

LEADING BY SERVING: SERVANT LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR INTERGENERATIONAL YOUTH MINISTRY ACTIVISTS IN GKI GEJAYAN

Chrysan Gomargana^{*1}, Samuel Adiprasetya Isaputra², Sandra Handayani Sutanto³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Pelita Harapan

Jl. M. H. Thamrin Boulevard 1100 Lippo Village, Tangerang 15811, Indonesia

Submitted: May 25, 2026

Revised: August 30, 2026

Accepted: September 10, 2026

* Corresponding author's e-mail: chrysan.gomargana@uph.edu

Abstrak

Kapasitas kepemimpinan dalam komunitas pelayanan pemuda lintas generasi memerlukan penguatan, khususnya dalam memahami kepemimpinan yang berorientasi pada pelayanan, komunikasi lintas generasi, dan pengelolaan konflik. Kegiatan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (PkM) ini bertujuan meningkatkan pengetahuan konseptual mengenai servant leadership serta mendukung penerapan prinsip-prinsip kepemimpinan yang melayani pada anggota Komisi Pemuda GKI Gejayan. Sebanyak 40 peserta mengikuti program yang terdiri atas empat tahap, yaitu sosialisasi dan asesmen kebutuhan kualitatif, pelatihan tatap muka, pendampingan daring, dan evaluasi. Pelatihan mencakup dua sesi utama, yaitu Pelatihan Servant Leadership serta Workshop Komunikasi Asertif dan Penyelesaian Konflik. Modul Leading by Serving digunakan sebagai kerangka instruksional utama dengan lima tema servant leadership yang dipilih berdasarkan kebutuhan program, yaitu empati, kerendahan hati, stewardship, komitmen terhadap pertumbuhan orang lain, serta tanggung jawab moral dan sosial. Evaluasi dilakukan menggunakan Model Empat Level Kirkpatrick. Hasil uji paired-samples t-test menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan pada pengetahuan konseptual peserta dari pre-test ($M = 60,00$, $SD = 11,80$) ke post-test ($M = 80,00$, $SD = 10,90$), $t(39) = 9,37$, $p < .001$, dengan ukuran efek yang besar (Cohen's $d_z = 1,48$). Tingkat kepuasan peserta juga tinggi terhadap materi pelatihan ($M = 4,60/5$) dan fasilitator ($M = 4,70/5$). Temuan kualitatif eksploratif selama fase pendampingan menunjukkan adanya refleksi yang lebih eksplisit terhadap motivasi kepemimpinan serta upaya penerapan prinsip servant leadership, komunikasi asertif, dan pengelolaan konflik dalam konteks pelayanan. Umpan balik mitra juga menunjukkan perubahan positif pada beberapa aspek komunikasi tim dan kolaborasi lintas generasi. Karena hasil perilaku dan tingkat tim tidak diukur menggunakan instrumen pre-post yang terstandar, temuan tersebut diinterpretasikan secara deskriptif. Secara keseluruhan, program menunjukkan peningkatan pengetahuan konseptual yang signifikan dan bukti awal penerapan strategi kepemimpinan yang melayani dalam konteks pelayanan gereja lintas generasi.

Kata kunci: komunikasi asertif; kepemimpinan lintas generasi; kepemimpinan melayani; pembelajaran pengalaman; pelayanan pemuda gereja.

Abstract

Leadership development in intergenerational youth ministry requires not only conceptual understanding but also opportunities to reflect on leadership motivation, communication, and conflict-management practices. This community service program aimed to strengthen participants' conceptual knowledge of servant leadership and support the application of servant-oriented leadership practices among members of the GKI Gejayan Youth Commission. Forty participants completed a four-phase program comprising program socialization and qualitative needs assessment, on-site training, online mentored practice, and evaluation. The training included two core sessions: Servant Leadership Training and an Assertive Communication and Conflict Resolution Workshop. The Leading by Serving module served as the primary instructional framework and emphasized five servant-leadership themes selected for their relevance to the identified ministry needs: empathy, humility, stewardship, commitment to others' growth, and moral and social responsibility. Evaluation was organized using Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Model. Pre- and post-training results showed a statistically significant increase in participants' conceptual knowledge of servant leadership from pre-test ($M = 60.00$, $SD = 11.80$) to post-test ($M = 80.00$, $SD = 10.90$), $t(39) = 9.37$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d_z = 1.48$). Participant satisfaction was also high for both training content ($M = 4.60/5$) and facilitators ($M = 4.70/5$). Exploratory qualitative findings from participant reflections, facilitator observations, mentoring records, and partner feedback suggested greater awareness of leadership motivations, attempts to apply servant-oriented leadership practices, and more intentional use of assertive



Copyright (c) 2026 PAKEM: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat. This is an open access article distributed under the Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

communication and constructive conflict-management strategies. Partner feedback additionally suggested favorable changes in selected aspects of team communication and intergenerational collaboration. Because behavioral and team-level outcomes were not assessed using standardized pre-post measures, these findings were interpreted descriptively. Overall, the program demonstrated significant gains in conceptual knowledge and preliminary evidence of behavioral application, supporting the feasibility of experiential servant-leadership training in an intergenerational church-ministry context.

Keywords: assertive communication; church youth ministry; experiential learning; intergenerational leadership; servant leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a foundational pillar of sustainable ministry communities. Dean, Clark, and Rahn (2010) affirm that theologically grounded and contextually relevant leadership development is a fundamental need in church youth ministry. In communities comprising multiple generations, the capacity to communicate across generational boundaries, manage conflict constructively, and lead according to transformative Christian values represents a set of competencies that is both urgently needed and chronically underdeveloped among newly appointed youth leaders.

Seemiller and Grace (2016) document Generation Z's distinctive characteristics in how they learn, communicate, and collaborate, characteristics that demand adaptive and contextual leadership approaches. Laudert (2018) further emphasizes that effective intergenerational leadership requires authentic and adaptive approaches, while Schlesman (2020) underscores the importance of building structured intergenerational leadership teams as the key to organizational sustainability in ministry settings. Yet in practice, many newly appointed ministry leaders lack adequate preparation to perform these roles effectively, relying instead on intuition or secular organizational experience rather than values-rooted leadership principles (Dean et al., 2010).

A central challenge identified in the youth leadership literature is the prevalence of what the Leading by Serving module (Isaputra et al., 2025) terms ego-oriented leadership, where the leader's focus shifts toward self-image maintenance and status preservation rather than genuine service. Related to this is performance-oriented leadership, in which leadership success is measured primarily by visible outcomes such as event attendance or public recognition, at the expense of attention to team members' emotional needs and personal development (Northouse, 2022). A third challenge, particularly acute among Gen Z youth in the social media era, is validation-seeking leadership, where external approval becomes the primary source of self-worth, distorting the motivation to lead (Twenge, 2017; Owens & Hekman, 2012).

Among several values-based leadership approaches, servant leadership was selected because its emphasis on follower development, stewardship, ethical use of influence, and service aligns closely with the relational and developmental demands of volunteer-based ministry. Transformational and authentic leadership similarly emphasize values, development, and authenticity; however, servant leadership is distinctive in positioning service to followers and broader stakeholders as a central motive of leadership, rather than primarily emphasizing organizational transformation or leader self-congruence (van Dierendonck, 2011; Eva et al., 2019). This follower-centered orientation is particularly relevant in intergenerational church ministry, where leadership frequently depends on relational trust, moral influence, and responsibility for others' growth rather than formal authority. Servant leadership also has documented conceptual links with Christian traditions of service, providing additional contextual relevance for the present setting (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Accordingly, servant leadership was selected as a contextually aligned framework for the identified ministry needs rather than as the only or universally superior leadership approach. Greenleaf (1977) proposed that authentic leadership begins with the desire to serve first, positioning the leader not as a figure of authority but as a facilitator of others' growth. Spears (2010), building on Greenleaf's foundational work,

identified 10 core characteristics of servant leadership, and the five servant leadership themes selected for the program were: empathy, humility, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and moral and social responsibility. Eva et al. (2019) confirmed in a systematic review that servant leadership is consistently associated with increased follower trust, well-being, engagement, and team performance, outcomes directly relevant to the ministry context. Kimotho (2019) further demonstrates that servant leadership has deep roots in the Christian tradition, making it especially fitting for faith-based community organizations.

This community service (PkM) program was conducted with the Youth Commission of GKI Gejayan, a multigenerational church-based community organization in Yogyakarta comprising members from different generational cohorts. Prior to intervention development, a preliminary qualitative needs assessment was conducted through stakeholder consultation during online coordination meetings with ministry leadership and activist coordinators. The consultation explored recurring leadership challenges, intergenerational communication difficulties, conflict-management concerns, and perceived gaps in structured leadership preparation. Three recurring priority areas were identified: (1) difficulties in applying contextual and inclusive leadership approaches, with concerns regarding reactive or overly directive leadership responses; (2) challenges in communication and collaboration across generational and cultural differences, contributing to misunderstanding and interpersonal tension; and (3) limited access to structured and reflective leadership-development opportunities. These findings were treated as contextual needs-assessment evidence rather than as psychometric estimates of participants' leadership competence or the prevalence of particular leadership problems. They provided the practical basis for the servant leadership, assertive communication, and conflict-resolution components of the program.

2. METHOD

This activity was implemented through an experiential learning-based participatory approach structured across four phases, a design consistent with structured training and mentoring models documented in comparable community service programs (Lewier et al., 2025). The partner, GKI Gejayan's ministry board, supervising pastor, and youth commission representatives, was actively involved throughout, providing participants, facilities, and institutional coordination. Training was delivered collaboratively with the Christian Psychology Association under HIMPSI (APK-HIMPSI) and the Faculty of Psychology of Universitas Proklamasi 45, ensuring that all content was grounded in both sound psychological science and contextually appropriate values.

a. Phase 1: Program Socialization and Qualitative Needs Assessment

The first phase involved online coordination meetings with GKI Gejayan's ministry council and activist coordinators. Activities included presentation of the program rationale, objectives, and implementation flow; clarification of partner roles; schedule coordination; participant registration; and partnership arrangements. As part of this process, a preliminary qualitative needs assessment was conducted through stakeholder consultation. Discussions focused on recurring leadership challenges, communication across generational groups, situations involving interpersonal conflict, and perceived leadership-development needs within the ministry context. Information from these discussions was synthesized descriptively to identify recurring areas of concern and to determine the emphasis of the training content. This preliminary assessment was intended for contextual program planning and was not used as a standardized or psychometric measure of participants' leadership competence. Consequently, no quantitative baseline score or competency classification was derived from this phase.

b. Phase 2: On-Site Training

The core training was delivered on-site across two main sessions, using the Leading by Serving module (Isaputra et al., 2025) as the primary instructional framework. Training design

followed Kolb's Experiential Learning cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2006), ensuring each session engaged participants through concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

The first session, Servant Leadership Training, opened with a diagnostic framing of the three dysfunctional leadership orientations documented in the module: ego-oriented, performance-oriented, and validation-seeking leadership. Rather than lecturing on these concepts, participants were first invited to complete a Self-Reflection checklist identifying their primary leadership motivations, surfacing existing assumptions before introducing theoretical frameworks. This approach reflected the program's selective application of Knowles' (1984) emphasis on learners' prior and self-relevant experience, while remaining consistent with the experiential orientation of the training. Participants were then introduced to Greenleaf's (1977) foundational conception of servant leadership as the desire to serve preceding the desire to lead, alongside the paradigm shift framing from 'How do I make people follow me?' to 'How do I help people grow?' A Leadership Style Reflection self-rating instrument allowed participants to assess their own current servant leadership tendencies across six behavioral dimensions.

Drawing on Greenleaf's foundational work, Spears (2010) articulated a broader set of servant leadership characteristics. For the present program, five training themes were selected for focused application: empathy, humility, stewardship, commitment to others' growth, and moral and social responsibility, based on their relevance to the identified ministry needs and the broader servant leadership literature (Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011; Eva et al., 2019). The session then engaged participants sequentially with each of the five servant leadership themes selected for the program, using structured reflective exercises and worksheets for each.

In the Empathy module, participants identified a team member currently experiencing difficulty, conducted a brief conversation with that person, and reflected on three questions: what the person might be feeling, what situational factors might be influencing their behavior, and what their own typical response pattern had been. The Humility module required participants to recall a leadership decision or attitude that had been mistaken, articulate its impact on others, and formulate what they would do differently. The Stewardship module asked participants to identify their current leadership role, specify what had been entrusted to them through that role, identify who was affected by their decisions, and reflect on how they were currently exercising their calling. The Commitment to Others' Growth module guided participants to focus on a specific team member, identify that person's strengths and growth areas, and articulate concrete ways they could actively support that member's development. The Moral and Social Responsibility module required participants to reflect on a past leadership decision, analyze its impact on both immediate team relationships and the wider community, and consider what they should have weighed more carefully.

The session closed with a Personal Commitment exercise in which participants identified one personal leadership strength and one growth area, followed by completion of a Personal Leadership Contract in which they articulated how they wanted to be described as a leader in one year's time, committed to a specific mindset shift from control orientation to service orientation, and signed the document as a form of personal accountability.

The second session, Workshop on Assertive Communication and Conflict Resolution, used role-play, reflective exercises, and simulation methods. Content covered the foundational principles of assertive communication, techniques for expressing opinions constructively without aggression or passivity, and strategies for managing conflict within multigenerational ministry teams. Role-play scenarios were drawn from realistic ministry contexts involving generational communication differences, enabling participants to practice and receive immediate feedback on their communication responses before applying them in their actual leadership roles.

c. Phase 3: Mentored Practice

Following the on-site training, participants entered an online mentored-practice phase designed to support the application of servant leadership, assertive communication, and conflict-

resolution strategies in their actual ministry roles. During mentoring, participants reflected on leadership situations encountered after the training, revisited commitments articulated in their Personal Leadership Contracts, discussed difficulties in applying the strategies introduced during the program, and received feedback from facilitators. Participant reflections and facilitator observations generated during this phase also contributed to the exploratory Level 3 evaluation of behavioral application.

d. Phase 4: Evaluation

Evaluation was structured according to Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Level 1 (Reaction) was assessed using participant satisfaction ratings for training content and facilitators. Level 2 (Learning) was assessed using pre- and post-training tests of conceptual knowledge concerning servant leadership. Level 3 (Behavior) explored the application of learning during the mentored-practice phase using participant self-reports, facilitator observations, and mentoring reflections. Three predefined behavioral domains guided the Level 3 evaluation: (a) awareness of personal leadership motivations and responses, (b) application of servant-oriented leadership practices, including attention to others' needs, stewardship, and support for others' growth, and (c) application of assertive communication and constructive conflict-management strategies in ministry interactions.

Level 4 (Results) explored perceived changes in team-level functioning through partner feedback and joint reflection with GKI Gejayan leadership. The domains examined included the quality of communication during team coordination, escalation of interpersonal conflict, and collaboration across generational groups. Qualitative records from Levels 3 and 4 were reviewed using a deductive content-analysis approach, in which the data were organized according to these predefined domains (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Patterns across participant reports, facilitator observations, and partner feedback were compared to examine convergence across data sources (Carter et al., 2014). Because these outcomes were based on naturalistic program-evaluation data rather than standardized behavioral measures, Level 3 and Level 4 findings were interpreted descriptively as exploratory evidence of behavioral application and perceived team-level change.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Preliminary Qualitative Needs Assessment

The preliminary qualitative needs assessment identified three recurring areas relevant to the development of the program. First, stakeholders described difficulties in applying contextual and inclusive leadership approaches, including situations in which leadership responses were perceived as reactive or overly directive. Second, communication and collaboration across generational and cultural differences were repeatedly identified as sources of misunderstanding and interpersonal tension within ministry activities. Third, stakeholders identified limited opportunities for structured and reflective leadership development as a gap in preparing ministry activists for their leadership responsibilities. These findings were treated as contextual program-planning data rather than as indicators of the prevalence or severity of leadership difficulties. They informed the subsequent emphasis on servant leadership, assertive communication, conflict management, and reflective leadership practice.

3.2. Program Implementation

The training program was attended by 40 members of the GKI Gejayan Youth Commission, meeting the target participant number. All four program phases were executed according to plan. Implementation faced one notable logistical challenge: scheduling adjustments were required in the early phase due to the program coinciding with the Christmas and New Year worship season, compounded by many participants returning to their hometowns during the university holiday period. This challenge was resolved through intensive coordination with the partner, and the core training was delivered within the rescheduled timeline without significant impact on program objectives.

a. Session 1: Servant Leadership Training

The opening self-reflection exercise was used to surface participants' existing assumptions and motivations concerning leadership. Participant reflections indicated variation in how they understood their reasons for leading, with some participants recognizing ego-oriented or performance-oriented tendencies in their own past responses, while others described a stronger service orientation. Because the Self-Reflection checklist was used as a formative reflective activity rather than as a standardized assessment instrument, responses were not analyzed to estimate the prevalence of each leadership orientation. The activity therefore served to contextualize the servant leadership material and promote self-reflection rather than to classify participants into leadership categories.



Figure 1. The facilitator guided participants in the Leadership Style Reflection and five-characteristic worksheet exercises during Session 1.

The introduction of Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership framework prompted a paradigm shift that participants described in reflective discussions as both challenging and clarifying. The contrast between asking 'How do I make people follow me?' and 'How do I help people grow?' resonated strongly with participants who had experienced team friction arising from control-oriented leadership styles within their ministry contexts. Eva et al.'s (2019) systematic review provided participants with an empirical basis for understanding servant leadership as more than an aspirational leadership philosophy, given its documented associations with follower trust, well-being, engagement, and team functioning.



Figure 2. Facilitator guiding participants to reflect on the central orientation of servant leadership.

The five servant leadership themes selected from the broader servant leadership framework were incorporated into sequential structured worksheets and appeared well suited to the experiential learning design. Each theme engaged participants at the level of personal reflection and applied experience rather than abstract principle, consistent with the experiential orientation of the training (Kolb & Kolb, 2006). The Humility exercise was especially evocative: several participants, during the post-exercise group debrief, articulated for the first time that specific past decisions they had made were shaped more by defensiveness or self-protection than genuine concern for their team. This level of honest self-recognition is precisely the metacognitive shift that servant leadership development requires, and its emergence within a structured, psychologically safe training environment reflects the value of the experiential approach.



Figure 3. The facilitator guided participants to shift their perspective and encouraged them to further discuss their commitment with others.

The Stewardship module extended participants' thinking from task completion to role accountability, prompting many to reflect on the gap between how they had been exercising their leadership role and how they felt called to exercise it. The Commitment to Others' Growth module shifted attention from self to others in a concrete, individualized way: rather than discussing team development abstractly, participants focused on a specific person, identified that person's specific strengths, and designed specific support actions. This specificity increased the ecological validity of the learning and made behavioral follow-through during the mentoring phase more likely.



Figure 4. Participants are writing their own leadership reflection and commitment during this session.

The Personal Leadership Contract, closing the session, served as a behavioral commitment device. Research on implementation intentions demonstrates that translating abstract goal intentions into specific, written, signed commitments substantially increases follow-through, and the contract format deliberately operationalized this principle within the ministry context.

b. Assertive Communication and Conflict Resolution Workshop

The core training was delivered on-site across two main sessions, using the Leading by Serving module (Isaputra et al., 2025) as the primary instructional framework. Training design followed Kolb's Experiential Learning cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2006), ensuring each session engaged participants through concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

The second section addressed the communication dimension of the three priority problems identified in the needs assessment. Multigenerational communication difficulties were repeatedly identified as a source of interpersonal friction within the ministry team with participants reporting that differences in communication directness, digital versus face-to-face preferences, and hierarchical expectations between Gen Z and older generation members frequently produced misunderstanding and unresolved tension.



Figure 5. Facilitator's explanation on how to shift their previous avoidance or passive-aggressive pattern to a more assertive one as a servant leader.

The assertive communication framework provided participants with a clear distinction between passive, aggressive, and assertive communication styles, and the role-play format enabled them to practice assertive responses in realistic ministry scenarios before encountering them in actual team interactions. Participants who had previously defaulted to either conflict avoidance or unproductive confrontation reported, during the post-session debrief, that practicing the assertive format, expressing their view clearly, acknowledging the other person's perspective, and proposing a constructive path forward, felt unfamiliar but achievable. This behavioral rehearsal component is consistent with the evidence that communication skill training produces more durable behavioral change when it includes active practice rather than passive instruction alone (Seemiller & Grace, 2016).



Figure 6. Group discussion on leadership and communication strategies during this section.

The conflict resolution component introduced participants to a participatory decision-making framework in which conflict is reframed not as a threat to team cohesion but as an opportunity for deeper mutual understanding and more robust collective decisions. In the context of a multigenerational ministry team, this reframing was particularly important: several participants noted that they had previously experienced intergenerational conflict as irresolvable or as evidence of fundamental incompatibility, rather than as a normal feature of diverse teams requiring skilled navigation. Schlesman's (2020) framework for building intergenerational leadership teams provided participants with a structural vocabulary for understanding why multigenerational dynamics produce friction and what specific practices can convert that friction into productive dialogue.

3.3. Learning Outcomes (Kirkpatrick Level 2)

Pre- and post-training results demonstrated a statistically significant increase in participants' conceptual knowledge of servant leadership. Mean scores increased from pre-test ($M = 60.00$, $SD = 11.80$) to post-test ($M = 80.00$, $SD = 10.90$). A paired-samples t-test indicated that this 20-point increase was statistically significant, $t(39) = 9.37$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size, Cohen's $d_z = 1.48$. These results provide evidence of substantial knowledge acquisition at Kirkpatrick Level 2. Importantly, the assessment measured conceptual knowledge rather than observed leadership behavior or leadership competency; therefore, the quantitative finding should not be interpreted as direct evidence of improved leadership competency. Behavioral application was examined separately and descriptively through the Level 3 evaluation.

Table 1. Summary of evaluation results (Kirkpatrick Levels 1 and 2)

Evaluation Aspect	Score / Result	Scale / Notes
Average pre-test score	60.00	0-100
Average post-test score	80.00	0-100
Score improvement	+20 points (33.3%)	Pre-post gain
t-value	$t(39) = 9.37$	$p < .001$
Effect size	Cohen's $d = 1.48$	Large effect
Satisfaction - training content	4.60	1-5 scale
Satisfaction - facilitator	4.70	1-5 scale
Number of participants	40	Youth commission members

3.4. Participant Satisfaction (Kirkpatrick Level 1)

Satisfaction ratings indicated that participants found the program credible, relevant, and engaging. Training content received a mean rating of 4.60 out of 5, and facilitators received 4.70 out of 5. These results meet the threshold that Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2016) identify as prerequisite for behavioral transfer beyond the training event. The slightly lower content satisfaction rating relative to facilitator satisfaction may reflect the psychological challenge of the self-reflective content: exercises requiring honest examination of one's leadership failures and ego-protective patterns are inherently more demanding than skills-based content. That satisfaction remained high despite this challenge suggests that participants experienced the difficulty as meaningful rather than aversive, consistent with well-designed experiential learning.

3.5. Exploratory Behavioral and Team-Level Outcomes (Kirkpatrick Levels 3 and 4)

Qualitative records collected during the mentored-practice phase provided exploratory evidence of behavioral application following the training. Across participant reflections and facilitator observations, recurring patterns were identified within the predefined Level 3 domains. Participants described greater awareness of their leadership motivations and reflected on situations in which ego protection, control, or service orientation influenced their responses. They also reported attempts to apply servant-oriented leadership practices and to use more assertive

and constructive communication strategies in ministry interactions. These findings represent reported and observed application of training content rather than a standardized measure of improvement in leadership competency.

At Level 4, partner feedback and joint reflection with ministry leadership suggested favorable changes in selected aspects of team functioning during the follow-up period. Recurring observations concerned communication during coordination activities, handling of interpersonal disagreements, and collaboration across generational groups. Because these outcomes were derived from qualitative partner feedback and were not systematically measured against standardized pre-intervention indicators, they should be interpreted as preliminary organizational-level observations rather than as evidence of a causal effect of the training.

The Personal Leadership Contract appeared to function as a useful reflective anchor during the online mentoring phase. Participants referred to specific commitments articulated in the contract when discussing leadership situations and personal accountability. The use of concrete behavioral commitments is consistent with implementation-intention research showing that specifying when, where, and how goal-directed action will occur can facilitate goal attainment (Gollwitzer & Sheeran, 2006).

A methodological caveat applies here as well. The pre-post design without a control group limits causal attribution. The 20-point mean gain could partly reflect the novelty effect of encountering servant leadership as a framework for the first time, rather than durable knowledge acquisition. A delayed post-test at three to six months following training would provide more reliable evidence of retention, and a matched comparison group would strengthen causal inference.



Figure 7. Participants and facilitators at the close of the on-site training program

3.6. Training Module

The primary program output is the Leading by Serving module (Isaputra et al., 2025), developed by the program team from Universitas Pelita Harapan's Faculty of Psychology. The module is structured across four thematic sections. The first addresses today's leadership challenges, specifically the ego-oriented, performance-oriented, and validation-seeking leadership patterns prevalent among Gen Z youth leaders, grounded in the empirical literature on leadership motivation and organizational behavior (Owens & Hekman, 2012; Northouse, 2022; Twenge, 2017). The second introduces the servant leadership concept drawing on Greenleaf (1977) and elaborates the selected five core characteristics through Spears' (2010) framework. The third section delivers best practice exercises for each characteristic: an Empathy Exercise requiring perspective-taking and structured reflection on a team member's situation; a Humility Latihan requiring reflection on a past leadership error and its impact; a Stewardship Latihan mapping the scope of leadership responsibility; a Commitment to Others' Growth Latihan focusing

strengths-based development planning on a specific team member; and a Moral and Social Responsibility Latihan examining the community-level consequences of past leadership decisions. The fourth section culminates in the Personal Commitment and Personal Leadership Contract activities. The module has been registered and awarded an Intellectual Property Certificate (HKI) by the Indonesian Ministry of Law and Human Rights.

3.7. Program Relevance and Contribution

This program contributes to an emerging body of Indonesian community-service literature on faith-based leadership development. The findings suggest that psychologically grounded, character-focused leadership training is feasible within a church-community setting and can produce measurable gains in conceptual knowledge alongside exploratory evidence of reflective and behavioral application. The integration of servant leadership with experiential and reflective learning appeared appropriate for this ministry context, although further evaluation using standardized behavioral measures and longer-term follow-up is needed before broader conclusions regarding effectiveness can be drawn. These design principles are transferable to other faith-based youth organizations across Indonesia and represent a replicable model for developing servant leaders in volunteer-based ministry communities.

4. CONCLUSION

This community service program demonstrated an increase in participants' conceptual knowledge of servant leadership following an experiential learning-based intervention. Participant satisfaction with the training was also high. Qualitative findings from the mentored-practice phase provided preliminary evidence that participants reflected more explicitly on their leadership motivations and attempted to apply servant-oriented leadership, assertive communication, and conflict-management strategies within their ministry responsibilities. Partner feedback additionally suggested favorable changes in selected aspects of team communication and intergenerational collaboration.

These findings should be interpreted according to the nature of the measures used. The pre- and post-training assessment evaluated conceptual knowledge rather than leadership competency, while behavioral and team-level outcomes were examined through exploratory qualitative program-evaluation data rather than standardized pre-post measures. Accordingly, the program provides evidence of knowledge acquisition and preliminary evidence of strategy application, but does not establish a quantifiable improvement in leadership competency or a causal improvement in team functioning.

Recommendations for further development: first, advanced sessions addressing specific leadership challenges such as team resilience and participatory decision-making should be developed as sequels to this foundational program. Second, a Training of Trainers component should be implemented to equip internal church facilitators capable of sustaining program delivery independently. Third, the program framework should be replicated in other church youth communities within the GKI synodal network, with appropriate contextual adaptation. Fourth, future iterations should incorporate a delayed post-test to assess knowledge and behavior retention, and a stronger behavioral observation protocol during the mentoring phase to provide more rigorous evidence of Level 3 outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express gratitude to the leadership and ministry board of GKI Gejayan, the Youth Commission participants, the Christian Psychology Association (APK-HIMPSI), and the Faculty of Psychology of Universitas Proklamasi 45 for their collaboration throughout this program. This activity was supported by the Community Development and Research Center of Universitas Pelita Harapan with approval number of PM-021-KDN-FPsi/VII/2025.

REFERENCES

- Arnett, J. J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545-547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>
- Dean, K. C., Clark, C., & Rahn, D. (2010). *Starting right: Thinking theologically about youth ministry*. Zondervan.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- 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>
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 69-119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(06\)38002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1)
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Kimotho, S. (2019). Is servant leadership a 'Christian theory'? A critical examination of Greenleaf's servant leadership concept. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 6(3), 71-78.
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*. Association for Talent Development.
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2006). Learning styles and learning spaces: A review of the multidisciplinary application of experiential learning theory in higher education. In *Learning Styles and Learning* (pp. 45-91).
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument*. Florida Atlantic University.
- Laudert, E. (2018). *Generation Z: Utilizing adaptive and authentic leadership to promote intergenerational collaboration at work*. UC San Diego.
- Lewier, M., Supriyono, A. Y., & Triyana, E. (2025). OPTIMALISASI PERAN MAHASISWA PBSI DALAM PKM MELALUI SOSIALISASI DAN COACHING. *PAKEM: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(2), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.30598/pakem.5.2.97-108>
- Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- OECD. (2018). *Education at a Glance 2018: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 787-818. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0441>
- Schlesman, S. G. (2020). *The passing zone: Building an intergenerational leadership team*. Assemblies of God Theological Seminary.
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z goes to college*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900205>
- Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy*. Atria Books.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>