

## The Role of Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Culture, and Servant Leadership in The Contextual Performance of The Startup Employees

Aulia  
Postgraduate Psychology  
Ahmad Dahlan University Indonesia  
aulia@psy.uad.ac.id

Ciptasari Prabawati  
Postgraduate Psychology  
Ahmad Dahlan University Indonesia  
ciptasari.prabawanti@psy.uad.ac.id

Zaenal Wafa  
Fakultas Ekonomi, Mercu Buana  
Yogyakarta  
zaenalwafa@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id

### Abstract

A functional performance assessment is crucial for planning an employee's career development working in the company. Nevertheless, related to the performance, so far, conceptually, it is divided into two, e.g., task and contextual performance. Subsequently, directly or indirectly, contextual performance influences individual task performance. Therefore, the study related to particular contextual performance becomes an essential matter to discuss. This study related to contextual performance is relatively scarce; moreover, it does not even find primarily in startup companies. The research objective is to observe the role of perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership on contextual performance. The method in this study is quantitative correlation research. The participants in this research are startup employees who are actively working. The instrument for collecting data is a psychological scale consisting of a contextual performance scale, perceived organizational support scale, organizational culture scale, and servant leadership scale. The data analysis technique employs multiple regression analysis. The research result indicates that the coefficient values are  $R=0.589$ ,  $F=4.615$ , and  $p=0.01$  ( $p<0,05$ ). Based on the data analysis result, simultaneously, perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership is indeed contributed to contextual performance.

**Keywords:** Organizational culture, Contextual performance, Perceived organizational support, servant leadership, Startup

Received 8 January 2022/Accepted 29 May 2022 ©Author all rights reserved

### Introduction

Many startup companies are identical to technology in the modern era, and people know them as startups. In Indonesia, the development of startup companies has been very fast in the last several years. The government strongly supports the growth of startup companies; even more, some programs were arranged to showcase the government's support, one of them is a thousand startup movement'. Through this program, the government wants to generate 1000 new startups in

Indonesia (<http://1000startupdigital.id/>, 2016). In addition, the exciting part is that currently, several Indonesian startups are successfully expanding their business to the international market.

Speaking of a startup is an organization designed to discover a suitable business model to generate maximum profit (Blank, 2013). Generally, a startup has several characteristics, i.e., less than three years, less than twenty employees, the annual sales of less than \$100,000.00, the venture is in a developmental phase, primarily engage business in technology, the product is generally generated application-based in the digital model, generally operating and engaging website and online-based, and most of the entrepreneurs are young people (Ryandono, 2018).

As a startup company, it is common in the development process for the venture experiences many obstacles. According to the previous studies mentioning that 90% of startups (in all sectors) failed to develop their business (Neil, 2015). Afterward, the research survey result conducted by Shikhar Ghosh on over 2.000 startups from 2004 to 2010 in the United States, published by Wall Street Journal (Deborah, 2012), showed that 75% of the Startup that was developing experienced failure in their development. It is found that many factors caused the Startup to fail to expand; one of them is that they did not have a solid team (Griffith, 2014). This indication was supported by Bill's research (Chris, 2017) on 200 startup companies located in Idealab, which explains five factors of startup success, and the solid team as the second top result after timing.

Based on the research conducted by the previous researcher indicating that human resources are the primary aspect of the Startup. Moreover, viewing from a venture capitalist, a team, in this case, human resources, is the most important in determining whether an investor will invest their fund in the venture or not (Uzzaman, 2015). Particularly in the startup company, human resources has a crucial role in assisting the company in growing toward success through their performance. Even today, startup business or enterprise tend to do layoffs on their employees through the assessment result of employee performance. This choice conforms to what has been done by a startup company, *We Work* or *We Company* (Sinintya, 2015), to their employees. Generally, performance assessment is the effort carried out by the company to provide a systematic evaluation or achievement assessment of their employees' performance. Such purpose is to increase employees'

productivity in working. Performance assessment is essential in designing career development for every employee working in the company. It means the employee with excellent working performance will have a good career opportunity in the company, while those with poor performance will likely get layoffs (Sinintya, 2015).

Discussing performance is the objectives achievement of the work plan and organize the steps in achieving the goals within the given deadlines (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Generally, the performance model can be associated with two concepts related to the task and context. Task performance is a determining role (Katz & Kahn, 1978); meanwhile, the contextual performance is somewhat discretionary (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

In this study, the researcher focuses on contextual performance, considering that contextual performance contributes to the organizational, social, and psychological contextual effectivity that functioned as a catalyst for the task and process activity. This means contextual performance has an essential function in the team arrangement in the workplace, which also influences the individual or organizational task performance. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1997), contextual performance is a skill set contributed to an organization that will lead to effectiveness in solving the tasks. The conceptual performance will be seen when the employees voluntarily help their co-workers who are left behind, act in specific ways to maintain good working relations, or put in the extra effort to finish the task on time (Van Scotter, 2000). The aspects of contextual performance, among others, are enthusiasm, voluntary cooperation, obeying regulations, support, and standing up for the organization's objective (Borman et al., 2001<sup>a</sup>).

Contextual performance correlates with the element of assistance and cooperation, which is widely known as prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988), or organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992). Meanwhile, the work assignments are not the same; Borman and Motowidlo (1993) identify five categories of contextual performance, including (a) voluntarily doing the tasks or activities which formally are not part of the job; (b) surviving with extra enthusiasm, if necessary, to complete the task activity successfully by themselves; (c) assist and cooperate with other co-workers; (d) following the organization's

regulations and procedures although they are not comfortable personally; and (e) support, stand up, and maintain organizational objective.

One of the factors influencing contextual performance is organizational support. It conforms to Borman et al.'s (2001<sup>b</sup>) research result indicating that organizational support is one factor that affects contextual performance. In this case, the forms of organizational support, among others, are a reliable organization, a trusted organization, the organization showing interest in its members, and the organization taking care of its members' welfare (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The organizational support, which its members perceive positively, will likely make the employee willing to do the job voluntarily even though it is out of the given scope of work.

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) explain the perceived organizational support as the employees' confidence related to how far the organization can appreciate the employee's efforts or contribution and how the organization thinks of the employees' welfare. The perceived organizational support is global confidence formed by the employees regarding their judgment of the organization, which was constructed based on their experience with the organization's policy and procedures, interaction with organization agents, and the judgment of the organization's concern for their welfare (Eisenberger et al., 1986). There are three main dimensions of perceived organizational support: fairness, supervisor support (superior), organization reward, and job condition (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The other factor influencing contextual performance is organizational culture. This notion conforms to the study conducted by Nofrianda et al. (2020) and Zhang (2016), explaining that organizational culture becomes one factor affecting contextual performance. Organizational culture can change the employees' conduct and attitudes to contribute to the work organization. It can increase the spirit of mutual cooperation, openness among fellow employees, togetherness, and effective communication, which constitutes the element of contextual performance (Oemar, 2013).

Organizational culture is explained by Robbins and Judge (2015) as a shared meaning system believed by its members, which distinguishes the organization from any other organization.

Meanwhile, George and Jones (2012) define organizational culture as a set of common values, trust, and norms that influence the way of thinking, feeling, and employees' behavior toward people. According to Robbins and Judge (2015), the aspect of organizational culture consists of seven characteristics, e.g., orientation and taking risks, attention to detail, orientation to result, orientation to human, orientation to the team, and being aggressive and stable.

Furthermore, aside from perceived organizational support and culture, leadership also becomes essential to be associated with performance. Referring to Sunanda's (2020) study, Islamic leadership influences working performance. Afterward, other research also specifically explains that paternalistic leadership (Malik, 2017) and transformational leadership (Mahayani, 2014) influenced the employees' contextual performance. As such, this research will focus more on servant leadership. Dierendonck and Patterson (2010) explain that servant leadership emphasizes enhancing services toward other people, using a holistic approach to work, promoting a sense of togetherness, and sharing authority in decision-making. Therefore, this leadership model can influence the employees' positive perception of the leader; hence, it can change their conduct and work attitude.

According to Wong and Page (2003), servant leadership is the leader who educates the worker about the importance of working collectively, group spirit, shared vision, and individual responsibility, which can be used for organizational purposes. Servant leadership is marked by the belief that leadership is the learning process that lasts a lifetime (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002). There are four dimensions in servant leadership, e.g., (a) character orientation which focuses on instilling the attitude to serve, and the values, credibility, and leader motives (integrity, humility, and servanthood); (b) people orientation, which focus in developing human resources, the relationship of a leader with people and its commitment to developing other people (caring for others, empowering others, and developing others); (c) task orientation that emphasizes on productivity and success, and focuses on the leader's task and skill required to achieve organizational purposes (visioning, goal setting, and leading); (d) process orientation to enhance organizational efficiency, and focuses on its leader skill to implement and develop a flexible, efficient, and open systems (modeling, team building, and shared decision-making) (Wong & Page, 2003).

The previous exploration implies that the research related to contextual performance associated with the variables of perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership has generally never been done on startup employees. Therefore, this research aims to observe the role of perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership on the contextual performance of startup employees. This study is expected to benefit from contributing to development in science, particularly in the organizational and industrial psychology discipline.

## Method

### *Participants*

The research participants have consisted of 30 employees from startup companies. The data collection process was carried out by applying *Gform* to this link <https://forms.gle/6j7qLinh6jYr9ggj8>.

### *Procedure*

Before conducting the data collection process, the researcher first arranges organizational culture and contextual performance scales' measurement instruments. The measurement instrument of the perceived organizational support scale adopts by Aulia et al. (2019). Meanwhile, the measurement instrument of the servant leadership scale adopts from Hurrahmah (2020). Subsequently, the data collection process was carried out by distributing the *Gform* link through Whatsapp (WA) group. Before the participant filled out the link provided, in the beginning, part of *Gform* was stated informed consent, which must be filled by the participants who were willing to be involved as the sample in this research.

### *Measurement*

In this research, the tools applied to measure each variable are the perceived organizational support scale, organizational culture scale, servant leadership scale, and contextual performance scale.

The perceived organizational support scale was measured using the perceived organizational scale arranged by Aulia et al. (2019), which was arranged based on the dimension of perceived organizational support by Rhoades and Eisenberg (2002) that consisted of fairness, superior

support, and appreciation from the organization. They are: the organization has the right ground to give me a raise (item no 1 of the fairness dimension); my superior provide direction to me to perform the work effectively (item no 2 of the dimension of superior support); the organization provides bonus conforming to my performance result (item no 3 of the dimension of the appreciation from organization and job condition. The validity coefficient of the perceived organizational scale based on Aulia et al. (2019) research result shows  $V=0.72$ . Meanwhile, the reliability coefficient value of the perceived organizational support scale processed using the Cronbach Alpha formula is  $rtt=0.899$ .

In this study, the organizational culture scale was arranged by Aulia using the organizational culture aspect according to Robbins and Judge (2015), which consists of seven characteristics, e.g., orientation, taking risks, attention to detail, orientation to result, orientation to human, orientation to the team, acting aggressive and stable. The examples of the item in the organizational culture scale are; every employee has the opportunity to come up with creative ideas for the company (item no 1 of the orientation aspect and taking risk); the employee is accustomed to making a plan in detail to get the job done (item no 2 of the attention to detail aspect); the company management has the strategy to enhance the operational productivity of the workers (item no. 3 of the attention to detail); every decision from the management has considered each of the employees' condition (item no. 4, of the orientation to human aspect); the enterprise accustomed the employee to finish their tasks by cooperating within the unit (item no 5 of the orientation to the team aspect); the company encourages the employee to compete for each other sensibly and correctly (item no 6 of the being aggressive aspect); the company continues to make improvements to maintain the business sustainably (item no 7 of stability aspect). The validity test applied to test the organizational culture scale is the content validity, that is, by conducting a rating process by five professional judgments. Afterward, the rating result of the professional judgment was processed using Aiken's V formula. The validity coefficient value of the organizational culture scale is  $V=0.89$ . Meanwhile, the organizational culture's reliability coefficient, which was arranged using the Cronbach Alpha formula, is  $rtt=0.932$ .

The servant leadership scale, in this research, adopts the servant leadership scale arranged by Hurrahmah (2020) based on the servant leadership dimension from Wong and Page (2003) that consisted of character orientation, people-orientation, task orientation, and process orientation. The item examples of the servant leadership scale are; the Superior is always responsible for every work carried out by the subordinate (item no 1 of the character orientation dimension); When there are family members of the subordinate got sick, the superior shows her concern (item no 2 of the people-orientation dimension); the Superior has the authority to achieve the company mission (item no 3 of the task orientation dimension); the Superior is the example every time the subordinate carried out their job (item no 4 of the process orientation dimension). The validity test used to test the servant leadership scale is the content validity, which is a rating by five professional judgments. This rating result from the professional judgment is then processed using Aiken's V formula. The gain of the validity coefficient from the servant leadership scale is  $V=0.83$ . Meanwhile, the servant leadership's reliability coefficient, processed using the Cronbach Alpha formula, is  $rtt=0.965$ .

The contextual performance scale, in this study, is arranged by Aulia by implementing the aspects of Borman et al. (2001<sup>a</sup>) contextual performance, which consisted of enthusiasm, volunteering, cooperation, obeying the regulation, support, and standing up for the organizational purpose. The item examples of the contextual performance scale are; Passion for completing the job (item no 1 of the enthusiasm aspect); Willing to work on the additional job outside of their obligatory work (item no 2 of the voluntary aspect); cooperating with a co-worker to get the job done (item no 3 of the cooperation aspect); consciously do the job conforming to the regulation even if does not comfortable (item no 4 of the obeying the regulation aspect); carrying out the decision made by the company without feeling burden by it (item no 5 of the support and stand up for the organizational purpose). The validity test applied to test the contextual performance scale is the content validity, a rating conducted by five professional judgment, and then the data were processed using Aiken's V formula. The gain of the validity coefficient from the contextual performance scale is  $V=0.89$ . Meanwhile, the reliability coefficient of the contextual performance scale, which was processed using the Cronbach Alpha formula, is  $rtt=0.875$ .



The gain of the validity and reliability coefficient of the four measurement instruments, i.e., perceived organizational support scale, organizational culture scale, servant leadership scale, and contextual performance scale, indicates that the fourth measurement instruments are valid and reliable. It means the fourth measurement instrument can be used in this research.

### Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this research is the multiple linear regression technique. The purpose is to observe the role of the three independent variables on the dependent variable, and the role of each independent variable is partially on the dependent variable.

### Result

Before testing the hypothesis, the writer conducts an assumption test as the requirement to take a parametric test, a multiple linear regression analysis technique. The assumption test carried out by the researcher are normality and multicollinearity test. The normality test based on the residual value is presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
*Normality Test Result*

<b>KSZ</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Remark</b>
Residual distribution	.200	Normal

The normality testing result shows p-value is = .200 ( $p > 0.05$ ); hence it can be declared that the residual meets the assumption of normal distribution. Afterward, the assumption test in the regression analysis implements Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) multicollinearity. The result of the multicollinearity analysis can be seen in table 2.

Table 2  
*Multicollinearity Test Result*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>VIF</b>	<b>Remark</b>
Perceived Organizational Support	2.953	No Multicollinearity

Organizational Culture	3.105	No Multicollinearity
Servant Leadership	4.239	No Multicollinearity

The multicollinearity analysis between perceived organizational support and contextual performance shows a VIF value of 2.953. The multicollinearity analysis result of the organizational culture and contextual performance is 3.105, and the multicollinearity analysis result between servant leadership and contextual performance is 4.239. The analysis result shows that the VIF score of all variables is under 10. This result indicates that all variables meet the assumption of free multicollinearity. It means no interconnection among the independent variables.

Afterward, based on the normality and multicollinearity test result, which has been met, the data analysis of this research can proceed by employing the multiple linear regression analysis techniques. The analysis result shows that organizational culture, servant leadership, and perceived organizational support simultaneously have a significant role in contextual performance. Later on, the regression coefficient is  $R=0.589$ ,  $F=4.615$ ,  $p=0.010$  ( $p<0.05$ ), with the effective contribution of the three variables by 34.7%. The regression analysis test's result is briefly seen in Table 3.

Table 3  
*Regression Analysis Result*

<b>R</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Sig.</b>
.589	4.615	.347	.010

The analysis proceeded by processing data partially on each independent variable on the dependent variables. The data analysis result implies that the perceived organizational support has a role in the contextual performance of the startup employee, with the coefficient of  $\beta=0.589$  and  $t=2.163$ ,  $p=0.04$  ( $p<0.05$ ). Subsequently, organizational culture partially does not have a role in contextual performance with the coefficient of  $\beta=-0.345$  and  $t=-1.236$ ,  $p=0.227$  ( $p>0.05$ ). Likewise, the servant leadership partially does not show the role of contextual performance with the coefficient of  $\beta=0.268$  and  $t=0.821$ ,  $p=0.419$  ( $p>0.05$ ). Table 4 shows the partially testing of each independent variable on the dependent variable.

Table 4

*Partial Test Result*

Information	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Perceived Organizational Support-Conceptual Performance	.589	2.163	.040
Organizational Culture – Contextual Performance	-.345	-1.236	.227
Servant leadership – Contextual Performance	.268	.821	.419

**Discussion**

The data analysis result indicates that the perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership have a role in contextual performance. Afterward, it partially explains that only perceived organizational support has a role in contextual performance among the third independent variable. The more positive the perceived organizational support, the employee will also have high contextual performance. On the contrary, the more negative the perceived organizational support, the employee will have low contextual performance in the company. Meanwhile, whether it is good or bad, the culture in an organization and whether it is high or low, the employee judgment on the servant leadership style attached to the superior does not have the role on the high or low of the employees' contextual performance.

These research findings conform to Borman et al.'s (2001<sup>b</sup>) research result showing that organizational support is one-factor influencing contextual performance. The form of organizational support is the reliable organization, trusted organization, organization showing interest in its member, and the organization taking care of its members' welfare (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The organizational support perceived positively by its member is likely to make the employee voluntarily do the job even though it is outside their given scope of work. This research result also confirms Klein and Kim's (1998) opinion explaining that the employee needs organizational support to achieve a high rate of working performance.

The role of perceived organizational support on the contextual performance occurred because the perceived organizational support is the employees' perception of how far the organization appreciates the employees' contribution and organizational concern on the employee's condition and requisite Chiang dan Hsieh (2012). Therefore, the trusted employee and sure that organization appreciate their contribution and concern for their welfare. Hence, they will respond by performing their job and being nice to reflect on their contextual performance in working. This study result also implies that perceived organizational support can encourage employees to have high contextual performance while working. In this case, it contributes extra work exceeding the task and responsibility given by the organization. The form of such extra contribution assists the fellow worker, taking action which can decrease the risk for the company, providing constructive suggestions, and obtaining beneficial knowledge and skill for the organization, which eventually will indirectly influence other employee performance and organization in general.

Afterward, this research does not conform to the research conducted by Nofrianda et al. (2020), and Zhang (2016), explaining that organizational culture becomes one of the factors influencing contextual performance. Organizational culture can alter the employees' attitude and conduct to contribute to working productivity. Hence it can increase the spirit of mutual cooperation, openness among employees, togetherness, and effective communication, which are elements in the contextual performance (Oemar, 2013). Based on this notion, it can be explained that the difference between research results conducted by the previous researchers with this research findings is that within the last two years, the employee was working online and was not in the office directly. The condition can psychologically influence how the employee perceives the company's value and contribution to their work and their conduct with their co-worker or the company, affecting their contextual performance. It corresponds to Cooper and Robertson's (2002) opinion explaining that organizational culture influences employees' performance, which the employee will establish a subjective perception of organizational culture in their workplace. Afterward, the positive perception supports the employee in the job and can also influence the rate of employees' performance. It means that the conformity of organizational culture values perceived directly by the employees in the workplace will affect their performance individually, particularly when the organization emphasizes local culture.

Later on, this research finding also indicates an incompatibility with Dierendonck and Patterson's (2010) research result explaining that servant leadership emphasizes enhancing services to other people, applying a holistic approach to work, and promoting a sense of togetherness, dividing authority in making decisions. Likewise, Bayram and Zoubi's (2020) research result analyzes the influence of servant leadership on performance by involving 720 employees. The analysis result of the moment of structural showing that the application of a poorly executed servant leadership significantly impacts employees' performance. The different result of the previous studies from this current research is that the employee has worked from home for two years. It means they do remote work and do not do face-to-face interaction; hence they do not feel direct leadership from their superiors.

The above analysis confirms Spears' (2010) opinion that the characteristic of servant leadership proposed himself refers to the correlation between leaders and their subordinates. It means the relationship between 'the trustee' and 'partner,' which will all lead to the success of the organization/company. Likewise, Laub (2005) also expresses a similar notion related to the OLA model, that the role of a leader in implementing the characteristic of servant leadership as the corporate culture can trigger the establishment of servant-organization condition, and it will make the subordinate performed the work as expected. Therefore, in the situation where they did not interact directly in specific periods, it can lead to positive or negative perceptions from the employee to the leader, but it does not influence their conduct and attitude in working. Subsequently, the research finding showing no influence of servant leadership on the contextual performance of the employees in a startup company is that the leadership in small-large companies has different management. Nugraha (2007) mentioned that small-medium enterprises have a simple management hierarchy; in this case, the owner is also acted as the leader. Hence, the conditions will be different if employees work in larger companies. Based on these findings, it can be explained that the size, large or small, of a company influences how servant leadership is applied. It will bring implications to the way they work, attitude, and contextual performance of every employee.

Moreover, the sample quantity involved in this research is limited. This research result can only be generalized to a population with similar characteristics. Later on, the addition of sample quantity in future research will possibly influence whether the hypothesis is acceptable or not. Therefore, the upcoming research should change the sample quantities and expand the object of study to strengthen the hypothesis test results in this research, which would bring implications for the generalization of the future research result.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the analysis and discussion result of this research, it can be concluded that simultaneously the perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and servant leadership have a role in the contextual performance of startup employees. The study also concludes that perceived organizational support has a role in the contextual performance of the startup employees. It means that the more positive the employees' perception of the support provided by the organization, the contextual performance of the employees will also get higher. On the contrary, the more negative the employees' perception of the support provided by the organization, the workers' contextual performance will also be lower. This research also deduces that whether it is good or bad, employees' judgment of Startup organizational culture does not influence the employees' high or low rate of contextual performance. Likewise, whether it is high or low, the servant leadership of the Startup's leader does not contribute to the employees' contextual performance working rates.

## **References**

- Aulia, A., Sutanto, A., & Hidayat, A. C. (2019). Determinants of work engagement for TNI-AD (Indonesian Armed Forces-Army) personnel [Determinan keterikatan kerja personel Tentara Nasional Indonesia-Angkatan Darat (TNI-AD)]. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 35(1), 35–55. <https://doi.org/10.24123/ajpj.v35i1.2881>
- Barbuto, J. E., and Wheeler, D. W. (2002). *Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes? NebGuide G02-1481-A*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.

- Bayram, P., & Zoubi, K. (2020). The effect of servant leadership on employees' self-reported performance: Does public service motivation play a mediating explanatory role? *Management Science Letters*, 10(8), 1771-1776.
- Blank, S. (2013). Why the lean Startup changes everything. *Harvard Business Review*. [https://hbr.org/2013/05/why-the-lean-start-up-changes\\_everything](https://hbr.org/2013/05/why-the-lean-start-up-changes_everything).
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, 71-98.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10: 2, 99-10.
- <sup>a</sup>Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 965.
- <sup>b</sup>Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 52-69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00163>
- Chiang, C.-F., & Hsieh, T.-S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180-190.
- Chris, D. (2017). 5 Top indicators for startup success, according to this TED talk. Retrieved from [www.inc.com](http://www.inc.com).
- Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T.2002. The influence of values in organizations: linking value and outcomes at multiple levels of analysis: Maierhofer, Kabanoff & Griffin. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.Vol.17, 217-263.
- Deborah, G. (2012). The venture capital secret: 3 out of 4 startups fail. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles>.
- Dierendonck, D.V., & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant leadership developments in theory and research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goodman, S. A., & Syantek, D. J. (1999). Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do

- shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(2), 254–275.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71(3), 500.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (2), 310.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*. Pearson Education. Inc, New Jersey.
- Griffith, E. (2014). Why startups fail, according to their founders. Wsj.Com, 1. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2014/09/25/why-startups-fail-according-to-their-founders/>
- Hurrahmah, M. (2020). Keterikatan kerja anggota polisi: Ditinjau dari cinta pekerjaan dan servant leadership. *Skripsi*. Yogyakarta. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.
- [Http://1000startupdigital.id/](http://1000startupdigital.id/). (2016). Gerakan 1000 StratUp, 6±7. Retrieved from <http://1000startupdigital.id/>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (Vol. 2, p. 528). New York: Wiley.
- Klein, H.J & Kim, J.S. (1998). A field study of the influence of situational constraints, leader-member exchange, and goal commitment on performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 88-95
- Laub, J. (2005). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) model. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, Vol 1, No 1, 155-178.
- Mahayani, V. S. (2014). Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap kinerja kontekstual melalui pemberdayaan karyawan dan motivasi berprestasi di Siloam Hospitals Surabaya (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Pelita Harapan Surabaya-Department of Business School-Master of Management).
- Malik A. J. (2017). Pengaruh kepemimpinan paternalistik pada kinerja tugas dan kinerja kontekstual karyawan: Peran mediasi rasa percaya pada pemimpin (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 79(4), 475.



- Nugraha, N. (2007). Studi eksplanatoris hubungan servant-leadership wirausahawan dengan kinerja karyawan (Multiple case study pada perusahaan skala kecil dan menengah di 3 sentra UKM di Jawa Timur). *Skripsi*. Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Airlangga.
- Nofrianda, R., Sari, E. Y. D., & Widiana, H. S. (2020). kinerja kontekstual dan faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi. *Psycho Idea*, 18(1), 45-52.
- Oemar, Y. (2013). Pengaruh budaya organisasi, kemampuan kerja, dan komitmen organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 11 (1), 65-76.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2015). *Organizational behavior*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ryandono, M. N. H. (2018). Fintech waqaf: Solusi permodalan perusahaan startup wirausaha muda. *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, 7(2), 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.39347>
- Sinintya, W. (2019). *Evaluasi kinerja, startup decacorn ini phk 300 karyawan*. <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/tech/20190304194807-37-58845/evaluasi-kinerja-startup-decacorn-ini-phk-300-karyawan>. (Diakses 13 Maret 2021).
- Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The journal of virtues & leadership*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Sunanda, W. D. (2020). Pengaruh kepemimpinan Islami dan religiusitas terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja karyawan sebagai variabel intervening (studi kasus pada waroeng spesial sambal). *jurnal ilmu manajemen*, 17(1), 20-36.
- Uzzaman, A. (2015). *Startuppedia*. Bentang.
- Van Scotter. (2000). Relationships of task performance and contextual performance with turnover, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, vol.10, 1, 79-95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00040-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00040-6)
- Wong, P.T., & Page, D. (2003). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*.
- Zhang, W. J. (2016). *Relationship between organizational culture identity and job performance of enterprise employees*. DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education, and Human Science, (icaem)

