14.8%) who have worked for 10-15 years, 6 respondents (4.9%) who have worked for 15-20 years, and 23 respondents (18.9%)

who have worked for more than 20 years. 106 (86.9%) of them graduated from higher education and 16 others (13.1%) graduated from senior high school.

**Table 4.1: Characteristics of Respondents**

Variable		N	%
Age	< 35 years	68	55,7
	> = 35 years	54	44,3
Gender	Male	18	14,8
	Female	104	85,2
Working period	Junior	94	77
	Senior	28	23
Education level	Higher Education	106	86,9
	High School	16	13,1

The summary of the primary finding is shown on the table below. It was found that the proportion between good servant leadership and good performance is higher (77.0%) than the proportion between poor servant leadership and poor performance (34.4%) with the p value (0.000) lower than the alpha value (0.05) and OR value=0.156 (95% CI=0.070-0.347). This implies that with good servant leadership, the servants have bigger chance (0.157 times) to perform better than those with poor servant leadership.

**Table 4.2: The relation between servant leadership and performance**

Servant Leadership	Performance				Total		p value	OR
	Good		Poor					
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Good	47	77,0	14	65,4	61	100		
Poor	21	34,4	40	62,2	61	100	0,000	0,156
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55,7</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44,3</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>(0,070-0,347)</b>

In relation to motivation, the proportion between high motivation and good performance is higher (64.0%) than the proportion between low motivation and poor performance (18.2%) with the p value (0.000) lower than the alpha value (0.05)

and OR value = 8.000 (95% CI = 2.513 – 25,463). This result indicates that with higher motivation, the servants have better chance (8.000 times) to perform better than those with low motivation.

**Table 4.3: The relation between motivation and performance**

Motivation	Performance				Total		p value	OR
	Good		Poor					
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
High	64	64,0	36	36,0	100	100		
Low	4	18,2	18	81,8	22	100	0,000	8,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55,7</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44,3</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>(2,513-25,463)</b>

In relation to working period, the result of the data analysis is presented on the table below. The proportion between good performance and long working period is

higher (60.6%) than the proportion between poor performance and short working period (39.3%) with the p value (0.075) higher than the alpha value (0.05) and OR value = 2,381

(95% CI=21,004-5,649). This finding working period and performance. justifies that there is no relation between

**Table 4.4: The relation between working period and performance**

Working period	Performance				Total		p value	OR
	Good		Poor		N	%		
Short	57	60,6	37	39,4	100	100		
Long	11	39,3	17	60,7	22	100	0,075	2.381
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55,7</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44,3</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>(1.004-5.649)</b>

In relation to education, the result of the data analysis shows a better proportion (59.4%) between higher education and good performance compared to the proportion between poor performance and lower

education (31.2%) with the p value (0.065) higher than the alpha value (0.05) and OR value=0.310 (95% CI=0.101-0.957). This means that good performance has got no relation to education level.

**Table 4.5: The relation between education level and performance**

Education	Performance				Total		p value	OR
	Good		Poor		N	%		
Higher	57	60,6	37	39,4	100	100		
Lower	11	39,3	17	60,7	22	100	0,075	2.381
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55,7</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44,3</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>(1.004-5.649)</b>

From the many variables involved, namely: servant leadership, motivation, working period, and education level, only two variables fit for the multivariate modelling. Servant leadership and motivation have got p value less than 0.05 while the two other variables have not, each standing at 0.075 and 0.065 respectively. Therefore, servant leadership and motivation are the only variables fitting for further analysis.

**Table 4.7: The result of multivariate analysis**

Variables	p value	OR	95% C.I.for EXP (B)	
			Lower	Upper
Servant leadership	0,000	3.891	1.639	9.239
Motivation	0,998	0.000	0.000	
Education level	0,331	1.968	0,502	7.715
Working period	0,444	0.657	0,224	1.926

The variables were then analysed by using logistic regression model. In the end, servant leadership appears to be the only free variable to have significant relation (OR = 4.476). to the performance of health care units in Way Kanan regency (p value < 0,05).

$$y = a + b1X1$$

$$\text{Health Care Units' Performance} = 19.885 + 1.499 (0)$$

**Table 4.6: The result of bivariate selection**

No	Variables	p value	Results
1	Servant leadership	0,000	Potential
2	Motivation	0,000	Potential
3	Working period	0,075	Potential
4	Education level	0,065	Potential

**Table 4.9: The final result of logistic regression**

Variables	Coefficient	p value	OR	95% C.I.for EXP (B)	
				Lower	Upper
Servant leadership	1.499	0,000	4.476	1.930	10.383
Constant	19.885				

The equation model above is formulated into probability formula to predict how significant the influence of the free variables on the performance is.

$$[P=1/(1+e)^{-y}]$$

P = probability

e = natural number

y = constant

$$[P=1/(1+2,7)^{-1,499}]$$

$$[P=1/(1+2,7)^{1,499}]$$

P = 0,184 = probability to enhance performance is 18.4 %

It is then concluded that servant leadership has the probability rate of 18.4% to enhance performance.

The results above are in line with Dessler's (2015) finding that the lack of leadership from the top leaders often lead to

poor performance. Factors mentioned in Wong & Page (2003) as well as in Barbuto & Wheeler (2006) did not seem to have been dealt with really well that in the end, despite their considerably high academic qualification and long working period, the employees involved in this study did not perform as expected. Seeing from the finding that most respondents agree that the leaders at the two health care units have good servant leadership, the only issue among them was the inability of these leaders to capitalise on that to enhance the factors mentioned by Wiwiek (2013): motivation, organisational culture, and employees' performance. In contrast to Riyadi's (2011), Robert & Angelo (2014) and James et. al. (2014) findings, the results of this study indicates that it is impossible for employees to perform better due to the expected financial reward, which is a part of transactional leadership style, as the setting of this study is a non-profit government-owned health care unit. However, Riyadi's (2011) suggestion that leadership style, which is more about the lack of supervision, could influence the performance might provide a reason to why the employees participating in this study were found to be underperforming. These findings are also in line with Arfindy, Adolfina, and Peggy (2014) and Roni et. al. (2015) which show that material rewards might not play such significant role in enhancing performance and that servant leadership could enhance performance better than other factors. It seems that the only way to enhance performance is by capitalising on leaders' high level of servant leadership implemented in simultaneous training and guiding process, as mentioned by Mondiani (2012) and Wiratana & Asih (2013).

## CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion of the results of data analysis, it appears that good servant leadership is much likely to improve the general performance of health care units. In this case, the improvement could be heavily influenced by servant leadership and

motivation is not likely to be the major driving force for such improvement.

**Acknowledgement:** None

**Conflict of Interest:** None

**Source of Funding:** None

## REFERENCES

1. Arfindy, Adolfina, Peggy.A.M, 2014 *Disiplin Kompensasi dan Pengembangan Karir Pengaruhnya terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Badan Lingkungan Hidup Provinsi Sulawesi Utara*. Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akutansi (ISSN 2303-1174) Vol 2 No 4.
2. Barbuto.JR.J.E, and Wheeler D.W.2006, *Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership; Group and Organization Management* June 2006, Vol 31, No 3, ABI/INFORM Global, page 300-326
3. Gary Dessler. 2015, *Human Resource Management*. Edisi 14, Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
4. James T. Et all 2014. *Kepemimpinan Transaksional, Transformasional, dan Sevant Leadership pengaruhnya terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Sinar Galesong Pratama Manado*. Jurnal EMBA ISSN 2303-1174 Vol 2 No 1 Maret 2014 Hal 295-304. Universitas Sam Ratulangi
5. Mondiani, 2012. Pengaruh kepemimpinan Transformasional dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. PLN UPJ Semarang. Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis Universitas Diponegoro. Vol 1 No 1.
6. Novitasari, A., Wahyudin, A., & Setiyani, R. (2012). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah, Lingkungan Kerja, Pendidikan, dan Pelatihan terhadap Kinerja Guru. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 1(2).
7. Robert K Greenleaf. 1977. *Servant Leadership*. Paulist Press. ISBN 0-8091-2527-7.
8. Robert Kreitner dan Angelo kinicki (2014). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Edisi 19. Jakarta, Salemba Empat.
9. Roni. S.et.al. (2015). *Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Pelayan terhadap Kinerja Pelayanan Publik Pegawai Negeri Sipil pada Pemerintah Kota Bekasi*. *Psicology Forum UMM*, ISBN: 978-979-796-324-8. Universitas Padjadjaran.

10. S. Riyadi. 2011 *Pengaruh Kompensasi Finansial, Gaya Kepemimpinan, dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada Perusahaan Manufaktur di Jawa Timur*. Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan (ISSN 1411-1438) Vol 13 No 1.
11. Wong, P.T., & Page, D. (2003). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*.
12. Wiwiek. H.2013. *influence of servant leadership to Motivation, organizational culture, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee's performance in outstanding cooperatives east java province, Indonesia*. IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), e-ISSN: 2278-487X. Volume 8, Issue 5 (Mar-April 2013), PP 50-58/.

How to cite this article: Eko Agus Fitrianto Samah. The influence of servant leadership and motivation on the service of health care units in Way Kanan Regency. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2021; 8(9): 582-587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20210973>

\*\*\*\*\*