THE INFLUENCE OF TOXIC LEADERSHIP, SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND WORKLOAD ON THE PERFORMANCE OF MEMBERS OF THE SOUTHERN KALIMANTAN REGIONAL POLICE FORCE

Taufik Suhardiman
College of Economics Pancasetia Banjarmasin
taufik.suhardiman@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine and analyze the effect To determine and analyze Toxic Leadership, Servant Leadership and workload have a significant simultaneous, partial and dominant effect on the performance of the South Kalimantan Regional Police. This study uses quantitative data analysis methods, namely grouping data based on variables and types of respondents, tabulating data based on variables from all respondents, presenting data for each variable studied, performing calculations to answer the problem formulation, and performing calculations to test hypotheses that have been proposed. The results showed that Toxic Leadership, Servant Leadership and Workload had a simultaneous effect on the performance of the South Kalimantan Regional Police. This means that the better the implementation of Servant Leadership and the workload in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency for employees to implement performance. Toxic Leadership partially has no significant effect on the Performance variable. Thus, it can be concluded that increasing Toxic Leadership does not increase performance. Servant Leadership partially has a significant effect on the Performance variable. This implies that the better the implementation of servant leadership in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency for performance to be implemented by employees. Workload partially has a significant effect on the performance variable. There is a significant effect of the workload variable due to the target that must be achieved in terms of how much work must be completed by an employee of the South Kalimantan Regional Police in a certain period of time. Workload has a dominant influence on the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police.

Keywords: *Toxic Leadership, Servant Leadership, Workload, Performance*

I.   INTRODUCTION

The development of organizations in this era of globalization has been increasingly rapid, so that human resources (HR) are required to be able to develop themselves proactively. Human resources in an organization are the most important asset that plays a role in achieving organizational goals. Human resources in an organization must be utilized as much as possible so that they become an element of development instead of becoming an element of organizational destruction.

On the other hand, every organization certainly wants to achieve goals. To achieve these goals, the role of human resources involved in it is very important. The success of an institution or organization is determined by two main factors, namely human resources, employees or workforce, facilities and supporting infrastructure or work facilities. Of the two main factors, human resources or employees are more important than supporting facilities and infrastructure. No matter how sophisticated and complete the supporting facilities owned by a work organization, without adequate resources, the organization cannot successfully realize its vision, mission and organizational goals. The quality of human resources is measured by their performance or productivity.

Over the past decade, the 'dark side of leadership' has gained significant attention among researchers from various backgrounds. Exploring this 'dark side', toxic leadership was identified as one of the most serious phenomena seen as an emerging and costly emergence in organizations today (Indradevi, 2016).

The phrase toxic leader was coined by Marcia Lynn Whicker in her book "Toxic Leaders: When Organizations Go Bad" (1996), and is associated with a number of dysfunctional leadership styles. Other names include little Hitler, manager from hell, toxic boss and boss from hell. Their leadership styles are self-destructive and ultimately corporately harmful as they subvert and destroy organizational structures (Indradevi, 2016).

Attempts to define toxic leadership are many and varied. This is because the term 'toxic' has been used to describe a wide range of dysfunctional leaders (Schmidt, 2008). Some authors use the term toxic leadership to describe people in leadership positions who are diagnosed with mental health disorders (Goldman,

2006). As such, little distinction is made between destructive leaders who are truly toxic, bad leaders who are not toxic but lack managerial skills, good leaders who are bad people, and leaders with mental health problems. Schmidt (2008) hypothesizes that toxic leadership is a distinct, specialized construct that does not include simple mismanagement, malicious intent, or mental health disorders. Toxic leaders generally belittle, berate, and bully colleagues. They make themselves very successful. They intend to show their self-image to others. They eliminate empathy, sensitivity, humanistic and hopelessness. Self-promotion, abusive supervision, unpredictability, narcissism, authoritarian leadership are features of the toxic leadership model (Schmidt, 2008; 2014).

Toxic leadership reduces employee motivation, creativity, satisfaction, productivity, commitment, performance while increasing turnover, health problems, stress and death (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Kellerman, 2004). Schmidt (2014) suggests that toxic leadership can damage employees' physical and mental health, trigger dysfunctional group behavior, low performance and group-think, or increase employee absenteeism and withdrawal.

In addition to Toxic leadership, the factor that affects performance is Servant Leadership. In contrast to Toxic leadership, Servant leadership is an ethical leadership concept introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990) in 1970 with his book entitled The Servant as Leader. Greenleaf was the Vice President of American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T). According to Spears (2002: 255), a servant leader is a leader who prioritizes service, starting with a person's natural feeling of wanting to serve and to prioritize service. Subsequently, consciously, this choice brings aspiration and drive in leading others. This distinction is evident in the attitude that the servant brings, firstly being confident that the highest needs of others are being met. The primary goal of a servant leader is to serve and fulfill the needs of others, which optimally should be the primary motivation for leadership (Russell & Stone, 2002:11). Servant leaders will eventually develop the attitudes of individuals around them in the hope of having the same attitude to serve well.

Researchers are interested in conducting research in the South Kalimantan Provincial Police where various kinds of leadership characters are reflected in this

organization to encourage the improvement of the performance of its members. It is not uncommon for leadership to be quite authoritarian, harsh, intimidating, then berating, and bullying its members who are not disciplined at work. There are also leaders who are more protective, nurturing and serving their subordinates to improve the performance of their members. Based on this, the title of this research is THE INFLUENCE OF TOXIC LEADERSHIP, SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND WORKLOAD ON THE PERFORMANCE OF SOUTH KALIMANTAN REGIONAL POLICE MEMBERS

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Toxic Leadership (X1)

According to Schmidt (2008) toxic leadership is a distinct, specialized construct that does not include simple mismanagement, malicious intent, or mental health disorders. Toxic leaders generally belittle, berate, and bully colleagues. (Goldman, 2006) toxic leadership to describe people in leadership positions who are diagnosed with mental health disorders (Goldman, 2006)

1. Controlling subordinates
2. Invading privacy
3. Not allowing subordinates
4. Ignoring subordinates' ideas
5. Inflexible
6. Makes decisions inappropriately

Servant Leadership

Servant Leadership or servant leadership. According to Spears (2002: 255) says that a servant leader is a leader who prioritizes service, starting with a person's natural feeling of wanting to serve and to prioritize service. Subsequently consciously, this choice brings aspirations and encouragement in leading others. Servant leaders will ultimately develop the attitude of the individuals around them in the hope of having the same attitude to serve well. Dimensions or indicators of Servant Leadership use (Jacobs, G. A., 2006 in Kartikarini 2015: 44):

1. Affection (love)

2. Empowerment

3. Vision

4. Humility

5. Trust

Workload

Workload is pressure as a response that cannot adjust, which is influenced by individual differences or psychological processes, which is a consequence of any external action (environment, situation, event that makes too many psychological or physical demands) on a person. The indicators according to Eva Kyndt et al., (2010, p. 18) are as follows:

1. External Factors

   Tasks, including physical tasks such as work stations, workplace layout, workspace conditions, work environment conditions, work attitudes, transportation methods, loads lifted. While mental tasks include responsibility, job complexity, worker emotions and so on. Work organization, including the length of working time, rest time, work shifts, work systems and so on. Work environment, this work environment can provide additional burden which includes, physical work environment, chemical work environment, biological work environment and psychological work environment.

2. Internal Factors

   Internal factors are factors that come from within the body as a result of external workload reactions that have the potential to act as stressors, including somatic factors (gender, age, body size, nutritional status, health conditions, etc.), and psychological factors (motivation, perception, belief, desire, satisfaction, etc.).

   Performance

   According to Wibowo, (2011, p.7) performance is about what is done and how to do it. According to Wibowo in Kurniawati and Solikhah (2012), performance is actually the same as work performance, performance is the result of work and how the work process takes place. Performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance

with the responsibilities given to him (Mangkunegara 2013: 67). Employee performance can be measured by the following indicators:

1. Work Quantity

    Which includes the amount of work that can be completed

2. Quality

    Namely applies as a standard process of implementing organizational plan activities.

3. Timeliness of work completion

    Namely the fulfillment of the suitability of the time required or expected in the implementation of activities

III.   METHODS

This type of research is included in the type of research that is explanatory science can be classified in the type of causality research, namely research that wants to find an explanation in the form of a cause-effect relationship between several concepts or several variables or several strategies developed in management and is directed to describe the cause and effect between several situations described in the variable, and on that basis a general conclusion is drawn (Ferdinand, 2014).

Population is a generalization area consisting of: objects / subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics set by researchers to study and then draw conclusions Sugiyono (2016). Thus it can be concluded that population is the total number of all members studied. The population in this study were members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police totaling 8,294. The sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population. The sample in this study was taken using the Slovin formula. Based on the Slovin formula, it can be seen that the minimum sample size is 7.65, so the sample in this study was increased to 78 respondents. In determining the sample in this study using purposive sampling technique, which means data source sampling techniques with certain considerations Sugiyono (2016). The reason for using the Purposive Sampling technique is because not all samples have criteria that match the phenomenon under study. Therefore, the authors chose the Purposive Sampling technique which

determines certain considerations or criteria that must be met by the samples used in this study. In this study, the samples were those that met certain criteria. The criteria used as research samples are: Police members and also HR Division employees totaling 78.

Research Results and Discussion
Multiple Linear Regression Test
Tabel 1
T-test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	4.189	1.644
	X1	-0.048	.138
	X2	0.337	.156
	X3	0.465	.217

Sumber: Data Primer diolah (2021)
Regression Equation
$$Y = 4.189 + -0.048\ X1 + 0.337\ X2 + 0.465\ X3 + e$$

a. The regression coefficient value of the Toxic Leaderhip variable (X1) -0.048 is negative, which means that there is no unidirectional relationship between the Toxic Leaderhip and Performance variables. This means that if the Toxic Leaderhip variable increases by one unit, the performance will also decrease by -0.048 or -04.8%

b. The regression coefficient value of the Servant Leadership variable (X2) 0.337 is positive, which means that there is a unidirectional relationship between the Servant Leadership variable and the Performance variable. This means that if the Servant Leadership variable increases by one unit, the performance will also increase by 0.337 or 33.7%.

c. The regression coefficient value of the Workload variable (X3) 0.465 is positive, which means that there is a unidirectional relationship between the Workload variable and the Performance variable. This means that if the Workload variable increases by one unit, the Performance will also increase by 0.465 or 46.5%.

Uji Hipotesis
Uji-F
Tabel 2
Hasil Uji-F

Model		F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.283	.000[b]
	Residual		
	Total		

Sumber : Data Diolah Peneliti (2021)

From the Anova Test or F test, the Sig. F value is smaller than α (0.000 <0.05) then the regression model can be used to determine the effect together on performance Uji-t

Tabel 3

Hasil Uji-t

Model		t	Sig.
	(Constant)	2.548	.013
1	X1	-.345	.731
	X2	2.163	.034
	X3	2.144	.035

Sumber: Data Primer diolah (2021)

This study has a t-table of 1.665 Based on the t test results listed in the table above, it can be seen that:

a. X1 Toxic Leaderhip variable obtained sig value. = 0.731 (Sig. > 0.05) and also has a t-count value of -0.345 greater than the t-table value, thus it can be seen that the Toxic Leaderhip variable partially has no significant effect on the Performance variable.

b. The X2 Servant Leadership variable obtained a sig value. = 0.034 (Sig. value <0.05) and also has a t-count value of 2.163 greater than the t-table value, thus it can be known that the Servant Leadership variable partially has a significant effect on the performance variable.

c. Variable X3 Workload obtained sig value. = 0.035 (Sig. value> 0.05) and also has a t-count value of 2.144 smaller than the t-table value, thus it can be known that the Workload variable partially has a significant effect on the Performance variable.

Dominance Test

Testing the independent variable that dominantly affects the dependent variable in a multiple linear regression model using the Standardized Coefficients Beta value. With the determination of the results, the higher the Beta value, the greater the influence on the dependent variable. Based on the table above, it can be seen that variable X1 has a standarized coefficient value of -0.076, variable X2 has a value of 0.316, and variable X3 has a value of 0.373, thus the variable that has a dominant effect on performance is the Workload variable (X3).

IV. RESULTS

Toxic Leadership, Servant Leadership and workload simultaneously affect the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police.

From the Anova Test or F test, the Sig value is obtained. 0.000 is smaller than 0.000, thus Toxic Leaderhip, Servant Leadership and Workload simultaneously affect the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police, so the regression model can be used to determine the effect together on performance. This means that the better the application of Servant Leadership and workload in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency of performance implementation by employees.

This implies that the better the application of servant leadership and also well controlled between workload and Toxic Leadership in the organization by the leadership, the tendency of performance implementation will be better by employees. Leadership with Toxic Leadership, for example, is quite authoritarian, harsh, intimidating, then berating, and bullying its members who are not disciplined at work, then giving high workloads can affect performance. The role of good Servant Leadership in the organization by the leader, the tendency of performance implementation will be better by employees.

Toxic Leadership, Servant Leadership and workload partially affect the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police.

1. Toxic Leaderhip has a partial effect on the Performance of Members of the South Kalimantan Police Force

Toxic Leaderhip obtained sig value. 0.731 is smaller than 0.05 and also has a t-count value of -0.345 smaller than the t-table value, thus it can be seen that the Toxic Leaderhip variable partially has no significant effect on the performance variable.

This study supports research conducted by Choyrunnisa, Rima (2019) with the results of research Toxic leadership has a negative and significant effect on employee performance. Thus it can be concluded that increasing Toxic Leaderhip does not improve performance. The reason why Toxic Leadership has no significant effect, Toxic Leadership makes the work environment less pleasant. They create

underperforming employees, high absenteeism, decreased productivity, and increased costs for emotional mismanagement of employees.

This is in accordance with the opinion of Schmidt (2014), who suggests that Toxic Leadership can damage employees' physical and mental health, trigger dysfunctional group behavior, low performance and group-think, or increase employee absenteeism and withdrawal. Toxic Leadership causes a number of negative consequences for organizations, including unwanted turnover, reduced employee satisfaction and commitment, and increased employee psychological distress.

2. Servant Leadership berpengaruh secara parsial Terhadap Kinerja Anggota Kepolisian Daerah Kalimantan Selatan

Servant Leadership obtained sig value. 0.034 is smaller than 0.05 and also has a t-count value of 2.163 greater than the t-table value, thus it can be seen that the Servant Leadership variable partially has a significant effect on the performance variable.

This study supports research conducted by Muji Rahayu, 2019, with the results of research Servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the better the application of servant leadership in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency of performance implementation by employees.

Servant leaders serve not only their organizations but also their followers. According to Greenleaf (1997; in Vondey, 2011) if leaders serve their followers, this will inspire followers who will serve others. Added again by Organ et al (2006) if followers see their leaders helping subordinates grow, providing personal encouragement to followers and showing interest in followers, this can make followers more motivated to imitate the behavior of the leader and have an impact on others

Workload partially affects the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police Force Workload obtained sig value. 0.035 is greater than 0.05 and also has a t-count value of 2.144 smaller than the t-table value, thus it can be

seen that the Workload variable partially has a significant effect on the Performance variable.

This study supports research conducted by Iwan Fauzi, 2017, with the results of research Workload significantly affects the Performance of Investigators of the General Criminal Investigation Directorate. The significant influence of the workload variable is due to the targets that must be achieved in the sense of how much work an employee of the South Kalimantan Regional Police must complete within a certain period of time. In addition, work conditions, use of working time, and work standards.

Variables that have a dominant effect on the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police Force

Testing the independent variable that dominantly affects the dependent variable in a multiple linear regression model using the Standardized Coefficients Beta value. With the determination of the results, the higher the Beta value, the greater the influence on the dependent variable. Based on the table above, variable X1 has a standarized coefficient value of -0.076, variable X2 has a value of 0.316, and variable X3 has a value of 0.373, thus the variable that has a dominant effect on performance is the Workload variable (X3).

V.   CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the description that has been presented in chapter 5, the results of this study can be concluded as follows:

1. Toxic Leaderhip, Servant Leadership and Workload simultaneously affect the Performance of Members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police. This means that the better the application of Servant Leadership and workload in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency of performance implementation by employees.

2. Toxic Leaderhip partially has no significant effect on the performance variable. Thus it can be concluded that increasing Toxic Leaderhip does not improve performance. Servant Leadership partially has a significant effect on the performance variable. This implies that the better the application of servant

leadership in the organization by the leadership, the better the tendency of performance implementation by employees. Workload partially has a significant effect on the performance variable. The existence of a significant influence of the workload variable is due to the targets that must be achieved in the sense of how much work an employee of the South Kalimantan Regional Police must complete within a certain period of time.

3. Workload has a dominant effect on the performance of members of the South Kalimantan Regional Police.

Advice

Based on the results of the research above by looking at the indicators of the existing variables, the suggestions that can be conveyed are as follows:

1. The management evaluates the workload, if the workload is high, there should be compensation, so that employee performance becomes better and continues to increase.

2. Create a more harmonious and comfortable working atmosphere for all employees of the South Kalimantan Regional Police, so that it is hoped that South Kalimantan Regional Police employees will be able to care about the unfinished work of fellow coworkers.

3. The management of the South Kalimantan Regional Police needs to maintain and improve the leadership role related to servant leadership so as to improve employee performance and also members. This can be done, for example, by leaders being effective communicators, motivating their subordinates, providing compensation on time, providing regular training and building a good work environment, so that employee performance becomes better and continues to increase.

4. The South Kalimantan Regional Police needs to be maintained and even improved so that the performance of employees can run optimally and well.

5. The leadership of the South Kalimantan Regional Police should pay attention to any changes made so that employee performance does not decrease and employees can produce better performance.

VI.   BIBLIOGRAPHY

AA. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara, 2013, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*, Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung.

Agnew, Palmer W, Kellerman, Anne S, Meyer, Jeanine.(1996).*Multimedia in the classroom*,Allyn and Bacon Boston.

Agusty Ferdinand, 2012, *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*, Badan. Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang.

Aji, Muhammad., dan Palupiningdyah. (2016). Pengaruh *Servant Leadership* terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan *Bournut* sebagai Variabel Intervening.*Management Analysis Journal* 5(3), 2016.

Almasdi, Yusuf Suit. 2000. *Aspek Sikap Mental dalam Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Ariawan, W. 2015. (skripsi yang tidak di publikasikan). *Pengaruh Gaji dan Insentif terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Golden Communication Bandar Lampung*. Ibi Darmajaya.

Barbuto, J.E. dan Wheeler, D.W. (2006). *Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership. Group and Organization Management,* 31:3, 300-326;

Budiharto, Widodo. 2014. *Teori dan Implementasi*. Edisi Revisi. Yogyakarta : Penerbit Andi

Chapra, S. Pelletier, G., 2008. *A Modelling Framework for Simulating River and Stream Water Quality. Olympia,* Environmental Assesment Program Washington State Departement of Ecology

Choi, W., Dobbs, R., Suh, D., Mischke, J., Chon, E., Cho, H., . . . Kim, H. (2013). *Beyond Korean Style: Shaping a new growth formula.* McKinsey Global Institute.

Choyrunnisa, Rima (2019) *Pengaruh Toxic Leadership, Iklim Organisasi, Dan Turnover Intention Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada PT. Global Putra International)*

Dennis, R. (2004). *Development of the Servant Leadership Assesment Instru*men. Dissertation Abstract International, 05, 18-57;

Dian K, Solikhah.2012. Hubungan Kelelahan Kerja Dengan Kinerja Perawat Di Bangsal Rawat Inap Rumah Sakit Islam Fatimah Kabupaten Cilacap. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*. 6(2):162-232.

Edy Sutrisno, 2014. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Cetak Ke Enam. Pranada Media Group, Jakarta.

Feng Yan, et al. 2013. Exposure to Cigarette Smoke Inhibits the Pulmonary T-Cell Response to Influenza Virus and Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Infection and Immunity*. 79 : 235-236

Ferdinand, Augusty. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bp Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang.

Ferdinand. 2012. *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Universitas Indonesia. Jakarta.

Ghozali, Imam. 2012. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program Ibm Spss*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, Imam. 2013. *Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program Spss*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Diponegoro.

Goleman D. 2006. *Emotional Intelligence: Kecerdasan emosional, mengapa EI lebih penting daripada IQ*. Alih bahasa: T. Hermaya. Jakarta: P.T Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Goleman, D. 1999. *Kecerdasan Emosional Untuk Mencapai Prestasi*. (Terjemahan Alex Tri KW). Edisi II. Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Greenberg dan Robert A. Baron. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations, Ninth Edition* New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Greenleaf, R.K., 1970, *The Servant as Leader, Greenleaf Center, Indianapolis,* IN.

Holloway,J. Christopher et.all . (2009). *The Business of Tourism 8th edition.* Pearson Edition Limited. USA

Husein, Umar. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Untuk Skripsi Dan Tesis Bisnis*. Jakarta : Pt.Raja Grafindo Persada.

Indradevi, R. 2016. *The Impact of of Psychological Empowerment on Job* Performance and Job Satisfaction in Indian Software Companies.

Irving, J. A. (2005). Servant Leadership and the Effectiveness of Teams. *Disertation of Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership.*

Irwansyah, Edy. 2013. *Sistem Informasi Geografis: Prinsip Dasar dan Pengembangan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta : Digibooks

Iwan Fauzi, 2017, *Pengaruh Kompetensi, Disiplin Kerja, Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Penyidik Direktorat Reserse Kriminal Umum Kepolisian Daerah* Kalimantan Selatan

Lantu, Donal, dkk (2007). *Servant Leadership*: *The Ultimate Calling to Fulfill Your Life's Greatness.* Cetakan pertama. Gradien Books: Yogyakarta.

Lipman-Blumen, Jean. (2012). Connective Leadership: Female Leadership Styles in the 21st-Century Workplace. *Sociological Perspectives* 35 (1): 183–203.

Mehta, C., & Gupta, P. (2014). Corporate Entrepreneurship: a Study on Entrepreneurial Personality of Employees. *Global Journal of Finance and Management,* 6(4), 305-312.

Muji Rahayu, 2019, *Pengaruh Servant Leadership Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bagian Prosesing Di Kantor Mail Processing Centre* Bandung

Priyatno, Duwi. 2016. *Belajar Alat Analisis Data Dan Cara Pengolahnnya Dengan Spss Praktis Dan Mudah Dipahami Untuk Tinkat Pemula Dan Menengah*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media

Putri Sukma Hayati, 2020, *Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Stres Pada Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Dan Wilayatul Hisbah Kota* Banda Aceh

Rayner, C., Hoel, H. & Cooper. (1997). *Workplace Bullying: What We Know, Who Is To Blame, and What Can We do?*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Russell, R.F., & Stone, A.G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 23(3), 145-157.

S.P,Hasibuan, Malayu. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara

Satpathy D, M. Vikram R, Soumya P D, 2014. Risk Assessment of Heavy Metals Contamination in Paddy Soil, Plants, and Grains (*Oryza sativa L.*) at the East Coast of India. Volume 2014 (2014), Article ID 545473.

Schmidt dan Charles, W. 2014. Beyond Malnutrition: The Role Of Sanitation In Stunted Growth. *Evironmental Health Perspectives.* 122 (11): A298.

Schmitt, Bernd H & Rogers, David L. (2008). *Handbook on Brand and Experience Management.* United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Spears, L.C., 2002. *On character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders.*

Stephen Eka Sapengga, 2016, *Pengaruh Servant Leadership Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Daun Kencana Sakti* Mojokerto

Sugiyono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung: Afabeta.

Wibowo. (2007). *Manajemen Kinerja.* Jakarta: Murai Kencana.

Wibowo. (2011). *Manajemen Kinerja. Edisi Ketiga.* Jakarta: Pt Raja Grafindo Persada.

Winston, W.L. (2002). *Operations Research Applications and Algorithms* (Ed. 4). California : Duxbury Press