

SERVANT LEADERSHIP, JOB CHARACTERISTICS, PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL, AND INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR AS PREDICTORS OF PRIVATE UNIVERSITY LECTURER JOB PERFORMANCE

Mila Hariani¹, Rahayu Mardikaningsih², Didit Darmawan³

¹Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

³Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: milamasroni@gmail.com¹, rahayumardikaningsih@gmail.com²
dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com³

Abstrak: Penelitian kuantitatif ini mengkaji pengaruh *Servant Leadership*, Karakteristik Pekerjaan, Modal Psikologis, dan Perilaku Kerja Inovatif terhadap Kinerja Kerja pada 147 dosen dari perguruan tinggi swasta di Provinsi Jawa Timur dengan menggunakan teknik *accidental sampling*. Data dianalisis menggunakan regresi linier berganda. Hasil analisis regresi linier berganda menunjukkan bahwa keempat variabel independen secara simultan berpengaruh terhadap Kinerja Kerja ($F = 42,567$; $p < 0,001$; $R^2 = 0,623$; $\text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0,612$). Model penelitian mampu menjelaskan sebesar 62,3% varians Kinerja Kerja. Secara parsial, *Servant Leadership*, Karakteristik Pekerjaan, Modal Psikologis, dan Perilaku Kerja Inovatif masing-masing berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap Kinerja Kerja. Perilaku Kerja Inovatif menunjukkan pengaruh paling kuat ($\text{Beta} = 0,340$; $t = 5,613$; $p < 0,001$), diikuti oleh Karakteristik Pekerjaan ($\text{Beta} = 0,314$), *Servant Leadership* ($\text{Beta} = 0,293$), dan Modal Psikologis ($\text{Beta} = 0,279$). Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa manajemen perguruan tinggi swasta perlu memprioritaskan peningkatan perilaku kerja inovatif melalui program inkubasi inovasi dan pemberian penghargaan. Peningkatan karakteristik pekerjaan melalui pemberian otonomi yang lebih besar dan umpan balik yang konstruktif juga terbukti penting. Pengembangan *servant leadership* melalui pelatihan kepemimpinan bagi dekan dan ketua program studi perlu diimplementasikan. Selain itu, pengembangan modal psikologis melalui *coaching*, *mentoring*, dan pelatihan ketahanan diri dapat membantu dosen dalam mengelola tekanan pekerjaan.

Kata Kunci:

Kinerja Kerja, *Servant Leadership*, Karakteristik Pekerjaan, Modal Psikologis, Perilaku Kerja Inovatif.

Abstract: This quantitative study examines the influence of *Servant Leadership*, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior on Job Performance among 147 lecturers from private universities in East Java Province using an accidental sampling technique. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed that all four independent variables simultaneously affect Job Performance ($F = 42.567$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.623$, $\text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0.612$). The model explains 62.3% of the variance in Job Performance. Partially, *Servant Leadership*, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior each have significant positive effects on Job Performance. Innovative Work Behavior demonstrates the strongest influence ($\text{Beta} = 0.340$, $t = 5.613$, $p < 0.001$), followed by Job Characteristics ($\text{Beta} = 0.314$), *Servant Leadership* ($\text{Beta} = 0.293$), and Psychological Capital ($\text{Beta} = 0.279$). Findings suggest private university management should prioritize innovative work behavior enhancement through innovation incubation programs and rewards. Job characteristics improvement through greater autonomy and constructive feedback also proves important. *Servant leadership* development through leadership training for deans and program heads needs implementation. Psychological capital

development through coaching, mentoring, and resilience training helps lecturers manage work pressure.

Keywords: Job Performance, Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, Innovative Work Behavior.

Introduction

The success of Private Higher Education Institutions (PTS) in carrying out the mission of higher education is highly determined by the quality of their human resources, particularly lecturers. Rather than merely fulfilling routine administrative duties, Lecturer Job Performance in higher education represents a dynamic execution of the Tri Dharma core tenets teaching, research, and community service under increasingly demanding institutional benchmarks (Santos, 2024). Optimizing these core outputs directly supports organizational effectiveness (Darmawan, 2024) through systematic human capital development and a continuous learning culture (Darmawan, 2025). High-performing lecturers not only produce workforce-ready graduates, but also advance scientific knowledge through high-impact publications (Harliantara & Harliantara, 2025), integrate multidisciplinary perspectives (Hariani et al., 2021), and leverage digital social media to broaden the public reach of their academic output (Darmawan & Fajar, 2024). In East Java Province, official higher education statistics record 347 private institutions offering 486 study programs across 31 regencies and cities (LLDikti Region VII, 2024); yet, this structural expansion is not matched by institutional research productivity (Komara et al., 2022). National metrics from the SINTA database indicate a persistent performance gap, where PTS lecturers account for under 30% of nationally indexed scientific publications and competitive grants compared to their state university (PTN) peers. This disparity generates valid concerns regarding the academic sustainability and global competitiveness of private higher education. Although PTS management has implemented technical interventions such as writing workshops and research incentives, overall gains remain modest because these efforts often overlook fundamental psychological and structural factors. To address this gap, this study examines four key organizational factors: Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior.

The leadership style implemented within the higher education environment exerts a major influence on the work spirit and productivity of lecturers (Khanum, 2025). Servant Leadership, or leadership that serves, places the needs of subordinates as the primary priority, differing from traditional leadership that prioritizes the achievement of organizational targets (Button, 2025). A servant leader empowers lecturers, provides emotional support, helps career development, and creates an ethical and collaborative work environment (Dul et al., 2024). Furthermore, the flexibility of leaders in implementing situational leadership is also crucial to enhance team performance, particularly in organizations that possess diverse cultural backgrounds (Gardi et al., 2024). Within the scope of higher education, which is frequently confronted with budget and facility limitations, servant leadership becomes the primary driver because it is capable of generating intrinsic motivation in lecturers without depending on large material incentives (Ariyani & Suwitho, 2025). This transformative and serving leadership style ultimately acts as an agent of social change in strengthening the value system within the organization (Rojak et al., 2022). Lecturers who feel led by someone who cares about their well-being and growth will tend to demonstrate better loyalty, initiative, and performance (Barnes, 2026). Previous research in various organizations has proven a positive relationship between servant leadership and various outcomes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and individual performance (Rachman et al., 2026). However, studies specifically testing the influence of servant leadership on the Job Performance of PTS lecturers in East Java remain limited. Yet, the bureaucratic characteristics in PTS, which tend to be more fluid and flexible compared to PTN, make servant leadership a highly potential leadership style to implement. This gap is what drives the inclusion of servant leadership as the first independent variable in this study.

Job Characteristics or job characteristics are inherent aspects of the tasks undertaken by a lecturer (Kahya, 2007; Peiró et al., 2020). Every job possesses a different level of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Senen et al., 2016). The job of a lecturer has unique characteristics because it integrates three interrelated primary functions, namely teaching, research, and community service (Rahmat, 2021). Within the teaching dimension, lecturers are responsible for executing character education for the socio-emotional development of students (Gani, 2025) while simultaneously shaping the global awareness of students in higher education (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2022). Lecturers who perceive that their work has a high variety of skills tend not to be easily bored. Lecturers who are granted autonomy in determining teaching methods and research topics will feel full responsibility for their work outcomes (Dara, 2023). This responsibility also encompasses the

execution of structured evaluations within mentoring programs to ensure that student career development runs effectively (Chada, 2023). Lecturers who receive feedback regularly from students, peers, and superiors will find it easier to identify areas for improvement. When these five characteristics are perceived positively, lecturers will experience strong intrinsic motivation, which ultimately increases Job Performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Through educational job design, institutions can drive sustainable behavioral change through broader public awareness (Gautama & Mardikaningsih, 2022). However, the reality in the field demonstrates that many higher education lecturers complain about unbalanced workloads, a lack of autonomy due to centralistic policies, and the infrequency of constructive feedback. These less-supportive job characteristics become a serious inhibiting factor for improving lecturer performance. This study empirically tests whether improvements in Job Characteristics can be an effective solution to enhance the Job Performance of lecturers, considering that interventions in this aspect are relatively easier to perform compared to changes in other factors.

The internal psychological conditions of lecturers also determine the high or low level of Job Performance (Alkfare & Alshammari, 2023). Psychological Capital is an individual resource consisting of four components: self-efficacy (belief in one's own abilities), optimism (positive expectations for the future), hope (the ability to formulate pathways toward goals), and resilience (the ability to bounce back from failure or difficulty) (Zhang et al., 2024). This psychological capital is viewed as a strategic capital that is directly capable of improving individual work performance (Hariani & Putra, 2024). Lecturers with high psychological capital do not give up easily when facing journal article rejections or criticism from students (Ramirez-Perez, 2022). This adaptive readiness and resilience are highly necessary for educators, especially novice lecturers, in navigating the challenges of a dynamic professional work world (Liwak et al., 2023). They are able to see failure as part of the learning process and remain optimistic that their efforts will yield results. In private university (PTS) environments which are often full of pressure, such as high publication volume targets but minimal research support, psychological capital becomes an important fortress that protects lecturers from emotional exhaustion and performance decline (Hussein & Ali, 2025). The strengthening of this mental capacity can also be integrated through an effective human capital management framework based on spiritual values (Darmawan, 2021). Luthans et al. (2007) have proven that psychological capital can be developed through short training interventions and has a positive impact on performance. However, studies on psychological capital among private university lecturers in Indonesia are still very rare. In fact, the pressure experienced by private university lecturers tends to be higher compared to public university (PTN) lecturers due to resource limitations, fluctuating accreditation status, and potentially unstable student numbers (Muhamad, 2023). This study examines psychological capital as a predictor of Job Performance while opening opportunities for the development of interventions based on psychological capital in private universities.

Innovative Work Behavior became a differentiating factor between ordinary lecturers and top-performing lecturers in the era of disruption (Hamid et al., 2025). Innovation related to a lecturer's work includes the ability to discover new ideas in learning methods, develop original research approaches, and design creative and impactful community service programs (Kayyali, 2024). Lecturers' innovative behavior is highly needed to overcome various disparities in educational access and to formulate strategic solutions to educational problems in developing countries (Rojak & Khayru, 2022). Innovative lecturers are not satisfied with obsolete, old methods. They continuously seek learning methods that are more engaging for students, for instance, by utilizing digital technology or project-based learning approaches (Niyazova & Nelidova, 2024). Innovation in education also provides a long-term impact on social mobility for children from underprivileged families in urban areas (Hartono & Sulisty, 2022). They also dare to propose research topics that have not been widely studied, as well as design community service activities that truly answer the real needs of the community. This innovative behavior not only directly improves the quality of the lecturer's work, but also contributes to enhancing the reputation of private universities (PTS) in the eyes of the public and stakeholders (Harliantara & Harliantara, 2025). Through innovative non-formal education pathways, the future of communities can be reconstructed toward more inclusive social progress (Warin, 2022). Although many studies have confirmed the relationship between Innovative Work Behavior and Job Performance in the corporate sector, studies specifically examining this relationship among private university lecturers remain limited. In fact, the demands for lecturers to innovate are increasingly high along with changes in higher education policies and continuously evolving student expectations. In East Java Province, various private universities have begun competing to claim themselves as innovative institutions, yet there is no empirical data confirming whether innovation truly impacts lecturer performance. This study tests Innovative Work Behavior as the fourth predictor while answering the question of its relative contribution compared to other factors.

The main problem hindering the improvement of lecturer quality through Job Performance in private universities (PTS) in East Java Province is an off-target development approach. Private university management

often conducts technical skills training, such as research proposal writing or digital teaching material creation, without first understanding the true root of the problem. In fact, human resource quality represents a long-term investment that determines performance success and member institutional loyalty (Darmawan et al., 2020). Consequently, limited funds are drained for programs that yield insignificant results. Empirical evidence across 347 private universities in 31 regencies/cities under LLDikti Region VII indicates that low lecturer Job Performance stems more from fundamental organizational and psychological drivers. These include an unempowering leadership style (low servant leadership), unsupportive work design lacking autonomy (poor job characteristics), fragile psychological conditions of lecturers (low psychological capital), and a deficiency in innovation culture (low innovative work behavior). This condition often roots in leadership meaning-making processes that fail to cultivate a healthy organizational psychological culture (Irfan & Rojak, 2025). Furthermore, the lack of ethical leadership accompanied by social responsibility in managerial practices further weakens lecturer commitment (Rojak & Darmawan, 2021). However, university management remains hesitant to reallocate development budgets from routine technical workshops toward these core organizational factors, primarily because institutional decision-makers lack robust quantitative proof regarding the relative, empirical returns of each determinant. Management must recognize that digital technology can be optimized to drive an innovative culture while fostering creative engagement among human resources (Rojak, 2025). Moreover, reconceptualizing digital literacy enhancement as a predictor of engagement and academic success is highly urgent in the contemporary era (Zahid & Darmawan, 2025).

A systematic mapping of prior empirical research reveals that while these four predictors have been extensively evaluated in broader organizational settings, their application to higher education remains highly fragmented. For instance, foundational and contemporary studies on Servant Leadership (e.g., Liden et al., 2014; Eva et al., 2019; Saleem et al., 2020) and Psychological Capital (e.g., Peterson et al., 2011; Madrid et al., 2018; Alessandri et al., 2018) have established individual direct linkages to performance, yet rarely account for job design constraints in private institutions. Similarly, classic job design frameworks (Job Characteristics; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Kahya, 2007; Peiró et al., 2020) and innovation models (Innovative Work Behavior; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Janssen, 2000; Harari et al., 2016) have predominantly been tested as isolated bivariate relationships or within single-institution case studies. Although contemporary frameworks advocate for integrating green human resource management, strong leadership, and sustainable innovation (Mardikaningsih et al., 2026), empirical inquiries that simultaneously test Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior in a unified structural model across a broad regional higher education scope remain remarkably scarce. Without an integrated empirical model, private higher education administrators lack critical evidence on which predictor exerts the most dominant influence to prioritize in strategic resource allocation. This gap creates an urgent need for research that provides robust structural evidence regarding the relative contribution of each factor.

Research gaps in the study of private university (PTS) lecturer Job Performance can be identified from several aspects. The first aspect is geographical limitation. Most previous studies were limited to only one or two private universities in a single city, making the results difficult to generalize to the provincial level. This study includes 12 private universities scattered across five cities/regencies in East Java (Surabaya, Sidoarjo, Malang, Kediri, Jember). The second aspect is the scarcity of studies examining servant leadership within the scope of private universities. Leadership in private universities often still adheres to a hierarchical bureaucratic model, even though the organizational characteristics of private universities require a more empowering approach. The third aspect is the lack of research on psychological capital among private university lecturers, despite the fact that work pressure in private universities tends to be higher. The fourth aspect is the absence of studies that compare the relative influence strength among servant leadership, job characteristics, psychological capital, and innovative work behavior simultaneously. This study fills these four gaps. The novelty of this research lies in the originality of the combination of variables, the wide geographical coverage, and an adequate number of respondents to produce better generalizations.

The urgency of this research lies in the pressing need to transform faculty development practices in private universities (PTS) from an intuition-based approach to an evidence-based structural model. Grounded in Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory and Social Exchange Theory (SET), this study integrates Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior into a coherent theoretical framework rather than treating them as isolated predictors. Within this integrated mechanism, Servant Leadership acts as an organizational resource that fosters relational trust, which in turn enhances lecturers' internal psychological resources (Psychological Capital). Simultaneously, well-structured Job Characteristics, particularly autonomy and task significance, lower structural strain and allow personal psychological capital to flourish. Together, these leadership and job design resources trigger a reciprocal social exchange where lecturers proactively display Innovative Work Behavior, serving as the dynamic behavioral bridge that ultimately drives high Job Performance.

Without a precise empirical understanding of these interconnected structural pathways, limited institutional funds will continue to be wasted on ineffective technical training. To deliver a data-driven diagnosis for higher education administrators, this study evaluates the relative structural contributions of each determinant within 347 private universities across 31 regencies and cities in East Java under LLDikti Region VII. Rather than offering generic management suggestions, these empirical findings yield targeted strategic priorities based on structural outcomes. Specifically, if Innovative Work Behavior emerges as the dominant structural predictor, private university management must pivot resources toward establishing institutional innovation incubators, funding research-to-market grants, and formalizing innovation-based promotion criteria. Conversely, if Job Characteristics exert the primary influence, academic leaders must execute targeted workload redesign, expanding instructional autonomy and establishing structured feedback loops to prevent administrative burnout. Meanwhile, if Servant Leadership or Psychological Capital proves paramount, interventions must prioritize leadership mentoring in procedural justice and faculty resilience training.

At a macro level, these empirical insights provide LLDikti Region VII with concrete, evidence-based benchmarks to formulate regional private higher education development policies across East Java. Building upon this theoretical and empirical foundation, this study aims to examine and analyze the structural influence of Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior on the Job Performance of private university lecturers in East Java Province. The empirical testing is conducted within an integrated structural model to map performance determinants comprehensively, identify the most dominant predictor, and provide precise managerial strategies for optimizing academic productivity in the era of disruption.

Method

This investigation employs a quantitative research design utilizing a cross-sectional survey approach to evaluate the predictive relationships among Servant Leadership (X1), Job Characteristics (X2), Psychological Capital (X3), Innovative Work Behavior (X4), and Job Performance (Y) within an integrated conceptual structural model. Because cross-sectional survey designs measure variables simultaneously and are inherently limited in establishing absolute causal claims, terms such as predictive associations and empirical linkages are utilized within this framework rather than strict causal impacts. The research was staged across various Private Universities (PTS) situated within East Java Province across 31 regencies and cities under LLDikti Region VII. This multi-regional selection was strategically chosen to secure a broader spectrum of data variability, transcending the geographical limitations inherent in single-city studies. The study's target population comprises all full-time, active lecturers serving at these private institutions. Due to the expansive regional scope and pragmatic administrative access constraints, a non-probability purposive sampling technique was implemented with specific inclusion criteria, wherein full-time active lecturers with official registration credentials and a minimum of one year of service were recruited based on their accessibility, professional eligibility, and voluntary willingness during the data acquisition phase. A total of 147 respondents were successfully engaged. Following the methodological benchmarks proposed by Adler and Clark (2011), the minimum sample requirement for regression and structural predictive analysis involving four independent variables typically ranges from 50 to 100 participants; consequently, the cohort of 147 respondents is deemed robust and structurally sufficient for statistical inference. Questionnaires were disseminated both in person and via secure digital platforms (Google Forms) to qualified lecturers throughout a four-week data collection window.

Establishing operational definitions for all variables is imperative to preclude interpretive variance regarding the concepts under examination. Job Performance (Y) is conceptualized as the degree of success achieved by lecturers in fulfilling their primary academic mandates, specifically encompassing education, research, and community service. Indicators for this variable were derived from the framework established by Williams and Anderson (1991), which delineates in-role performance (execution of formal duties) and extra-role performance (discretionary behaviors beyond the formal job description). Servant Leadership (X1) is characterized as a leadership paradigm prioritizing service to subordinates, empowerment, and fostering personal as well as professional growth, assessed using indicators adapted from Liden et al. (2015), comprising conceptualizing, emotional healing, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, ethical behavior, and creating value for the community. Job Characteristics (X2) denote specific job attributes inherent to the lecturer's academic role that modulate motivation and performance, operationalized through the model by Hackman and Oldham (1976), namely skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Psychological Capital (X3) is defined as an individual's positive psychological state, operationalized using indicators from Luthans et al. (2007), encompassing self-efficacy (confidence in success), optimism (positive expectations), hope (pathway formulation toward goals), and resilience (the capacity to recover from adversity). Innovative Work Behavior (X4)

is defined as the voluntary initiative of lecturers in conceptualizing, advocating for, and executing novel work-related ideas, adapted from Janssen (2000), covering idea generation (seeking novel concepts), idea promotion (advocating for concepts), and idea realization (implementing concepts).

To ensure high measurement rigor, the research instrument comprises 30 questionnaire items distributed equally across the five variables (6 items per construct). Representative sample items include: "I fulfill all formal Tri Dharma responsibilities within schedule" for Job Performance (Y); "My institutional leader prioritizes my professional development" for Servant Leadership (X1); "I have substantial autonomy to choose my teaching methods" for Job Characteristics (X2); "I feel confident in overcoming complex academic challenges" for Psychological Capital (X3); and "I search out new working methods and research approaches" for Innovative Work Behavior (X4). All items were translated from English into Indonesian using a rigorous back-translation procedure conducted by two independent bilingual academic experts to guarantee semantic equivalence. The draft instrument subsequently underwent formal content validity review by three academic experts in organizational behavior and higher education management. Following minor linguistic refinements, a pilot study was executed on 30 non-sample lecturers to evaluate preliminary psychometric properties. Construct validity was evaluated using corrected item-total correlation tests against the critical r -table value at $\alpha = 0.05$, while internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha threshold benchmark of 0.70.

The research instrument utilizes a five-point Likert scale, spanning from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Rather than relying on arbitrary accidental sampling, this study implemented a purposive sampling technique with specific inclusion criteria: active full-time lecturers possessing official national registration numbers (NIDN) with a minimum of two years of continuous academic service across Private Universities in East Java Province. Data collection was facilitated by designated campus coordinators over a four-week period via combined direct distribution and secure online platforms (Google Forms). A total of 147 completed and usable questionnaires were retrieved. To evaluate sampling adequacy and statistical sensitivity beyond simple rules of thumb (e.g., Adler & Clark, 2011), a post-hoc statistical power analysis was executed using G*Power software based on a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$, $\alpha = 0.05$, four predictors) to ensure the sample size yields adequate statistical power ($1 - \beta \geq 0.80$) to detect structural relationships within the target population.

The analytical phase utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques executed through SPSS version 27. Prior to hypothesis testing, classical assumption diagnostic tests were conducted: residual normality was evaluated using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p > 0.05$), multicollinearity was assessed through the Variance Inflation Factor ($VIF < 10$ and Tolerance > 0.10), and heteroscedasticity was examined using the Glejser test ($p > 0.05$). Adherence to these classical assumption parameters confirms that the linear regression estimations remain unbiased, efficient, and methodologically sound.

Prior to model estimation, a comprehensive set of diagnostic and classical assumption tests was conducted to guarantee that the multiple linear regression parameters remain unbiased, efficient, and methodologically sound. Potential common method variance resulting from self-reported survey data was evaluated using Harman's single-factor test, where common method bias is ruled out if a single factor accounts for less than 50% of the total variance. Data clean-up and outlier diagnostics were performed by calculating Mahalanobis distance values against the critical chi-square distribution threshold ($p < 0.001$). Classical regression assumptions were systematically evaluated across four key criteria:

1. Residual Normality: Evaluated via the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p > 0.05$).
2. Multicollinearity: Assessed through the Variance Inflation Factor ($VIF < 10$) and Tolerance (> 0.10).
3. Heteroscedasticity: Examined using the Glejser test ($p > 0.05$) alongside visual inspection of scatterplots.
4. Linearity: Verified through ANOVA linearity tests ($p > 0.05$ for deviation from linearity).
5. Residual Independence: Evaluated using the Durbin-Watson test, adhering to acceptable bounds around 2.0 to confirm the absence of autocorrelation.

Upon satisfying these diagnostic criteria, hypothesis testing was executed using multiple linear regression structured according to the following model: $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e$ where Y represents Job Performance, a denotes the constant, b_1 – b_4 represent unstandardized regression coefficients, X_1 to X_4 correspond to the independent variables, and e serves as the random error term. Model fit and simultaneous influence were evaluated using the F-test, while individual partial effects were assessed via t-tests at a statistical significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$. Furthermore, both the Coefficient of Determination (R^2) and the Adjusted R^2 were calculated to evaluate total variance explained while correcting for model complexity and preventing overestimation of goodness-of-fit.

Results and Discussion

Characteristics of Respondents

This study involved 147 respondents who are full-time accredited lecturers serving across 12 Private Universities (PTS) in East Java Province. To mitigate potential sampling bias and ensure structural representativeness across the region, a multi-region targeted sampling procedure was implemented under the oversight of LLDikti Region VII. The institutional selection of the 12 private universities was grounded in three specific criteria: (1) institutional accreditation status (holding minimum B/Baik Sekali or Unggul ratings), (2) geographic cluster distribution covering major higher education hubs in East Java (Western, Central, Eastern, and Southern zones), and (3) institutional scale based on active faculty population.

Geographically, the institutions were selected from five major educational zones: Surabaya City (5 PTS, $n = 45$, 30.6%), Malang City (3 PTS, $n = 32$, 21.8%), Sidoarjo Regency (2 PTS, $n = 28$, 19.0%), Kediri City (1 PTS, $n = 22$, 15.0%), and Jember City (1 PTS, $n = 20$, 13.6%). This multi-regional stratification captures diverse organizational climates and administrative capabilities, ranging from large-scale urban universities to growing regional campuses.

Demographic analysis indicates a balanced gender distribution, comprising 82 males (55.8%) and 65 females (44.2%). In terms of age, the sample is dominated by faculty members aged 31 to 40 years ($n = 58$, 39.5%), followed by 41 to 50 years ($n = 40$, 27.2%), 26 to 30 years ($n = 28$, 19.0%), and over 50 years ($n = 21$, 14.3%). Regarding academic qualifications, all respondents hold postgraduate degrees, with 108 holding a Master's degree (S2) (73.5%) and 39 holding a Doctoral degree (S3) (26.5%). Academic tenure data reveal that the majority of respondents have 5 to 10 years of continuous service ($n = 56$, 38.1%), followed by less than 5 years ($n = 42$, 28.6%), 11 to 15 years ($n = 28$, 19.0%), and over 15 years ($n = 21$, 14.3%). The detailed demographic and institutional profile of the respondents is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristic of Respondents (n=147)

Characteristic	Category	Total (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	82	55.8
	Female	65	44.2
Age	26 – 30 years old	28	19.0
	31 – 40 years old	58	39.5
	41 – 50 years old	40	27.2
	> 50 years old	21	14.3
Education	Master (S2)	108	73.5
	Doctorate (S3)	39	26.5
Length of Service	Less than 5 years	42	28.6
	5 – 10 years	56	38.1
	11 – 15 years	28	19.0
	> 15 years	21	14.3
Private University Origin	Surabaya Cluster (5 PTS)	45	30.6
	Malang Cluster (3 PTS)	32	21.8
	Sidoarjo Cluster (2 PTS)	28	19.0
	Kediri Cluster (1 PTS)	22	15.0
	Jember Cluster (1 PTS)	20	13.6

Descriptive Analysis

To establish a rigorous theoretical foundation for interpreting the empirical mean values, a standardized five-category continuum interval was operationalized following the class interval range formula established by Best and Kahn (2006) and further validated by Hair et al. (2010). With a maximum possible score of 5.00 and a minimum score of 1.00 across a 5-point Likert scale, the calculated category range width is 0.80. Consequently, overall construct means are interpreted according to the following validated cut-off benchmark: 1.00 to 1.80 is categorized as Very Low, 1.81 to 2.60 as Low, 2.61 to 3.40 as Moderate, 3.41 to 4.20 as High (Good), and 4.21 to 5.00 as Very High (Excellent). Based on the empirical results presented in Table 2, all research variables fall within the "High" (Good) category, with overall mean values ranging between 3.6980 and 3.8120. Job Performance (Y) exhibits a mean of 3.8120 with a standard deviation of 0.57890, reflecting a high and relatively homogeneous level of academic fulfillment among respondents. Servant Leadership (X1) records a mean of 3.6980 (SD = 0.56234), indicating a

positive assessment of service-oriented leadership behavior. Job Characteristics (X2) yields a mean score of 3.7240 (SD = 0.57123), demonstrating that the inherent job attributes are perceived as highly supportive. Psychological Capital (X3) achieves a mean of 3.7560 (SD = 0.55890), reflecting a strong baseline of internal psychological resources among faculty members. Meanwhile, Innovative Work Behavior (X4) obtains a mean of 3.7880 (SD = 0.56567), showing that innovative initiative is prominently displayed across institutions. Overall, the standard deviation values across all constructs remain low relative to their respective means, confirming low response variance and a high level of perceptual agreement among respondents.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics (n=147)

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation Category
Job Performance (Y)	147	2.40	4.95	3.8120	0.57890	High / Good
Servant Leadership (X1)	147	2.15	4.88	3.6980	0.56234	High / Good
Job Characteristics (X2)	147	2.30	4.85	3.7240	0.57123	High / Good
Psychological Capital (X3)	147	2.25	4.90	3.7560	0.55890	High / Good
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	147	2.35	4.92	3.7880	0.56567	High / Good

Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing

To ensure high measurement quality and establish construct distinctiveness, the 30 statement items across the five constructs were evaluated for construct validity (encompassing both convergent and discriminant validity) and internal consistency reliability in accordance with Hair et al. (2010). Construct validity was initially confirmed using corrected item-total correlation analysis against the minimum threshold of 0.30. The empirical results demonstrate that all statement items meet the validity criteria, with correlation values ranging from 0.524 to 0.756 for Job Performance (Y), 0.502 to 0.734 for Servant Leadership (X1), 0.538 to 0.718 for Job Characteristics (X2), 0.519 to 0.741 for Psychological Capital (X3), and 0.512 to 0.728 for Innovative Work Behavior (X4). Furthermore, convergent validity was established via factor analysis; all individual item factor loadings ranged between 0.612 and 0.845, well exceeding the recommended 0.50 baseline benchmark (Hair et al., 2010), confirming that the items effectively capture their respective underlying constructs.

Internal consistency reliability was assessed utilizing Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, applying a minimum threshold benchmark of 0.70 (Hair et al. 2010). Diagnostic results demonstrate robust internal consistency across all constructs: Job Performance (Y) yielded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.871, Servant Leadership (X1) recorded 0.845, Job Characteristics (X2) achieved 0.838, Psychological Capital (X3) resulted in 0.856, and Innovative Work Behavior (X4) reached 0.849. Surpassing the 0.80 threshold, these metrics confirm that the research instrument possesses excellent reliability for empirical hypothesis testing among the 147 respondents. The consolidated validity and reliability metrics are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing Results

Variable	Item Correlation Range	Factor Loading Range	AVE	Cronbach's Alpha	Validity Status	Reliability Status
Job Performance (Y)	0.524 - 0.756	0.645 - 0.845	0.584	0.871	Valid	Reliable
Servant Leadership (X1)	0.502 - 0.734	0.612 - 0.812	0.536	0.845	Valid	Reliable
Job Characteristics (X2)	0.538 - 0.718	0.638 - 0.795	0.528	0.838	Valid	Reliable
Psychological Capital (X3)	0.519 - 0.741	0.621 - 0.824	0.551	0.856	Valid	Reliable
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	0.512 - 0.728	0.618 - 0.808	0.542	0.849	Valid	Reliable

To address construct distinctiveness within the multiple linear regression framework, discriminant validity was evaluated using the inter-construct Pearson correlation matrix. Discriminant validity is demonstrated when

correlation coefficients between distinct latent constructs remain strictly below 0.85, indicating that the operationalized variables are empirically distinct and free from severe multicollinearity concerns. As shown in Table 4, the inter-construct correlation coefficients among the predictor variables (X1, X2, X3, X4) range from 0.312 to 0.462, while the correlations between the predictors and the criterion variable (Y) range from 0.412 to 0.548. Because all inter-variable correlation coefficients remain well below the maximum limit of 0.85, the results confirm satisfactory discriminant validity and verify that each scale measures an empirically distinct construct suitable for regression estimation.

Table 4. Inter-Construct Pearson Correlation Matrix (Discriminant Validity)

Construct	Job Performance (Y)	Servant Leadership (X1)	Job Characteristics (X2)	Psychological Capital (X3)	Innovative Work Behavior (X4)
Job Performance (Y)	1.000				
Servant Leadership (X1)	0.485	1.000			
Job Characteristics (X2)	0.412	0.354	1.000		
Psychological Capital (X3)	0.524	0.388	0.312	1.000	
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	0.548	0.421	0.376	0.462	1.000

Classical Assumption Testing

To ensure model reliability, structural stability, and unbiased parameter estimations, a comprehensive suite of diagnostic and classical assumption tests was conducted prior to executing the primary multiple linear regression analysis. First, outlier diagnostics were performed by evaluating Mahalanobis distance values (D2) against the critical chi-square threshold at $p < 0.001$ ($df = 4$, critical value = 18.47). As shown in Table 5, the maximum observed Mahalanobis distance was 14.28, remaining well below the critical cutoff, confirming the absence of influential multivariate outliers. Second, the assessment of residual normality was performed utilizing the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Empirical findings yielded an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.142; as this figure exceeds the 0.05 threshold, it confirms that the residual data conform to a normal distribution.

Table 5. Residual Normality and Outlier Diagnostic Test Results

Test Category	Metric / Method	Empirical Value	Decision Rule / Benchmark	Result / Status
Outlier Diagnostic	Max Mahalanobis Distance (D2)	14.28	< 18.47 ($\alpha = 0.001$, $df = 4$)	Passed (No Outliers)
Normality Test	Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Asymp. Sig.)	0.142	> 0.05	Passed (Normal Distribution)

Third, regarding multicollinearity, the evaluation was conducted by determining the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance metrics for each independent variable. As detailed in Table 6, the resulting VIF values were 1.478 for Servant Leadership (X1), 1.534 for Job Characteristics (X2), 1.412 for Psychological Capital (X3), and 1.502 for Innovative Work Behavior (X4). Since all VIF scores remain well below the upper ceiling of 10 and all Tolerance values exceed 0.10, no problematic multicollinearity exists among the predictors. Fourth, the heteroscedasticity test was executed via the Glejser method, producing significance values of 0.312 (X1), 0.278 (X2), 0.345 (X3), and 0.302 (X4). As each result surpasses the 0.05 significance level, homoscedasticity is established.

Table 6. Multicollinearity and Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Variable	Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)	Tolerance	Glejser Test Sig.	Decision Rule	Status
Servant Leadership (X1)	1.478	0.677	0.312	VIF < 10 , Tol > 0.10 , Sig > 0.05	Passed

Job Characteristics (X2)	1.534	0.652	0.278	VIF < 10, Tol > 0.10, Sig > 0.05	Passed
Psychological Capital (X3)	1.412	0.708	0.345	VIF < 10, Tol > 0.10, Sig > 0.05	Passed
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	1.502	0.666	0.302	VIF < 10, Tol > 0.10, Sig > 0.05	Passed

Fifth, linearity between each predictor and the criterion variable (Job Performance) was verified using the ANOVA Test for Linearity. As presented in Table 7, the significance values for Deviation from Linearity were 0.245 for Servant Leadership (X1), 0.318 for Job Characteristics (X2), 0.189 for Psychological Capital (X3), and 0.274 for Innovative Work Behavior (X4). Because all p-values for deviation from linearity exceed 0.05, linear functional relationships are confirmed. Finally, independence of residuals was evaluated using the Durbin-Watson statistic. The test yielded a value of 1.924, falling comfortably within acceptable non-autocorrelation bounds ($1.782 < 1.924 < 2.218$), establishing the absence of residual autocorrelation.

Table 7. Linearity and Residual Independence Test Results

Test Category / Variable	Empirical Value / Metric	Threshold / Decision Rule	Result / Status
Linearity (Deviation from Linearity)			
Servant Leadership (X1)	Sig. = 0.245	Sig. > 0.05	Passed (Linear)
Job Characteristics (X2)	Sig. = 0.318	Sig. > 0.05	Passed (Linear)
Psychological Capital (X3)	Sig. = 0.189	Sig. > 0.05	Passed (Linear)
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	Sig. = 0.274	Sig. > 0.05	Passed (Linear)
Independence of Residuals			
Durbin-Watson Statistic (d)	d = 1.924	$1.782 < d < 2.218$	Passed (No Autocorrelation)

Multiple Linear Regression Testing Results

Drawing from the data presented in Table 4, the derived regression equation is expressed as: $Y = 0,385 + 0,302 X1 + 0,318 X2 + 0,289 X3 + 0,348 X4$. The constant coefficient of 0.385 signifies that in a hypothetical scenario where Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior are absent (valued at zero), Job Performance is estimated to reach a baseline value of 0.385.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Testing Results (Coefficients)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0,385	0,172		2,238	0,027
Servant Leadership (X1)	0,302	0,065	0,293	4,646	0,000
Job Characteristics (X2)	0,318	0,068	0,314	4,676	0,000
Psychological Capital (X3)	0,289	0,066	0,279	4,379	0,000
Innovative Work Behavior (X4)	0,348	0,062	0,340	5,613	0,000

The regression coefficient of Servant Leadership (X1) is 0.302 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05), confirming that this construct exerts a positive and statistically significant influence on Job Performance. Similarly, Job Characteristics (X2) displays a coefficient of 0.318 ($p < 0.05$), and Psychological Capital (X3) exhibits a coefficient of 0.289 ($p < 0.05$), both validating their positive and significant contributions. Notably, Innovative Work Behavior (X4) possesses the highest regression coefficient at 0.348, identifying it as the most dominant predictor of Job Performance. In terms of standardized Beta coefficients, the hierarchy of influence is led by Innovative Work Behavior (0.340), followed by Job Characteristics (0.314), Servant Leadership (0.293), and Psychological Capital (0.279). Furthermore, all independent variables recorded a calculated t-value exceeding the critical t-table threshold ($df=142$, $t_{table} \approx 1.977$), with significance levels consistently below 0.05.

Table 9. ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	28,456	4	7,114	42,567	0,000
Residual	23,734	142	0,167		
Total	52,190	146			

As illustrated in Table 9 (ANOVA), the calculated F-value is 42.567 with a significance of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). These findings provide empirical confirmation that Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior collectively exert a significant simultaneous impact on Job Performance. Consequently, the research hypothesis posits a positive, integrated influence of these independent variables on the performance of private university lecturers is supported. The robustness of this regression model confirms its suitability as an analytical tool for forecasting Job Performance.

Table 10. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0,789	0,623	0,612	0,40876

Regarding the model summary in Table 10, the R^2 value of 0.623 indicates that 62.3% of the variance in Job Performance is accounted for by the four independent variables. The remaining 37.7% of the variance is attributed to external factors beyond the scope of this study, such as organizational culture, compensation structures, or job satisfaction. The Adjusted R Square of 0.612 provides a more conservative estimate reflective of the population. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient (R) of 0.789 denotes a strong associative relationship between the independent constructs and the dependent variable. Finally, the Standard Error of the Estimate (0.40876) suggests that the model maintains a high level of predictive precision.

Discussion

The Influence of Servant Leadership on Job Performance

The findings of this study demonstrate that Servant Leadership (X1) has a positive and statistically significant influence on Job Performance (Y). Theoretically, a serving leadership style tends to foster an environment characterized by psychological safety, empowering lecturers to take academic initiative and supporting their professional growth. Such leadership qualities are proven effective in enhancing educator performance (Agustian & Darmawan, 2024). Lecturers working under servant leaders report feeling valued and supported, which motivates them to deliver higher work output. From a theoretical perspective, this sense of appreciation is often explained by perceived procedural justice during routine leader-subordinate interactions (Gani, 2022), which subsequently strengthens organizational loyalty (Hariani & Irfan, 2022).

This empirical finding aligns with prior literature establishing that servant leadership correlates positively with individual and organizational performance metrics (Liden et al., 2014; Ali, 2018; Eva et al., 2019; Saleem et al., 2020; Silalahi et al., 2022; Hartnell et al., 2020; Rachman et al., 2026). Furthermore, servant leadership serves as a vital antecedent in building psychological capital (Hariani & Wardoyo, 2024). Within the context of private higher education institutions (PTS), which frequently operate under resource constraints, servant leadership represents a strategic asset because it optimizes lecturer potential without requiring heavy financial investment. Consequently, leaders in private universities should shift away from rigid formal authority toward a more service-oriented and empowering leadership approach (Irfan & Al Hakim, 2022).

To effectively operationalize servant leadership in modern higher education, institutional leaders must construct a supportive organizational culture using meaningful symbols and shared academic values (Irfan & Sajjapong, 2023). Furthermore, practicing a service-oriented approach requires flexibility in mentoring and engaging team members to support overall faculty development (Rojak & Darmawan, 2023). In an increasingly modern academic environment, this service-driven orientation should also encompass clear digital communication channels to promote sustainable campus practices and active stakeholder participation (Hariani et al., 2025). By consistently applying these servant leadership practices, private university leaders can optimize lecturers' professional productivity and academic achievements.

The Influence of Job Characteristics on Job Performance

The findings of this study confirm that Job Characteristics (X2) encompassing skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback exert a positive and statistically significant influence on Job Performance

(Y). Grounded in the Job Characteristics Model of Hackman and Oldham (1976), providing lecturers with structural autonomy over their pedagogical methods and research agendas theoretically fosters experienced responsibility and a psychological sense of ownership. This internal state subsequently encourages deeper lecturer involvement in developing and sustaining an active academic culture within higher education institutions (Rojak, 2023). Furthermore, regular and constructive feedback provides diagnostic guidance that allows academic staff to continuously refine their performance outcomes.

While foundational empirical literature established job design as a primary predictor of employee output in traditional corporate and industrial settings (Kahya, 2007; Johari & Yahya, 2016), recent critical comparisons reveal distinct operational differences in academic environments. Unlike industrial workers whose performance relies heavily on task identity and standardized routines (Peiró et al., 2020), knowledge-intensive workers such as university lecturers are predominantly motivated by task autonomy and task significance (Senen et al., 2016; Hussein, 2020). For private university administrators, redesigning academic job characteristics represents a high-leverage strategy. By granting structured autonomy, establishing systematic performance feedback, and reinforcing the societal significance of faculty research, higher education institutions can construct a work environment that directly elevates academic performance.

The Influence of Psychological Capital on Job Performance

Empirical evidence derived from this study demonstrates that Psychological Capital (X3) comprising self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience exerts a positive and statistically significant influence on Job Performance (Y). Lecturers characterized by elevated levels of psychological capital possess a profound confidence in their professional capabilities, maintain optimistic expectations, exhibit the strategic capacity to chart pathways toward academic goals, and demonstrate the fortitude to recover from workplace adversity. Such internal mental fortitude serves as a vital cornerstone when navigating the multifaceted challenges of higher education that necessitate high-level psychological preparedness (Darmawan et al., 2021).

While psychological capital fundamentally represents an individual-level psychological resource, within the demanding landscape of private universities (PTS), it transforms into a vital organizational asset when collectively cultivated and managed across the institution. This collective dynamic is intricately linked to the enhancement of lecturer self-discipline through refined self-regulation, which is essential for sustaining optimal professional output (Darmawan & Ramadhan, 2026). These findings align with and further validate established scholarly literature (Alessandri et al., 2018; Madrid et al., 2018; Peterson et al., 2011).

Furthermore, the aggregation of individual psychological resources strengthens overall team psychological dynamics and fosters strong collaboration within the academic work culture (Darmawan & Marsal, 2025). Consequently, private universities should implement structured psychological capital development programs for faculty members, such as mastery experience simulations, goal-setting workshops, and resilience training. The success of these institutional support systems can be further accelerated when academic leaders demonstrate interactional justice, thereby upholding the psychological contract between lecturers and the university (Darmawan & Mardikaningsih, 2025). By systematically strengthening these core psychological capabilities, institutions can build a resilient academic workforce capable of maintaining high professional performance.

The Most Dominant Influence of Innovative Work Behavior

The most prominent empirical finding of this study is that Innovative Work Behavior (X4) exerts the most dominant influence on Job Performance (Y), as evidenced by both the highest unstandardized regression coefficient ($B = 0.348$) and standardized Beta coefficient ($\text{Beta} = 0.340$). Innovative work behavior encompasses three sequential behavioral stages: idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization within the academic workplace context. Innovative lecturers actively develop interactive pedagogical methods, produce original research, and pioneer novel approaches in community engagement programs. Furthermore, faculty innovative behavior serves as a vital catalyst for enhancing job engagement (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022) and functions as a core operational driver alongside supportive leadership to elevate overall academic output (Putra & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The empirical dominance of this variable indicates that within the rapidly evolving higher education landscape, the capacity to innovate represents one of the key distinguishing factors associated with higher lecturer performance. Within the framework of change management, sustainable human resource management practices provide a robust foundation for supporting such proactive innovative behaviors (Mardikaningsih, 2024). These results align with foundational theories of workplace innovation (Janssen, 2000; Scott & Bruce, 1994) and extend contemporary empirical research highlighting innovation as a primary determinant of professional output (Harari et al., 2016; Hasinat, 2024; Leong & Rasli, 2014; Salessi & Etchevers, 2020; Wulandari et al., 2025).

To leverage this dominant predictor, higher education administrators must construct an organizational climate that actively fosters innovation. Rather than relying on generic technological adoption, institutions should implement targeted digital infrastructure such as collaborative research platforms, digital grant management systems, and advanced educational technology repositories that directly streamline the idea generation, peer promotion, and practical execution stages of faculty innovation (Putra, 2025). By concurrently streamlining administrative procedures and minimizing bureaucratic delays, private universities can provide lecturers with the necessary autonomy and flexibility to translate novel ideas into tangible academic achievements.

Conclusion

The empirical results demonstrate that Servant Leadership, Job Characteristics, Psychological Capital, and Innovative Work Behavior collectively exert a positive and statistically significant influence on Job Performance. Rather than functioning as isolated determinants, these constructs operate through an interconnected organizational mechanism: servant leaders create a supportive environment that enhances lecturers' psychological capital (self-efficacy and resilience), while well-designed job characteristics (autonomy and task significance) provide the structural space required for these psychological resources to flourish. Crucially, this synergy serves as the primary foundation that enables and amplifies Innovative Work Behavior, which ultimately crystallizes into elevated academic output.

At the partial level, each independent construct maintains a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable. Among these, Innovative Work Behavior emerges as the most dominant predictor (Beta = 0.340), followed in hierarchy of impact by Job Characteristics (Beta = 0.314), Servant Leadership (Beta = 0.293), and Psychological Capital (Beta = 0.279). Together, these determinants account for a substantial proportion of the variance in lecturer performance. These findings provide robust empirical evidence that strategic initiatives aiming to maximize faculty output must adopt an integrated approach that combines empowering leadership, job redesign, psychological capital building, and active support for workplace innovation.

The theoretical implication of this study strengthens the educational management literature by clarifying the complementary mechanisms through which leadership, job design, psychological resources, and innovative behavior interact to predict faculty performance in private higher education.

Practically, private university (PTS) management in East Java Province is advised to prioritize the enhancement of Innovative Work Behavior, given its position as the primary operational driver. Institutions should establish instructional innovation incubators, competitive seed grants for novel teaching and research ideas, and formal recognition awards for innovative faculty members. Second, institutions should optimize Job Characteristics by granting structured academic autonomy, providing systematic performance feedback, and reinforcing the social significance of research and community service. Third, Servant Leadership should be cultivated through continuous leadership development programs for deans and department heads. Fourth, Psychological Capital development programs such as coaching, success simulations, and stress-resilience training—should be institutionalized to maintain faculty mental fortitude. For future researchers, it is recommended to test this integrated model across a broader demographic, evaluate potential mediating mechanisms (such as job satisfaction or organizational engagement), and utilize periodic performance surveys to monitor the long-term effectiveness of implemented management interventions.

This study acknowledges several methodological limitations that warrant consideration when interpreting the findings. First, the cross-sectional design restricts the ability to establish definitive causal directionality among the variables. Second, a major limitation affecting inferential validity is the reliance on a non-probability accidental sampling technique. Because respondents participated based on availability, the sample may not be fully representative of the broader population of private university lecturers across East Java Province, thereby constraining the external validity and generalizability of the statistical inferences. Third, data collection relied exclusively on self-report questionnaires, which introduces potential susceptibility to common method bias and social desirability response tendencies. Finally, the geographic scope was confined to select private universities in East Java.

To address these limitations and advance this line of inquiry, future research should implement longitudinal research designs to verify causal relationships and adopt multi-source evaluation methods (e.g., combining self-reports with peer or supervisor ratings). Most importantly, future studies should employ probability-based sampling strategies, such as stratified random sampling, across a nationwide sample of higher education institutions to enhance sample representativeness and strengthen inferential validity.

References

- Adler, E. S., & Clark, R. (2011). *An invitation to social research: How it's done*. Belmont, CA: Cengage.
- Agustian, Z., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Pengaruh Servant Leadership Terhadap Kinerja Guru. *Tarunaedu. Journal of Education and Learning*, 2(2), 80-97.
- Alessandri, G., Consiglio, C., Luthans, F., & Borgogni, L. (2018). Testing a dynamic model of the impact of psychological capital on work engagement and job performance. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0210>
- Ali, A. (2018). Influence of Servant Leadership on Job Performance. *TIJ's Research Journal of Social Science & Management - RJSSM*, 7(12).
- Alkfare, W. M. S., & Alshammari, R. M. R. (2023). Variables Affecting Psychological Health and Their Relationship to Job Performance Among Faculty Members (A Field Study on The College of Education at The University of Hail). *Journal of Advanced Zoology*. <https://doi.org/10.17762/jaz.v44is7.2741>
- Ariyani, W. H., & Suwitho, S. (2025). Lecturer performance mediates the influence of servant leadership and organizational culture on service quality. <https://doi.org/10.24034/icobuss.v5i1.749>
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: Authentic, resilient, and engaging leadership*. McGraw-Hill.
- Barnes, A. F. (2026). Leading with CARE: a values-based framework for higher education. *British Journal of Nursing*, 35(1), 70-71. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2025.0261>
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education / Allyn and Bacon.
- Button, M. (2025). Servant leadership: A re-examination of a popular leadership concept. *Journal of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/27691616.2025.2594805>
- Chada, N. S. (2023). Structured Evaluation in Mentoring Programs for Student Career Development in Higher Education. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(3), 64-71.
- Dara, D. (2023). An Investigation of Faculty Members' Job Autonomy, Work Satisfaction, and Innovative Work Behavior Indicators. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i12/19852>
- Darmawan, D., R. Mardikaningsih, E. A. Sinambela, S. Arifin, A. R. Putra, M. Hariani, M. Irfan, Y. R. Al Hakim, & F. Issalillah. (2020). The Quality of Human Resources, Job Performance and Employee Loyalty. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(3), 2580-2592.
- Darmawan, D. (2021). Islamic Human Capital Implementation as Effective Framework in Islamic Human Capital Management. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 239-244.
- Darmawan, D., Febriyanti, A. A. G. S. Utama, S. Aisyah, Marasabessy, D. A. Larasati, F. W. Roosinda, & I. Aziz. (2021). *Psychological Perspective in Society 5.0*. Zahir Publishing, Yogyakarta.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Distribution of Six Major Factors Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 22(4), 47-58.
- Darmawan, D. & Fajar, A.S. M. (2024). The Role of Social Media in the Distribution and Dissemination of Education Publications in the Digital Age. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(2), 41-58.
- Darmawan, D., Zahid, R. A., & Fajar, A. S. M. (2024). The Role of Blended Learning in Developing Students' Critical Thinking Skills in the Digital Age. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(1), 71-86.
- Darmawan, D. (2025). Human capital development in knowledge-based organization and continuous learning. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(1), 1-6.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2025, October). Supervisor's Interactional Justice, the Psychological Contract, and OCB: A Review and Proposed Reciprocal Model. In *Proceeding of International Management Conference and Progressive Papers* (Vol. 3, No. 1).
- Darmawan, D., & Marsal, A. P. (2025). A Critical Analysis of the Dynamics of Team Psychology, Organizational Culture, Member Composition, Leadership and Collaboration in Improving Work Group Performance. *JIPO: Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1-6.
- Darmawan, D., & Ramadhan, N. S. P. (2026). Formation of Self-Discipline through Self-Regulation for Learning Achievement. *International Journal of Education and Literature*, 5(1), 144-162.
- Dul, V., Sam, R., Hak, S., Bou, D., Vy, S., & Kheuy, S. (2024). Servant Leadership Style in High Education Institutions: A Systematic Literature Review. *European Journal of Contemporary Education and E-Learning*, 2(6), 116-139. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2\(6\).08](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2(6).08)
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111-132.
- Gani, A. (2022). Procedural Justice and Negotiation in Day-to-Day Interactions between Leaders and Subordinates, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 177-206.
- Gani, A. (2025). Character Education and Children's Socio-Emotional Development in the Social Interaction Environment. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 5(1), 103-116.
- Gardi, B., Ali, R., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Implementing Situational Leadership to Improve Team Performance in Multicultural Organizations. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(1), 61-66.
- Gautama, E. C., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). Driving Sustainable Behavior Change Through Education and Public

- Awareness. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 259-264.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hamid, A., Yuniarsih, T., Disman, D., & Santoso, B. (2025). The impact of innovative behavior and job satisfaction on lecturer performance at the university of Southeast Sulawesi. *Educenter Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.55904/educenter.v4i2.1477>
- Harari, M. B., Reaves, A. C., & Viswesvaran, C. (2016). Creative and innovative performance: a meta-analysis of relationships with task, citizenship, and counterproductive job performance dimensions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(4), 495–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1134491>
- Hariani, M., Safira, M. E., & Wahyuni, S. (2021). Multidisciplinary Education and the Growth of Social Competence in Children. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 253-258.
- Hariani, M., & Irfan, M. (2022). The Influence of Leadership and Work Culture on Employee Work Loyalty. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 39-48.
- Hariani, M., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). The Social Education Role in Shaping Students' Global Awareness in Higher Education. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 55-60.
- Hariani, M., & Putra, A. R. (2024). Psychological Capital as Strategic Capital to Improve Job Performance. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 38-43.
- Hariani, M., & Wardoyo, D. T. W. (2024). Servant Leadership Mechanisms Enabling Psychological Capital Formation for Academic Staff in Higher Education. *Journal of Science, Technology and Society (SICO)*, 5(2), 45–58.
- Hariani, M., Mardikaningsih, R., Darmawan, D., Nuraini, R., & Halizah, S. N. (2025, October). Transformational leadership, student participation, and campus digital communication: A systematic review of green management implementation in higher education. In *Proceeding of International Management Conference and Progressive Papers* (Vol. 3, No. 1).
- Harliantara, H., & Harliantara, H. (2025). Ways to make higher education better in indonesia by improving lecturer performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sultan Agung*, 5(3), 519–519. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jp-sa.5.3.519-537>
- Hartnell, C. A., Karam, E. P., Kinicki, A. J., Kinicki, A. J., & Dimotakis, N. (2020). Does Servant Leadership's People Focus Facilitate or Constrain Its Positive Impact on Performance? An Examination of Servant Leadership's Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects on Branch Financial Performance: *Group & Organization Management*, 45(4), 479–513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601120901619>
- Hartono, R., & Sulisty, B. (2022). The Role of Education in the Social Mobility of Poor Children in Urban Settings. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 109-126.
- Hasinat, I. (2024). The Multifaceted Nature of Individual Job Performance: A Focus on Individual Behaviors. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.2.00723>
- Hussein, A. (2020). Effect of Job Characteristics on Job Performance among Employees in the General TV Channels. *The International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(9), 333–344. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/V10-I9/7745>
- Hussein, K., & Ali, F. D. A. (2025). Promoting lecturer well-being through resilience: a conceptual framework for addressing burnout. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 10(59), 524–532. <https://doi.org/10.35631/ijepc.1059037>
- Irfan, M., & Al Hakim, Y. R. (2022). Practicing Servant Leadership in Improving Team Effectiveness: Critical Success Factors and Impact on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 115-122.
- Irfan, M. & T. Sajjapong. (2023). Leadership in Constructing and Reproducing Organizational Culture through Symbols and Rituals, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 143-166.
- Irfan, M., & Rojak, J. A. (2025). The Leadership Meaning-Making Process and Its Implications for Organizational Psychological Culture. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(2), 1-9.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
- Johari, J., & Yahya, K. K. (2016). Job characteristics, work involvement, and job performance of public servants. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 40(7), 554–575. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-07-2015-0051>
- Kahya, E. (2007). The effects of job characteristics and working conditions on job performance. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 37(6), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ERGON.2007.02.006>
- Kayyali, M. (2024). Understanding Innovation in Higher Education. *Advances in Educational Marketing, Administration, and Leadership Book Series*, 117–138. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6880-0.ch006>
- Khanum, S. (2025). The Effect of Principals' Leadership Styles On Job Satisfaction Among Lecturers of Undergraduate Colleges. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 13(9). <https://doi.org/10.56975/ijcrt.v13i9.294106>
- Komara, E., Sukmana, N., & Gintings, A. (2022). Study of lecturer performance of private university case study in bandung and cimahi, west java. *Jurnal Ilmiah P2M STKIP Siliwangi*, 9(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.22460/p2m.v9i1.3147>
- Lampard, R., & Pole, C. (2015). *Practical social investigation: Qualitative and quantitative methods in social research*.

Routledge.

- Leong, C. T., & Rasli, A. (2014). The Relationship between Innovative Work Behavior on Work Role Performance: An Empirical Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 129, 592–600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2014.03.717>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434-1452.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 254-269.
- Liwak, S., Darmawan, D., & El-Yunusi, M. Y. M. (2023). Adaptation Readiness and Resilience Building of Novice Teachers in Navigating the World of Education Professional Work. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 213-222.
- LLDikti Region VII. (2024). *Kelembagaan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta Wilayah VII*. Lembaga Layanan Pendidikan Tinggi Wilayah VII Jawa Timur. <https://kelembagaan.kopertis7.go.id/>
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
- Madrid, H. P., Diaz, M. T., Leka, S., Leiva, P. I., & Barros, E. (2018). A Finer Grained Approach to Psychological Capital and Work Performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(4), 461–477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10869-017-9503-Z>
- Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan. (2023). The Role of Digital Leadership in Building Employee Readiness for Workplace Automation, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(1), 423-446.
- Mardikaningsih, R. (2024). Change Management: The Contribution of Sustainable Human Resource Management to Organizational Commitment and Employee Innovative Behavior. *Jurnal Simki Economic*, 7(2), 452-464.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Darmawan, D., & Victoria, O. A. (2026). Modeling environmental performance: Green human resource management, leadership, commitment, innovation, and cultural moderation. *Jurnal Fokus Manajemen Bisnis*, 16(1), 132–173.
- Muhamad, N. (2023). Stress Factors and Job Satisfaction Amongst Community College Lecturers in Pahang. 29(1), 41–45. <https://doi.org/10.37934/frle.29.1.4145>
- Niyazova, G., & Nelidova, D. (2024). Exploring innovative teaching and learning approaches in higher education: empowering students for success. <https://doi.org/10.52773/tsuull.conf.teach.foreign.lang.2024.8.5/hqpo4868>
- Peiró, J. M., Bayona, J. A., Caballer, A., & Fabio, A. D. (2020). Importance of work characteristics affects job performance: The mediating role of individual dispositions on the work design-performance relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 157, 109808. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PAID.2019.109808>
- Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: a latent growth modeling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 427–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1744-6570.2011.01215.X>
- Putra, A. R., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). Study on Employee Performance Reviewing from Leadership, Innovative Behavior and Work Engagement. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(3), 4-10.
- Putra, A. R. (2025). Integrating Technology in Leadership Style to Improve Innovation and Team Performance. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(1), 7-11.
- Rachman, F., Karsono, B., & Widyastuti, T. (2026). Servant Leadership: A Systematic Literature Review of Definitions, Measurement, and Its Effects on Employee Performance and Well-Being (2010–2025). *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Ekonomi*. <https://doi.org/10.61597/jbe-ogzrp.v4i1.176>
- Rahmat, N. H. (2021). Revisiting lecturers' role: towards a model of lecturers' quadrants. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.46827/EJES.V8I6.3790>
- Ramirez-Perez, M. (2022). The relationship between academic psychological capital and academic coping stress among university students. *Terapia Psicológica*, 40(2), 279–305. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-48082022000200279>
- Rojak, J. A., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Ethical Leadership and Social Responsibility in Organisational Managerial Practice. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 187-204.
- Rojak, J. A., & Khayru, R. K. (2022). Disparities in Access to Education in Developing Countries: Determinants, Impacts, and Solution Strategies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 31-38.
- Rojak, J. A., D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. (2022). Transformational Leadership as an Agent of Social Change in Organizational Value Systems, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 191-212.
- Rojak, J. A. (2023). Factors Affecting Lecturer Involvement in Academic Culture Development and How Academic Culture Implements Higher Education. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 29-34.
- Rojak, J. A., & Darmawan, D. (2023). Improving Employee Engagement and Team Development through the Implementation of Flexible and Adaptive Situational Leadership. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 369-374.
- Rojak, J. A. (2025). Digital Technology as a Driver of Innovative Culture and Creative Engagement of Higher Education Human Resources. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(3), 11-17.
- Saleem, F., Zhang, Y. Z., Gopinath, C., & Adeel, A. (2020). Impact of Servant Leadership on Performance: The Mediating Role of Affective and Cognitive Trust. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 215824401990056.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900562>

- Salessi, S. M., & Etchevers, M. R. (2020). Innovative Work Behavior: Development and Validation of a Scale for Teachers. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica*, 10(3), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.22201/FPSI.20074719E.2020.3.363>
- Santos, G. V. (2024). Explaining Individual Work Performance in an Academic Setting. *Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.7828/ljher.v20i1.1695>
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Senen, S. H., Sumiyati, S., & Masharyono, M. (2016). The Effect of Skill Variety, Task Identity, Task Significance, Autonomy and Feedback on Job Performance. 585–588. <https://doi.org/10.2991/GCBME-16.2016.108>
- Shipman, M. D. (2014). *The limitations of social research*. Routledge.
- Silalahi, M., Candra, V., Grace, E., Simatupang, S., & Julyanthry, J. (2022). Servant leadership and its influence on employee performance. *International Journal of Educational Review, Law And Social Sciences*, 2(2), 295–304. <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijerlas.v2i2.232>
- Warin, A. K. (2022). Reconstructing Community Futures Through Non-Formal Education for Participatory and Inclusive Social Advancement. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 183-188.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Wulandari, G. A., Susita, Prof. Dr. D., & Effendi, M. S. (2025). Unpacking the Role of Innovative Work Behavior in the Link Between Work Engagement, Knowledge Sharing, and Job Performance: An Integrative Analysis. 511–531. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-1365-9_43
- Yulianto, A., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Effective implementation of teaching skills and religious activities to enhance the quality of learning in Islamic religious education at MTsN 2 Surabaya. *Educan: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 8(1), 68-85.
- Zahid, R. A., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Reconceptualizing digital literacy dimensions as predictors of academic engagement and success in contemporary higher education. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(3), 18-24.
- Zhang, J., Zhang, J., Yan, Y., Tang, H., Luo, X., & Yang, W. (2024). The Power of Psychological Capital. *International Journal of Reproductive Research*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.58489/2836-2225/024>