AFRICAN JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY, TOURISM AND LEISURE
2026, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 780-788
https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.782

AJHTL
OPEN ACCESS

Research article

Does servant leadership and organizational justice impact the job performance in community-based ecotourism?

Stefanus Rumangkit*[1], Mohammad Hamsal[1], Nugroho J Setiadi[1] and Evelyn Hendriana[1]

[1] Management Department, BINUS Business School, Doctor of Research in Management, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the influence of servant leadership and organizational justice on job performance through organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and work engagement, while examining the moderating role of environmental hostility using the stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model. The research method uses a cross-sectional quantitative approach by collecting data from 100 active Pokdarwis members in Java, Indonesia, via purposive sampling, and analyzing the data through Partial Least Squares - Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with an emphasis on effect size. The results reveal that both servant leadership and organizational justice positively affect OCB, work engagement, and job performance, with OCB and work engagement demonstrating substantively significant effects on performance, while environmental hostility exhibits a promising moderating role. Implications of this study suggest that CBET leaders should implement servant leadership practices and maintain organizational justice to enhance member engagement and performance. Ultimately, this research offers unique value by extending the SOR model to voluntary, contractual employees in community-based ecotourism and examining environmental hostility at the individual level.

KEYWORDS

Job performance; servant leadership; organizational justice; work engagement; community-based ecotourism

Introduction

Job performance has attracted the attention of academics and practitioners because it is an important factor that drives organizational success (Alwali & Alwali, 2022). This is evidenced by the growing body of research investigating job performance and its antecedents, including job satisfaction (Gazi et al., 2024), work motivation (Bashir et al., 2020), organizational commitment (Ahmad & Raja, 2021), and leadership style (Gemeda & Lee, 2020). Studies on job performance continue to be explored because it not only reflects individual effectiveness but also reflects organizational efficiency in managing human resources (Hilton et al., 2021). Job performance can be analyzed from the perspective of individuals, teams, and organizations (Carlos & Rodrigues, 2016). Research on job performance has been conducted in various employee employment statuses. The number of studies exploring the job performance of permanent employees (Al-Harazneh et al., 2024; Korsakienė et al., 2024; Ludwikowska et al., 2025) is more prevalent than research on contract employees' job performance (Ayoobzadeh, 2022). Research on job performance by employment status continues to be carried out because it is influenced by various antecedents, such as job characteristics, varying levels of job security, and motivation, ultimately affecting work behavior and performance outcomes (Al-Harazneh et al., 2024). This research examines the job performance of voluntary, contractual employees in the context of community-based ecotourism (CBET). In Indonesia, most CBETs are managed by the Community Tourism Awareness Groups (*Pokdarwis*, hereafter). *Pokdarwis* is a community-based non-profit organization with voluntary and contractual employment relationships. The study of job performance in CBET is an interesting area and can help fill a gap in previous research, which has found that job performance among employees with contract status remains limited. Superior job performance is often

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR'S CONTACT: Stefanus Rumangkit stefanus.rumangkit@binus.ac.id.
HOW TO CITE: Rumangkit, S., Hamsal, M., Setiadi, N.J. & Hendriana, E. (2026). Does servant leadership and organizational justice impact the job performance in community-based ecotourism?. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 15(3), 780-788
https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.782

ISSN: 2223-814X (Online) | © 2026 AJHTL

This work is published by African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Open Rubric

associated with leadership style, yet the study of leadership style and job performance is paradoxical. Naderi et al. (2019) and Yulianeu et al. (2021) found that transformational leadership positively affects job performance, whereas Tuan (2020) argued that charismatic leadership is more closely associated with job performance. In addition, the investigation of the influence of leadership style on job performance showed inconsistent results. Leadership style was found to affect job performance in research by Ludwikowska et al. (2025), Naderi et al. (2019), and Yulianeu et al. (2021) but not in the studies by Burawat (2019) and Zhang & Yao (2019). The large body of leadership research does not focus on a specific style that is likely to yield inconsistent findings and is difficult to implement in organizations (Piwowar-Sulej & Iqbal, 2023). Therefore, Alghizzawi et al. (2024) suggest that research on leadership and job performance use clear specifications of leadership style to measure its effectiveness in encouraging job performance.

This study investigates servant leadership as the leadership style expected to affect the job performance of *Pokdarwis* members. Although previous research indicates that job performance can be influenced by servant leadership (Khan et al., 2022), it remains rarely explored (Al-Azab & Al-Romeedy, 2023; Yulianeu et al., 2021). The influence of servant leadership on job performance is evident in the interaction between the leader and his followers. Servant leadership fosters close emotional relationships between leaders and subordinates, promoting mutual trust and openness. Employees who feel cared for and supported by their leaders tend to feel more satisfied and attached to their work (Khan et al., 2020). Servant leadership is believed to improve the performance of *Pokdarwis* members because it prioritizes members' needs, encourages empowerment, and builds trust-based working relationships that align with the characteristics of *Pokdarwis*, which aim not to pursue profits but to build tourism that benefits the surrounding community. Voluntary and contractual employees may consider organizational justice an important factor influencing their job performance. In *Pokdarwis* context, organizational justice concerns perceptions of fairness in task allocation, access to information, and decision-making. Organizational justice can create positive relationships between employees and the organizations they work for (AlMazrouei & Zacca, 2021). When employees are treated fairly, they feel appreciated, recognized, and well-treated (Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022). Organizational justice affects members' motivation to participate actively and maintain consistency of contributions. In a community-based setting, fair perceptions strengthen trust among members and administrators, ultimately improving job performance (Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022). Referring to the stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model, external stimuli must evoke individuals' internal states before resulting in a specific response (Liu et al., 2023). As such, this study sees organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and work engagement as mediators in the relationship between servant leadership and organizational justice on job performance (Aboramadan et al., 2020; Kaya & Karatepe, 2020). Eva et al. (2019) stated that OCB and work engagement need further exploration in relation to servant leadership, organizational justice, and job performance. According to the SOR model, servant leadership and organizational justice can be seen as stimuli that can stimulate positive employee behavior, including high job performance through work engagement and OCB (Kim et al., 2021). When a leader puts employees' needs first, this is believed to encourage OCB, which ultimately leads to higher job performance (Fröhlich et al., 2025). In the same vein, employees with high levels of work engagement tend to feel passionate, dedicated, and positively connected to their tasks, as well as feel tied to the organization's goals and values (Wang & Chen, 2020). With high spirits, employees can face challenges with a positive attitude and actively contribute to the team. Employees also tend to feel satisfied with their work, which can increase employee retention. Awareness of the impact of their work on organizational success motivates employees to continually seek ways to innovate and make a real contribution. (Ferraro et al., 2020). This study also explores the role of environmental hostility, which is believed to moderate the relationships among OCB, work engagement, and employee performance. When the external environment is full of challenges, this environment encourages employees to develop resilience, adaptability, and positive behavior to face competition (Isip et al., 2023). However, research on environmental hostility has been extensively researched at the organizational level (Isip et al., 2023; Martínez-del-Río et al., 2022) and is very rarely done at the individual level. Therefore, investigating environmental hostility at the individual level is very important as it can affect perception of the risk of external pressure and *Pokdarwis* members' ability to carry out their work (Oyarce, 2009). This study fills the gap by examining the relationship between servant leadership, organizational justice, OCB, work engagement, and job performance in the context of voluntary and contractual employees, who are rarely studied. It also aims to investigate the potential moderating role of environmental hostility, measured at the individual level, in the relationships among OCB, work engagement, and employee performance.

Literature review

Stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model as underpinning theory

The SOR model was developed by Mehrabian and Russell in 1974 as a development of classical Stimulus-Response theory (Liu et al., 2023). In the SOR model, a stimulus can be an event or object in the environment that triggers an organism, including internal processes, such as cognition and emotions, to produce a response arising from the interaction between the stimulus and the organism (Yu et al., 2021). The SOR model is used in this study to understand how organizational factors affect job performance by placing servant leadership and organizational justice as stimuli, OCB and work engagement as organisms, and job performance as a response.

Stimulus: Servant leadership and organizational justice

Servant leadership has attracted researchers' interest recently due to its ability to influence positive individual behaviors, such as organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), work performance, and job satisfaction (Arefin et al., 2022; Dahleez & Aboramadan, 2022; Lu et al., 2023). Servant leadership is a leadership style that focuses on the growth and development of followers (Dahleez & Aboramadan, 2022). Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness within an organization, which, in turn, influences their attitudes and behaviors in the workplace (Halbusi et al., 2020). Both servant leadership and organization may affect job performance. Through servant leadership, leaders show integrity and empathy in daily interactions, making members feel valued and supported, thereby encouraging them to work with passion and deliver their best performance (Yulianeu et al., 2021). Meanwhile, employees who feel treated fairly are more likely to work together and are open to collaborating to achieve common goals (Qiu & Dooley, 2022). This aligns with the views of Aggarwal et al. (2022), who emphasize that organizational justice can increase the sense of ownership in the organization and encourage active contributions toward achieving organizational goals. Based on the explanation above, the proposed hypotheses are:

H1: Servant leadership has a positive effect on job performance
H2: Organizational justice has a positive effect on performance

Organism: Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and work engagement

OCB is the behavior of individuals who voluntarily do work outside of core work (Qiu & Dooley, 2022). OCB includes actions such as assisting colleagues, prioritizing innovation, complying with existing rules and procedures within the organization, and being willing to work beyond working hours (de Geus et al., 2020). Work engagement is the extent to which employees feel motivated, excited, and dedicated to their work (Kaya & Karatepe, 2020). Servant leadership can increase OCB and work engagement because leaders who focus on employees' needs, well-being, and development will make employees feel valued and encourage them to contribute more beyond their formal duties (Panaccio et al., 2015). In terms of organizational justice, employees who feel they are treated fairly, across distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, tend to feel an obligation to help the organization achieve common goals (Rahman & Karim, 2022). Employees who feel treated fairly tend to show dedication through high work engagement, an emotional connection to their work and roles, and help in achieving organizational goals (Wang & Chen, 2020). Servant leadership can also affect work engagement by fostering a work environment characterized by trust and psychological security, where employees feel supported and valued (Huning et al., 2020), thereby increasing their sense of ownership and responsibility for their work. These relationships are presented as follows:

H3: Servant leadership has a positive effect on OCB
H4: Servant leadership has a positive effect on work engagement
H5: Organizational has a positive effect on OCB
H6. Organizational justice has a positive effect on work engagement

Response: Job performance

Job performance is the results of individual efforts, whether through the execution of key tasks or contextual contributions, that directly or indirectly support the effectiveness and sustainability of the organization (Pattnaik & Pattnaik, 2020). OCB, such as helping colleagues, maintaining harmony, and showing initiative, can optimize employee work outcomes (Qalati et al., 2022). When employees have a high level of OCB, they proactively contribute beyond their formal job descriptions to improve work processes, thereby speeding up work and improving efficiency (Gupta et al., 2024). Work is an emotional and cognitive

involvement carried out by employees (Salem et al., 2023). Thus, employees with high work engagement will feel that they are not only working to receive compensation, but also because they believe that the work they do has meaning for themselves and others, thereby yielding optimal work results (Wang & Chen, 2020). The proposed hypotheses are:

H7: OCB has a positive effect on job performance
H8: Work engagement has a positive effect on job performance

Contingency: Environmental hostility

Environmental hostility is defined as a business environment characterized by high uncertainty, resource limitations, intense competition, and a lack of exploitable growth opportunities (Martínez-del-Río et al., 2022). High environmental hostility, which is characterized by fierce competition, can weaken the influence of OCB and work engagement on job performance. Intense competition often pressures organizations to prioritize short-term results and directly measurable performance (Quyen & Khuong, 2024), so employees are more focused on achieving their personal performance goals and are reluctant to take on work outside their core work. (Pelfrene et al., 2003). This phenomenon causes employees to divert their energy from behaviors that are not explicitly required to the core tasks outlined in their job descriptions. Employees may feel that OCB behavior will not be rewarded, especially if managers prioritize immediately apparent results. OCB will be more successful when the environmental conditions are stable and supportive. As conditions become more hostile and competitive, organizations and employees adjust their behavior, thereby weakening OCB's positive relationship with job performance. This study proposes the following hypotheses:

H9a: Environmental hostility weakens the influence of OCB on job performance
H9b: Environmental hostility weakens the influence of work engagement on job performance

Methods

This study uses a quantitative, cross-sectional approach. This study population was members of tourism-conscious groups (*Pokdarwis*). The sampling technique uses purposive sampling, with criteria including being a *Pokdarwis* member who manages self-governing CBET-based tourist destinations on Java Island and having been a member for at least 1 year. There are not many self-governing CBET managed by *Pokdarwis* in Java; thus, this study collected data from 100 respondents, which met the rule of thumb for using the PLS-SEM in small populations, where the required sample size is between 30 and 100 (Hair et al., 2014). This study adopted a measurement tool from previous research. Servant leadership was measured by 7 items adapted from Liden et al. (2015). Organizational justice, which has three dimensions, namely procedural justice, distributive justice, and interpersonal justice, was measured using 17 items adapted from Shimamura et al. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior has five dimensions, namely altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness, which were measured using 17 items adapted from Shimamura et al. (2021). Work engagement was measured by 7 items adapted from Korsakienė et al. (2024). Job performance with 2 dimensions, namely in-role performance and extra-role performance, was measured using 6 items adapted from Pattnaik & Pattnaik (2020). As for environmental hostility, it was measured using 3 items from Martínez-del-Río et al. (2022). All variables except environmental hostility were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, while environmental hostility was measured using a dichotomous scale. The collected data were analyzed using PLS-SEM to maximize the predictive ability. It allows for more accurate measurement of the cause-and-effect relationship between exogenous and endogenous variables, while accounting for measurement errors, data imperfections, and small sample size (Hair et al., 2014).

Results and discussion

Table 1 presents the respondents' profile.

Table 1: Respondent profile

No	Demographic Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender			
1	Male	83	83%
2	Female	17	17%
Age			
1	18 – 23	15	15%
2	24 – 29	20	20%
3	30 – 37	32	32%
4	38 – 46	20	20%
5	47 – 55	10	10%
6	Above 55	3	3%
Education Level			
1	Primary School	10	10%
2	Secondary School	40	40%
3	Diploma	35	35%
4	Bachelor	15	15%

Work Tenure in *Pokdarwis*			
1	1 – 3 Years	35	35%
2	4 – 6 Years	43	40%
3	7 – 9 Years	22	20%
Interaction frequency with *Pokdarwis* leader			
1	More than once a week	10	10%
2	Once a week	45	45%
3	Twice a month	20	20%
4	Once a month	35	35%

As presented in Table 1, this study was dominated by males aged 30-46 years old, classified as Millennials. The proportion of those who have completed tertiary education was equal to that of those who have not. Most of them interacted with the *Pokdarwis* leader more than once a month, indicating that communication is quite intense in managing activities in the local *Pokdarwis* environment consistently and effectively. One indicator, OJ6 at organizational justice, was excluded due to the lower-order construct discriminant validity issue. After eliminating OJ6, the remaining indicators fulfilled the construct validity and reliability with factor loadings greater than 0.7, AVE greater than 0.5, Cronbach's alpha, and composite reliability greater than 0.7 (Hair et al., 2020) (Table 2) and discriminant validity based on Fornell-Larcker criterion (Table 3). This study used a disjoint second-order analysis. The validity and reliability tests of the higher-order construct also met the criteria.

Table 2: Construct validity and reliability: Lower-order constructs

Variable/Dimension	Number of valid items	Factor loading	AVE	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability
Servant Leadership	7	0.722 – 0.867	0.659	0.913	0.916
Organizational Justice:					
Procedural Justice	7	0.742 – 0.820	0.633	0.904	0.909
Distributive Justice	4	0.842 – 0.890	0.767	0.900	0.918
Interpersonal Justice	5	0.859 – 0.915	0.776	0.928	0.918
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB):					
Altruism	5	0.863 – 0.924	0.824	0.946	0.948
Courtesy	3	0.880 – 0.937	0.842	0.906	0.907
Civic Virtue	3	0.906 – 0.950	0.851	0.912	0.915
Sportsmanship	3	0.870 – 0.917	0.791	0.868	0.877
Conscientiousness	3	0.893 – 0.910	0.810	0.883	0.885
Work Engagement	7	0.807 – 0.920	0.762	0.948	0.952
Job Performance:					
In-role Performance	3	0.890 – 0.910	0.817	0.888	0.889
Extra Role Performance	3	0.918 – 0.928	0.855	0.915	0.917
Environmental Hostility	3	0.886 – 0.890	0.789	0.867	0.868

Table 3: Discriminant validity: Lower-order construct

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Altruism	0.908												
2. Civic virtue	0.834	0.922											
3. Conscientiousness	0.802	0.823	0.900										
4. Courtesy	0.871	0.812	0.765	0.918									
5. Distributive Justice	0.597	0.587	0.507	0.525	0.876								
6. Environmental Hostility	0.683	0.665	0.648	0.645	0.607	0.888							
7. Extra Role Performance	0.753	0.803	0.738	0.674	0.543	0.708	0.925						
8. In-role Performance	0.810	0.649	0.588	0.682	0.794	0.756	0.591	0.881					
9. Interpersonal Justice	0.762	0.803	0.776	0.711	0.552	0.751	0.856	0.588	0.904				
10. Procedural Justice	0.675	0.599	0.562	0.607	0.823	0.647	0.527	0.817	0.543	0.796			
11. Servant Leadership	0.721	0.628	0.658	0.652	0.533	0.552	0.626	0.655	0.623	0.774	0.812		
12. Sportsmanship	0.833	0.832	0.885	0.846	0.483	0.685	0.719	0.650	0.738	0.571	0.659	0.890	
13. Work Engagement	0.848	0.858	0.870	0.792	0.607	0.717	0.848	0.666	0.851	0.654	0.718	0.847	0.873

Bootstrapping with 5,000 sub-samples was performed for hypothesis testing. Due to the small sample size, the interpretation is based on the p-value for statistical significance and effect size (f^2) for substantive significance. Unlike the p-value, f^2 is not dependent on sample size, providing more interpretable results for small-sample analysis. As presented in Table 4, some paths were not statistically significant (H1, H7, H9a, and H9b), but their effect size were significant with values between 0.025 and 0.058. They indicated that the effect magnitudes were significant, even though they were classified as small. The insignificance of the statistical results might be related to the sample size. As such, this study found that six hypotheses were statistically and substantively supported (H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, and H8) and four were statistically insignificant, but indicated a significant magnitude (H1, H7, H9a, and H9b). Among these four with significant effect sizes, one of them showed the opposite direction, which was H9a.

Table 4: Hypotheses testing

	Hypotheses	β	t-value	p-values	f^2	Remarks
H1	Servant Leadership > Job Performance	0.056	0.635	0.369	0.025	Not Supported*
H2	Organizational Justice > Job Performance	-0.193	1.952	0.047	0.054	Supported
H3	Servant Leadership > OCB	0.400	2.014	0.009	0.328	Supported
H4	Servant Leadership > Work Engagement	0.443	2.632	0.002	0.275	Supported
H5	Organizational Justice > OCB	0.435	2.678	0.005	0.144	Supported
H6	Organizational Justice > Work Engagement	0.375	2.554	0.005	0.130	Supported
H7	OCB -> Job Performance	0.217	1.424	0.092	0.058	Not Supported*
H8	Work Engagement > Job Performance	0.520	3.428	0.000	0.159	Supported
H9a	Environmental Hostility x OCB > Job Performance	0.130	0.848	0.222	0.039	Not Supported*
H9b	Environmental Hostility x Work Engagement -> Job Performance	-0.181	1.304	0.108	0.050	Not Supported*
	R^2 Work Engagement = 0.585					

	R^2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior = 0.590 R^2 Job Performance = 0.828

Note: *Although the relationship is not statistically significant, its effect size is significant

Based on the effect size, this study finds that implementing servant leadership increases job performance, while the insignificant statistical result is due to the small sample size. The findings of this study indicate that servant leadership shows a positive effect on job performance in terms of effect size, yet this relationship is not statistically significant. This result shows that servant leadership practices, including empowerment, ethical conduct, and concern for follower well-being, tend to associate with improved performance outcomes at a practical level (Huning et al., 2020). Leaders who foster psychological safety and an inclusive work climate may still contribute to stronger employee motivation and goal-directed behavior, but the observed influence does not reach statistical significance in this model (Sahlmueller et al., 2022). Servant leadership is also found to enhance OCB, supporting the study of Elche et al. (2020) and Qiu & Dooley (2022). It is also able to elevate work engagement, which is in line with the studies by Kaya & Karatepe (2020). Servant leadership is characterized by prioritizing service, giving attention to employees' needs, and supporting individual development, encouraging the emergence of voluntary behaviors that go beyond the demands of formal work (Elche et al., 2020). When employees feel valued, trusted, and supported by leaders, they tend to show greater concern for the organization by helping colleagues, actively participating in organizational activities, and making additional contributions toward achieving common goals (Tuan & Ngan, 2021).

Organization justice has positive effects on job performance, OCB, and work engagement, giving support to AlMazrouei & Zacca (2021) and Hermanto & Srimulyani (2022). These findings confirm that perceptions of fair treatment encourage members to voluntarily engage in extra-role behavior for the betterment of the organization. Organizational justice has been shown to increase members' motivation to engage in OCB behaviors, such as helping peers and actively participating in organizational activities (Shimamura et al., 2021). Further, when members experience consistent fairness in reward allocation, procedures, and interpersonal interactions, it fosters trust and respect, creating a strong psychological foundation (Adamovic, 2023). Regarding the OCB effect on job performance, it is not statistically significant, but its effect size shows a small substantive effect. It indicates the potential true effect of OCB on job performance despite the sample size. Thus, this finding is in line with those of Huang & Tsai (2024) and Qalati et al. (2022). The organizational context or type of work can affect the relationship between OCB and job performance (Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2023). Employees may actively help colleagues, collaborate, or exhibit pro-social behavior, and these contributions may be reflected in specific performance metrics, such as output targets, individual productivity, or formal work outcome evaluations (Wonda, 2024). The effect of work engagement on job performance is evident, indicating employees with high work engagement tend to show greater passion, dedication, and focus in carrying out their duties (Corbeanu & Iliescu, 2023). This involvement not only enables employees to complete work according to the assigned responsibilities but also enables them to strive to provide the best work results through seriousness, perseverance, and commitment to achieving organizational goals (Stankevičiūtė & Savanevičienė, 2021).

Lastly, this study finds a weak substantive moderating effect of environmental hostility in the relationships among OCB, work engagement, and job performance. There is an indication that environmental hostility could weaken the effect of work engagement on job performance. According to contingency theory, competitive and uncertain environmental conditions ideally force individuals to divert their energy from extra-role behavior (OCB) and reduce work attachment due to aggressive target pressure (Pelfrene et al., 2003; Quyen & Khuong, 2024). Suprisingly, this study finds that environmental hostility strengthens the positive effect of OCB on job performance, contradicting the proposed hypothesis. The finding that environmental pressure strengthens the effect of OCB on performance can be explained through stress appraisal and adaptive coping mechanisms (Mitchell et al., 2019). Employees with a strong emotional attachment tend to view external pressure as a challenge to be addressed rather than a threat. This appraisal triggers active coping, manifested in increased discretionary contributions to maintain organizational sustainability (De Clercq et al., 2019). In this condition, OCB functions as an adaptive strategy that enhances coordination and work effectiveness.

Conclusion

The conclusion places greater emphasis on the effect size rather than solely on statistical hypothesis testing based on p-values, given the small sample size. This study shows that the increase in job performance among *Pokdarwis* members is not only directly influenced by servant leadership or organizational justice but could also be mediated by OCB and work engagement. Environmental hostility plays a dual role. On one side, it weakens the positive effect of work engagement on job performance. On the other side, it strengthens the positive effect of OCB on job performance. This study validates the use of the SOR model to explain the relationships among organizational stimuli (servant leadership and organizational justice), the organism

(OCB and work engagement), and the response (job performance). This study also gives a potential extension of the SOR model by integrating environmental hostility as the contingent factor that may influence the magnitude of the organism's effect on the response. The findings indicate the effectiveness of servant leadership in fostering a sense of ownership toward *Pokdarwis* and increasing members' work engagement, which eventually enhances their job performance. Thus, *Pokdarwis* leaders should consider implementing this leadership style to encourage their members to perform well. They must also fulfill organizational justice by treating the members fairly. The focus is on strengthening emotional attachment, work meaning, and member participation to improve sustainable performance in community-based organizations in the local tourism sector, more effectively and measurably in the future. Future research should increase the sample size and the number of sampled areas. This study considers servant leadership as a unidimensional construct, whereas some literature argues it is multidimensional. Therefore, future research may treat it as a multidimensional construct. Future studies may also consider other leadership styles, such as sustainable leadership or supportive leadership, and test their effect on OCB, work engagement, and job performance.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by a grant with Scheme Doctoral Dissertation Research from The Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia by contract number 282/C3/DT.05.00/PL-BARU/2026.

References

Aboramadan, M., Dahleez, K., & Hamad, M. H. (2020). Servant leadership and academics outcomes in higher education: The role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *29*(3), 562–584. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2019-1923

Adamovic, M. (2023). Organizational justice research: A review, synthesis, and research agenda. *European Management Review*, *20*(4), 762–782. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12564

Aggarwal, A., Jaisinghani, D., & Nobi, K. (2022). Effect of organizational justice and support on organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions: The mediating role of employee engagement. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *14*(4), 525–554. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-08-2021-0112

Ahmad, M. R., & Raja, R. (2021). Employee Job Satisfaction and Business Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment. *Vision*, *25*(2), 168–179. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262920985949

Al-Azab, M. R., & Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2023). Servant leadership and tourism businesses' outcomes: A multiple mediation model. *Tourism Review*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2022-0538

Alghizzawi, M., Ahmed, E., Alhawamdeh, Z. M., & Almhaisen, F. (2024). A Key Factor in Leadership Style with Employee Performance: A Comparative Analysis. In B. Awwad (Ed.), *The AI Revolution: Driving Business Innovation and Research* (Vol. 525, pp. 873–883). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54383-8_66

Al-Harazneh, R., Abu shosha, G. M., Al-Oweidat, I. A., & Nashwan, A. J. (2024). The influence of job security on job performance among Jordanian nurses. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, *20*, 100681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2024.100681

Alwali, J., & Alwali, W. (2022). The relationship between emotional intelligence, transformational leadership, and performance: A test of the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *43*(6), 928–952. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2021-0486

AlMazrouei, H., & Zacca, R. (2021). The influence of organizational justice and decision latitude on expatriate organizational commitment and job performance. *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, *9*(4), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-06-2020-0093

Arefin, Md. S., Faroque, O., Zhang, J., & Long, L. (2022). High-performance work systems and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of goal congruence and servant leadership. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, *18*(11), 5432–5453. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-03-2019-0209

Ayoobzadeh, M. (2022). Freelance job search during times of uncertainty: Protean career orientation, career competencies and job search. *Personnel Review*, *51*(1), 40–56. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2020-0563

Bashir, A., Amir, A., Jawaad, M., & Hasan, T. (2020). Work conditions and job performance: An indirect conditional effect of motivation. *Cogent Business & Management*, *7*(1), 1801961. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1801961

Burawat, P. (2019). The relationships among transformational leadership, sustainable leadership, lean manufacturing and sustainability performance in Thai SMEs manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *36*(6), 1014–1036. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-09-2017-0178

Carlos, V. S., & Rodrigues, R. G. (2016). Development and validation of a self-reported measure of job performance. *Social Indicators Research*, *126*(1), 279–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0883-z

Corbeanu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2023). The Link between work engagement and job performance. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *22*(3), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000316

Dahleez, K., & Aboramadan, M. (2022). Servant leadership and job satisfaction in higher education: The mediating roles of organizational justice and organizational trust. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2052753

De Clercq, D., Suhail, A., Azeem, M., & Haq, I. (2019). Citizenship pressure and job performance: roles of citizenship fatigue and continuance commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. 57(4), 483–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12241

De Geus, C. J. C., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior in the public sector: A Systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Public Administration Review*, *80*(2), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13141

Elche, D., Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Linuesa-Langreo, J. (2020). Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of empathy and service climate. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *32*(6), 2035–2053. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2019-0501

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., Van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(1), 111–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Ferraro, T., dos Santos, N. R., Moreira, J. M., & Pais, L. (2020). Decent work, work motivation, work engagement and burnout in physicians. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *5*(1), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41042-019-00024-5

Fröhlich, P., Rehwaldt, R., Beitz, S., Diestel, S., & Kortsch, T. (2025). Leadership, happiness, and extra-role behavior: The role of happiness at work as a mediator between instrumental leadership and OCB in newcomers. *Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift Für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO)*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-025-00809-0

Gazi, Md. A. I., Yusof, M. F., Islam, Md. A., Amin, M. B., & Senathirajah, A. R. B. S. (2024). Analyzing the impact of employee job satisfaction on their job behavior in the industrial setting: An analysis from the perspective of job performance. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *10*(4), 100427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100427

Gemeda, H. K., & Lee, J. (2020). Leadership styles, work engagement and outcomes among information and communications technology professionals: A cross-national study. *Heliyon*, *6*(4), e03699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03699

Gupta, V., Mittal, S., Ilavarasan, P. V., & Budhwar, P. (2024). Pay-for-performance, procedural justice, OCB and job performance: A sequential mediation model. *Personnel Review*, *53*(1), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2021-0782

Halbusi, H., Williams, K. A., Mansoor, H. O., Hassan, M. S., & Hamid, F. A. H. (2020). Examining the impact of ethical leadership and organizational justice on employees' ethical behavior: Does person–organization fit play a role? Ethics & Behavior, 30(7), 514–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2019.1694024

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (Seventh edition, Pearson new international edition). Pearson Education Limited.

Hermanto, Y. B., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2022). The effects of organizational justice on employee performance using dimension of organizational citizenship behavior as mediation. *Sustainability*, *14*(20). https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013322

Hilton, S. K., Madilo, W., Awaah, F., & Arkorful, H. (2021). Dimensions of transformational leadership and organizational performance: The mediating effect of job satisfaction. *Management Research Review*, *46*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2021-0152

Huang, L., & Tsai, H. (2024). The effects of recovery experiences on hotel employees' subjective well-being, organizational citizenship behavior, and task performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *121*, 103798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103798

Huning, T. M., Hurt, K. J., & Frieder, R. E. (2020). The effect of servant leadership, perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and job embeddedness on turnover intentions: An empirical investigation. *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, *8*(2), 177–194. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-06-2019-0049

Isip, M. I., Baconguis, R., Depositario, D. P., Quimbo, M. A., & Paunlagui, M. (2023). How environmental hostility, entrepreneurial orientation and dynamic capabilities are manifested to influence above-average export performance during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Continuity & Resilience Review*, *5*(2), 135–157. https://doi.org/10.1108/CRR-10-2022-0025

Kaya, B., & Karatepe, O. M. (2020). Does servant leadership better explain work engagement, career satisfaction and adaptive performance than authentic leadership? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *32*(6), 2075–2095. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2019-0438

Khan, F., Arshad, M., Raoof, R., & Farooq, O. (2022). Servant leadership and employees' performance: Organization and information structure perspective. *The Service Industries Journal*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2022.2086976

Khan, M. A., Ismail, F. B., Hussain, A., & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. *SAGE Open*, *10*(1), 2158244019898264. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019898264

Kim, W., Hantula, D. A., & Di Benedetto, A. (2021). Organizational citizenship behaviors perceived by collectivistic 50-and-older customers and medical-care service performance: An application of stimulus-organism-response theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *34*(10), 2237–2268. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-01-2021-0027

Korsakienė, R., Stankeviciene, A., & Nawal, A. (2024). Work engagement and individual performance of teachers: The role of job demands and job resources. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *22*(3), 528–541. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(3).2024.40

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(2), 254–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.12.002

Liu, Y., Fu, Y., Liang, Z., & Liu, Y. (2023). Factors influencing the adoption of public mobile libraries in China: A stimulus–response perspective. *The Electronic Library*, *42*(1), 37–59. https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-06-2023-0143

Lu, J., Falahat, M., & Cheah, P. K. (2023). A systematic literature review on the relationship between servant leadership and its team and organizational level outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *37*(2), 255–282. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2023-0112

Ludwikowska, K., Zakkariya, K. A., & Aboobaker, N. (2025). Academic leadership and job performance: The effects of organizational citizenship behavior and informal institutional leadership. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, *14*(1), 115–131. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-04-2024-0074

Martínez-del-Río, J., Perez-Luño, A., & Bojica, A. M. (2022). In prosperity and adversity? The value of high-performance work practices for SMEs under conditions of environmental hostility and social embeddedness. *International Journal of Manpower*, *44*(4), 618–634. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-12-2021-0707

Mitchell, M. S., Greenbaum, R. L., Vogel, R. M., Mawritz, M. B., & Keating, D. J. (2019). Can You Handle the Pressure? The Effect of Performance Pressure on Stress Appraisals, Self-regulation, and Behavior. Academy of Management Journal. 62(2), 531–552.

Naderi, A., Nasrolahi Vosta, L., Ebrahimi, A., & Jalilvand, M. R. (2019). The contributions of social entrepreneurship and transformational leadership to performance: Insights from rural tourism in Iran. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *39*(9/10), 719–737. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-06-2019-0124

Quyen, L., & Khuong, N. V. (2024). How market competition influences organizational performance: Mediation in the interplay of management accounting system, enterprise risk management, and organizational innovation performance. *Business Strategy & Development*, *7*(1), e302. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsd2.302

Oyarce, C. E. M. (2009). *Environmental hostility, individual learning, and intrapreneurship as predictors of organizational learning: A study applied to two selected mining companies in Chile* [Dissertation]. Texas A&M University.

Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an Understanding of When and Why Servant Leadership Accounts for Employee Extra-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *30*(4), 657–675. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9388-z

Pattnaik, S., & Pattnaik, S. (2020). Exploring employee performance dimensionality in Indian public sector units. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *70*(3), 657–674. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-08-2019-0374

Pelfrene, E., Vlerick, P., Moreau, M., Mak, R. P., Kornitzer, M., & De Backer, G. (2003). Perceptions of job insecurity and the impact of world market competition as health risks: Results from Belstress. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*(4), 411–425. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317903322591569

Piwowar-Sulej, K., & Iqbal, Q. (2023). Leadership styles and sustainable performance: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *382*, 134600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134600

Qalati, S. A., Zafar, Z., Fan, M., Sánchez Limón, M. L., & Khaskheli, M. B. (2022). Employee performance under transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediated model. *Heliyon*, *8*(11), e11374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11374

Qiu, S., & Dooley, L. (2022). How servant leadership affects organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of perceived procedural justice and trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *43*(3), 350–369. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-04-2021-0146

Rahman, M. H. A., & Karim, D. N. (2022). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of work engagement. *Heliyon*, *8*(5). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09450

Ruiz-Palomino, P., Linuesa-Langreo, J., & Elche, D. (2023). Team-level servant leadership and team performance: The mediating roles of organizational citizenship behavior and internal social capital. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, *32*(S2), 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12390

Sahlmueller, B., Van Quaquebeke, N., Giessner, S. R., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2022). Dual leadership in the matrix: Effects of leader-member exchange (LMX) and dual-leader exchange (DLX) on role conflict and dual leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *29*(3), 270–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221096547

Salem, N. H., Ishaq, M. I., Yaqoob, S., Raza, A., & Zia, H. (2023). Employee engagement, innovative work behaviour, and employee wellbeing: Do workplace spirituality and individual spirituality matter? *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, *32*(2), 657–669. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12463

Shimamura, M., Fukutake, M., Namba, M., & Ogino, T. (2021). The relationship among factors of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, and ease of work among Japanese nurses. *Applied Nursing Research*, *61*, 151479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2021.151479

Stankevičiūtė, Ž., & Savanevičienė, A. (2021). Linkage between leaders' behaviour in performance management, organisational justice and work engagement in public sector. *Economies*, *9*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9010015

Tuan, L. T. (2020). Crafting the sales job collectively in the tourism industry: The roles of charismatic leadership and collective person-group fit. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *45*, 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.08.003

Tuan, L. T., & Ngan, V. T. (2021). Leading ethically to shape service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior among tourism salespersons: Dual mediation paths and moderating role of service role identity. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *60*, 102421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102421

Wang, C.-H., & Chen, H.-T. (2020). Relationships among workplace incivility, work engagement and job performance. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, *3*(4), 415–429. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-09-2019-0105

Wonda, T. A. (2024). Examination of organizational citizenship behavior influence on employee performance attainment: An empirical investigation. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1), 2418422. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2418422

Yu, Z., Klongthong, W., Thavorn, J., & Ngamkroeckjoti, C. (2021). Understanding rural Chinese consumers' behavior: A stimulus–organism–response (S-O-R) perspective on Huawei's brand loyalty in China. *Cogent Business & Management*, *8*(1), 1880679. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1880679

Yulianeu, A., Ferdinand, A. T., & Purnomo, R. (2021). Transformational leadership and energizing organizational learning: Empirical model for improving community-based eco-tourism performance in Indonesia. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, *38*(4), 1135–1142. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.38419-753

Zhang, X., & Yao, Z. (2019). Impact of relational leadership on employees' unethical pro-organizational behavior: A survey based on tourism companies in four countries. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(12), e0225706. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225706