



Christ-Informed Servant Leadership in Religious Higher Education: A Theological-Conceptual Study of John 13:1–15

Maria Titik Windarti^{1✉}, Timotius Sukarna², Dwi Gatot Suprasetya³

^{1,2} STT Kadesi Bogor, Indonesia

³ STT Elsadday Surakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study examines how Jesus' leadership in John 13:1–15 can inform academic leadership in religious higher education, particularly governance, faculty development, student formation, and organizational culture. It addresses a gap between biblical-theological discussions of John 13 and the institutional practice of religious higher education. The study employs a qualitative theological-conceptual design combining close exegetical reading with an integrative review of contemporary literature on servant leadership, higher education leadership, organizational culture, faculty development, student engagement, and religious higher education. The analysis identifies three interrelated principles: incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion, together with embodied and reproducible service as the narrative movement that connects them. These principles are translated into four institutional domains: participatory governance, faculty leadership and development, student formation, and a culture of service and empowerment. The study contributes a Christ-informed framework in which authority is retained but reoriented toward the growth, participation, and flourishing of others.

OPEN ACCESS

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 12-05-2026

Accepted: 31-08-2026

KEYWORDS

Christ-Informed Leadership, Servant Leadership, Religious Higher Education, Academic Leadership, John 13:1–15

Introduction

Leadership in higher education is no longer adequately understood as the exercise of formal authority over academic units. Universities and religious higher education institutions operate through complex relationships among leaders, faculty members, students, professional staff, governing bodies, and wider communities. Consequently, questions of participation, organizational culture, faculty development, student formation, accountability, and educational quality have become central to discussions of academic leadership. Recent research in higher education shows that participative leadership and organizational culture are associated with organizational performance and commitment, while recent reviews of servant leadership identify faculty development, student engagement, organizational climate, and community-building as

important areas of application (Riza et al., 2025; Adams et al., 2025; Dul et al., 2024; Namatovic & Tushabe, 2024).

This concern is especially significant in religious higher education. Religious colleges and seminaries are not only organizations that deliver academic programs; they are formative communities in which knowledge, vocation, character, spirituality, and professional identity are developed together. In Indonesia, religious higher education includes Christian theological institutions and programs that are formally situated within the national system of religious higher education. The official database of the Ministry of Religious Affairs lists study programs such as Theology, Christian Religious Education, Christian Educational Management, and Christian Leadership within Christian Religious Higher Education (PTKK), indicating the institutional presence of both theological and leadership-oriented educational programs (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2026). The regulatory framework for Christian religious higher education likewise emphasizes orderly administration and quality in the establishment and delivery of programs (Direktorat Jenderal Bimbingan Masyarakat Kristen, 2022).

The educational challenge, therefore, is not simply whether a leader is personally humble or whether an institution uses the language of servant leadership. The deeper issue is how a value-based understanding of authority becomes visible in institutional arrangements and educational practices. A religious higher education institution may affirm service, humility, and spiritual formation in its theological curriculum while its leadership practices remain strongly centralized, communication remains one-directional, faculty participation is limited, or student formation is treated as secondary to academic administration. Such a disconnection between institutional values and organizational practice can weaken the formative credibility of religious education.

John 13:1–15 provides a distinctive theological resource for addressing this problem. In the passage, Jesus—identified as Teacher and Lord—performs the socially subordinate act of washing the disciples' feet. The narrative therefore does not simply commend individual humility. It presents a reconfiguration of authority: status is retained, but the exercise of status is redirected toward service, relationship, and the growth of others (Brown, 1970; Carson, 1991; Köstenberger, 2004). This pattern is particularly relevant to academic leadership because educational authority is inherently relational. Leaders influence the conditions under which other people learn, teach, participate, and develop.

Existing studies provide important foundations for this discussion but leave a conceptual gap. The literature on servant leadership in higher education has increasingly examined organizational climate, faculty outcomes, student engagement, and academic quality (Adams et al., 2025; Dul et al., 2024; Ghasemy & Frömbing, 2022; Giantama et al., 2025). Research in an Indonesian Christian university also shows how servant leadership among professors can be expressed through stewardship, empowerment, development of others, role modelling, and a Christian worldview (Ekayanti & Priyatna, 2025; Dami et al., 2022). However, these educational studies do not by themselves explain how a specifically Johannine account of Jesus' authority can provide a theological rationale for translating servant leadership into institutional governance and educational formation. Conversely, theological studies of John 13 often emphasize humility, discipleship, or ecclesial leadership without sufficiently specifying implications for the management and quality of religious higher education.

The research gap addressed by this study is therefore located at the intersection of biblical theology and religious education: how can the leadership pattern in John 13:1–15 be conceptually translated into a framework for academic leadership that addresses the actual domains of religious higher education? The study asks three questions: (1) What leadership principles emerge from John 13:1–15 when the passage is read with

attention to authority, service, and formation? (2) How can these principles be translated into academic leadership within religious higher education? and (3) What implications do they have for governance, faculty development, student formation, and institutional culture?

The purpose of this study is thus not to evaluate the leadership performance of a particular seminary. Rather, it develops a theological-conceptual framework that can be used to interpret and improve leadership practice in religious higher education, especially Christian theological institutions. This repositioning is important because the contribution of the article lies in religious education rather than in exegesis as an end in itself. The exegesis functions as the theological foundation for an educational argument.

Methods

This study uses a qualitative theological-conceptual design. It combines close exegetical reading of John 13:1–15 with an integrative review of contemporary scholarship on servant leadership, higher education leadership, organizational culture, faculty development, student engagement, and religious higher education. The study is conceptual rather than empirical and is not presented as a systematic literature review or a PRISMA-based review.

John 13:1–15 constitutes the primary theological source. The exegetical analysis attends to narrative structure, historical-cultural context, key lexical expressions, the relationship between Jesus' identity and authority, the embodied action of foot washing, the dialogue with Peter, and Jesus' interpretation of the action in verses 12–15. Brown (1970), Carson (1991), Keener (2003), and Köstenberger (2004) serve as principal exegetical dialogue partners.

For the educational dialogue, literature was identified through targeted searches of academic search platforms and publisher databases using combinations of the terms "servant leadership," "higher education leadership," "academic leadership," "participative leadership," "Christian higher education," "religious higher education," "faculty development," "student formation," and "organizational culture." Priority was given to peer-reviewed studies published from 2022 to 2026. Seminal theoretical and exegetical works were retained when necessary to establish the conceptual and theological foundations. Studies were included when they directly addressed leadership, governance, organizational culture, faculty development, student engagement, or religious/Christian higher education; sources without a clear conceptual or educational connection were excluded from the analytical dialogue.

The literature selection was purposive rather than statistical. The purpose was to bring relevant educational research into dialogue with the theological analysis, not to estimate an effect size or establish causal relationships. An audit trail was maintained conceptually by recording each selected source according to its principal topic—leadership, governance, faculty development, student formation, organizational culture, or religious higher education—and then mapping those topics against the Johannine concepts emerging from the exegetical reading.

Data analysis proceeded in three stages. First, John 13:1–15 was coded conceptually around identity and authority, embodied service, relationship, example, and formation. Second, these concepts were compared with recurring themes in the selected educational literature. Third, convergent themes were synthesized into a conceptual framework linking three leadership principles—incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion—to four institutional domains: governance, faculty development, student formation, and organizational culture. Embodied and

reproducible service functions as the narrative movement through which the three principles become institutional practice.

No survey, interview, observation, or institutional performance data were collected. Accordingly, the framework is a theoretically grounded proposition rather than an empirically validated model. The analysis is intended to generate propositions that can subsequently be examined through case studies, surveys, or mixed-method research in Christian and other religious higher education settings.

Results

1. Analytical Findings on Academic Leadership Challenges

Academic leadership in religious higher education operates at the intersection of institutional governance and educational formation. Leadership decisions shape not only administrative performance but also the conditions in which faculty teach and develop, students participate and mature, and institutional values become visible in everyday practice. Recent higher education scholarship identifies participative leadership, organizational culture, faculty development, and student engagement as significant dimensions of academic leadership (Adams et al., 2025; Dul et al., 2024; Riza et al., 2025).

Within religious higher education, this issue becomes more complex because institutions pursue academic purposes together with religious, ethical, vocational, and formational aims. The central educational problem is therefore not merely whether leaders are personally humble, but whether institutional authority is exercised in ways that support participation, faculty development, student formation, accountability, and a healthy academic culture. A gap can emerge when institutions affirm service and formation as educational values while organizational practices remain highly centralized or insufficiently participatory.

This study addresses that problem by examining how John 13:1–15 can provide a theological rationale for reorienting academic authority. The passage is not treated as an empirical study of a particular seminary; rather, it functions as the theological foundation for a conceptual argument about religious higher education. The study consequently asks how Christ-informed authority can be translated into governance, faculty development, student formation, and organizational culture.

2. Reconstructing Academic Authority through John 13:1–15

The first finding is that John 13 presents service not as the abandonment of authority but as its reconfiguration. The narrative begins with Jesus knowing that He came from God and was returning to God (John 13:3). This theological framing is important because the act of washing feet is performed by a person whose identity and authority are secure. Jesus does not serve because He has lost status; He serves precisely while occupying the status of Teacher and Lord. Brown (1970) and Köstenberger (2004) therefore read the opening verses as essential for understanding the symbolic force of the action.

For religious higher education, this distinction changes the question of leadership. The relevant question is not whether leaders should have authority, but what authority is for. Formal authority is necessary for institutional accountability, decision-making, quality assurance, and academic responsibility. Yet John 13 challenges leaders to understand authority as stewardship rather than possession. Authority becomes educationally legitimate when it creates conditions in which other people can learn, participate, mature, and contribute.

Verses 4–5 make this principle concrete. Jesus rises, lays aside His outer garment, takes a towel, pours water, and washes the disciples' feet. Keener (2003) emphasizes the

cultural significance of the action. Foot washing could be associated with low-status service, so Jesus' action crosses an expected status boundary. The educational significance is that leadership becomes embodied. A leader cannot claim to value students, faculty, or staff while remaining structurally and relationally inaccessible. Servant leadership requires practices that make institutional values tangible.

The dialogue with Peter in verses 6–11 exposes the difficulty of this reversal. Peter's resistance illustrates how deeply relationships can be shaped by conventional expectations about who should serve whom. In an academic institution, similar assumptions can appear when seniority, academic rank, administrative position, or institutional status is treated as a reason for unilateral authority. John 13 does not erase differences of role; it changes the moral direction of those differences. Seniority becomes responsibility for developing others, not a license for domination.

Finally, verses 12–15 provide the normative interpretation of the action. Jesus identifies Himself as Teacher and Lord and nevertheless commands the disciples to follow the example He has given. The term *hypodeigma* indicates a pattern or example to be enacted (Bauer, 2000; Köstenberger, 2004). Thus, the narrative moves from identity, to embodied action, to interpretation, and then to institutionalizable practice. For educational leadership, this sequence is significant: values become formative when they are embodied by leaders and reproduced through organizational practices.

3. Theological Foundations for Christ-Informed Academic Leadership

3.1 Incarnational Presence and the Accessibility of Academic Leadership

The first dimension is incarnational presence, understood in this study as the accessibility of academic leadership. Jesus' leadership is not exercised from a distance. He is physically present with the disciples and performs an ordinary, uncomfortable, and embodied act of service. The theological logic of incarnation therefore supports a leadership posture characterized by proximity to the educational community. In religious higher education, leaders should be sufficiently present to understand the realities of teaching, learning, student formation, faculty workload, and institutional service.

This principle has direct implications for faculty development. Leadership should not be limited to evaluating faculty performance; it should create conditions for mentoring, scholarly growth, pedagogical improvement, collaboration, and vocational development. Recent higher education research identifies faculty development and people-centred leadership as important dimensions of servant leadership (Adams et al., 2025; Dul et al., 2024; Ghasemy & Frömbling, 2022; Liu et al., 2024). In a Christian institution, such development can be framed not merely as human-resource optimization but as stewardship of the vocation and gifts of educators.

Incarnational presence also challenges bureaucratic distance. Leaders who rarely engage the academic community may rely excessively on reports and formal indicators. Data and accountability remain necessary, but they cannot substitute for relational knowledge. A Christ-informed leader therefore combines institutional information with attentive presence.

3.2 Relational Participation and the Formation of Academic Community

The second dimension is relational participation, understood as the formation of an academic community in which leadership is exercised through interaction and shared responsibility. Jesus' act occurs within a community of disciples, and the meaning of the action is developed through interaction with Peter and the others. Leadership is consequently not a one-way transmission of instruction but a relational process in which people are invited to understand, participate, and grow.

In higher education, participative leadership is increasingly linked with organizational culture, commitment, and institutional performance. Riza et al. (2025), for example, demonstrate the importance of participative leadership and organizational culture in Indonesian higher education. This supports a move away from viewing participation as a symbolic courtesy. Participation can become an institutional mechanism through which academic communities share responsibility, communicate concerns, and develop innovation.

For religious higher education, relational participation also has a formative dimension. Students are not merely recipients of curriculum; they are developing professional, ethical, and spiritual identities. Faculty members likewise require a community in which scholarship and teaching are practiced collaboratively. Recent Indonesian research on servant leadership among professors in a Christian university found that stewardship, empowerment, development of others, role modelling, and a Christian worldview are prominent expressions of academic servant leadership (Ekayanti & Priyatna, 2025). The present study extends that insight by locating such practices within the Johannine reconfiguration of authority.

3.3 Hierarchical Inversion and the Reorientation of Institutional Authority

The third dimension is hierarchical inversion, which concerns the reorientation rather than the abolition of institutional hierarchy. The phrase does not mean that every organizational hierarchy should be abolished. Educational institutions require differentiated roles, responsibilities, and accountability. The inversion concerns the direction in which authority is used. The one who occupies the higher position becomes the one who serves the development and participation of those with less institutional power.

This principle is especially relevant to governance. In conventional administrative models, information and decision-making may flow primarily from the top downward. A Christ-informed model seeks to reverse that direction by asking how formal authority can create space for voice, responsibility, and empowerment. This resonates with contemporary research on participative leadership and distributed leadership, which emphasizes shared roles, trust, adaptive responsibility, and collaborative organizational cultures (Riza et al., 2025; Alotaibi et al., 2024).

The distinctive theological contribution is that empowerment is not merely an efficiency strategy. It is grounded in the identity and action of Christ. Leaders serve because authority itself is redefined by the Gospel. Consequently, institutional participation should not be adopted only because it is administratively fashionable; it becomes part of the moral and formative identity of a Christian educational institution.

4. Translation into Institutional Domains

4.1 Academic Governance and Participatory Decision-Making

The first institutional implication concerns academic governance and the distribution of decision-making authority. If authority is understood as stewardship, decision-making should be designed to include meaningful participation from those affected by decisions. This includes faculty involvement in academic planning, transparent communication of institutional priorities, student representation in appropriate educational matters, and clear mechanisms for feedback and accountability.

Participatory governance does not imply that every decision is made by consensus. Rather, it requires leaders to explain decisions, listen to relevant stakeholders, distribute appropriate responsibility, and remain accountable for the exercise of formal authority. In this sense, John 13 provides an ethical orientation for governance: institutional power should produce participation rather than dependency.

This is consistent with contemporary concerns about governance in religious higher education. Recent scholarship on faith-based higher education in Indonesia shows that governance involves negotiating institutional values, autonomy, accountability, and quality assurance (Jaenudin & Victorynie, 2026). A Christ-informed framework adds a theological criterion to these concerns: governance should be evaluated not only by compliance and efficiency but also by whether authority serves the educational flourishing of the community.

4.2 Faculty Development and the Practice of Formative Leadership

The second institutional implication concerns faculty development and the formative role of educators. In religious higher education, lecturers and professors occupy a dual position: they are educators and, often, formative leaders. The leadership model in John 13 therefore calls faculty members to embody the values they teach. Faculty development should consequently include not only research productivity and pedagogical competence but also mentoring, relational competence, ethical leadership, and the capacity to model the institution's religious values.

Servant leadership research in higher education increasingly associates people-centred leadership with faculty outcomes and institutional community. Adams et al. (2025) identify faculty-oriented outcomes as a significant area of servant leadership research, while Dul et al. (2024) synthesize evidence connecting servant leadership with faculty development, organizational climate, and student engagement. In a Christian context, Ekayanti and Priyatna (2025) similarly show that professor-level servant leadership can be expressed through stewardship and developing others.

Accordingly, a religious higher education institution could operationalize this principle through structured mentoring, peer observation, faculty learning communities, leadership development, and reflective practices that connect teaching with institutional mission. The aim is not to turn every lecturer into an administrator, but to develop educators who understand academic authority as a form of service.

4.3 Student Formation and the Educational Environment

The third institutional implication concerns students and the educational environment in which their intellectual, ethical, spiritual, and vocational identities develop. The ultimate test of academic leadership is not merely whether administrative processes function, but whether the educational environment enables students to grow. In religious higher education, student formation includes intellectual, ethical, spiritual, vocational, and relational dimensions.

John 13 suggests that formation occurs through example as well as instruction. Jesus does not merely explain humility; He performs an act that the disciples can see, interpret, and reproduce. This has pedagogical implications. Students should encounter leaders and faculty whose conduct provides credible examples of service, accountability, listening, and responsibility. Leadership formation therefore becomes part of the hidden curriculum of the institution.

Recent research also indicates a relationship between servant leadership, student engagement, learning satisfaction, and academic quality (Giantama et al., 2025; Yousofi & Rahimzad, 2024; Yue et al., 2024). While the present conceptual study does not test those relationships empirically in religious higher education, the evidence strengthens the educational plausibility of connecting leadership practice with students' learning environments. The theological contribution is to explain why such a connection matters within Christian education: students are formed by the practices through which authority is encountered.

4.4 Organizational Culture and the Reorientation of Authority

The fourth institutional implication concerns organizational culture, because leadership principles become educationally meaningful only when they are embedded in institutional practices. A leadership model cannot remain an individual virtue if institutional systems reward the opposite behaviour. If leaders preach service while promotions, communication, workload distribution, conflict resolution, and decision-making are controlled through fear or status, the institution produces a contradiction between its curriculum and its lived culture.

John 13 therefore calls for a culture in which service is reproduced. The example of Jesus becomes organizationally significant when it shapes expectations for how leaders communicate, how faculty collaborate, how students are treated, how conflict is handled, and how responsibility is distributed. This is why hierarchical inversion should be understood as a cultural principle rather than only a leadership style.

Contemporary higher education research supports the importance of culture. Riza et al. (2025) found that organizational culture and participative leadership are important to organizational performance and commitment in Indonesian state universities. The present study does not transfer those findings directly to Christian seminaries; rather, it uses them to establish the educational relevance of organizational culture and participation. The theological framework then specifies a distinctive rationale for a service-oriented culture in Christian religious higher education.

5. Integrated Conceptual Framework

The synthesis of the theological and educational analysis produces a four-domain framework. First, the theological foundation is Christ's redefinition of authority through embodied service. Second, three leadership principles mediate this foundation: incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion. Third, these principles are translated into four institutional domains: governance, faculty development, student formation, and organizational culture. Fourth, the intended educational outcomes are participation, empowerment, holistic formation, academic community, and institutional trust.

Theological foundation	Leadership principles	Educational domains	Expected formative orientation
Jesus as Teacher and Lord serves the disciples	Incarnational presence	Governance and leadership practice	Accessible, accountable authority
Jesus serves within relationship	Relational participation	Faculty leadership and development	Mentoring, collaboration, shared responsibility
Jesus reverses expected status	Hierarchical inversion	Student formation	Empowerment, agency, growth
Jesus gives a hypodeigma/example	Embodied and reproducible service	Institutional culture	Service becomes a shared institutional norm

The framework differs from a generic servant-leadership model in two respects. First, its starting point is not a list of leadership traits but the narrative relationship among identity, authority, embodied service, and example in John 13. Second, the framework treats leadership as an educational and institutional phenomenon. It therefore asks how service becomes visible in governance structures, faculty development, student formation, and culture. This makes the model more directly relevant to the management and development of religious higher education.

The framework also clarifies the relationship between hierarchy and participation. The goal is not institutional egalitarianism in which formal responsibilities disappear. Instead, differentiated authority is retained while its purpose is redirected toward the flourishing and participation of others. Such an approach can help religious higher education institutions hold together accountability and humility, leadership and participation, institutional standards and relational care.

Previous study	Primary focus	What it establishes	Contribution of the present study
Adams et al. (2025)	Servant leadership in higher education	Maps the knowledge base and major research themes.	Adds a Johannine theological logic for reorienting academic authority.
Dul et al. (2024)	Servant leadership in higher education	Synthesizes applications to faculty, students, culture, and engagement.	Connects these applications to a Christological account of embodied service.
Dami et al. (2022/2024)	Servant leadership in Indonesian Christian higher education	Examines trust, job satisfaction, leader–member exchange, and organizational citizenship.	Moves from empirical outcomes to a theological-conceptual framework for institutional practice.
Ekayanti & Priyatna (2025)	Servant leadership among professors in a Christian university	Identifies stewardship, empowerment, developing others, role modelling, and Christian worldview.	Extends professor-level characteristics into governance, student formation, and organizational culture.
Riza et al. (2025)	Participative leadership and organizational culture	Shows links among participation, culture, innovation, commitment, and performance.	Reinterprets participation as an expression of Christ-informed authority rather than only an administrative mechanism.
Jaenudin & Victorynie (2026)	Governance in faith-based higher education	Highlights autonomy, accountability, quality assurance, and value-based governance.	Adds the theological criterion that institutional authority should serve educational flourishing.
Present study	John 13:1–15 and religious higher education	Integrates biblical theology with educational leadership.	Proposes three principles—incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion—translated into four institutional domains.

Discussion

The comparative synthesis indicates that the distinctive contribution of this study is not a new list of servant-leadership traits, but a theological reconfiguration of authority in which biblical identity, embodied service, participation, and institutional formation are conceptually connected.

6. Theoretical and Practical Contributions to Religious Higher Education

The novelty of this study lies in the conceptual translation of John 13:1–15 into an institutional framework for religious higher education. Previous higher education research establishes the relevance of servant leadership to faculty outcomes, organizational culture, student engagement, and institutional performance, while Christian higher education studies identify concrete leadership practices and outcomes. The present study differs by beginning with the Johannine relationship among identity, authority, embodied service, and example, and then translating that theological logic into three leadership principles—incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion—and four institutional domains: governance, faculty development, student formation, and organizational culture. The comparative distinction is summarized in the preceding synthesis table. The contribution is therefore not a claim that servant leadership itself is new, but that John 13 provides a theological rationale for reorganizing how authority functions within religious higher education.

The theoretical contribution is therefore interdisciplinary. To theology, the study shows that John 13 can function as a resource for thinking about educational governance and institutional formation rather than only personal morality. To educational leadership, it adds a Christological and theological rationale for participatory and empowering authority. To religious education, it proposes that the credibility of institutional mission should be considered together with the lived practices through which students and educators encounter authority.

The practical contribution is a set of domains that institutions can use for reflection and future empirical testing: whether governance mechanisms provide meaningful participation; whether faculty development prioritizes the growth of educators as well as institutional output; whether students experience leadership as formative rather than merely administrative; and whether organizational culture embodies service consistently across levels of authority. These are propositions for institutional development, not claims that the present study has already verified empirically.

Limitations and Directions for Further Research

This study has an important limitation. It is theological-conceptual and does not contain primary empirical data from a religious higher education institution. Consequently, it cannot establish whether the proposed framework improves academic quality, student engagement, faculty performance, or institutional governance. The framework should therefore be understood as a theoretically grounded proposition for educational leadership, not as an empirically validated institutional model.

Future research should test the framework through qualitative case studies, surveys, or mixed-method designs across Christian religious higher education institutions. Such studies could examine how the four domains operate in different institutional settings and whether the three leadership principles are visible in leadership behaviour, governance mechanisms, faculty development, student experience, and organizational culture. Comparative research across religious higher education traditions could also examine which elements of service-based authority are context-specific and which represent broader principles of religious educational leadership.

Conclusion

John 13:1–15 offers more than a general exhortation to humility. It presents a distinctive account of authority in which Jesus remains Teacher and Lord while deliberately assuming the position of a servant. The narrative moves from secure identity, to embodied service, to relational engagement, and finally to an example that the community is expected to reproduce. Read in relation to religious higher education, this pattern provides a theological basis for understanding academic authority as stewardship directed toward the growth and participation of others.

The study identifies three principles—incarnational presence, relational participation, and hierarchical inversion—and translates them into four educational domains: participatory governance, faculty leadership and development, student formation, and institutional culture. The resulting Christ-informed academic leadership framework contributes to religious education by connecting biblical theology with educational management and institutional formation. Its distinctive claim is that servant leadership in Christian higher education should not be reduced to a leader's personal humility; it should shape how authority is exercised, how people participate, and how the institution forms its members.

Because the study is conceptual, its proposed framework requires empirical testing. Nevertheless, it provides a focused theoretical basis for future research and institutional reflection. For religious higher education, the central question is not simply whether leaders are willing to serve, but whether the structures and culture of the institution allow authority to become a means of empowering people to learn, mature, and contribute. In this sense, the example of Jesus in John 13 becomes an educational and organizational paradigm rather than merely a moral illustration.

Declarations

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to the conceptualization, theological analysis, literature integration, drafting, critical revision, and approval of the final manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability: No primary empirical data were collected in this theological-conceptual study. The analysis is based on the biblical text and published scholarly and institutional sources.

References

- Adams, D., Feng, X., & Omar, I. M. (2025). Review of the knowledge base of servant leadership in higher education research, 1998 to 2023. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 47(6), 629–648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2025.2470747>
- Alotaibi, A. S., et al. (2024). Distributed leadership in educational contexts: A catalyst for school improvement. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100835>
- Bauer, W. (2000). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. University of Chicago Press.

- Brown, R. E. (1970). *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI* (Vol. 29A). Doubleday.
- Carson, D. A. (1991). *The Gospel according to John*. Eerdmans.
- Dami, Z. A., Imron, A., Burhanuddin, B., & Supriyanto, A. (2022). Servant leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating role of trust and leader-member exchange. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 1036668. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1036668>
- Direktorat Jenderal Bimbingan Masyarakat Kristen. (2022). Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Bimbingan Masyarakat Kristen Kementerian Agama Nomor 118 Tahun 2022 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Pendirian Sekolah Tinggi Keagamaan Kristen yang Diselenggarakan oleh Masyarakat dan Penyelenggaraan Program Studi Keagamaan Kristen pada Perguruan Tinggi.
- Dul, V., Sam, R., Hak, S., Bou, D., Vy, S., & Kheuy, S. (2024). Servant leadership style in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Contemporary Education and E-Learning*, 2(6), 116–139. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2\(6\).08](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2(6).08)
- Efendi, N., Sholeh, M. I., Munif, M., Abror, S., & Sholihan. (2026). Religious transformative collegial leadership in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 11, 1810099. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1810099>
- Ekayanti, R., & Priyatna, N. (2025). Karakteristik servant leadership profesor di perguruan tinggi swasta Kristen di Tangerang. *Aletheia Christian Educators Journal*, 6(2), 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.9744/aletheia.6.2.65-72>
- Ghasemy, M., & Frömbling, L. (2022). A conditional time-varying multivariate latent growth curve model for the relationships between academics' servant leadership behavior, affective commitment, and job performance during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Quality & Quantity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01568-6>
- Giantama, M. S., Karnati, N., & Rahmawati, D. (2025). Academic quality through servant leadership and learning satisfaction among education students. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 16(2), 104–126.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Hoag Sanfilippo, J. (2024). Empowering the next generation: Unveiling leadership motivators for millennial women in Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 23(1–2), 68–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2024.2304739>
- Jaenudin, J., & Victorynie, I. (2026). Hybrid governance of religious-based higher education with limited autonomy and dual meritocracy of the University of Muhammadiyah in Indonesia. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, 8(2), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v8i2.9429>
- Keener, C. S. (2003). *The Gospel of John: A commentary*. Hendrickson.
- Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2026). Daftar program studi pada Pendidikan Tinggi Keagamaan Kristen (PTKK). Sistem Informasi Data Agama Kristen.
- Köstenberger, A. J. (2004). *John*. Baker Academic.
- Liu, X., Chen, Z., & Sun, M. (2024). The influence of mission valence on faculty's voice behavior: The role of thriving at work and servant leadership. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(12), 1214. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14121214>
- Madison, K. (2024). From hero to humility: Critical approaches to teaching servant leadership. *New Directions for Student Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20579>

- Namatovuc, A., & Tushabe, M. (2024). Servant leadership and healthy work relationships in university context: A moderated mediation analysis of psychological safety and socially responsible leadership. *Cogent Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2418802>
- Naseema, W., Mahmood, H., Rauf, A., & Yen, Y. Y. (2025). Alleviating workplace stress: The role of servant leadership in preventing productivity decline among Pakistan's private higher education institutions. *Cogent Business & Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2451131>
- Riza, M. F., Hutahayan, B., & Chong, H. Y. (2025). Fostering high-performing organizations in higher education: The effect of participative leadership, organizational culture, and innovation on organizational performance and commitment. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2448884.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2448884>
- Sanfilippo, J. H. (2024). Empowering the next generation: Unveiling leadership motivators for millennial women in Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 23(1-2), 68-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2024.2304739>
- Smith, J. W., Jr., & Monihen, L. K. (2024). Characteristics and practices of highly rated senior leadership teams: A comparative case study of CCCU institutions. *Christian Higher Education*, 23(1-2), 139-160.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2024.2306235>
- Yousofi, R., & Rahimzad, F. (2024). EFL students' empowerment using servant leadership: A look through the lens of students in Afghanistan. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2334877>
- Yue, X., Zou, L., Ye, Y., & Cai, T. (2024). The impact of undergraduates servant leadership on their employability. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241260936>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.