The Effect of Servant Leadership on The Quality of Education And The Characteristics of Millennial Teachers
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Abstract:
Leadership, at this time, has methods of leadership styles including democratic, transformational, authoritarian, delegative, visionary, and servant leadership that can be applied in leading an organization. One method of leadership style is servant leadership. Human resource management in the education sector still needs to be improved to attain the quality of education. Education quality is influenced by servant leadership and millennial teacher characteristics. This study aims to determine the characteristics of millennial teachers as an intervening variable. This research was conducted at the Ma’arif NU Education Foundation Talang Pasuruan with a total sample of 104 respondents. The data used are primary data obtained directly from respondents through questionnaires and the respondents are all teachers at the Ma’arif NU Talang Education Foundation which consists of the Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, Madrasah Tsanawiyah, and Madrasah Aliyah educational institutions. The test results show that servant leadership affects the quality of education, the characteristics of millennial teachers affect the quality of education, and finally, the characteristics of millennial teachers can mediate servant leadership on the quality of education.
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Abstrak:
INTRODUCTION

The quality of schools during the COVID-19 pandemic saw a decline in student grades. This was revealed by the head of the Jogjakarta city education, youth, and sports office, Budi Santosa Asrori (Baharun et al., 2021; Nasution et al., 2021). To maintain the quality of education, it is necessary to have a good relationship between the principal and the teacher so that there is no conflict (Liebowitz & Porter, 2019; Suchyadi & Nurjanah, 2018). So that it can affect the quality of schools. In addition to the leadership factor, there are also millennial teacher characteristics that affect the quality of education (Devi & Subiyantoro, 2021; Muali et al., 2022). With the facts that have been mentioned, it is necessary to conduct a study that specifically discusses servant leadership, millennial teachers, and the quality of education (Pawar et al., 2020).

Service Leadership is a holistic leadership approach that involves followers in various dimensions (eg relational, ethical, emotional, and spiritual) so that they are empowered to become what they want to be, (Eva et al., 2019) Service leadership affects the quality of education because not all leaders can manage well. (Mulyadi, 2010) revealed that servant leadership has a significant and positive influence on improving teacher performance, and improving the quality of learning (Yolanda, 2020). The generation of millennial employees, including teachers, affects the quality of education. (Sapengga, 2016) and (Irving, 2010) reveals that trewalsere are 5 indicators of service leadership, namely love, humility, vision, trust, and empowerment. Leadership has a very large role in the management of the organization which has an impact on the quality of education. Such as research conducted by (Dian et al., 2022) and (Bashori, 2019). Research conducted by (Mulyadi, 2010) and (Tambunan et al., 2014), found that servant leadership has a positive impact on teacher performance, organization, and learning quality. In line with that, the servant leadership model is considered suitable for today's educational philosophy (Mufassir et al., 2019).

Educational quality or quality is one thing that must be owned by every educational institution, as regulated in article 1 paragraph 1 PP no. 32 of 2013 which affirms that "The National Education Standard is the minimum criterion regarding the education system in all jurisdictions of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia. Suryana (2020) revealed that the problems of education quality include human resources and the government's commitment to education. According to (Kuntoro, 2019), revealed that there are three things to see the quality of schools, both private schools, and public schools. The first is
that schools have commitment, concern, and awareness that quality is important, the second has the initiative and creativity to improve the quality, and lastly, having strong leadership and getting parental support (Fatchurochman, 2021; Ma’arif et al., 2022). Education quality standards refer to national education standards which include 8 things, namely content standards, processes, graduate competencies, education personnel, facilities and infrastructure, management, financing, and assessment of education (Triwiyanto, 2013).

Teachers are important figures in the education process that takes place in schools because teachers are the printers of quality and moral future generations. The image and concept of teachers in the millennial era are very different from the concept of the past (Mucharomah, 2017). Millennial teachers are known as a dynamic generation and have the ability and love for the previous generation (Suryahadikusumah & Kurniasari, 2019). Millennials have characteristics that have connected, confident and creative indicators that affect the quality of an organization (Alsup, 2019; Mäkinen et al., 2018; Tang et al., 2020).

Looking at the condition of servant leadership, the quality of education and the characteristics of millennial teachers, this study has objectives, namely, how the relationship between servant leadership and the quality of education is how the characteristics of millennial teachers affect the quality of education and and how the relationship between servant leadership and quality education regarding the characteristics of millennial teachers is.

Based on the facts above, while servant leadership affects the quality of education, the characteristics of millennial teachers affect the quality of education and, servant leadership has a significant effect on the quality of education through the characteristics of millennial teachers. The difference between this study and previous research lies in the characteristics of millennial teachers as an intervening variable, where previous research analyzed the effect of a direct relationship between the characteristics of millennial teachers on the quality of education.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey conducted to examine the relationship and direct influence between exogenous and endogenous variables through intervening variables (Given, 2012). The exogenous variable of this research is servant leadership (X₁), (Sapengga, 2016) and (Irving, 2010) reveals that there are 5 indicators of service leadership, namely love, humility, vision, trust, and empowerment. The endogenous variable is the quality of education (Y₂), indicators of education quality are standards of content, process, competency of graduates, education staff, facilities and infrastructure, management, financing, and assessment of education (Triwiyanto, 2013). and the intervening variable is the characteristics of millennial teachers (Y₁), indicators Millennial characteristics have connected, confident and creative that affect the quality of an organization (Alsup, 2019; Mäkinen et al., 2018; Tang et al., 2020). This research is located at the NU Ma’arif Education Foundation, Talang Pasuruan.
The population in this study was the Educational Institutions at the Ma'arif NU Talang Pasuruan Education Foundation which consisted of MI (Madrasah Ibtidaiyah), MTs (Madrasah Tsanawiyah), and MA (Madrasah Aliyah) Education while the research sample consisted of all 104 teachers at the Foundation. This sample is called the census method, because it takes the entire population, (Muhyi et al., 2018) data collection is done by distributing questionnaires that have been tested for validity and reliability on all question items.

The data used are primary data obtained directly from respondents through questionnaires distributed to respondents (Sugiyono, 2008). Questionnaires distributed to respondents have been tested for validity and reliability. Validity test using Pearson's product-moment correlation. Its formula is as follows:

\[
 r = \frac{N \sum XY - \left( \sum X \right) \left( \sum Y \right)}{\sqrt{\left( N \sum X^2 - \left( \sum X \right)^2 \right) \left( N \sum Y^2 - \left( \sum Y \right)^2 \right)}}
\]

Information
r= correlation coefficient
X= Item Score
Y= Item Total Score
N= Sample Total (Respondent)
Reliability Test

Because the number of respondents was more than 100, this study used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis (Hair Jr et al., 2010). The stages of SEM analysis include developing a concept or theory-based model, constructing a path diagram, converting a path diagram to a structural model, evaluating the goodness of fit index, interpretation, and modification. Next, test the three hypotheses.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The structural equation model (SEM) test for confirmatory factor analysis of exogenous servant leadership variables (X1) showed the results of factor loading values X1.1 = 0.82, X1.2 = 0.75, X1.3 = 0.74, X1.4 = 0.77 and X1.5 = 0.71. Because the overall factor loading value is > 0.50, the five indicators can be used to form the servant leadership variable. The value of the results of confirmatory factor analysis of the Intervening Characteristics of Millennial Teachers (Y1) shows the following results: The value of the loading factor of Millennial Teachers' Characteristics is variable Y1.1 = 0.81, Y1.2 = 0.84, and Y1.3 = 0.76. The value of the loading factor of the three millennial teacher indicators is > 0.5, then the three indicators can be used as a forming variable for the characteristics of millennial teachers, while the results obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of the education quality variable (Y2) get the results: Y2.1 = 0.81, Y2.2= 0.78, Y2.3= 0.72, Y2.4 = 0.65, Y2.5 = 0.80, Y2.6 = 0.66, Y2.7 = 0.75 and Y2.8 = 0.70. The loading factor value obtained > 0.50 means that the eight indicators of education quality can be used as a form of education quality variable. While the results of the full model analysis can be seen in Figure 1.
Figure 1 shows that the value of the servant leadership coefficient (X1) on the characteristics of millennial teachers (Y1) is 0.88. The coefficient of servant leadership (X1) on the quality of education (Y2) has a value of 0.54, while the coefficient on the characteristics of millennial teachers (Y1) on the quality of education (Y2) has a value of 0.39.

The results of the suitability test and statistical test for the full sem model can be seen in table 1.

Table 1: SEM Model Fit Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of fit index</th>
<th>Cut off Value</th>
<th>Analysis result</th>
<th>Model Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>183,278</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>≥ 0,05</td>
<td>0,480</td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>≤ 2,00</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0,90</td>
<td>0,815</td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0,90</td>
<td>0,751</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0,95</td>
<td>0,907</td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ 0,95</td>
<td>0,922</td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results obtained in general, it can be concluded that in general the SEM model used can be categorized as good to describe the causality of the factors used.
Table 2: Normality Assumption Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>skew</th>
<th>c.r.</th>
<th>kurtosis</th>
<th>c.r.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1.1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>2,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1.2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1.3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.6</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.7</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>1,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.8</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>2,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2.1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2.2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2.3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2.4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the normality test obtained the value of cr between -2.58 - 2.58 so that all questions on the indicators of each variable were normally distributed.

Table 3: Hypothesis Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>&lt;---</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>&lt;---</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>&lt;---</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 3, it can be proved as follows: 1) Test the first hypothesis of servant leadership on the quality of education. The critical ratio value of 7.533 shows that it is greater than 2 which is a condition for accepting the hypothesis, while the p value is less than 0.05 as a condition for accepting the hypothesis. Based on this value, it can be stated that servant leadership on the quality of education has been tested.

Test the second hypothesis of the characteristics of millennial teachers on the quality of education. The critical ratio value of 3.720 shows that it is greater than 2 which is a condition for accepting the hypothesis, while the p value is less than 0.05 as a condition for the hypothesis to be accepted. Based on this value, it can be stated that the characteristics of millennial teachers on the quality of education have been tested.

Test the third hypothesis of servant leadership on the quality of education through the characteristics of millennial teachers. Testing the third hypothesis of servant leadership on the quality of education through the characteristics of millennial teachers can be seen in table 4.
Table 4: Effect Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Servant Leadership (X)</th>
<th>Millennial Teacher Characteristics (Y1)</th>
<th>Quality of Education (Y2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Direct Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial Teacher Characteristics (Y1)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education (Y2)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Total Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education (Y2)</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Primary Data

Based on the results of direct influence and total influence, it can be proven that the total influence between variables is greater than the direct effect, the third hypothesis which states that servant leadership affects the quality of education through the characteristics of millennial teachers. The love indicator is the biggest value that forms the service leadership variable. The results of the study revealed that servant leadership which consists of indicators of love, humility, vision, trust and empowerment has a significant influence on the quality of education. These results strengthen the research that has been done (Mufassir et al., 2019), where . Indicator of love is the biggest value in forming servant leadership. Love is meant is sincerity to do the right thing at the right time to give the best reasons and decisions.

Quality of Education is formed on indicators of standard content, processes, competence of graduates, education staff, facilities and infrastructure, management, financing, and assessment of Education and is the largest reflection of the standards of educational content (Idris et al., 2022; Sa’dullah & Hidayatullah, 2020). These results indicate that the Ma’arif NU Talang Pasuruan Education Foundation provides teaching materials and levels of competence in accordance with the level of education.

The achievement of the quality of education is related to servant leadership at the Ma’arif NU Talang Pasuruan Education Foundation because, when making policies, someone who has service leadership is not only based on the authority (power) he has (Jondar, 2019) so that in the future become a leadership style that is suitable for the millennial generation. The millennial generation has very different characteristics from the previous generation.

The characteristics of millennial teachers who are formed are connected, confident and creative where the confidence indicator is the biggest reflection of connected and creative indicators (Alugar, 2021; Castillo, 2020). The self-confidence that is owned will be able to help the teacher adapt in carrying out new tasks. Good self-confidence can also create opportunities instead of waiting for opportunities to come and can also inspire enthusiasm to achieve organizational goals. This is in line with (Illahi, 2020), which reveals that the character of a good teacher affects the quality and quality of education.

The quality of education, which is influenced by the characteristics of millennial teachers, has a significant effect. This is because the characteristics of millennial teachers who have high self-confidence have a positive impact on the organization because they can reduce feelings of inferiority or feeling inferior when they find new jobs or are in a new environment. In addition, it can also
find new opportunities for innovation in organizational development. (Budimansyah, 2008) revealed that millennial teachers play a role in improving the quality of education because they always update information, because they are connected to the internet.

Servant leadership has a strong influence on the quality of education due to the role of the characteristics of millennial teachers who in their work have a desire to be connected, confident and creative (Heyler & Martin, 2018; Liao et al., 2021). Connected is meant to be actively connected globally and also able to create networks in a virtual world or in other words they like technology, the internet and so on. Confidence is feeling optimistic about what they are facing and lastly about being creative, namely the characteristics of millennial teachers who have high creativity because they have a sense of boredom because they were born in a different technological era compared to previous generations.

CONCLUSION
Based on the SEM analysis, which was obtained through 104 respondents, it was found that servant leadership has an effect on the quality of education, and the characteristics of millennial teachers have a significant effect on the quality of education and finally, the characteristics of millennial teachers mediate servant leadership on the quality of education. The servant leadership indicators consist of love, humility, vision, trust and empowerment, the highest score is on the love indicator. The millennial characteristic indicators consist of connected, confident and creative and the confidence indicator gets the highest score. Education quality indicators consist of content standards, processes, competency of graduates, education staff, facilities and infrastructure, management, financing, and assessment of education and get the highest score on the content standard indicators.

The main finding of this research is on the characteristics of millennial teachers who are able to mediate servant leadership on the quality of education at the Ma'arif NU Talang Pasuruan Education Foundation. Where the previous researchers did not place the characteristics of millennial teachers as an intervening variable. This research was conducted in the field of Education, in order to obtain consistent results from this model, it is necessary to propose retesting in other fields such as industry or other fields.
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