

The Knowledge Characteristics Work Design; Analysis of Job Fit Influence on Role Performance

Setyabudi Indartono, Hawjeng Chiou, and Chun-Hsi Vivian Chen
(964401605@cc.ncu.edu.tw)

Department of Business Administration
National Central University, Taiwan

Email: setyabudi_indartono@uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates how work design predicted Performance mediated by personal job Fit. This Study also explored difference of servant Leadership style moderate the model. 407 teachers from several schools in Indonesia were examined. The result indicates personal job fit mediate information processes of knowledge characteristics related to in role performance. Servant leadership moderate the relationship between knowledge characteristics and personal job fit, and moderate the relationship between personal job fit and in role performance. Servant leadership also found moderate these two relationships, differently. Implication of the findings for organizations and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Knowledge characteristics, personal Fit, intra Role Performance, Servant Leadership

INTRODUCTION

Changing the nature of work after Industrial Revolution, spawning the use of assembly-line systems that maximized employee efficiency and minimized the employee skills needed to perform the work. Gilbreth and Taylor (1911) study, focused on specialization and simplification in an attempt to maximize worker efficiency. Yet, one of the problems of designing work to maximize efficiency was to increase employee satisfaction, to decrease turnover and absenteeism, and manage employees in simplified jobs (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). Now days, work design become something of a fad among Leaders and organizational consultants (Hackman, 1975). Work design continues to be of great practical significance to organizations as they try to attain conflicting outcomes such as efficiency and satisfaction. The most popularity programs such as total quality management (Deming, 1986; Juran et al 1988; Waldman, 1994) and reengineering (Hammer et al, 1993), also current trends in human resource management research that consider to HR strategic (Delery & Shaw, 2001) and human capital management (Lepak & Snell, 1999), considered on theoretical and practical implications of job-design research. Trends in designing work, illustrate an important insight the nature of work. It has substantial impact on an employee's performance and attitude (Morgeson, 2005).

Successful work-design initiatives must overcome many obstacles in order to have impact and influences on multiple outcomes such as increase positive behavioral (e.g., job performance) and attitudinal (e.g., job satisfaction) and decrease negative behavioral (Humphrey, 2007).

Work Design has major characteristics categories: task, knowledge, social and work context characteristics (Morgeson and Campion, 2003). They have difference contribution to performance. Highest supporting of performance on work design is average of knowledge characteristics (Humphrey, 2007). Knowledge characteristics reflect the kinds of knowledge, skill, and ability demands that are placed on an individual as a function of what is done on the job (Morgeson, 2006). Knowledge characteristics cover job complexity, information processing, problem solving, skill variety and Specialization (Campion & McClelland, 1993, Morgeson, 2006). Knowledge characteristic has significant influence to wellbeing outcomes such as work overload, job satisfaction and involvement at attitudinal outcomes, and significant to all of critical psychological states (Humphrey, 2007).

Critical psychological cover experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results (Humphrey, 2007). Critical psychological states would independently act as mediators (Johns et al., 1992; Oldham, 1996). Performance mediates differently by these of critical psychological states. Job satisfaction and internal work motivation are fully mediated experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility. Literally thousands of studies have been conducted examining work design issues. There is good reason for such interest, as study after study has shown that work design is important for a range of individual, group, and organizational (Morgeson & Campion, 2003; Parker & Wall, 1998; Wall & Martin, 1987). Previous study also found that there was a relationship of Performance and personal fit (O'Reilly et al 1991, Chatman 1991, Edward 1996, Judge 1996, Saks 1997).

Personal Fit is described as an inventory assessment of both the needs-supplies and the knowledge, Skills, and abilities associated with the job (Kristof et all, 2005). If employee perceives of fit on job or organization, he/she will support critical psychology appeared. Based on this relationship, we suggested that there are relations among knowledge characteristics of work design, personal job fit and performance. Thus, this study was to extend the literature on work design investigate how Personal Job Fit mediate relationship between knowledge characteristics and Performance. We also explored moderation of servant leadership style on the model.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Work Design

Since job design study interest and discussions, conceptually and practically development of job design was widely accepted and applied in several situation. Variety program has developed job design such as total quality management (Deming, 1986; Juran et al 1988; Waldman, 1994), reengineering (Hammer et al, 1993), Job enlargement and enrichment (Hackman, 1975), and growth or downsizing jobs. Work design also attract to discuss more on multiple outcomes, different approaches studies, predicting the nature of the job, individual differences complications, and it's long and short-term effects (Campion et al, 2005).

In the first stage, job design concept was concern of Taylor studies (1911). It is intense interest in motivational aspects of work in the 1970s (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Then, it became most commonly used on job design measure, the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Work design was focused on a narrow set of motivational job characteristics, retains a central place in work design theory today. Extended by Campion 1988; Campion & Thayer, 1985, they developed more comprehensive Multi method Job Design Questionnaire (MJDQ). Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that five work characteristics make jobs more satisfying for workers: autonomy (i.e., the freedom an individual has in carrying out work), skill variety (i.e., the extent to which an individual must use different skills to perform his or her job), task identity (i.e., the extent to which an individual can complete a whole piece of work), task significance (i.e., the extent to which a job impacts others' lives), and feedback from the job (i.e., the extent to which a job imparts information about an individual's performance). These work characteristics were expected to increase positive behavioral (e.g., job performance) and attitudinal (e.g., job satisfaction) outcomes and decrease negative behavioral outcomes (e.g., absenteeism). It also mediated their influence on three critical psychological states: experienced meaningfulness (i.e., the degree to which an employee feels the job has value and importance), experienced responsibility (i.e., the degree to which an employee feels liable and accountable for job results), and knowledge of results (i.e., the degree to which the employee is aware of his or her level of performance).

Although work design research has slowed in the Industrial/Organizational (I/O) psychology and management fields during the past 20 years, it is important that researchers continue to investigate this topic, as the design of work has a profound effect on employees' behavior, attitudes, and well-being (Campion, Mumford, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005). More than 34% of the variance in performance and more than 55% of the variance in job satisfaction was a function of the 14 work characteristics and behaviors (Humphrey et al 2007).

This study focused on knowledge characteristics. This characteristic has highest contribution to performance. Knowledge characteristics that covered job complexity, Information processing, Problem solving, skill variety and Specialization (Campion &

McClelland, 1993, Morgeson, 2006), reflect the kinds of knowledge, skill, and ability demands that are placed on an individual as a function of what is done on the job (Morgeson, 2006). Job complexity refers to the extent to which the tasks on a job are complex and difficult to perform. Information processing mean that the amount of information processing needed at work reflects the degree to which a job requires attending to and processing data or other information. Some jobs require higher levels of monitoring and active information processing than others (Martin & Wall, 1989; Wall & Jackson, 1995; Wall et al., 1995). Problem solving reflects the degree to which a job requires unique ideas or solutions and reflects the more active cognitive processing requirements of a job (Jackson, Wall, Martin, & Davids, 1993; Wall et al., 1995). Problem solving involves generating unique or innovative ideas or solutions, diagnosing and solving non routine problems, and preventing or recovering from errors (Jackson et al., 1993; Wall, Corbett, Clegg, Jackson, & Martin, 1990). It is conceptually related to the creativity demands of work and is a natural extension to the information demands of a job (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000). Skill variety reflects the extent to which a job requires an individual to use a variety of different skills to complete the work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). It is important to distinguish skill variety from task variety because the use of multiple skills is distinct from the performance of multiple tasks. The use of multiple skills is often challenging and thereby engaging to perform. Specialization reflects the extent to which a job involves performing specialized tasks or possessing specialized knowledge and skill. Average of knowledge characteristics has highest supporting to performance (Humphrey, 2007)

Therefore, the research extended prediction:

Hypothesis 1: Knowledge characteristics is positively related to performance

Personal Fit

The fit between individual characteristics and job requirements is frequently uses to explain job performance and satisfaction (O'Reilly, 1990). Person fit included person job fit (PJ Fit) and person organization fit (PO fit). PJ fit study is based on two broad definitions: desires/supplies fit and demands/abilities fit. Employee to available job supplies fit, to job satisfaction, motivation and goal setting (Edwards, 1991). The most common forms of employee desires are psychological needs, goals, values, interests, and preferences. These desires have been associated with job pay, decision making latitude, role clarity, enrichment characteristics and occupational characteristics (Edwards, 1991). The second of job fit definition refers to the compatibility between an individual's knowledge, skill and abilities (KSA'a) with the demands of the job. This type of PJ Fit is most commonly found in job stress, job performance retention, and promotion studies. Recent researcher distinguish PJ Fit is an inventory assessment of both organizational and vocational characteristics (Edward, 1991, kristof 1996, werbel and Gilliland, 1999). PJ Fit related to

performance (Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1990), job satisfaction and subjective performance (O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell 1991, cable and judge 1996, Chatman, 1989; Chatman and Barsade, 1995; Harris and Mossholder, 1996; Silverhart and Hinchliffe, 1996, Saks and Ashfort 1997).

Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that work characteristics impact behavioral and attitudinal outcomes through critical psychological states. They are experienced responsibility (i.e., the degree to which an employee feels liable and accountable for job results), knowledge of results (i.e., the degree to which the employee is aware of his or her level of performance) and varieties of performance mediators (Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1990, Chatman and Caldwell 1991, cable and judge 1996, Saks and Ashfort 1997). Humprey (2007) suggested that modification of mediation model for work characteristics to work outcome relationships is experienced meaning. It is not surprising that meaningfulness is the best mediator relationships between work characteristics and work outcomes. We also expected the personal job fit relates to knowledge characteristics and performance.

Thus we predict

Hypothesis 2: Knowledge characteristic is positively related to Personal Job Fit

Hypothesis 3: Personal Job Fit is positively related to performance

Hypothesis 4: Personal Job Fit mediated correlation between Knowledge Characteristics and in role Performance

Servant Leadership

Several meta-analytic summarized and extended the literature on work design for individual-level jobs. Few studies tested the relationship between leader behaviors and person-fit (Li 2006). Leader can influence the level of person fit (Reichers, 1987). These indications directed us to define relation between work design with job and performance in the broader work environment (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006), such as Leadership contributions.

Generally, Study found Leadership related to employees' motivation, commitment, empowerment (Cantor and Bernay, 1992; Cleland, 1994; Helgesen, 1990; Hoffarth, 1993; Stanford et al., 1995) improve communications, enhance participation and involvement (Helgesen, 1990; Hoffarth, 1993; Johnson, 1976; Stanford et al., 1995), and improve satisfaction and performance (Heller and Yukl, 1969). Leader behaviors are be able to involve interaction between the leader and his or her subordinates more intensive, may have greater impact, by affecting the values, attitudes and behaviors of subordinates (Meglino et al., 1991; Weiss, 1978). The leader behavior such as being a good listener, showing empathy, sharing information with others, and a 'soft' approach in dealing with people, fostering mutual trust and respect among organizational members command-and-control-oriented, will have different outcomes (Li, 2006). It mean that Leadership

were able to both supported and withdraw employee desire and close to performance effort.

Organizational leaders show wide variations in the styles and behaviors. The styles are charismatic, transactional, and transformational leadership (Oshagbemi, 2005). Each Style relate with behavioral and attitudinal outcomes differently. Such as affective commitment, job enrichment, satisfaction, performance (Jung, 2000, Whittington 2004, Chen, 2005, Roward 2007, Schaubroeck 2007, Daviddizar 2007, Vecchio 2008, Limsila 2008), obligation and trust (Jung, 2000; Chen, 2005; Twigg, 2008), stimulates employees' creativity and innovation (Politis, 2004), related to emotional intelligence (cherril, 2008), Organization Condition (Leithwood, 1999), value (Jung, 2000), provides additional endorsement for model (Schwartz 1999). These leadership styles and behaviors were varying in the extent to which leaders adopted the following styles and behaviors in their day-to-day activities (Bass, 1974; Bass et al., 1975; Bass and Avolio, 1990). Some leaders use a variety of leadership styles and behaviors in their day-to-day activities, while others utilized one or two of the leadership styles or behavior dimensions (Oshagbemi, 2005).

Previous study found a concept of servant leadership. It began with the natural feeling that one wants to serve and to serve first. It was identified by ten characteristics as the essence of a servant leader. The characteristics were listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and building community. Several educational theorists, such as Bolman, Deal, Covey, Fullan, Sergiovanni, and Heifetz also reference these characteristics as essential components to effective leadership. This concept of servant-leadership addresses to the leader's personal characteristics such moral objects (Turner, 1998). Servant leadership also relate to both behavioral and attitudinal outcomes such as Job satisfaction (Ikel, 2005) and motivation (Graham, 1995). Servant leaders serve their followers best and encourage others not only to engage in independent moral reasoning, but also to follow it up with constructive participation in organizational governance (Graham, 1995).

Thus, this Study also tried to observe servant leadership style as moderator within WDQ and performance relationship, and we predict:

Hypothesis 5: Servant Leadership style moderated relationship between Knowledge Characteristic and personal job fit

Hypothesis 6: Servant Leadership style moderated relationship between personal job fit and performance

Hypothesis 7: Servant Leadership style moderate relationship of knowledge characteristic-personal job fit and relationship of personal job fit-in role performance differently.

METHOD

Participants

The sample in this study consists of 407 teachers from several schools. Thirty three point four percent samples are male. The age of sample range from 18.92 to 60 years, and mean sample ages was 34.7 years. Collecting data process were conduct in several province of Indonesia from Aceh to east Java in February to May 2008. Data collected directly from the participants by staff researchers, and pooled in each regions.

Hypothesis testing

A confirmatory analysis used Factor analysis with maximum likelihood extraction (Costello and Osbourne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999) constructing development questionnaire items. Cronbach's coefficient will be used as the test of questionnaire reliability. Analysis of regression used to indicate the correlation, mediation and moderation. Amos version 7 software, used by this study to evaluate the adequacy of the model of fit (arbucl and wothke 1999, joreskog and sorborn 2001, kelloway 1998, McDonald and Ho 2002, Reykov et al. 1991). Index of fit used were Goodness of fit Index (GFI), Adjustment Goodness of fit Index (AGFI), Comparative fit index (CFI), Norm Fit Index (NFI), Tucker-Lewis coefficient (TLI) and root mean square residual (RMR).

RESULT

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 reports the means for all Variable and dimension questionnaire. All questions had answers spanning the entire range, from the minimum of one to the maximum of five.

Descriptive Statistics							
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
JC	400	1.00	5.00	3.0939	.74371	.022	1.14
IPs	405	1.50	5.00	4.1215	.60593	-.303	1.13
SV	402	2.00	5.00	3.9540	.72223	-.301	1.13
PS	407	1.00	5.00	3.9454	.58953	-.537	1.13
Spec	406	2.00	5.00	4.0433	.53042	-.547	1.13
Know	432	2.50	5.00	3.3419	.40427	-.032	1.15
PF	402	1.63	5.00	3.7212	.41272	-.530	1.13
IRP	400	1.33	5.00	3.5137	.41227	-.375	1.14
SL	470	1.33	5.00	3.3317	.52331	-.934	1.13
Valid N (listwise)	440						

Table 1 - 1 : Mean of Variable and dimension

JC = Job complexity, IPs=Information processes, SV=Skill variety, PS=Problem Solving, Spec=Specialization, Know = Knowledge characteristics, PF=Personal job fit, IRP=in role performance, SL=Servant leadership.

Reliability and Validity Analysis

The coefficient cronbach's alpha for reliability of the knowledge characteristic items scale is .797 with instruments validities from .337 to .562. Four items of knowledge characteristic <.3 were deleted. Personal job fit items scale is .764 with instruments validities from .443 to .628. Three items of personal job fit <.3 were deleted. In Role Performance items scale is .655 with instruments validities from .442 to .511. Service leadership items cronbach's alpha was .950 instruments validities from .361 to .784.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Rotated Factor Matrix ^a			
JC_1			.323
JC_2			.741
JC_3			
JC_4			.705
IP_1		.415	
IP_2		.435	
IP_3		.409	
IP_4		.427	
PG_2		.537	
PG_3		.332	
PG_4		.541	
SV_1	.745		
SV_2	.742		
SV_3	.458		.312
SV_4	.829		
Spec_1			.444
Spec_2			.440
Spec_3			.731
Spec_4		.340	.710

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

a.

Table - 2 : Factor Analysis of Knowledge Characteristics items

The Knowledge Characteristics items were also factor analyzed using maximum likelihood extraction (Castelo and Osborn, 2005; fabriger et al 1999). For the initial Eigenvalue factor analysis, the first factor has total of 5.515, and 29.028% accounted variance. The next third factors had total value 1.948 ranging from 10.250% to 39.278% of the variance, 1.680 ranging from 8.845% to 48.122% of the variance, 1.316 ranging from 6.925% to 55.048% of the variance, and 1.113 ranging from 5.858% to 60.905% of the variance. A two-factor solution was also attempted (as

per the Eigenvalue >1 criterion), using an oblique rotation (Costello and Osbourne, 2005).

Table II displays the results of factor solutions. The solution were job characteristic (JC_1, JC_2, JC_4), information processing (IP_1 to IP_4), problem solving (PS_1 to PS_4), Skill Variety (SV_1 to SV_4), and Specialization (Spec_1 to Spec_4). Based on Tabachnick and Fidell's (2001), we recommend employing criterion of at least 0.32 as the minimum loading for keeping items. This study found factor load consistently items to each dimension of conceptual knowledge characteristics dimensions approach.

Rotated Factor Matrix^a

pf1	.737
pf2	-.651
pf3	.606
pf4	.555
pf5	.727
pf6	.827
pf7	.830
pf8	.523

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

a.

Table - 3 : Factor Analysis of Person Fit

Factor analyzed showed in table III, of Personal Job Fit using maximum likelihood extraction, for the initial Eigenvalue factor analysis, the first factor has total of 3.554, and 44.425% accounted variance. The other factor had total value 1.401 ranging from 17.518% to 61.943% of the variance. This study found factor load consistently items to each mension of conceptual personal job fit approach (pf3 to pf8)

Rotated Factor Matrix^a

f1	3.554
f2	1.401
f3	1.401
f4	1.401
f5	1.401
f6	1.401
f7	1.401

Rotated Factor Matrix^a

s8	545		
s9	421		
s10	454		
s11		924	
s12		427	
s13		591	
s14		564	
s15		513	
s16		709	
s17		728	
s18			
s19		491	
s20		515	
s21			495
s22			713
s23			725

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood

a.

Table - 4 : Factor Analysis of Service Leadership

Factor analyzed in table IV of servant leadership using maximum likelihood extraction, for the initial Eigenvalue factor analysis, the first factor has total of 11.613, and 50.491% accounted variance. The other factor had total value 1.316 ranging from 5.721% to 56.212% of the variance and 1.130 ranging from 4.914% to 61.126% of the variance. This study found factor load consistently items to each dimension of conceptual servant leadership dimensions approach. S1 to s10 were represented of commitment dimension, s11 to s15 were represented of service dimension and s21 to s23 were represented of vision dimension.

Rotated Factor Matrix^a

ip1	.727		
ip2	.726		
ip3	.756		
ip4	.729		
ip5	.625		
ip6		.994	
ip7		.528	

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

a.

Table - 5 : Factor Analysis of In Role Performance

Factor analyzed showed in table IV of in role performance using maximum likelihood extraction, for the initial Eigenvalue factor analysis, the first factor has total of 3.047, and 43.531% accounted variance. The other factor had total value 1.522 ranging from 21.744% to 65.274% of the variance. This study found factor load consistently items to each dimension of conceptual in role performance approach (ip1 to ip5).

Overall of fit

Multiple fit indices were adopted to evaluate the adequacy of the model of fit (arbucl and wothke 1999, joreskog and sorborn 2001, kelloway 1998, McDonald and Ho 2002, Reykov et al. 1991). The final CFA model knowledge characteristics showed an fairly fit to our data: goodness of model fit statistics were $\chi^2(df=160)=3.48$, Comparative fit index (CFI) = .896, Norm Fit Index (NFI) = .871, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)= 0.063.

Hypothesis testing

Correlations					
PF	.134 **	.220 **	.064	.184 **	.355 **
IRP	.227 **	.153 **	.228 **	.209 **	.275 **
SL	.228 **	.112 *	.120 *	.178 **	.252 **

**
*:

Table - 6 : Correlation between data characteristics and variables

Table VI showed the relation between all dimension of knowledge characteristics and in role performance (r-JC=.227, r-IPs=.153, r-PS=.228, r-SV=.206, r-spec=.275) were significant ($p < 0.01$), thus supported hypothesis-1. Relation between dimensions of knowledge characteristics (excluded problem solving) and personal job fit (r-JC=.135, r-IPs=.220, r-SV=.184, r-spec=.355) were significant ($p < 0.01$), thus supported hypothesis-2. Also relation between personal job fit and in role performance ($r=.274$) was significant ($p < 0.01$), thus supported hypothesis-3.

Personal Fit Mediation

Regarding to the Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggestion of job fit and its relationship to performance (Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1990, Chatman and Caldwell 1991, cable and judge 1996, Saks and Ashfort 1997), we expected personal job fit relate to knowledge characteristics and performance. PJ fit mediate the relationships between knowledge characteristic and performance. This study used three equation approach based on baron and Kenny (1986). Personal fit will be as a mediator on relationship between knowledge characteristics or its dimension and in role performance. The procedure was regressed the

mediator on the independent variable, dependent variable on the independent variable, and finally dependent variable simultaneously on both the independent variable and on the mediator. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), mediation is demonstrated if the independent variable affects the mediator in their first equation and the dependent variable in their second equation, the mediator affects the dependent variable in their third equation and the effect of the independent on the dependent variable is less in the third than the second equation. Table-VII (VIIa to VIIe) showed that personal fit have no mediation the relationship between knowledge characteristics and in role performance ($\beta=.348^{**}$; $\beta'=.288^{**}$), personal fit have no mediation the relationship between job characteristics and in role performance ($\beta=.227^{**}$; $\beta'=.194^{**}$), personal fit mediated the relationship between information processes and in role performance ($\beta=.153^{**}$; $\beta'=.097$), personal fit have no mediation the relationship between Skill Variety and in role performance ($\beta=.209^{**}$; $\beta'=.156^{**}$), personal fit have no mediation the relationship between Problem Solving and in role performance ($\beta=.228^{**}$; $\beta'=.208^{**}$), personal fit have no mediation the relationship between Specification and in role performance ($\beta=.275^{**}$; $\beta'=.202^{**}$). Therefore only personal fit mediated the relationship between information processes and in role performance, Thus Hypothesis-4 was not supported.

Equation	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	β in independent variable	r	R ²
1	Knowledge Characteristics	Personal Job Fit	.181 **	.4818 **	0.094
2	Knowledge Characteristics	In role Performance	.143 **	.4331 **	0.131
3	Knowledge Characteristics	In role Performance	.333 **	.4937 **	0.171
	Personal Job Fit	In role Performance	.374 **	.4337 **	0.071

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table - 7 : Mediated regression analysis for knowledge characteristics

Equation	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	β in independent variable	r	R ²
1	Job Characteristics	Personal Job Fit	.114 **	.3389 **	0.032
2	Job Characteristics	In role Performance	.339 **	.3187 **	0.038
3	Job Characteristics	In role Performance	.194 **	.3494 **	0.031
	Personal Job Fit	In role Performance	.374 **	.4337 **	0.071

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 7.a. : Mediated regression analysis for job characteristics

Equation	Independent Variable		β (in independent variable)	r	R ²
	Dependent Variable				
1	Information processing	Personal Job Id	.338 **	.38414 **	0.049
2	Information processing	In-role Performance	.171 **	0.066 **	0.031
1	Information processing	In-role Performance	.297	0.099 **	0.034
	Personal Job Id	In-role Performance	.274 **	0.025 **	0.077

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 7.b. : Mediated regression analysis for Information processing

Equation	Independent Variable		β (in independent variable)	r	R ²
	Dependent Variable				
1	360 Needs	Personal Job Id	.134 **	0.073 **	0.04
2	360 Needs	In-role Performance	.289 **	0.263 **	0.041
1	360 Needs	In-role Performance	.176 **	0.019 **	0.077
	Personal Job Id	In-role Performance	.274 **	0.025 **	0.077

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 7.c. : Mediated regression analysis for Skill Variety

Equation	Independent Variable		β (in independent variable)	r	R ²
	Dependent Variable				
1	Problem Solving	Personal Job Id	.264	0.011	0.004
2	Problem Solving	In-role Performance	.333 **	0.094 **	0.010
1	Problem Solving	In-role Performance	.383 **	0.070 **	0.110
	Personal Job Id	In-role Performance	.274 **	0.025 **	0.077

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 7.d. : Mediated regression analysis for problem solving

Equation	Independent Variable		β (in independent variable)	r	R ²
	Dependent Variable				
1	Specialization	Personal Job Id	.177 **	0.016 **	0.026
2	Specialization	In-role Performance	.277 **	0.076 **	0.076
1	Specialization	In-role Performance	.383 **	0.070 **	0.110
	Personal Job Id	In-role Performance	.274 **	0.025 **	0.077

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 7.e. : Mediated regression analysis for Specialization

Servant Leadership Moderation

Moderating effect of knowledge characteristics and personal job fit and in role performance

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	3.77	1.07
Servant leadership	4.88	1.01
Self-leadership	3.78	1.04
Age	34.73	8.89
Gender	1.85	.40
FF	3.73	.47
ICF	3.54	.47
SL	3.83	.57

Table Caption
 ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 gender 1 female

Table 8 : Mean and standard deviation

Equal	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	ΔR ²	ΔF change	β (independent variable)
1	Knowledge characteristics	Personal Job Fit	.394**		.387**
2	Servant leadership	Personal Job Fit	.394**		.317**
3	SL + SL	Personal Job Fit		.108**	.116**

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 9.a. : Servant leadership moderator regression analysis for knowledge characteristics

Equal	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	ΔR ²	ΔF change	β (independent variable)
1	Personal Job Fit	In role performance	.377*		.374**
2	Servant leadership	In role performance	.367*		.361**
3	SL + SL	In role performance		.106**	.141**

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 9.b. : Servant leadership moderator regression analysis for personal job fit
 Table IX-a showed that Service Leadership moderated the relationship between

knowledge characteristics and personal job fit (β and βR change of X^*M_o was significant), thus hypothesis-5 was supported. Table IX-b showed that service leadership moderated the relationship between personal job fit and in role performance (β and βR change of X^*M_o were significant), thus hypothesis-6 was supported.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	β in independent variable
Servant Leadership	Personal job fit	.319 **
High SL	Personal job fit	.116 **
Low SL	Personal job fit	.319 **
Servant Leadership	In role performance	.361 **
High SL	In role performance	.141 **
Low SL	In role performance	.361 **

Table 10 : Effect of moderation showed for high and low of each independent variable:

Table X showed the value of Effect of moderation showed for high and low of each independent variable of servant leadership moderate on knowledge characteristics (LE=.037;HE=.379) that was less than servant leadership moderate on personal job fit (LE=.067;HE=.455), thus hypothesis-7 was supported.

CONCLUSION

Discussion

From above finding, we see that all dimensions of knowledge characteristic related to in role performance. It was consist with Humphrey (2007) study. Job complexity which was the extent to which a job is multifaceted and difficult to perform would tend to be mentally demanding was likely hurt efficiency. Skill variety supports performing a job (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Information processing was expected to change the requirements for jobs in order complete their work (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Problem solving which was the extent to which a job requires the production of unique solutions or ideas solved non routine problems, and dealing with (or preventing) errors (Jackson, Wall, Martin, & Davids, 1993; Wall, Corbett, Clegg, Jackson, & Martin, 1990). Problem solving also provide a chance for employees to perform in challenging, novel situations in which they can demonstrate and reinforce their sense of competence on the job (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Specialization which was extended to which a job involves the performance of tasks requiring specific knowledge and skill, would increase job efficiency (Morgeson & Campion, 2002) and performance. It also may make work more motivating by requiring a depth of knowledge in a specific area (Humprey, 2007). All of these

work characteristics would increase performance.

Knowledge characteristics dimensions (excluded problem solving) related to *personal job fit*. It was consist with previous Kristof et all (2005) study. This characteristic was one of demand-ability fit of person job fit (Edwards, 1991) such as skill variety or specialization with the demands of the job such as job complexity. This study found that problem solving was not needed on ability's fit. It is open opportunities to observe this finding more deeply.

Relation between *personal job fit* and *in role performance* consist with previous studies. The fit involves identifying the complete set of skills and abilities that are necessary for successful performance in a particular job (Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1990, O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell 1991), fit are significantly related to work outcomes (Saks and Ashfort 1997, Cable and judge 1996, Chatman, 1989; Chatman and Barsade, 1995; Harris and Mossholder, 1996, Silverhart and Hinchliffe, 1996).

The finding that *personal job fit* mediates the relationship between *information processes* dimension of knowledge characteristics and *in role performance* provides insight into how job aspects and individual characteristics are translated into performance outcomes. Information processing has theoretically link to performance (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). It is expected to change the requirements for jobs in order complete their work. This direct relationship has been small. Personal job fit increase R^2 , relation between information processes and in role performance, from 0.023 to 0.084, change the requirements in order complete the works.

Service Leadership moderated the relationship between *knowledge characteristics* and *personal job fit*, and moderated the relationship between *personal job fit* and *in role performance* consisted with previous research. Previous research has shown that leadership was related to expanded work roles. By investigating servant leadership, it shows individuals with greater been served are likely to perform more work tasks (Hofmann et al., 2003).

Effect of moderation of servant leadership, moderate on knowledge characteristics was less than moderate on personal job fit. It was because the self effort on job fit is greater to support encourage to performance.

Managerial Implication

Personal job fit mediation on relation between *information processes* of knowledge characteristics and *in role performance*, have number of implications. Firstly, this research adds to our understanding of critical psychological states act as mediators independently (Johns et al., 1992; Oldham, 1996, Humphrey, 2007). In previous research experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results (Humphrey, 2007) independently act as mediators (Johns et al., 1992; Oldham, 1996).

By investigating knowledge characteristics, this research demonstrates the personal job fit mediate information process of knowledge characteristics on in role performance. These findings are important, although personal job fit mediated only on information processes dimension of knowledge characteristics. Secondly, adequate information were needed in an occupation would help the job perform better (Saks and Ashfort 1997). The current research suggests that it would influence how the information be flowed through the job, organization structure and organizational chart.

Servant leadership was act as moderator of relation between knowledge characteristics-personal job fit and relation of knowledge characteristics-in role performance. The implications of this research adds to our understanding of indications define work design as the attributes of the task, job, social and organizational environment, relate the job and the broader work environment (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Previous research sought servant leadership related to both behavioral and attitudinal outcomes such as Job satisfaction (Ikel, 2005), and motivation (Graham, 1995). This research demonstrates servant leadership is useful to meaningfully group on fitting and perform the job (Oshagbemi, 2005). The current research also suggests that how to maximize leader natural feeling that one wants to serve and to serve first (Turner, 1998, Ikel, 2005, Graham, 1995)

Limitation and Future Research Direction

Notwithstanding these contributions, this study also has several limitations. As noted, this research has a single occupation. They are teachers from several school levels. Although this allows us to rule out knowledge characteristics of job design-related explanations for the observed findings (i.e., personal fit, in role performance and servant leadership), it is an open question as to whether these results will generalize to other, different occupations. It is also important to recognize that our performance measure focused on in role performance (O'Reilly and Chatman 1986). Extra role performance such as organizational citizenship behavior-OCB (Katz, 1964, Larry J William, 1991) was not included. In role performance reflects activities that are formally recognized as part of the job and support the organization's technical core, whereas contextual performance such as OCB reflects the activities that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Our results are likely limited to an in role performance because our work design reflects to the knowledge characteristics. We suggest extra role performance elements reflect to the social characteristics on work design (Morgeson, 2006).

Finally, although these results support our hypotheses, additional research should be conducted to measure extra role performance outcomes and explore in more different occupations. Also investigate other mediation variables and variety of moderators. In order to confirm the causal ordering of this model, using experimental or quasi experimental research designs is needed to help rule out potential alternative explanations for these results (Morgeson, 2006).

References

- Baron R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986), **The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations.** *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J., (1990), The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, and organizational development, *Research in Organizational change and development*, vol, 4 pp 231-72.
- Bass B.M., Farrow, D.L., Valenzi, E.R. and Solomon, R.J.,(1975), Management styles associated with organizational, task, personal and interpersonal contingencies, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol 60., No 6, pp. 720-9
- Bass, B.M., (1974), The bass-valenzi management styles profile: A computerized systems survey feedback procedure, *IRGOMTR report 74-12*, Management Research center, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.
- Bechtel, W. (1988), Philosophy of science: An overview for cognitive science. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. In Humphrey, et all 2007, Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Cable D.M. and Judge, T.A. (1996), person organization fit, job choice decision and organizational entry, *Organizational behavior and Human decision processes* 67 pp 294-311
- Caldwell, David F., O'Reilly, Charles A., III, (1990), Measuring Person-Job Fit with a Profile-Comparison Process., *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Washington: Dec 1990. Vol. 75, Iss. 6; p. 648 (10 pages)
- Campion M. A., & McClelland, C. L. (1993), Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 339–351.
- Campion M.A (1988), Interdisciplinary approaches to job design: A constructive replication with extensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 467–481.
- Campion, M. A., & Thayer, P. W. (1985), Development and field evaluation of an interdisciplinary measure of job design, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 29–43.
- Campion, M. A., Mumford, T. V., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Work redesign: Obstacles and opportunities, *Human Resource Management*, 44, 367–390.
- Chatman, J.A., (1991), matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms, *Administrative science quarterly*, 36 pp. 459-484
- Chen, Lien-Tung, D.B.A., (2005), Exploring the relationship among transformational and transactional leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover on the IT Department of Research and Development in Shanghai, China, 202 pages; AAT 3169070
- Cherril, Meredith L, (2008), The relationship of emotional intelligence and transformational leadership behavior in non-profit executive leaders, 191 pages; AAT 3290654

- Davidhizar, Ruth, and Robbins, Beverly, (2007), Transformational Leadership in Health Care *Today The Health Care Manager*, Vol. 26, Iss. 3; pg. 234
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior, *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Edward, JR. (1996), An examination of competing versions of the person-environment fit approach to stress, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 292-339.
- Edwards J. R., Scully, J. A., & Brtek, M. D. (1999). The measurement of work: Hierarchical representation of the multimethod job design questionnaire, *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 305–334.
- Edwards, (1991). Person–job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In I. T. Robertson & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 283–357). Oxford, England: Wiley.
- Fabrigar L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research, *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272–299.
- Gilbreth, F. B. (1911). Motion study. London: Constable. In Humphrey et al, 2007, Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159–170.
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250–279.
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics, *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph*, 55, 259– 286.
- Harris SG, Mossholder KW. (1996). The affective implications of perceived congruence with culture dimensions during organizational transformation, *Journal of Management*, 22(4), 527-547.
- Hofmann D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between LMX and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 170–178.
- Humphrey, Stephen E, Jennifer D. Nahrgang and Frederick P. Morgeson, (2007), Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Ikel, (2005), Servant leadership in higher education: Exploring perceptions of educators and staff employed in a university setting, 86 pages; AAT 3199527
- Jackson, P. R., Wall, T. D., Martin, R., & Davids, K. (1993). New measures of job control, cognitive demand, and production responsibility, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 753–762.

- Johns , G., Xie, J. L., & Fang, Y. (1992). Mediating and moderating effects in job design, *Journal of Management*, 18, 657–676.
- Kristof, R.A., 1996, Person organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement and implications, *Personnel psychology*, 49, pp.1-49
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. In Humphrey et al, 2007, Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Laudan, L. (1977). Progress and its problems: Toward a theory of scientific growth. Berkeley: University of California Press. In Humphrey et al, 2007, Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. London: Open University Press. Lepak & Snell, 1999. in Samuel Ngunia, Peter Slegersb, and Eddie Denessen, 2006, *Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian case*, School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 2006, pp. 145 – 177
- Li Ji, (2006), The interactions between person–organization fit and leadership styles in Asian firms, an empirical testing, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1689–1706
- Limsila, Kedsuda , and Ogunlana, Stephen O., (2008), Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*. Vol. 15, Iss. 2; pg. 164
- Martin R., & Wall, T. D. (1989). Attentional demand and cost responsibility as stressors in shopfloor jobs, *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 69–86.
- Meglino, BM, Ravlin EC, Adkins CL. (1991). Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction, *Human Relations*, 44(5), 481-495.
- Morgeson , F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Minimizing tradeoffs when redesigning work: Evidence from a longitudinal quasi-experiment, *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 589–612.
- Morgeson F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2003), *Work design*, In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 423–452). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Morgeson F. P., Delaney-Klinger, K. A., & Hemingway, M. A. (2005). The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 399–406.
- Morgeson Frederick P. and Stephen E. Humphrey, (2006), The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and Validating a Comprehensive Measure for Assessing Job Design and the Nature of Work, *Journal*

of *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91, No. 6, 1321–1339, Copyright 2006 by the American Psychological Association

- O'Reilly III, C.C., Chatman, J., and Caldwell, D.F., (1991), people and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit, *Academy of Management Journal*, pp. 487-516
- Oldham G. R. (1996). Job design. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 33–60.
- O'Reilly, 1990, In Humphrey et al, 2007, Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 5, 1332–1356
- Oshagbemi Titus, (2005), Age influences on the leadership styles and behaviour of managers *Employee Relations*, pg. 14
- Parker S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 835–852.
- Politis, John D.,(2004), Transformational and Transactional Leadership Predictors of the 'Stimulant' Determinants to Creativity in Organisational Work Environments, Higher Colleges of Technology,UEA
- Roward, Jens, Heinitz, Kathrin, (2007), Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 18, Iss. 2; pg. 121
- Saks, A.M., and Ashfort, B.E., (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information source, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes., *personnel psychology*, 50, pp. 395-426
- Schaubroeck, Lam, John, Simon S K, Cha, Sandra E, (2007), Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, Iss. 4; pg. 1020
- Schwartz, Susan M., D.B.A., (1999), Transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership: An investigation of Bass's (1985) theory in the perioperative environment, 150 pages; AAT 9938888
- Staw, B. M., & Boettger, R. D. (1990), Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 534–559.
- Taylor F. W. (1911), *The principles of scientific management*, New York: Norton.
- Twigg, Nicholas W J, Fuller, Bryan, Hester, Kim, (2008), Transformational Leadership in Labor Organizations: The Effects on Union Citizenship Behaviors, *Journal of Labor Research*, Fairfax: Mar 2008. Vol. 29, Iss. 1; pg. 27
- Vecchio, Robert P, Justin, Joseph E, Pearce, Craig L, (2008), The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 81, Iss. 1; pg. 71

- Wall T. D., & Martin, R. (1987). Job and work design. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 61–91). Oxford, England: Wiley.
- Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (1995). New manufacturing initiatives and shopfloor job design. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp. 139–174). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wall, T. D., Corbett, J. M., Clegg, C. W., Jackson, P. R., & Martin, R. (1990). Advanced manufacturing technology and work design: Towards a theoretical framework, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 201– 219.
- Werbel, J.D., and Gilliland, S.W., (1999). Person-environment fit in the selection process. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, vol. 17, pp. 209-243
- Williams J Larry and Anderson E stella, (1991), Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in role behavior, *Journal of management*, Vol. 17., no. 3, p 601-617

Measurement Appendix

Work Design Questionnaire

Knowledge Characteristics

Job Complexity

1. *The job requires that I only do one task or activity at a time (reverse scored).*
2. *The tasks on the job are simple and uncomplicated (reverse scored).*
3. *The job comprises relatively uncomplicated tasks (reverse scored).*
4. *The job involves performing relatively simple tasks (reverse scored).*

Information Processing

1. *The job requires me to monitor a great deal of information.*
2. *The job requires that I engage in a large amount of thinking.*
3. *The job requires me to keep track of more than one thing at a time.*
4. *The job requires me to analyze a lot of information.*

Problem Solving

1. *The job involves solving problems that have no obvious correct answer.*
2. *The job requires me to be creative.*
3. *The job often involves dealing with problems that I have not met before.*
4. *The job requires unique ideas or solutions to problems.*

Skill Variety

1. *The job requires a variety of skills.*
2. *The job requires me to utilize a variety of different skills in order to complete the work.*
3. *The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.*
4. *The job requires the use of a number of skills.*

Specialization

1. *The job is highly specialized in terms of purpose, tasks, or activities.*
2. *The tools, procedures, materials, and so forth used on this job are highly specialized in terms of purpose.*
3. *The job requires very specialized knowledge and skills.*

4. *The job requires a depth of knowledge and expertise.*

Person Job Fit (Cable & Judge, 1996 ; Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

1. *I believe my skills and abilities match those required by the internship*
2. *My job performance is hurt by a lack of expertise on the job.*
3. *My knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of the internship*
4. *I possess the skills and abilities to perform this job.*
5. *I feel that this internship enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.*
6. *This internship measures up to the kind of internship I was seeking.*
7. *This internship is a good match for me.*
8. *This internship fulfills my needs.*

In Role Performance (7 items by William and Andersons 1991)

1. **Adequately completes assigned duties**
2. **Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description**
3. **performs task that are expected**
4. **meets formal performance requirements of the jobs**
5. **engages in activities that will directly affect performance evaluation**
6. **neglect aspects of the job is obligated to perform ®**
7. **fails to perform essential duties ®**

Servant leadership instrument

Page and Wong (2003): vision (0.97 Cronbach alpha), empowerment (0.89 Cronbach alpha), and service (0.94 Cronbach alpha).

Service leadership: empowering (10) –service (5) –vision (8)

1. **Actively seeking ways to utilize people's differences as a contribution to the group**
2. **Valuing everyone on his/her team**
3. **very forgiving when others make a mistake and helping them learn from their mistakes**
4. **setting clear and realistic goals**
5. **Usually coming up with solutions accepted by others as helpful and effective**
6. **deriving satisfaction from bringing out the best in others**
7. **modeling for others how everyone can improve the process of production**
8. **willing to have his or her ideas challenged**
9. **not asking anyone to do what he or she is unwilling to do**
10. **willing to share his or her power and authority with others**
11. **not seeking recognition or rewards in serving others**
12. **able to learn from subordinates whom he or she serves**
13. **willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others**
14. **seeking to serve rather than be served**
15. **committed to the concept that leadership is more of responsibility than a position**
16. **motivated by a sense of a higher calling**
17. **driven by values that transcend self interests and material success**
18. **supportive of the belief that every organization needs a higher purpose**
19. **able to articulate a clear sense of purpose and direction for his or her organization's future**
20. **aware of what he or she wants his or her organization to become or do for society**
21. **Able to inspire other with his or her enthusiasm and confidence for what can be accomplished**
22. **very focused and disciplined at work**
23. **leading by example**