



## Article

# Servant Leadership and Its Impact on Organizational Commitment and Effective Management Practices for Sustainable Performance

Allan B. Pleno <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bulacan State University-Bustos Campus

Correspondence: [allan.pleno@bulsu.edu.ph](mailto:allan.pleno@bulsu.edu.ph)

## Abstract

*This study used a descriptive correlational methodology to investigate organizational commitment, effectiveness, and servant leadership behavior among managers from rural, savings, and cooperative banks in Bulacan. Data were collected from 260 respondents, including 204 employees and 56 managers. The findings revealed that managers evaluated themselves highly, but employees gave greater rates to servant leadership behaviors. Both behavioral and attitudinal dimensions of organizational commitment were highly linked to servant leadership. Furthermore, servant leadership was found to have a strong and positive correlation with organizational effectiveness, as assessed by quality, productivity, and adaptability. Independent t-tests revealed no significant difference in managers' and employees' evaluations of organizational effectiveness. Although managers' self-assessments of specific servant leadership characteristics did not significantly predict success, employees identified conceptualization as an important predictor. These findings emphasize the critical role of servant leadership in increasing organizational commitment and effectiveness in the banking sector, corroborating global research that has shown its favorable influence on organizational performance and employee engagement.*

**Keywords:** *Servant leadership, organizational commitment, effective management practices, sustainable performance*

## Suggested citation:

Pleno, A. (2025). Servant Leadership and Its Impact on Organizational Commitment and Effective Management Practices for Sustainable Performance. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI2), 171-190. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.154>



## Introduction

Servant leadership is gaining popularity as a revolutionary leadership style that puts employee and community well-being ahead of traditional profit-driven practices, particularly in the Philippine financial sector. It promotes ethical behavior, employee engagement, and corporate social responsibility, ultimately improving company culture and long-term performance (Garcia & Santos, 2023; Reyes & Cruz, 2024). This leadership style encourages individual variety and competent resource management in the face of unpredictability (Lopez et al., 2022). Organizational effectiveness today depends on proactively exploiting environmental resources and assessing performance from financial, customer, internal processes, and learning perspectives (Mendoza, 2021; Tan, 2022; Rivera, 2023).

Organizational commitment, which is closely related to employee loyalty, indicates employees' identification with and the intention to stay with the organization by matching their behavior with organizational values (Mete et al., 2016; Garcia & Lim, 2023). Luthans (2018) describes it as a desire to stay, effort put in, and belief in organizational goals, a framework reinforced by current research on retention and performance (Rodriguez & Tan, 2022; AlJabari & Ghazzawi, 2019; Santos & Morales, 2024).

Despite its advantages, servant leadership is unusual in profit-driven firms that prioritize growth and authority-based leadership styles (Yukl, 2010; Santos & Lim, 2023). Servant leaders encounter problems in competitive situations where members' interests may collide with organizational goals (Garcia & Mendoza, 2024). Furthermore, prioritizing profit over member welfare may impede profit targets and long-term growth (Yukl, 2010). While servant leadership has been related to increased organizational culture, dedication, citizenship behavior, and employee performance, empirical research remains scarce (Harwiki, 2016; Sokol, 2014; Melchar & Bosco, 2010; Rachmawati & Lantu, 2014; Hutapea & Dewi, 2012). More scholarly research is needed to fully comprehend its potential and applications (Parris & Peachey, 2012a; Liden et al., 2014).

This study will examine the relationship between servant leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and managerial effectiveness in the Philippine banking industry. It aims to understand better how servant leadership creates organizational commitment and sustains managerial effectiveness, ultimately improving sector-wide management practices. This study adds to the expanding body of evidence supporting servant leadership as a promising alternative for boosting organizational performance and development by investigating its function in establishing commitment and management effectiveness. It emphasizes servant leadership's ability to

fundamentally empower individuals, instill service-oriented ideals in organizational culture, and foster resilience and long-term success (Frankl, 1984; Harwiki, 2016; Garcia & Lim, 2023; Reyes & Cruz, 2024; Parris & Peachey, 2012a).

## **Methodology**

### *Subject*

Participants in this study contributed valuable insights regarding the impact of servant leadership behavior on managers' organizational commitment and performance, and the practical implementation of servant leadership on effective management practices.

The sample included managers and staff from Bulacan's savings, rural, and cooperative banks who matched the following criteria: (a) they were currently employed as managers, area heads, or bank personnel in these banks; and (b) they had at least 3 to 10 years' banking experience. The study included 260 participants, 56 of whom were managers and 204 worked for banks.

### *Data Collection Procedure*

Careful explanation of the contents of the questionnaire was utilized. Respondents were reminded that they must indicate their honest opinion and participation in the items included in the questionnaire. Questionnaires were retrieved after 6 to 10 days upon distribution.

The bank managers and staff were assured that their responses would be treated with utmost confidentiality and reviewed systematically, organized, and analyzed for the research alone.

### *Research Design*

The researcher used a descriptive correlational strategy to investigate the association between two or more quantifiable variables without modifying them (Sharma et al., 2018; Survey Sparrow, Scribbr). This strategy, also known as statistical or descriptive research, assists in determining the existence of a link and its strength and direction (Creswell, 2018). The study used a survey approach, with participants responding to structured questionnaires that captured their impressions (Ponto, 2015). One significant advantage of descriptive research is its ability to efficiently handle real-world problems while producing valuable data in a limited timeframe (Willis et al., 2016).

Overall, this technique suits the study's goal of investigating the links between servant leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and management effectiveness in a natural situation without experimental manipulation.

#### *Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment*

The researcher used Pearson's correlation method to determine the degree and direction of relationships among variables, specifically between manager servant leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and effectiveness, as it is widely used to assess such associations (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017; Sharma, 2018). To further investigate the relative importance of these variables, regression analysis was used, which allowed for the prediction of dependent variable outcomes based on independent variables.

This descriptive-quantitative technique, which included correlation and regression analyses, enabled the researcher to thoroughly investigate the linkages and predictive impacts of servant leadership characteristics on organizational commitment and managerial effectiveness in the banking industry.

## **Results and Discussions**

*Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Servant Leadership Indicators as Perceived by Managers*

Indicators		Inventory Score			
		N	M	SD	Interpretation
Listening	I give others the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way they feel is best	56	3.18	0.690	High
	I sacrifice my interests to meet others' needs	56	3.18	0.636	High
Empathy	I encourage others to handle important work decisions	56	3.43	0.599	Very High
	I take time to talk to others on a personal level	56	3.23	0.632	High
	I am always interested in helping people within the organization	56	3.45	0.601	Very High
Healing	I tell if something work-related is going wrong	56	3.38	0.676	Very High
	I can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them	56	3.18	0.575	High
Awareness	I care about employee well-being	56	3.45	0.630	Very High
	I care more about others' success	56	3.05	0.796	High
Persuasion	I give others responsibility to make important decisions about their job.	56	3.13	0.574	High
	I provide the information needed to perform the work well	56	3.43	0.599	Very High
	I do what I can to make the other job easier	56	3.41	0.626	Very High

Conceptualization	I provide others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills	56	3.32	0.606	Very High
	I emphasize the societal responsibility of our work	56	3.27	0.587	Very High
	I am interested in making sure others reach their career goals	56	3.39	0.623	Very High
Stewardship	I value honesty more than profits	56	3.48	0.687	Very High
	I would not compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success	56	3.38	0.728	Very High
	I can solve work problems with new or creative ideas	56	3.32	0.575	Very High
<b>Overall Mean</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>0.635</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 1 shows that managers have very high levels of servant leadership ( $M = 3.31$ ,  $SD = 0.635$ ,  $N = 56$ ). They empower subordinates by fostering autonomy and decision-making, demonstrate genuine caring via emotional healing, and maintain high ethical standards that prioritize honesty. Managers promote their subordinates' success and career growth, have excellent conceptual skills in problem solving and goal comprehension, and actively participate in community activities. These findings are consistent with Liden et al.'s (2018) paradigm, emphasizing managers embodying servant leadership's seven qualities and their dedication to establishing a supportive, ethical, and community-focused leadership culture.

*Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Servant Leadership Indicators as Perceived by the Staff*

Indicators		Inventory Score			
		N	M	SD	Interpretation
Listening	My manager gives others the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way they feel is best	204	3.25	0.510	Very High
	My manager sacrifices their interests to meet others' needs	204	3.23	0.562	High
Empathy	My manager encourages others to handle important work decisions	204	3.30	0.519	Very High
	My manager takes time to talk to others on a personal level	204	3.20	0.510	High
	My manager is always interested in helping people within the organization	204	3.26	0.492	Very High
Healing	My manager tells me if something work-related is going wrong	204	3.28	0.532	Very High
	My manager can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them	204	3.20	0.510	High
Awareness	My manager cares about employee well-being	204	3.30	0.521	Very High
	My manager cares more about others' success	204	3.15	0.560	High

Persuasion	My manager gives others responsibility to make important decisions about their job.	204	3.25	0.524	High
	My manager provides the information needed to perform the work well	204	3.31	0.494	Very High
	My manager does what he/she can to make the job easier	204	3.29	0.498	Very High
Conceptualization	My manager provides others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills	204	3.24	0.472	High
	My manager emphasizes the societal responsibility of our work	204	3.23	0.466	High
	My manager is interested in making sure others reach their career goals	204	3.29	0.508	Very High
Stewardship	The manager values honesty more than profits	204	3.27	0.487	Very High
	My manager would not compromise ethical principles to achieve success.	204	3.22	0.499	High
	My manager can solve work problems with new or creative ideas	204	3.23	0.465	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>0.507</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 2 shows that employees rate their managers' servant leadership practices positively, with overall mean scores indicating a "High" level of servant leadership ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 0.505$ ,  $N = 56$ ). Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and stewardship are typically rated as "High" to "Very High," indicating managers' attention to employee needs, ethical ideals, and developmental support. The best evaluations were found in categories such as flexibility in managing problems, fostering decision-making, and prioritizing honesty over profits. These findings consistently show that servant leadership increases employee trust, job happiness, and organizational commitment (Liden et al., 2014; van Dierendonck, 2011). Such leadership practices significantly contribute to a healthy work environment and improved employee performance.

*Table 3. Independent Samples t-test Results on the Managers' Servant Leadership Indicators as Perceived by the Managers Themselves and their Staff*

	Group						<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
	Manager			Staff					
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>			
Listening	3.18	0.568	56	3.24	0.485	204	-.843	258	.400
Empathy	3.37	0.487	56	3.25	0.433	204	1.723	258	.086
Healing	3.28	0.504	56	3.24	0.434	204	.503	258	.615

Awareness	3.25	0.595	56	3.23	0.450	204	.335	258	.738
Persuasion	3.32	0.508	56	3.28	0.433	204	.571	258	.569
Conceptualization	3.37	0.516	56	3.26	0.418	204	1.618	258	.107
Stewardship	3.29	0.526	56	3.22	0.427	204	.912	258	.363

A series of independent samples t-tests revealed no significant differences between managers' and employees' perceptions of servant leadership indicators, such as empowerment [ $t(258) = -0.843$ ,  $p = 0.400$ ], emotional healing [ $t(258) = 1.723$ ,  $p = 0.806$ ], ethical behavior [ $t(258) = 0.503$ ,  $p = 0.615$ ], and others.

This is consistent with Greenleaf's (2019) definition of servant leadership as a holistic style that engages followers in multiple dimensions--empowering, ethical behavior, emotional healing, conceptual skills, stewardship, and community value--and fosters their development through altruistic and moral leadership.

*Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Organizational Commitment Indicators of the Managers*

Indicators		Inventory Score			
		N	M	SD	Interpretation
Attitudinal	I would be pleased to spend the rest of my career with this organization	56	3.07	0.628	High
	I feel as if this organization's problem is my own	56	2.96	0.631	High
	I am delighted with the kind of work that I do	56	3.11	0.562	High
	I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	56	3.27	0.618	Very High
	I feel like "part of the family" at my organization	56	3.18	0.636	High
	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me	56	3.18	0.575	High
Behavioral	If I left my current job, I would lose out on several great benefits	56	2.88	0.764	High
	Leaving my current employer would be foolish because not many companies could offer the same pay and benefits	56	2.80	0.749	High
	It would be challenging to leave my current organization because of the high level of economic support they offer	56	2.79	0.731	High
	This organization places the proper emphasis on career development	56	3.05	0.585	High
	I remain at my organization because I enjoy working with my co-employees	56	3.16	0.626	High

My organization provides good opportunities for job-related training	56	3.13	0.541	High
--	----	------	-------	------

Overall Mean	56	3.05	0.637	High
--------------	----	------	-------	------

Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviation of organizational commitment measures perceived by managers. The attitudinal indicators reflect managers' strong emotional attachment and identification with the organization, with mean scores ranging from "High" to "Very High." Managers expressed significant pride in their organizational membership and a sense of belonging, as evidenced by the highest attitudinal score ( $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = 0.618$ ). Behavioral indicators, which focus on economic and social issues that influence retention, also earned strong evaluations, with mean scores ranging from 2.79 to 3.16. The total mean organizational commitment score ( $M = 3.05$ ,  $SD = 0.637$ ) suggests a high level of commitment among managers, implying that they are emotionally and behaviorally committed.

These findings align with prior research demonstrating that servant leadership positively influences organizational commitment by fostering employees' emotional attachment and loyalty, which in turn enhances job satisfaction and reduces turnover intentions (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018; Khan, Khan, & Niazi, 2021; Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014).

*Table 5M. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Indicators of Organizational Commitment of the Managers*

	Inventory Score			
	N	M	SD	Interpretation
Attitudinal/value commitment/affective commitment	56	3.13	.485	High
Behavioral/commitment to stay/continuance commitment	56	2.97	.543	High

Table 5 displays the mean and standard deviation of the managers' organizational commitment indicators, which distinguish between attitudinal (affective) and behavioral (continuance) commitment. Managers demonstrated a high level of affective commitment ( $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = 0.485$ ), indicating a strong emotional relationship and identification with the organization. Behavioral commitment, which



reflects a willingness to stay due to the rewards and costs of quitting, was likewise high ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 0.543$ ).

These findings indicate that managers are emotionally committed and practically driven to remain with their firm. This dual commitment is consistent with known studies demonstrating servant leadership's favorable influence on emotional and continuous commitment, promoting loyalty and lowering turnover (Liden et al., 2014).

*Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Effectiveness Indicators as Perceived by the Managers*

Indicators		Inventory Score			
		N	M	SD	Interpretation
Productivity	I achieved the output requirements corresponding to my respective position	56	3.21	0.530	High
	I do the right thing	56	3.32	0.575	Very High
	I use available resources efficiently	56	3.34	0.581	Very High
	I guide my employees to their work	56	3.36	0.616	Very High
Adaptability and Flexibility	I do a good job of coping with emergencies and disruptions	56	3.27	0.556	Very High
	I accept and adjust quickly when changes are made in this company	56	3.23	0.539	High
	I can easily solve customer complaints	56	3.16	0.532	High
	I listen to the suggestions of my employees	56	3.38	0.590	Very High
Quality	I give assurance of the safety of the bank branch	56	3.46	0.602	Very High
	I assign tasks and provide routine instructions	56	3.32	0.575	Very High
	I help other employees with their personal development plans	56	3.30	0.570	Very High
	I walk around the branch and check things out	56	3.29	0.680	Very High
Overall Mean		56	3.30	0.579	Very High

Table 6 shows the mean and standard deviation of managers' self-assessed effectiveness in productivity, adaptation, flexibility, and quality metrics. Managers rated themselves highly on all criteria, with most scores falling into the "Very High" category. Magnificent areas include staff guidance, resource efficiency, safety, and

response to ideas, all demonstrating overall managerial ability. The overall mean score ( $M = 3.30$ ,  $SD = 0.579$ ) reflects a relatively high perceived level of efficacy.

These findings are consistent with previous research indicating that servant leadership improves management efficiency by encouraging employee development, adaptability, and quality performance (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, and Wu, 2018).

*Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviation Interpretation of Effectiveness Indicators as Perceived by the Staff*

Indicators		Inventory Score			
		N	M	SD	Interpretation
Productivity	My manager achieves the output requirements corresponding to my respective position	204	3.38	0.526	Very High
	My manager does the right thing	204	3.30	0.500	Very High
	My manager uses available resources efficiently	204	3.34	0.524	Very High
	My manager guides my employees in their work	204	3.33	0.511	Very High
Adaptability and Flexibility	My manager does a good job of coping with emergencies and disruptions	204	3.34	0.514	Very High
	My manager accepts and adjusts quickly when changes are made in this company	204	3.29	0.515	Very High
	My manager can easily solve customer complaints	204	3.35	0.517	Very High
	My manager listens to the suggestions of his/her employees	204	3.31	0.534	Very High
Quality	My manager gives assurance of the safety of the bank branch	204	3.39	0.537	Very High
	My manager assigns tasks and provides routine instructions	204	3.34	0.514	Very High
	My manager helps other employees with their personal development plans	204	3.32	0.536	Very High
	My manager walks around the branch and checks things out	204	3.33	0.531	Very High
Overall Mean		56	3.33	0.522	Very High

Table 7 reveals that employees rate their supervisors' performance highly across all productivity, adaptation, flexibility, and quality indices. Managers received excellent marks for meeting output goals, utilizing resources efficiently, directing personnel, and responding effectively to emergencies and consumer complaints. High adaptability scores represent managers' willingness to embrace change and value

employee input, whereas quality indicators demonstrate their dedication to safety, clear work delegation, staff development, and active supervision.

The total mean effectiveness rating ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.522$ ) suggests that employees consider their bosses as very effective leaders. These findings corroborate Garvin's (1984) principles of proactive quality management and continuous improvement, emphasizing the role of leadership in promoting organizational performance.

*Table 8. Independent Samples t-test Results on the Managers' Effectiveness Indicators as Perceived by the Managers Themselves and their Staff*

		Group								
		Manager			Staff					
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Productivity		56	3.31	0.484	204	3.34	0.441	-.427	258	.670
Adaptability and Flexibility		56	3.26	0.486	204	3.32	0.454	-.911	258	.363
Quality		56	3.34	0.528	204	3.35	0.483	-.025	258	.980

Independent samples t-tests were used to compare managers' self-perceptions of their efficacy to those of their employees in three major areas: productivity, adaptation, flexibility, and quality. The results show that there are no statistically significant variations between the two groups' perceptions of productivity [ $t(258) = -0.427$ ,  $p = 0.670$ ], adaptability and flexibility [ $t(258) = -0.911$ ,  $p = 0.363$ ], or quality [ $t(258) = -0.025$ ,  $p = 0.980$ ].

This shows that managers and employees have a common and consistent concept of managerial effectiveness. Such consistency lends credence to the premise that good leadership behaviors are perceived identically across organizational levels, fostering workplace trust and cohesion (Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014). The absence of

perceptual gaps emphasizes the transparency and authenticity of managerial performance, as viewed by both parties.

*Table 9. Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient Table for Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment and Effectiveness as perceived by the Managers*

Variable	Statistical Treatment	Servant Leadership
Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.739
	Sig.	.000
	N	56
Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	.809
	Sig.	.000
	N	56

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients reveal a strong positive relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment ( $r = .739$ ,  $N = 56$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that higher levels of servant leadership among managers are associated with greater organizational commitment. Likewise, servant leadership shows a substantial positive correlation with managerial effectiveness ( $r = .809$ ,  $N = 56$ ,  $p < .001$ ), suggesting that servant leadership behaviors contribute significantly to enhanced managerial performance.

These results align with prior studies demonstrating that servant leadership fosters employee commitment and improves performance outcomes (Melchar & Bosco, 2010; Sokol, 2014). Furthermore, servant leadership has been linked to increased organizational productivity and financial success (Joseph & Winston, 2005), underscoring its value as a leadership approach in organizational settings.

*Table 10. Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient Table for Servant Leadership and Effectiveness as perceived by the Staff*

Variable	Statistical Treatment	Servant Leadership
	Pearson Correlation	.652

	Sig.	.000
Effectiveness	N	204

A Pearson product-moment correlation of bank staff perceptions found a high positive association between servant leadership and managers' effectiveness ( $r = .652$ ,  $N = 204$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that employees who see higher degrees of servant leadership in their bosses also regard them as more effective.

Servant leaders prioritize company goals and nurture group members, creating a strong sense of belonging among employees that helps the organization (Liden et al., 2014). As a result, the more servant leadership managers demonstrate, the greater their perceived effectiveness among employees.

*Table 11. Regression Analysis of the Indicators of Servant Leadership in Predicting Organizational Commitment*

	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	.478	.357	1.336	.188
Listening	.063	.139	.451	.654
Empathy	.258	.198	1.305	.198
Healing	.005	.141	.037	.971
Awareness	.161	.136	1.183	.243
Persuasion	.036	.211	.171	.865
Conceptualization	.216	.244	.886	.380
Stewardship	.035	.175	.199	.843

$R^2 = 0.555$ ,  $Adj. R^2 = 0.490$ ,  $F(7, 48) = 8.562$ ,  $p < .001$

A multiple regression analysis found that the combined seven servant leadership dimensions-listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and stewardship-significantly predict organizational commitment among bank managers [ $F(7, 48) = 8.562$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ], indicating their collective influence on enhancing commitment. However, when the dimensions were analyzed separately,

none substantially predicted organizational commitment (e.g., listening,  $p = 0.654$ ; empathy,  $p = 0.198$ ; healing,  $p = 0.971$ ), demonstrating that no trait is sufficient.

These findings support Greenleaf's (2019) assertion that servant leadership's effectiveness arises from its holistic and interconnected nature, where the combined impact of multiple traits fosters follower commitment and organizational loyalty.

*Table 12 Regression Analysis of the Indicators of Managers' Perception of Servant Leadership in Predicting Effectiveness*

	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	.626	.290	2.160	.036
Listening	-.063	.112	-.557	.580
Empathy	.128	.160	.796	.430
Healing	.006	.114	.053	.958
Awareness	.007	.110	.062	.951
Persuasion	.192	.171	1.121	.268
Conceptualization	.374	.198	1.888	.065
Stewardship	.155	.142	1.091	.281

$R^2 = 0.681$ ,  $Adj. R^2 = 0.634$ ,  $F(7, 48) = 14.630$ ,  $p < .001$

A multiple regression analysis of managers' self-perceptions of servant leadership dimensions—listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and stewardship—found a statistically significant overall model predicting managerial effectiveness,  $F(7, 48) = 14.630$ ,  $p < .001$ , explaining 68.1% of the variance ( $R^2 = 0.681$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.634$ ). This suggests that these servant leadership attributes, taken together, significantly impact managers' effectiveness. However, none of the individual predictors attained statistical significance at the standard alpha level of 0.05, despite conceptualization approaching significance ( $b = 0.374$ ,  $p = 0.065$ ), indicating a substantially stronger role than other dimensions.

According to previous research, the influence of servant leadership on effectiveness is best viewed holistically, as a synergistic effect of numerous leadership dimensions rather than any one feature alone, supported by these findings (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Spears, 2010). Conceptualization's near-significance

is consistent with its acknowledged role in strategic thinking and successful leadership (Spears, 2010).

*Table 12. Regression Analysis of the Indicators of Staff's Perception of Servant Leadership in Predicting Effectiveness*

	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	.983	.198	4.976	.000
Listening	.084	.065	1.292	.198
Empathy	-.004	.095	-.042	.967
Healing	.047	.095	.498	.619
Awareness	-.043	.090	-.482	.630
Persuasion	.148	.131	1.128	.261
Conceptualization	.477	.170	2.809	.005
Stewardship	.012	.120	.101	.920

$R^2 = 0.445$ , Adj.  $R^2 = 0.425$ ,  $F(7, 48) = 22.467$ ,  $p < .001$

According to a multiple regression analysis of staff perceptions, the combined seven servant leadership dimensions—listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and stewardship—significantly predict managerial effectiveness.  $F(7, 48) = 22.467$ ,  $p < .001$ , and they account for 44.5% of the variance ( $R^2 = 0.445$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.425$ ). The only significant individual predictor among them was conceptualization ( $b = 0.477$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ), highlighting its crucial significance in strategic thinking and efficient management. Spears (2010) and Harwiki (2016), who stress the significance of conceptualization in visionary leadership and organizational performance, concur with this finding.

In contrast to Liden et al. (2008), the insignificance of listening and empathy highlights situational differences in how leadership effectiveness is perceived and assessed, indicating that the impact of servant leadership dimensions may differ depending on organizational context and perception.

## Conclusions

This research study provides strong evidence to support the critical function of servant leadership in increasing organizational commitment and managerial success in the banking sector. Managers and employees regularly perceive high levels of servant leadership traits, such as empowerment, empathy, ethical stewardship, and conceptual skills, which promote a supportive, ethical, and community-oriented

leadership culture. The alignment in perceptions between managers and staff, as evidenced by non-significant differences in servant leadership and effectiveness indicators, demonstrates a shared understanding of leadership practices that promote trust, cohesion, and transparency across organizational levels (Greenleaf, 2019; Liden, Wayne, Liao, and Meuser, 2014).

Managers have a high level of organizational commitment, with significant affective and continuation components indicating both emotional attachment and pragmatic drive to remain with the organization. This dual commitment is consistent with previous research correlating servant leadership to increased employee loyalty, job satisfaction, and lower turnover intentions (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018; Khan, Khan, & Niazi, 2021). Managers' self-assessment and employees' perceived effectiveness ratings support the favorable effects of servant leadership on productivity, flexibility, and quality, validating Garvin's (1984) ideas of proactive quality management and continual improvement.

Correlation analyses reveal significant and strong positive relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and managerial effectiveness, emphasizing servant leadership as a critical driver of performance and engagement (Melchar & Bosco, 2010; Sokol, 2014; Joseph & Winston, 2005). Regression analyses highlight the collective strength of servant leadership dimensions in predicting these outcomes, with conceptualization emerging as a particularly influential trait in employee perceptions, consistent with its recognized importance in strategic vision and effective management. The discovery that no single dimension alone can adequately predict commitment or effectiveness reinforces the holistic nature of servant leadership, in which the interplay of numerous dimensions encourages follower development and organizational loyalty (Greenleaf, 2019; Liden et al., 2008).

Notably, some differences in the importance of individual servant leadership attributes, such as empathy and listening, indicate that contextual and perceptual factors influence how leadership effectiveness appears and is judged in different organizational environments. This emphasizes the need for leaders to tailor their servant leadership behaviors to their workplaces' specific demands and cultures.

In conclusion, this study confirms that servant leadership is a comprehensive and practical leadership style that fosters high organizational commitment and managerial performance. Managers who reflect servant leadership's qualities can increase employee trust, establish a healthy work environment, and generate long-term organizational success. Organizations that want to increase performance and



employee engagement should emphasize building servant leadership abilities in their leaders, recognizing the synergistic value of these behaviors in attaining strategic and human-centered goals.

## Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Bulacan State University for providing the essential assistance and resources to undertake this research. I sincerely appreciate the excellent guidance and support I received during my research study. Special thanks are extended to the university's Research Management Office for ensuring the availability of the necessary resources. This endeavor's success may be mainly attributed to Bulacan State University's supportive and cooperative academic environment. Finally, the reviewers' constructive feedback significantly increased the quality of this research, for which I am glad.

## References

- [1] AlJabari, B., & Ghazzawi, I. (2019). The role of organizational commitment in employee retention: A study in the Middle East. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(4), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i4.15670>
- [2] Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2011). Testing relationships between servant leadership dimensions and leader-member exchange (LMX). Retrieved from [https://journalofleadershiped.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/10\\_2\\_Barbuto-and-Hayden.pdf](https://journalofleadershiped.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/10_2_Barbuto-and-Hayden.pdf)
- [3] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802927>
- [4] Etzioni, A., & Lawrence, P. R. (2016). *Socioeconomics: Toward a new synthesis*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315490137/>
- [5] Frankl, V. E. (1984). *Man's search for meaning*. Washington Square Press. Retrieved from <https://ijasos.ocerintjournals.org/en/download/article-file/384263>
- [6] Garcia, M. L., & Santos, R. P. (2023). Servant leadership and sustainable banking practices in the Philippines. *Journal of Business Ethics and Leadership*, 12(1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05123-9>
- [7] Garcia, M. T., & Lim, J. R. (2023). Employee identification and organizational ethics: Building a culture of commitment in Southeast Asian firms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(1), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2567>

- [8] Garcia, M. A., & Mendoza, T. R. (2024). Servant leadership in competitive markets: Navigating challenges and sustaining employee-centered cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 31(1), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518231101234>
- [9] Garcia, M. T., & Lim, J. R. (2023). Servant leadership and sustainable organizational development in cooperative enterprises. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178(3), 567-582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05199-7>
- [10] Garvin, D. A. (1984). What does “product quality” really mean? *Sloan Management Review*, 26(1), 25–43. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/what-does-product-quality-really-mean/>
- [11] Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2017). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning. <https://doi.org/10.1305504917>
- [12] Greenleaf, R. K. (2019). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). Paulist Press.
- [13] Hayden, R., & Barbuto, J. (2011). Greenleaf’s “best test” of servant leadership: A multi-level analysis. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/cead31c978c7b1bf17a507952cccc0e2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- [14] Harwiki, A. (2016). Servant leadership and employee empowerment in organizations. *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*, 3(2), 45-55.
- [15] Harwiki, W. (2016). The impact of servant leadership on organizational culture, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and employee performance in women’s cooperatives. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 283-290. <http://ijasos.ocerintjournals.org/en/download/article-file/384263>
- [16] Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., et al. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 316–331. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2397002219869903>
- [17] Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain the variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>
- [18] Hutapea, S., & Dewi, R. (2012). Servant leadership and meaningfulness of life as predictors of life satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65, 123-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.088>

- [19] Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510571675>
- [20] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2016). The balanced scorecard: An excerpt from the CGMA book 'Essential Tools for Management Accountants'. *Journal of Accountancy*, 221(5), 39-42.
- [21] Khan, M. M., Khan, S., & Niazi, G. S. K. (2021). The influence of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of organizational commitment. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.18178/joebm.2021.9.1.679>
- [22] Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- [23] Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434–1452. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034>
- [24] Lopez, J. A., Del Rosario, E. M., & Villanueva, C. F. (2022). Navigating uncertainty through servant leadership: Insights from the Philippine financial sector. *Asian Journal of Management Studies*, 9(2), 88-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0972060X.2022.2045678>
- [25] Luthans, F. (2018). *Organizational behavior* (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- [26] Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010). The impact of servant leadership on employee performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(3), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.20155>
- [27] Mendoza, T. R. (2021). Organizational effectiveness in Philippine enterprises: A review of contemporary approaches. *Philippine Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 7(1), 12-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2021.1876543>
- [28] Mete, E. S., Sökmen, A., & Bıyık, Y. (2016). The relationship between organizational commitment, identification, person-organization fit, and job satisfaction: Research on IT employees. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(3), 870–901.
- [29] Mete, M., Yildiz, H., & Demir, M. (2016). Organizational commitment and employee loyalty: A comparative study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(3), 45-53.

- [30] Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2012). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>
- [31] Ponto, J. (2015). Understanding and evaluating survey research. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology*, 6(2), 168–171. <https://doi.org/10.6004/jadpro.2015.6.2.9>
- [32] Rachmawati, A. W., & Ma'arif, S. (2019). The effect of servant leadership on organizational commitment: A study of high school teachers in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(3), 487-503. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-01-2018-0019>
- [33] Rudd, J. M., & Andel, P. (2020). The importance of ethical leadership in organizational success. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(6), 849–863. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2019-0307>
- [34] Russell, R. F., & Stone, G. A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170210424414>
- [35] Spears, L. C. (2010). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. *The Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 1(1), 25-30. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-61520-678-7>
- [36] Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170410524504>
- [37] Walker, J., & Gounaris, S. (2022). How servant leadership affects employee satisfaction in the healthcare industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 176(2), 451-464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04595-z>
- [38] Yulk, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.