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Abstract:
The purpose of this study was to determine the role of work motivation in mediating the influence of servant leadership on employee performance at the Legian Beach Hotel, Kuta Bali. Determination of the sample in this study using a census, which is if all members of the population as many as 65 people were used as samples. Data analysis using smartPLS software version 3.2.7. The result is that the implementation of servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on work motivation; servant leadership does not affect employee performance; work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance; servant leadership is able to mediate the effect of servant leadership on employee performance at the Legian Beach Hotel, Kuta Bali.
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Introduction:
Hotels as an industry engaged in services, very much expecting guests to stay will come back (guest repeaters). A hotel is formed as a place for a group of individuals to achieve certain prescribed visions and missions. To achieve this vision and mission, good human resource management is needed and supported by competent human resources in their field. Sinurat (2008: 2) says that human resources are the only company resources that have the power to plan and control other resources within the organization. Without good human resources, employee performance cannot be optimally achieved so that it will affect the company's performance. Good quality of workforce and supported by other good production factors, it will be able to perform well (Widyawati and Verawati, 2016).

Employee performance is the result or success rate of an employee as a whole in a certain period of time in carrying out tasks compared to various other things, such as work results standards, targets or criteria that have been determined in advance and have been agreed upon (Anggriawan et al, 2015). According to Widyawati and Karwini (2018) employee performance is the result of work achieved by someone in carrying out their duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. In the process of
achieving employee performance, of course it involves the interaction of both parties where one party delegates duties and responsibilities while the other party accepts the task and responsibility to be done. Warmana and Widnyana (2018) in overcoming the difficulties, every HR must work together to think and do the best steps by mobilizing all their potential.

The research was conducted in the hospitality industry, a four-star hotel located in the tourist area of Legian. This hotel still continues to this day, of course not separated from the cooperation carried out by the General Manager, Department Head, and employees. The following is shown in Table 1. regarding compilation of guest comment data on employee performance (task performance) that interacts directly with guests through surveys contained in software revinate at Legian Beach Hotel.

| No. | Topic Category       | Score | Reviews | Positive     | Neutral | Negative   |
|-----|----------------------|-------|---------|--------------|---------|------------|
| 1   | Overall              | 61    | 4373    | 67% (2910)   | 21% (928) | 12% (535)  |
| 2   | Service              | 66    | 1305    | 80% (1040)   | 13% (173) | 7% (92)    |
| 3   | General Staff        | 68    | 1013    | 86% (874)    | 9% (91)  | 5% (48)    |
| 4   | Rooms                | 56    | 904     | 52% (466)    | 27% (248) | 21% (190)  |
| 5   | Food / Beverage      | 64    | 762     | 77% (584)    | 13% (102) | 10% (76)   |
| 6   | Breakfast            | 66    | 395     | 81% (321)    | 14% (54)  | 5% (20)    |
| 7   | Cleanliness          | 62    | 151     | 71% (107)    | 20% (30)  | 9% (14)    |
| 8   | Front Desk           | 58    | 103     | 54% (56)     | 25% (26)  | 20% (21)   |
| 9   | Check in / Check out | 54    | 51      | 39% (20)     | 33% (17)  | 27% (14)   |
| 10  | The manager          | 62    | 42      | 83% (35)     | 14% (6)   | 2% (1)     |
| 11  | Security             | 61    | 37      | 78% (29)     | 11% (4)   | 11% (4)    |
| 12  | Housecleaning        | 66    | 34      | 79% (27)     | 18% (6)   | 3% (1)     |
| 13  | Waitstaff            | 66    | 29      | 86% (25)     | 10% (3)   | 3% (1)     |
| 14  | Restaurant           | 54    | 26      | 46% (12)     | 23% (6)   | 31% (8)    |
| 15  | Bar                  | 61    | 24      | 75% (18)     | 13% (3)   | 13% (3)    |
| 16  | Room service         | 60    | 23      | 65% (15)     | 17% (4)   | 17% (4)    |
| 17  | Concierge            | 52    | 5       | 20% (1)      | 40% (2)   | 40% (2)    |
| 18  | Bellstaff            | 54    | 2       | 50% (1)      | 50% (1)   | 0% (0)     |

Source: Revinate Software (2018)

Based on Table 1 can be seen that a number of categories of topics that get a negative rating scale are close to the positive rating scale, some even exceed the positive scale such as: check in / checkout, restaurant, and concierge. So that these topics need to be a more serious concern and need to be carried out on continuous improvements to achieve the goals of this hotel.
There are various factors that are closely related to employee performance, one of the factors that play an important role in the success of the company is employee motivation. Without any driving factor in the employee, the work that is charged will not be able to be carried out optimally. Motivation is a factor that encourages a person to do a certain activity (Sutrisno, 2009: 109). Motivation for good work can be seen from the encouragement to do the work that is charged and can prove with good work results. Based on research conducted by Shahzadi et al. (2014) states that employee motivation has a significant effect on employee performance. Employee performance is actually influenced by motivation because if employees are motivated then they will do work with more effort and by which performance will ultimately increase. However the opposite results were obtained from the study of Widyawati et al. (2018) that work motivation does not affect employee performance.

Maintaining work motivation and improving employee performance are the responsibility of a leader. An effective leader can be said to be a leader who not only uses his power but is also able to encourage his subordinates and provide motivation to be able to achieve optimal performance. At present leaders are not only in charge of influencing and subordinates follow. The leader must have efforts to improve the quality of work and the growth of the behavior of his subordinates. Based on the existing leadership theory, servant leadership is a characteristic of appropriate leadership in this regard. Leadership that serves is a leadership style that is characterized by exceeding the interests of the leaders themselves and will focus on opportunities to help their followers grow and develop (Robbins and Judge, 2015: 267). Several previous studies have been conducted to examine the effect of servant leadership on work motivation. One of them is the research conducted by Harwiki (2013), which states that there is a positive and significant influence between servant leadership on motivation. Good leadership style and supported by motivation, employee performance will also be good. Aji and Palupiningdyah (2016) state that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on the level of employee performance. These results indicate that servant leadership is an aspect that affects the good and bad performance of employees in the company.

Interviews regarding the implementation of servant leadership were also conducted with five employees from the departments that interacted directly with guests, namely housekeeping, front office, human resources, and food and beverages service at Legian Beach Hotel, are said that the lack of supervisors who want to listen to problems experienced by subordinates, often occurs miscommunication between superiors and subordinates, lack of supervisor control over subordinates so that the boss has not maximally understood what is felt by the subordinates, the communication ability of superiors in influencing and moving subordinates is still lacking, the boss does not prioritize aspects of career development for potential employees, the boss is still not maximal in interpreting his duties and responsibilities as a boss, and supervisor weak in building subordinate perspectives on good leadership and as an example especially in the community of their own departments and other departments.

**Literature Review:**

The theory of social exchange teaches that the interaction between members of the community starts from the principle of exchanging among each other which in this case starts from "giving" something to others, and "receiving back" something from that other person in a balanced composition, so that the behavior community members are always carried out by considering the "cost benefit", for example in the form of "cost reward" or "reward punishment" (Fuady, 2011: 28-30). Where in the process of achieving company goals reflected in employee performance, of course, it cannot be separated from the participation of the supervisors who work with their subordinates. This process involves the interaction of both parties who need each other. Where one party delegates duties and responsibilities while the other party accepts the task and
responsibility to be done. The drive to do a job and provide evidence with good work results is something that is expected by management within the company.

According to Handoko (2003: 74) motivation is as a condition in a person who encourages the individual's desire to carry out certain activities in order to achieve goals. Employee performance is a work achievement, namely a comparison between work results that are seen in real terms with the work standards set by the organization (Dessler, 2006). Research conducted by Ibrahim and Brobbey (2015) give evidence that motivation positive and significant impact on performance employee. Motivation is an important factor in determining employee satisfaction and performance.

Efforts to improve work motivation and employee performance are the tasks of a leader. Servant leadership is an effective leadership style for managing work motivation and employee performance in a company. Leadership that serves is a leadership style that is characterized by exceeding the interests of the leaders themselves and will focus on opportunities to help their followers grow and develop (Robbins and Judge, 2015: 267). The effectiveness of servant leadership can be seen from how a boss motivates employees to do their jobs and empower them. Employees who feel motivated will do their job to the fullest. Vice versa, if the employee is not motivated to do his job, then he will not be able to complete the work that is charged, so that the quality and quantity of his work decreases.

The research conducted by Syahrial et al (2016) shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership and work motivation. Servant leadership usually directly involved in the organization that can build up and encourage their employees to continue to grow. This research is also supported by research conducted by Aji and Palupiningdyah (2016) that there is a positive and significant influence between servant leadership on the level of employee performance. These results show that servant leadership is an influential aspect bad performance of employees. In addition, research conducted by Ristiana et al (2014) prove that work motivation variables are able to mediate the influence of servant leadership on employee performance. Based on this explanation, four hypotheses can be proposed as follows:

H₁ : Servant leadership positive and significant effect on work motivation.
H₂ : Servant leadership positive and significant effect on employee performance.
H₃ : Work motivation positive and significant effect on employee performance.
H₄ : Work motivation mediates the influence of servant leadership on employee performance.

Methodology:

This research is a causal research design, which aims to analyze the influence between variables (Timothy, 2017: 16). Data collection techniques in this study are questionnaires with a scale of 1-5, namely scores (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) doubt, (2) disagree, and (1) strongly disagree (Sugiyono, 2017: 93). Sample calculation in this study refers to non probability sampling, namely saturated sampling, that is if all members of the population are used as samples. A total of 65 employees were taken as research respondents from the housekeeping, front office, human resources, and f & b services with a minimum work period of 3 years. Respondents' answers that have been collected must be declared valid and reliable through validity test (product moment correlation coefficient > 0.30) and reliability test (cronbach alpha > 0.60). The following is shown in Table 2. regarding sample distribution:
Table 2. Research Population and Samples

| No. | Department               | Section              | Population | Sample |
|-----|--------------------------|----------------------|------------|--------|
| 1   | Housekeeping             | Room Attendant       | 24         | 24     |
| 2   | Front Office             | Front Desk           | 10         | 10     |
|     |                          | Concierge            | 7          | 7      |
| 3   | Human Resources          | Security             | 10         | 10     |
| 4   | Food and Beverage Service| Restaurant & Room Service | 14     | 14     |
|     | Total                    |                      | 65         | 65     |

Source: HRD Legian Beach Hotel (2018)

Results:

This study uses smart PLS software version 3.2.7. In the steps of using Partial Least Squares (PLS), a measurement model/outer model is evaluated, structural model evaluation (structural model / inner model), and hypothesis testing. For probability values, p-value with alpha 5% is less than 0.05, the t-table value for alpha 5% is 1.96, so the hypothesis acceptance criteria are when t-statistics > t-table. The following is shown in Table 1.3, Table 1.4, and Table 1.5 regarding model evaluation measurements (measurement model/outer model):

Table 3. Convergent Validity Test Results

| No. | Indicator                                      | Symbol | Outer Loading | Information |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|--------|---------------|-------------|
| 1   | Form a concept                                 | X1     | 0.787         | Valid       |
| 2   | Restoring emotions                             | X2     | 0.544         | Valid       |
| 3   | Prioritize followers                           | X3     | 0.718         | Valid       |
| 4   | Helps followers grow and succeed               | X4     | 0.598         | Valid       |
| 5   | Behave ethically                               | X5     | 0.764         | Valid       |
| 6   | Empower                                        | X6     | 0.712         | Valid       |
| 7   | Creating value for employees                   | X7     | 0.553         | Valid       |
| 8   | Intrinsic Motivation                           | Y1.1   | 0.722         | Valid       |
| 9   | Integrated Regulation                          | Y1.2   | 0.732         | Valid       |
| 10  | Identified Regulation                          | Y1.3   | 0.896         | Valid       |
| 11  | Introjected Regulation                         | Y1.4   | 0.789         | Valid       |
| 12  | External Regulation                            | Y1.5   | 0.732         | Valid       |
| 13  | Task Performance                               | Y2.1   | 0.857         | Valid       |
| 14  | Contextual Performance                         | Y2.2   | 0.798         | Valid       |
| 15  | Adaptive Performance                           | Y2.3   | 0.820         | Valid       |

Source: Data processed (2018)

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that all statement items from each variable have an outer loading coefficient above 0.50, so it can be concluded that this measurement meets the convergent validity requirements.
Table 4. Discriminant Validity Test Results Through Cross Loading

| No. | Indicator                                      | Servant Leadership | Work motivation | Employee performance |
|-----|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1   | Form a concept (X₁)                            | 0.787              | 0.719          | 0.523                |
| 2   | Restoring emotions (X₂)                        | 0.544              | 0.451          | 0.355                |
| 3   | Prioritize followers (X₃)                      | 0.718              | 0.513          | 0.268                |
| 4   | Helping followers grow and succeed (X₄)        | 0.598              | 0.373          | 0.150                |
| 5   | Behave ethically (X₅)                          | 0.764              | 0.705          | 0.691                |
| 6   | Empower (X₆)                                   | 0.712              | 0.539          | 0.647                |
| 7   | Creating value for society (X₇)                | 0.553              | 0.491          | 0.527                |
| 8   | Intrinsic motivation (Y₁,₁)                    | 0.757              | 0.722          | 0.489                |
| 9   | Integrated regulation (Y₁,₂)                   | 0.551              | 0.732          | 0.672                |
| 10  | Identified regulation (Y₁,₃)                   | 0.812              | 0.896          | 0.721                |
| 11  | Introjected regulation (Y₁,₄)                  | 0.478              | 0.789          | 0.786                |
| 12  | External regulation (Y₁,₅)                     | 0.618              | 0.732          | 0.534                |
| 13  | Task performance (Y₂,₁)                        | 0.660              | 0.812          | 0.857                |
| 14  | Contextual performance (Y₂,₂)                  | 0.460              | 0.484          | 0.798                |
| 15  | Adaptive performance (Y₂,₃)                    | 0.648              | 0.684          | 0.820                |

**Source:** Data processed (2018)

Discrimination validity can be done by looking at the cross loading value, where the construct correlation with the indicator must be higher than the construct correlation with other constructs. Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the servant leadership construct correlation with its indicators is higher than the servant leadership indicator correlation with other constructs (work motivation and employee performance). This also applies to the correlation of work motivation constructs with a higher indicator than the correlation between work motivation indicators and other constructs (servant leadership and performance). Likewise with the construct of employee performance with a higher indicator compared to the correlation between employee performance indicators and other constructs (servant leadership and work motivation).

Table 5. Composite Reliability Test Results, Rho_A value and Cronbach Alpha

| No. | Variable          | Value of Reliability | Composite rho_A | Value Cronbach Alpha | Information |
|-----|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 1   | Servant Leadership| 0.851                | 0.819           | 0.802                | Reliable    |
| 2   | Work motivation   | 0.883                | 0.845           | 0.834                | Reliable    |
| 3   | Employee performance | 0.865            | 0.799           | 0.771                | Reliable    |

**Source:** Data processed (2018)

Based on Table 5, it can be explained that the results of the test composite reliability, rho_A value, and cronbach alpha for all variables are reliable, where the reliability composite value, rho_A value, and cronbach alpha is greater than 0.70. Then after the evaluation phase the measurement model is complete, followed by the structural model evaluation stage (structural model/ inner model) which consists of two parts, namely:
Table 6. Value of R - Square (R^2) Endogenous Variables

| No. | Variable                  | Symbol | R-Square Value (R^2) |
|-----|---------------------------|--------|----------------------|
| 1   | Work motivation           | Y_1    | 0.696                |
| 2   | Employee performance      | Y_2    | 0.690                |

Source: Data processed (2018)

Based on Table 6 above can be explained that the model of servant leadership influence on work motivation give the R-square value (R^2) of 0.696 which can be interpreted that the variability of the construct of motivation can be explained by the variability of the construct of servant leadership by 69.6 percent, while 30.4 percent is explained by other variables outside the study. Then, the model of servant leadership influence on the performance of the employee gives the R-square value (R^2) of 0.690 which can be interpreted that the variability of the construct of employee performance can be explained by the variability of the construct of servant leadership by 69 percent while 31 percent is explained by other variables outside the research. It can be concluded that the construct of motivation and performance of employees affected by the construct of servant leadership has a value of R-Square (R^2) above 0.67 and categorizing models a strong influence. Then done evaluation of structural models through Q-Square Predictive Relevance (Q^2). Q-Square Predictive Relevance (Q^2) calculation formula:

\[ Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R_y_1^2) (1 - R_y_2^2) \]
\[ = 1 - (1 - 0.696) (1 - 0.690) \]
\[ = 1 - (0.304) (0.310) \]
\[ = 1 - 0.094 \]
\[ = 0.905 \]

Based on the value of Q-Square Predictive Relevance (Q^2) for 0.905 above, it can be concluded that the research model is getting better and the model is relatively strong because it is above 0.35.

The test results using the bootstrap resampling method can be seen in Figure 1. Below:

Figure 1. Partial Least Square (PLS) Analysis Results
The results of the Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis above are supported by Table 1.7 regarding the results of path coefficients:

### Table 7. Path Coefficients

| No. | Variable                                      | Correlation coefficient | T-Statistics | P-Values | Information |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|
| 1   | Work Motivation (Y₁) -> Employee Performance (Y₂) | 0.716                   | 4.713        | 0.000    | Sig         |
| 2   | Servant Leadership (X) -> Employee Performance (Y₂) | 0.134                   | 0.805        | 0.421    | No Sig      |
| 3   | Servant Leadership (X) -> Work Motivation (Y₁)  | 0.834                   | 25.339       | 0.000    | Sig         |

Source: Data processed (2018)

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that the effect of work motivation on employee performance obtains a correlation coefficient of 0.716 and its t-statistic value is 4.713 (t-statistical value > t-table 1.96), the effect of servant leadership on employee performance obtains a correlation coefficient of 0.314 and the t-statistic value is 0.805 (t-statistic value < t-table 1.96), and the effect of servant leadership on work motivation obtains a correlation coefficient of 0.834 and its t-statistic value is 25.333 (t-statistics value > t-table 1.96).

**Discussion:**

The findings of this study provide results that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. This shows that the better the servant leadership, the more work motivation of employees, especially employees who interact directly with guests. The results of this study are in line with previous studies. These studies include: Awan et al. (2012), Harwili (2013), Bande et al. (2016), Wahyuni et al. (2014), Syahrill et al. (2016), and Mehrmanesh and Tirabadi (2015), where the results show that there is a positive and significant influence between servant leadership variables and work motivation.

The results of the study also show that servant leadership positive but not significant effect on employee performance. This shows that the better the servant leadership, the less significant it is in improving employee performance. The results of this study reinforce with research conducted by Kamanjaya et al. (2017) stating that servant leadership has no significant effect on employee performance. This means getting better servant leadership, there is no tendency to improve employee performance.

The effect of work motivation is proven to have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the more employees show confidence in performance in their jobs, the better performance of employees will be. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Shahzadi (2014), Ibrahim and Veronica (2015), Pratiwi and Darmastuti (2014), Sutrischastini and Riyanto (2015), Muntaha and Mufrihah (2017), and Sumantri (2016) and Farizki and Wahyuati (2017) also conducts research, where the results have a positive and significant effect between work motivation on employee performance.

Based on the calculation of VAF, the mediating effect of work motivation on the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance is 81 percent and these results indicate that the role of work motivation is able to mediate fully (full mediation). This means that to improve employee performance, the servant leadership variable must pass work motivation because directly the effect of servant leadership on employee performance is insignificant. The results of this study are in line with previous studies. These studies include: Ristiana et al (2014) and Awan et al. (2012) show that there is a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership on employee performance mediated by work motivation.

---
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Conclusion:

Based on the results of the discussion presented earlier, it can be concluded that the application of servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. The better the servant leadership, the more work motivation experienced by employees who interact directly with guests will increase. Then servant leadership positive and not significant effect on employee performance. These results indicate that the better the servant leadership, the less significant it is in improving employee performance. The application of servant leadership is not able to improve employee performance directly.

Work motivation felt by employees who interact directly with guests has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the more employees show confidence in performance in their jobs, the better performance of employees will be. The results of mediation testing show that servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance through work motivation. These results indicate that the better servant leadership, it will be able to increase work motivation, so that employee performance increases. To improve employee performance, servant leadership must pass through work motivation because directly the influence of servant leadership on employee performance is insignificant.
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