

DEVELOPMENT OF A MALAYSIAN SERVANT LEADERSHIP INSTRUMENT

Asmawati Mahidi

Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
asmawati@um.edu.my

Muhammad Faizal A Ghani

Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
mdfaizal@um.edu.my

Abd. Muhith

UIN Kiai Haji Achmad Siddiq Jember
abd.muhith1972@gmail.com

Ahmad Khuza'i Faruq

UIN Kiai Haji Achmad Siddiq Jember
sandalutuh@gmail.com

DOI: <http://10.35719/jieman.v5i1.183>

Abstract

The development and validation of a tool to evaluate the servant leadership component of elementary school leaders in the local context is the aim of this study. This is due to the fact that most of the instruments now in use are from the west and are therefore less suitable for usage in Malaysian schools. Three servant leadership specialists tested the validity of the measure. The study's quantitative design is then tested for reliability using SPSS 26.0. Additionally, the researcher tested the instrument's reliability index using Cronbach Alpha. Then, 25 instructors who teach in the Miri area and were chosen at random to complete this instrument, which comprises of 40 items, were given copies of it via Google Form. This tool was created to assess six (6) aspects of servant leadership, including teacher self-worth, teacher competence, creating a positive school climate, applying leadership based on local circumstances,

and developing vision and mission. vi) managing the distribution of power. Additionally, the study's findings demonstrate that Cronbach Alpha has a dependability of 0.981. Since this instrument can be used during the real study stage because the Cronbach Alpha score is more than 0.7.

Pengembangan dan validasi alat untuk mengevaluasi komponen kepemimpinan yang melayani kepala sekolah dasar dalam konteks lokal adalah tujuan dari penelitian ini. Hal ini disebabkan karena sebagian besar instrumen yang digunakan sekarang berasal dari barat dan karena itu kurang cocok untuk digunakan di sekolah-sekolah Malaysia. Tiga spesialis kepemimpinan yang melayani menguji validitas ukuran tersebut. Rancangan kuantitatif penelitian ini kemudian diuji reliabilitasnya dengan menggunakan SPSS 26.0. Selain itu, peneliti menguji indeks reliabilitas instrumen dengan menggunakan Cronbach Alpha. Kemudian, 25 instruktur yang mengajar di wilayah Miri dan dipilih secara acak untuk melengkapi instrumen yang terdiri dari 40 item ini, diberikan salinannya melalui Google Form. Alat ini dibuat untuk menilai enam (6) aspek kepemimpinan yang melayani, antara lain harga diri guru, kompetensi guru, menciptakan iklim sekolah yang positif, menerapkan kepemimpinan berdasarkan keadaan setempat, dan mengembangkan visi dan misi. vi) mengelola distribusi kekuasaan. Selain itu, temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa Cronbach Alpha memiliki ketergantungan 0,981. Karena instrumen ini dapat digunakan pada tahap pembelajaran sesungguhnya karena skor Cronbach Alpha lebih dari 0,7.

Keywords : Instruments, Servant Leadership, Cronbach Alpha

Introduction

Malaysia's education development plan has entered the third wave 2021-2025 which is the last stage in transforming the country's education system. At this point, the system needs to move towards excellence through increased operational flexibility at all levels. Therefore, in order to fulfill the third shift, which is to produce people who appreciate values, what needs to be taken into account is the role of a school leader. But lately, the role of leaders has become the main question in forming a school that can produce human capital that can compete in this all-challenging current of globalization. There are several types of leadership that are known to help subordinates in the workplace. For example, transformational leadership which is considered as an agent of

change in the organization.¹ Through this leadership, a leader will be a facilitator for subordinates to adapt to the changes that occur in the organization.²

However, one of the leadership choices is servant leadership. Servant leadership that prioritizes the people being led is an option that can be considered appropriate to create a school that upholds values³ However, there is still a lack of instruments developed to identify the effectiveness of servant leadership practiced by leaders in an organization.⁴ However, there are also local researchers, who have adapted existing instruments from the west to be used in the local context. In fact,⁵ servant leadership instruments exist more in the western context such as⁶ have developed instruments to study

¹ Rohana Ahmad, & Ahmad Martadha Mohamed. *Hubungan pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap pelaksanaan program pelan penggantian pembangunan kerjaya dalam perkhidmatan awam Malaysia*. Jurnal Pengurusan, 55, (2019). 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.17576/pengurusan-2019-55-13>

² Muhammad Siddique. *The influence of workplace isolation on the relationship between servant leadership, self-efficacy and job outcomes*. *Psychology and Marketing*. (Malaya: University, 2016),23

³ Ahmed Bilal, Ahmad Siddiquei, Muhammad Ali Asadullah, Hayat Muhammad Awan, & Fahad Asmi. Servant leadership: a new perspective to explore project leadership and team effectiveness. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(3), (2020). 699–715. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2019-1975>

⁴ Asnani Bahari. *Pengaruh kepimpinan servant, personaliti proaktif, ciri sosial, rekabentuk kerja terhadap gelagat kewarganegaraan organisasi*. (In Universiti Utara Malaysia. 2020), 10-49

⁵ Izani Ibrahim, & Yahya Don. Servant leadership and effective changes management in schools. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), (2014). 2250–3153. www.ijsrp.org

⁶ Laub, James Alan. Assessing the servant organization development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument.(1999).

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042814020023>
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815031535>
<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042815003511>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.044>

about servant leadership however, not many instruments are developed in the local context.⁷

As a result, this study has taken the initiative to support leaders by creating a local servant leadership instrument to serve as a manual for school leaders on how to better confront and manage a school. The instrument will then serve as a benchmark for measuring the level of servant leadership used by school leaders.

A popular phrase in leadership discourse is leading by example. This usually means that people who are recognized as leaders must exhibit behaviors that followers can emulate.⁸

An analogy to leadership is that the leader offers themselves to be someone extraordinary - someone who stands by the followers at all time.⁹ The universal approach assumes that leadership characteristics and processes are relatively constant across cultures and that leadership models can be applied universally, regardless of context.¹⁰

Therefore, leadership is a power-laden, value-based and ethically driven relationship between leaders and followers who share a common vision and achieve real change that reflects their common purpose and goals.¹¹

“The servant-Leader is servant first” this is probably the most famous and famous quote in the field of servant leadership. It is also the closest definition to us as written by Greenleaf himself.

Servant leadership is defined as leadership that aims at the well-being of the organization with a leader who truly cares and serves his followers. states that servant leadership is leadership that

⁷ Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), (2011). 249-267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>

⁸ Spoelstra, S. *Leadership and organization* (1st ed.). (Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. 2018), 59

⁹ Mckimm, J., & Swanwick, T. (2013). *Educational leadership. Understanding Medical Education: Evidence, Theory and Practice: Second Edition*, 473-491. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118472361.ch33>

¹⁰ Gupta, V., Wart, M. Van, & Suino, P. *Leadership across the globe* (1st ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. (2016).

¹¹ Gini, A., & Green, R. M. *10 Virtues of outstanding leaders: Leadership and character* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (2013).

is rooted in our ethical and moral teaching; leadership that works because it is based on how people need to be treated, motivated and led.

According to Patterson,¹² servant leadership is an individual-oriented leader's attitude that can pave the way for safe and strong relationships in an organization.

While according to Liden et al.¹³ servant leadership is based on leaders who provide the best service for their followers, and those leaders rely on two-way communication to understand the abilities, needs, desires, goals and potential of each individual in the organization.

To identify the leadership style practiced in an organization, many researchers have developed a servant leadership instrument. has developed a Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument which contains 60 items in total and is based on the Greenleaf model which includes 6 dimensions which are valuing the individual, developing the individual, developing the community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership and sharing leadership.¹⁴

have developed a Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) based on Patterson's model which outlines 7 dimensions namely Agapao Love, empowerment, vision, Altruism, service, trust and humility. The instrument contains a total of 42 servant leadership items that are used to identify the level of servant leadership practices practiced in an organization.

¹² Patterson, Kathleen. *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. School of Leadership Studies Regent University, 10. (2003). http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2003pdf/patterson_servant_lead

¹³ Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. *Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), (2008). 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>

¹⁴ Laub, James Alan. *Assessing the servant organization development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument*. (1999).

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042814020023>
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815031535>
<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042815003511>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.044>

Next, developed the Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) to test the level of servant leadership practices in organizations. This instrument is based on the model of Liden et al.¹⁵ and contains as many as 28 items based on 7 dimensions which are conceptual skills, empowerment, helping followers to succeed and grow, putting followers first, acting ethically, emotional healing and creating value for the community.

have developed a Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) instrument that contains 30 items based on 8 dimensions, namely empowerment, accountability, standing firmly behind followers, humility, authenticity, desire, interpersonal acceptance and supervision (Table 1).

There are also local researchers who use instruments adapted from existing instruments for local studies. Therefore, this study is to develop instruments in the local context to be more suitable for use in the school context as an organization.

In addition, it is important to be noticed that culture clashes are the most challenging problem faced by local leader. Clashes on local work canvas are almost always result of value distinction, consequently, it is necessary for local leader to carefully handle on what those values are by using appropriate instrument that represent those values. Fons Trompenaars and Ed Voerman categorized seven dilemmas faced by local studies to be more suitable for the use in the school context as an organization. Those are; leading-serving, rules-expectation, parts-the whole, control-passion, specific-diffuse, short term-long term and push-pull.

Table 1: Servant leadership instruments that have been developed

| Model | Laub (1999) | Dennis & Bocarnea (2005) | Liden (2008) | Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011) |
|-------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Instrument | Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) | Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) | Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) | Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) |
| Item | 40 | 42 | 28 | 30 |
| Construct | 1. Value | 1. <i>Agapao love</i> | 1. Conceptual | 1. Empowerment |

¹⁵ Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), (2008). 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| people | 2. Empowerment | skills | 2. Accountability |
| 2. Develop people | 3. Vision | 2. Empowering | 3. Standing back |
| 3. Builds community | 4. <i>Altruism</i> | 3. Helping subordinates | 4. Humility |
| 4. Display authenticity | 5. Service | grow and succeed | 5. Authenticity |
| 5. Provides leadership | 6. Trust | 4. Putting subordinates first | 6. Courage |
| 6. Shares leadership | 7. Humility | 5. Behaving ethically | 7. Interpersonal acceptance |
| | | 6. Emotional healing | 8. Stewardship |
| | | 7. Creating value for the community | |

Method

1. Data

The literature research makes it evident that organizational leaders are becoming more aware of servant leadership. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26.0 was used to create the data, which was gathered using surveys.

2. Sampling

This study's multi-method approach makes use of expert interviews and survey surveys for instrument validation. Most research investigations employ survey questionnaires extensively because they save time, effort, and money.¹⁶

3. Instrument

The instrument used is the Servant Leadership Organization Assessment (SOLA).¹⁷ The rationale for using this instrument is that it is widely used by local researchers to conduct research in a local context¹⁸ Therefore, this study adapted the SOLA questionnaire instrument to be used in the context of the school as an

¹⁶ Mohd Majid Konting. *Kaedah penyelidikan pendidikan. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Kuala Lumpur.* (2000). 52-95

¹⁷ Laub, Jame Alan. *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument.* (1999). 102-135

¹⁸ Jaggil Apak, Muhammad Suhaimi Taat, Roslee Talip, & Dg Norizah Ag Kiflee. *Kepimpinan servan: Satu alternatif pengurusan sekolah abad ke-21.* Malaysia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 4(3), (2019). 173-184.

organization. As shown in table 2, this research instrument consists of two parts. Part A contains the respondents' demographic items, while Part B contains items that measure the construct of servant leadership.

Table 2: Sections in the questionnaire

| Section | | Number of Items |
|------------------|---|-----------------|
| Section A | Demographics | 2 |
| Section B | Servant leadership: | |
| | Appreciate the teacher's self | 7 |
| | Using the teacher's competence | 7 |
| | Develop a conducive school climate | 7 |
| | Apply leadership based on the local context | 7 |
| | Formulation of vision and mission | 5 |
| | Distribute power in a controlled manner | 5 |
| | Jumlah item | 38 |

The process of developing this servant leadership instrument involves four main phases, namely identifying the design, developing items for the construct being studied, providing measurement guides such as Likert scales and review by experts.¹⁹

In the first phase, the researcher has identified six constructs of the to be adapted and used in the design of the servant leadership study.

In the second phase, the researcher has identified several suitable research instruments. For example there is a servant leadership research instrument by Laub, Dennis & Bocarnea, Liden et al. and Dierendonck & Nuijten. However, the researcher has decided to use the items from the Laub, questionnaire because the meaning of each item is clear and aimed at servant leadership in particular and has also been adapted and translated into Malay from English.

The third phase, for the instrument being tested, a Likert scale measurement guidance is provided in the third phase. The

¹⁹ Adzhar Hudiya, Aidah Abdul Karim, & Muhammad Uzair Sahrin. *Pembangunan Instrumen Penerimaan E-Pembelajaran Pelajar Pascasiswazah Menggunakan Analisis Rasch*. Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia, 42(2), (2017). 147-155. <https://doi.org/10.17576/jpen-2017-42.02-08>

responses were evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale that included the following response options: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. This Likert scale is intended to gauge respondents' attitudes of servant leadership techniques among school leaders.

Finally, to verify that the items used in this instrument have high face validity and are appropriate for assessing the construct being examined, experts perform up to two modifications and corrections in the fourth phase. Dimension validity refers to the number of items required to measure each servant leadership construct, whereas face validity refers to the language, sentence structure, and physical qualities of the instrument. The phrasing and sentence structure of the items have been changed by the researcher in response to expert criticism to better fit the respondents. The instrument's reliability was then evaluated after being distributed to 25 responders.

4. Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) program version 26.0 was used to enter the data and make Cronbach Alpha reliability analysis. Reliability is a concept related to internal consistency, homogeneity or unidimensionality that can help when measured.²⁰ It was given to 24 teachers in order to test the validity of the items on the servant leadership questionnaire created by the school leader.

Result and Discussion

1. Result of Respondent Demographics

Three experts, one in leadership and the other two in servant leadership, made up the initial round of respondents. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degrees in their respective professions are held by all three professionals.

In the second stage, a total of 16 (64%) female respondents and 9 (36%) male respondents completed the questionnaire. The majority of responders (36%) are teachers who have worked for between 11 and 15 years. 28% of respondents have between six and

²⁰ Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, (2011). 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>

ten years of service. Next, 12% of respondents with more than 20 years of service and 16% of respondents with between 16 and 20 years of service. While 8% of the respondents had a tenure of between two and five years.

2. Instrument Validity

In the first phase of the development of this instrument, the researcher identified 6 constructs of servant leadership and the earliest researcher who developed the instrument was Laub.²¹ For local use, the English-language version of the instrument has been translated into Malay. The instrument was then improved upon to make it more appropriate for use in a classroom setting, as indicated in table 3.

Table 3: The items of the servant leadership instrument

| Construct | Original item | Develop item |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Appreciate the teacher's self | 1. Trust each other | 3. trust the teacher's competence |
| | 2. Maintain high ethical standards | 4. concerned about the welfare of teachers |
| | 3. Be considerate and compassionate to each other | 5. immediately identify the cause of a teacher's issue |
| | 4. Relate well to each other | 6. accept the teacher as a valuable asset rather than a liability |
| | 5. Admit personal limitations and faults | 7. loyal listener of teacher issues |
| | 6. Encourage people to take risks even though they may fail | 8. prioritizing the teacher's welfare over oneself |
| | 7. Practice the same behavior as they expect from others | 9. open to various views of the teacher |
| | 8. Facilitate community and team building | |
| Using the teacher's competence | 9. Strive to work with others more than working alone | 10. guide teachers to turn challenges into opportunities |
| | 10. Knowing how to get along with people | 11. encourage teachers to be examiners of public examination papers |
| | 11. Use persuasion to influence others rather than coercion or coercion | 12. encourage teachers to be examiners of public examination papers |

²¹ Laub, Jame Alan. *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument.* (1999). 102-135

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | 12. Provide support and resources needed to help employees achieve goals | 13. identify weaknesses in the teacher's teaching activities |
| | 13. Say what they mean, and mean what they say | 14. provide a space for knowledge sharing in every teacher's activity |
| | 14. Not demanding special recognition to be a leader | 15. supervise the effectiveness of competency development programs through post-mortem |
| | | 16. influencing teachers to implement in-house training after taking courses outside the school |
| Develop a conducive school climate | 15. Mutual respect | 17. collaborate with school members in solving issues |
| | 16. Knowing where this organization is heading into the future | 18. provide physical facilities that can be used adequately |
| | 17. Work well in a team | 19. communicate informally with school members |
| | 18. Can be trusted | 20. less emphasis on protocol when communicating with teachers |
| | 19. Responsible for achieving work goals | 21. be sensitive to the use of terms when communicating |
| | 20. Work to maintain a positive working relationship | 22. implement school rules according to the context |
| | 21. Do not hesitate to provide the necessary leadership | 23. reduce bureaucracy |
| Apply leadership based on the local context | 22. Allows individuality of style and expression | 24. willing to learn from mistakes |
| | 23. State a clear vision of the future of the organization | 25. willing to accept criticism from other individuals |
| | 24. Willing to learn from those below them in the organization | 26. make decisions based on majority decisions |
| | 25. Work alongside | 27. apologize publicly |
| | | 28. self-reflect on the decisions that have |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | employees instead of being separated from them | 29. self-reflect on the decisions that have been taken |
| | 26. Encourage open communication and information sharing | 30. study the school culture before planning |
| | 27. Encourage people in the organization to exercise leadership | |
| Formulation of vision and mission | 28. Be clear about the main goals of the organization | 31. formulate a clear vision and mission |
| | 29. Non-judgmental - they are open-minded | 32. futuristic thinking in making vision and mission |
| | 30. Differentiating values in culture, race and ethnicity | 33. display the school's vision and mission in strategic places |
| | 31. Be aware of other people's needs | 34. formulate a vision and mission together with all school members |
| | 32. See conflict as an opportunity to learn and grow | 35. publicize the school's vision and mission to school members systematically |
| | 33. Empower employees to make important decisions | |
| | 34. Be open to criticism and challenges from others | |
| Distribute power in a controlled manner | 35. Showing high integrity and honesty | 36. provide controlled freedom for teachers to implement the program |
| | 36. Encouraged by supervisor to share in making important decisions | 37. identify the layers of school leaders |
| | 37. Accept people as they are | 38. share leadership knowledge with teachers |
| | 38. Allow employees to help determine where the organization is headed | 39. encourage teachers to participate in leadership development programs |
| | 39. Create an environment that encourages guiding teachers in making decisions about the school | 40. encourage teachers to participate in leadership development programs |
| | 40. Learning | |
| | 41. Lead by example by | |

modelling
appropriate behavior

3. Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the instrument was done by distributing the servant leadership instrument to 25 respondents who served in the school. The results of instrument item reliability are as in Table 4.

Table 4: Reliability of instrument items

| | Mean | Deviation Standard | N |
|--|------|--------------------|----|
| B1. believe in the teacher's competence | 4.00 | .866 | 25 |
| B2. concerned about the welfare of teachers | 3.96 | .735 | 25 |
| B3. immediately identify the cause of a teacher's issue | 3.88 | .833 | 25 |
| B4. accept the teacher as a valuable asset rather than a liability | 4.00 | .764 | 25 |
| B5. loyal listener of teacher issues | 3.80 | .764 | 25 |
| B6. prioritizing the teacher's welfare over oneself | 3.80 | .577 | 25 |
| B7. open to various views of the teacher | 3.60 | .957 | 25 |
| B8. guide teachers to turn challenges into opportunities | 3.96 | .735 | 25 |
| B9. encourage teachers to be examiners of public examination papers | 3.80 | .816 | 25 |
| B10. identify the latest knowledge needs to develop teacher competence | 4.00 | .764 | 25 |
| B11. identify weaknesses in teacher teaching activities | 3.96 | .790 | 25 |
| B12. providing space for knowledge sharing in every teacher activity | 3.96 | .790 | 25 |
| B13. overseeing the effectiveness of competency development programs through postmortem | 3.84 | .898 | 25 |
| B14. influencing teachers to implement in-house training after taking courses outside the school | 4.28 | .678 | 25 |
| B15. Collaborate with school members in solving issues | 4.12 | .726 | 25 |
| B16. provide adequate physical facilities that can be used | 4.08 | .702 | 25 |
| B17. communicate informally with school members | 3.96 | .841 | 25 |
| B18. less emphasis on protocol when communicating with teachers | 3.60 | .957 | 25 |
| B19. be sensitive to the use of terms when communicating | 3.84 | .800 | 25 |
| B20. implement school rules according to the context | 4.04 | .790 | 25 |
| B21. reduce bureaucracy | 3.88 | .781 | 25 |
| B22. willing to learn from mistakes | 3.92 | .954 | 25 |
| B23. ready to accept criticism from other individuals | 3.72 | 1.061 | 25 |
| B24. make decisions based on majority decisions | 3.80 | .866 | 25 |
| B25. publicly apologize | 3.68 | .988 | 25 |
| B26. self-reflect on the decisions that have been taken | 3.84 | .943 | 25 |
| B27. adapt external best practices according to the school context | 4.12 | .781 | 25 |

| | | | |
|---|------|-------|----|
| B28. study the school culture before planning | 3.92 | .862 | 25 |
| B29. formulate a clear vision and mission | 3.88 | .881 | 25 |
| B30. futuristic thinking in making vision and mission | 3.88 | 1.013 | 25 |
| B31. display the vision and mission of the school in strategic places | 4.24 | .723 | 25 |
| B32. formulate a vision and mission together with all school members | 3.96 | .889 | 25 |
| B33. publicize the school's vision and mission to school members systematically | 4.12 | .833 | 25 |
| B34. guide teachers in making decisions about the school | 4.00 | .866 | 25 |
| B35. providing controlled freedom for teachers to implement the program | 4.16 | .688 | 25 |
| B36. identify the layers of school leaders | 3.96 | .676 | 25 |
| B37. share leadership knowledge with teachers | 4.08 | .759 | 25 |
| B38. encourage teachers to participate in leadership development programs | 4.16 | .800 | 25 |

Next, Cronbach's Alpha value for the instrument items is 0.954 as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Reliability based on Cronbach's Alpha

| Reliability statistics | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------|------------------|
| Construct | Construct Name | No. item | Cronbach's Alpha |
| 1 | Teacher's self-esteem | 7 | 0.977 |
| 2 | Using the teacher's competence | 8 | 0.977 |
| 3 | Develop a conducive school climate | 6 | 0.978 |
| 4 | Applying leadership based on the local context | 7 | 0.837 |
| 5 | Formulation of vision and mission | 5 | 0.977 |
| 6 | Distribute power in a controlled manner | 5 | 0.977 |
| | | 38 | 0.954 |

Cronbach's alpha scores for each of the six constructions are higher than 0.7. Additionally, the Cronbach's Alpha value for all 38 items is 0.954, exceeding the 0.6 cut-off. The study concludes that the instrument's internal reliability for measuring the construct of servant leadership is adequate. In addition, according to Chua.²² a reliability value of more than 0.7 indicates that the items have a high reliability value. As a result, the elements that were taken from

²² Chua, Y. P. *Kaedah Penyelidikan* (Ketiga). McGraw-Hill Education (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd. (2014), 75-103

each construct to measure the construct of servant leadership were trustworthy and appropriate. Therefore, this research recommends that future research make use of this servant leadership concept.

4. Discussion

This study has added an extraordinary contribution in measuring the construct of servant leadership, especially for school leaders in the local context. This is due to the high Cronbach Alpha value for each construct tested, this instrument can be used as a tool to measure the level of servant leadership practices practiced by leaders in schools. These results also reveal that the items developed can be used in research Fazilah Patman et al,²³ Jaggil Apak et al.²⁴ Kuldip Singh, Relly Tasap, The demanding scale development and validation of the current study confirms that the validated instrument is consistent and stable across samples, and can be used in future research to measure servant leadership constructs using the Greenleaf model.

However, the limitations on the use of this instrument are limited to primary school leaders only. Therefore, for future studies this instrument can also be tested on high school leaders and other organizational leaders. Studies can also be conducted between secondary and primary schools to see the difference in leadership between head teachers and principals based on the construct of servant leadership.

This study also has the limitations of a qualitative approach that is used only for instrument validity is also a limitation. Thus, the method and approach of interviews or focus groups will help to analyse the knowledge obtained from the sample size. As such, this method can explore deeply into people's minds and gain deep insights that can be used in future research. Parallel to the study of

²³ Fazilah Patman, Suhairullah Omar Ramih, & Mohd Khairuddin@Jerry Abdullah. Kepimpinan servan pengetua dan pelaksanaan kemahiran berfikir aras tinggi guru di sekolah menengah Negeri Sabah. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(5), (2021). 78-83. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v6i5.787>

²⁴ Jaggil Apak, Muhammad Suhaimi Taat, Roslee Talip, & Dg Norizah Ag Kiflee. Kepimpinan servan: Satu alternatif pengurusan sekolah abad ke-21. *Malaysia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(3), (2019). 173-184.

who used the Modified Delphi Technique in building instrument items involving 11 experts.

In addition, this instrument can also be improved and used by various respondents and for different environments depending on the needs and creativity of the researcher. In line with the study conducted by Kuldip Singh,²⁵ on leaders in the Land and Survey Department and found that the influence of servant leadership is closely related to job satisfaction.

Therefore, the findings of this study and the questionnaire instrument that has been constructed can help and be a guide to the Malaysian Ministry of Education, the State Department of Education, the Aminuddin Baki Institute, school leaders and middle school leaders to measure the construct of servant leadership.

Conclusion

This study aims to build a local servant leadership instrument by using various methods. The researcher developed measurement items to see the level of servant leadership practices among local primary school leaders. Therefore, the results of this study have high reliability and validity. Therefore, this finding will be an instrument to measure the construct of servant leadership practiced by local school leaders.

References

- Adzhar Hudiya, Aidah Abdul Karim, & Muhammad Uzair Sahrin. (2017). Pembangunan Instrumen Penerimaan E-Pembelajaran Pelajar Pascasiswazah Menggunakan Analisis Rasch. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, 42(2), 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.17576/jpen-2017-42.02-08>
- Ahmed Bilal, Ahmad Siddiquei, Muhammad Ali Asadullah, Hayat Muhammad Awan, & Fahad Asmi. (2020). Servant leadership: a new perspective to explore project leadership and team effectiveness. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(3), 699–715. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2019-1975>

²⁵ Kuldip Singh. Influence of servant leadership on job satisfaction : A study of land and survey department. 3(13), (2019). 161–173. <https://insightjournal.my/>

- Asnani Bahari. (2020). Pengaruh kepemimpinan servant, personaliti proaktif, ciri sosial, rekabentuk kerja terhadap gelagat kewarganegaraan organisasi. In Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Chua, Y. P. (2014). *Kaedah Penyelidikan (Ketiga)*. McGraw-Hill Education (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014a). *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014b). Research design. SAGE Publication Ltd. <http://library1.nida.ac.th/termpaper6/sd/2554/19755.pdf>
- Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), 600–615. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510633692>
- Fazilah Patman, Suhairullah Omar Ramih, & Mohd Khairuddin@Jerry Abdullah. (2021). Kepimpinan servan pengetua dan pelaksanaan kemahiran berfikir aras tinggi guru di sekolah menengah Negeri Sabah. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(5), 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v6i5.787>
- Gini, A., & Green, R. M. (2013). *10 Virtues of outstanding leaders: Leadership and character* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gultekin, H., & Dougherty, M. (2021). The relationship between servant leadership characteristics of school teachers and students' academic achievement. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 8(No.2), 276–295. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/698>
- Gupta, V., Wart, M. Van, & Suino, P. (2016). *Leadership across the globe* (1st ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

- Izani Ibrahim, & Yahya Don. (2014). Servant leadership and effective changes management in schools. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), 2250–3153. www.ijsrp.org
- Jaggil Apak, Muhammad Suhaimi Taat, Roslee Talip, & Dg Norizah Ag Kiflee. (2019). Kepimpinan servan : Satu alternatif pengurusan sekolah abad ke-21. *Malaysia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(3), 173–184.
- Kuldip Singh. (2019). Influence of servant leadership on job satisfaction : A study of land and survey department. 3(13), 161–173. <https://insightjournal.my/>
- Laub, Jame Alan. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument.
- Laub, James Alan. (1999). Assessing the servant organization development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042814020023%5Cnhttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815031535%5Cnhttp://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042815003511%5Cnhttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.044%5Cnwww.s>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- Mckimm, J., & Swanwick, T. (2013). Educational leadership. *Understanding Medical Education: Evidence, Theory and Practice: Second Edition*, 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118472361.ch33>
- Mohd Majid Konting. (2000). Kaedah penyelidikan pendidikan. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Kuala Lumpur.

- Muhammad Siddique. (2016). The influence of workplace isolation on the relationship between servant leadership, self-efficacy and job outcomes. *Psychology and Marketing*.
- Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. Undefined.
- Patterson, Kathleen. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. School of Leadership Studies Regent University, 10.
http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2003pdf/patterson_servant_lead
- Pelan pembangunan pendidikan Malaysia. (2013). *Pelan pembangunan pendidikan Malaysia 2013 - 2025*. Education, 27(1), 1-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- Relly Tasap. (2016). Hubungan amalan kepimpinan servan, kompetensi komunikasi, personaliti guru besar serta budaya organisasi sekolah terhadap motivasi kerja guru sekolah rendah yang mendapat tawaran baru (New Deal) di negeri Sarawak. *Universiti Malaysia Sabah*.
- Rohana Ahmad, & Ahmad Martadha Mohamed. (2019). Hubungan pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap pelaksanaan program pelan penggantian pembangunan kerjaya dalam perkhidmatan awam Malaysia. *Jurnal Pengurusan*, 55, 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.17576/pengurusan-2019-55-13>
- Spoelstra, S. (2018). *Leadership and organization* (1st ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Trompenaars, F., & Voerman, E., (2010). *Servant-Leadership Across Cultures*. The McGraw Hill Companies New York.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>