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Abstract. The study is a groundwork of Sustainability Leadership. It aims to explore spiritual leadership as it relates to sustainability measurement from the perspective of Indonesian employees. This study uses a quantitative approach. Data were obtained from 221 respondents who are Indonesian employees. The collected data was analyzed by Rash Model analysis and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) Analysis with second-order confirmatory factor analysis. The Rasch Model results found that employees are aware of their company's sustainable objective. Yet, they still are unable to recognize its impact. The Item measure of Rasch Model shows employees are aware that their current leaders are still reluctant to bring up workplace difficulties. The SEM Findings showed that the three research hypotheses have strong support. First, leadership in sustainability is highly influenced by both vision and hope. Altruistic love, the final factor, has also a big impact on sustainable leadership. Although there have been several past studies, they have been inconsistent and lacking in clarity in developing leadership for sustainability. Hence, this study aims to provide a groundwork of Sustainability Leadership to develop leadership for sustainability measurement.

1 Introduction

Living in a time of tremendous challenges and opportunity, individual priorities are being shifted as a result of the climate catastrophe, global health concerns, and shifts in societal values. Globalization and geopolitics are causing tectonic plate movements throughout the planet. Advances in technology and the development of generations that were "born digital" are continuously reinventing how we live and work [1].

Climate change, ozone depletion, deforestation, ecological destruction, and biodiversity loss have received great attention. On the other hand, businesses and organizations must take greater responsibility for environmental protection and implement environmental and natural resource management approaches [2].

Esteemed scholars explain an enterprise is a system of long-term cooperative interactions between impacted parties. These include the company's management and employees, customers and clients, investors, suppliers, and the cities, states, and countries where the company is based or offers goods and services. It is even future generations of stakeholders. In such a system, stakeholder influence pressures the corporation to be ethically, environmentally, and socially responsible. This interdependence, in turn, supports the firm's sustainability and resilience [4].

Organizations were built and operated for an industrial context for decades. They were focused on retaining stability, scalability, and predictability while increasing revenues for shareholders, with little regard for the broader—often unintended—impact of their activities. Not any longer. Many firms have lately realized that this method is unsuitable for today's complicated difficulties, particularly the variety of social expectations that businesses must now address. [1].

A fundamentally new and enhanced style to leadership is emerging for 21st-century firms working in today's complicated commercial environment. Today's leaders are focusing on creating agile, human-centered, and digitally empowered firms capable of thriving in today's unprecedented environment and meeting the requirements of a larger variety of stakeholders (customers, workers, suppliers, and communities, in addition to investors) organization [5].

Leadership is a set of behaviors used to help people align their collective direction, to execute strategic plans, and to continually renew an organization [5]. Peter G. Northouse, a leadership expert, wrote that leadership is about coping with change [6]. To some extent, all leaders do the same thing. Leadership is about leading and...
effecting outcomes, enabling groups of people to work together to do something they couldn't do alone, whether you're talking about an executive, manager, sports coach, or schoolteacher. Leadership, in this view, is something you do rather than something you are. Some people in official positions of power are terrible leaders, while many people who exercise leadership have no formal authority. Their acts, not their words, elicit trust and energy [5].

Leadership has a significant impact on the amount to which individuals can demonstrate high levels of innovative thinking in their performance. When leaders demonstrate ethical, positive, supportive, responsible, and sustainable behavior, it can result in favorable behavioral outcomes among employees. Such as enhanced job satisfaction, innovation behavior, and innovation performance [7].

Management experts have shown an increasing interest in analyzing an expanding number of conceptual frameworks that define leadership in organizations during the last sixty years. Situational leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, distributed leadership, autocratic leadership, participatory leadership, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, responsible leadership, change leadership, and positive leadership are some examples. Leadership has been researched. Both the forces that drive leader practices and the impact of leadership behavior on employees and organizations [8].

Organizational leaders should impact traditional organizational outcomes, such as employee attitudes and behaviors, organizational tasks, and financial and safety performance [3].

The alternative method is known as 'sustainable leadership. According to research in over 50 firms worldwide, sustainable leadership necessitates taking a long-term perspective in decision-making. It is also necessary to foster systemic innovation to increase customer value. In addition, develop a skilled, loyal, and highly engaged workforce; and offer quality products, services, and solutions [4]. As a result, sustainable leadership is emerging as an intriguing area of study within management [8].

Organizational leaders should impact traditional organizational outcomes, such as employee attitudes and behaviors, organizational tasks, and financial and safety performance [3].

The alternative method is known as 'sustainable leadership. According to research in over 50 firms worldwide, sustainable leadership necessitates taking a long-term perspective in decision-making. It is also necessary to foster systemic innovation to increase customer value. In addition, develop a skilled, loyal, and highly engaged workforce; and offer quality products, services, and solutions [4]. As a result, sustainable leadership is emerging as an intriguing area of study within management [8].

There has been much discussion about the need for a new paradigm of organizational leadership development [8], [9]. According to some, organizations should discontinue thinking of leadership as a control role and instead emphasize conversation and the concept of a mutually dependent relationship between leaders and their followers [8], [9]. Furthermore, due to the economic and environmental crisis’s aftermath, the theory of sustainable leadership has grown in prominence and importance [9].

There is much research related to leadership for sustainability. A meta-analysis was conducted by [9]. The study synthesizes and provides often referred concept elements within the internal and external variables influencing sustainable leadership framework.

[10] conducted a qualitative study about leaders who appear to be seeking their personal understanding of sustainability to adjust and continuously enhance overall performance. Leaders must become innovative managers who have established strong leadership competency that focuses on the organization's long-term survival to produce sustainable innovation or a sustainable leadership style. The study found that a manager's charismatic, instrumental, strategic, or interactive leadership style significantly contributed to sustainable innovation processes [10].

[8] conducted bibliometric research. His study examined 952 Scopus-indexed documents directly concerned with sustainable leadership using scientific mapping tools. The review’s objectives were to document this literature's extent, the direction of growth, and geographic distribution. It identifies significant journals, authors, and documents, examines this knowledge base's intellectual structure, and highlights emergent subjects. The review recorded an extensive but recent knowledge base centered in Western developed cultures but to a global extent. Within this knowledge foundation, six Schools of Thought were identified, one of which—Sustainable Leadership—received special attention. The study serves as a resource for researchers new to the field and advises on high-value frameworks, research priorities for the future, and practical applications [8].

[11] also promoted a study about global sustainability leaders becoming more committed to progressing beyond satisfying stakeholders' goals for economic returns and toward a more sustainable, triple-bottom line, balanced strategy. The extant literature on sustainability leadership is greatly influenced by many leadership styles. Work in this area has lately expanded into three lines of academic inquiry: sustainable leadership, responsible leadership, and conscious leadership [11]. All three emphasize a balanced stakeholder approach to leadership [4], [8], [11].

To the best of our knowledge, few previous research has proposed an empirical study exploring sustainability leadership at the workplace with Rasch Model analysis and Structural equation modeling (SEM) with second-order confirmatory factor analysis as the second analysis method. Therefore, this paper, in this sense, provides a novel perspective on sustainability leadership in the workplace. Furthermore, its distinctive qualities can be explained as no research has studied sustainability leadership at the workplace using two statistical methods.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Sustainability

In 1713, the word Nachhaltigkeit (German for sustainability) was first used with this meaning. It is related to the concern with safeguarding natural resources for the future is perennial. The Palaeolithic predecessors must have been concerned about their prey becoming extinct, and early farmers must have been concerned about keeping soil fertility [12].

The term "sustainability" to refer to "sustainable development." One reason for its appeal is that sustainable development appears to give many desirable things to all people, which others argue leads to mainly ineffective efforts on those challenges [13]. The United Nations' approval of seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 signals a revived interest in the expectation that governments, cities, businesses, and other organizations may make progress on social and economic concerns while not negatively impacting the
environment. Although the SDGs or 'Global Goals' appear to be a step forward in mainstreaming environmental considerations when compared to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), they actually represent a dilution of environmental primacy in the early stages of promoting sustainable development. This shows how, throughout time, the emphasis on the need for nations to develop within their environmental 'carrying capacity' of the nation and planet has been sidelined as the pursuit of economic expansion has predominated globally [13].

The framework of sustainable development is also applied to organizations within societies, such as business organizations, giving rise to an abundance of theories and initiatives in fields such as corporate social responsibility, corporate accountability, corporate sustainability, and social enterprise [13].

Sustainable development is a kind of development that necessitates the "commitment to action by individuals, voluntary groups, enterprises, institutes, and governments". In other words, sustainable development is considered as a societal undertaking including various economic and social participants in transformation processes. Change inevitably involves business, but these altered practices cannot be separated from the change brought about by other parties. There is no implication that the corporation or its actions are the unit of analysis for sustainable development [14].

Sustainable development is more than just change; it is change that exhibits integration of economic, social, and environmental goals, relies on economic, social, and environmental data, and leads to coherent decisions. This is accomplished by a combination of technological, organizational, institutional, and managerial innovation [14].

Corporate Responsibility (CR) activities that contribute to sustainable development include leaders in developing and implementing innovative ways of collaborating with others to bring about these innovations [14].

Just as the terms 'sustainability' and 'sustainable development' are used in very diverse research and policy settings, with various implicit exclusions and inclusions, so is the term 'leadership' used to signify or suggest very different things. However, it may assist individuals in exploring the variety of leadership and sustainability possibilities [13].

2.2 Spiritual Leadership

Around the year 2000, a notion of spiritual leadership evolved as a result of increased academic interest in the search for a healthy and sustainable workplace. According to several research, spiritual people prefer to focus on sustainability and make contributions that go beyond their personal interests, and workplace spirituality brings significantly to individuals' sustainable behavior [15].

Fry [16] defined spiritual leadership as "the values, attitudes, and behaviors required to motivate themselves and meet the fundamental needs for spiritual well-being through calling and membership that positively affect employee welfare, sustainability, corporate social responsibility, and financial performance [16]."

Spiritual leadership is characterized as a comprehensive system that includes moral, transformation, ethics, kindness, righteousness, teamwork, congruence, and wholeness [17]. Spiritual people tend to focus on sustainability and make contributions that go beyond their personal interests, and workplace spirituality brings significantly to individuals' sustainable behavior. However, there has been inadequate research on how spiritual leadership affects workplace sustainability [15].

Spiritual leadership and sustainability are two increasingly relevant issues in today's world. Spiritual leadership is leading from a place of inner understanding, compassion, and principles, whereas sustainability entails addressing the needs of the present without jeopardizing future generations' ability to meet their own needs [18], [19].

2.3 Spiritual Leadership and Sustainability

Sustainability and spiritual leadership are interrelated ideas that have been examined in a variety of circumstances. According to prior research, spiritual leadership may help sustainability initiatives.

A meta-analysis study conducted by [15] explores 373 publications from the Scopus database, spanning the period from 1980 to 2019 about the concept of spiritual leadership and proposes a conceptual model of spiritual leadership within the context of the sustainability of the workplace. The findings indicate that the development of the spiritual leadership theory is relevant and applicable to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable workplace for employees.

[20] conducted a study that looks at the relationship between spiritual leadership, workplace spirituality, and sustainable careers in Pakistan's health industry. The results show that while employees were generally content with a spiritual workplace and spiritual leadership, their productivity, well-being, and health varied depending on the context of time, people, and the business. The study also provide new perspectives to the literature on sustainable careers and workplace spirituality.

Additionally, by enhancing employees' own spiritual needs and igniting their intrinsic desire, feeling of duty, and purpose in the workplace, spiritual leadership may be a helpful attempt to achieve organizational strategy and sustainable growth [21]. The development of spiritual leadership theory has expanded to include ethical and spiritual well-being, the triple bottom line of people, planet, and profit, and global leadership for sustainability, despite the fact that there is little research in this area in the higher education system [18]. The study of Fry proves that spiritual leadership and sustainability are related ideas that may help build a more fair, just, and sustainable society for all. According to the research findings, spiritual leadership may support sustainability initiatives in a variety of settings, including the workplace, environmental leadership, and corporate strategy [11].
2.4 Leadership for Sustainability

Leadership for sustainability is a recent research subject that extends beyond common leadership methods focusing on internal organizational processes and outcomes. Instead, it offers a dramatically enlarged approach to leadership that allows individuals committed to creating long-term change in their organizations, communities, and society to be leaders [11].

Hargreaves and Fink provided one of the first conceptual designs of sustainable leadership in 2004 [8]. They stated that sustainable leadership is leadership that tries to deal with the requirements of today’s society without jeopardizing future generations’ ability to prosper.

Sustainable leadership is concerned with creating current and future profits for an organization while improving the lives of all concerned [4], [10]. Another academic stated sustainable leadership necessitates maintaining an outlook on the future when making decisions. In addition, it supports systematic innovation to enhance customer value, generating a talented, loyal, and highly engaged staff and providing quality products, services, and solutions [8], [9].

Thus, leadership for sustainability surpasses formal position or authorized power. Instead, these leaders find themselves in a wide range of collaborative partnerships. They are also confronted with the challenge of co-creating a shared vision and developing synergies among an extensive range of internal and external stakeholders [11]. He categorized sustainability leadership into three dimensions. First Vision identifies who we are and what we do. It describes the organization’s journey and why we carry it out. The Second is Hope. It is the assurance that the goals sought will be realized. It is the conviction that the organization’s vision/purpose/mission will be realized. The last one is Altruistic Love. It is a sense of wholeness, harmony, and well-being brought about by concern for oneself and others. Therefore, after conducting a literature review, the researchers developed the hypotheses listed below:

H1 Vision influences sustainability leadership significantly.

H2 Hope influences sustainability leadership significantly.

H3 Altruistic love influences sustainability leadership significantly.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Approaches

The research aims to conduct a quantitative study of sustainability leadership among employees in large cities like Jakarta, Indonesia’s capital city. Its aim was to provide explanations. The study was carried out only once. It shows that the research was done in segments. As a result, the study collected data for a particular point in time using a cross-sectional sample survey and a field study. It is advantageous to collect large amounts of information from the population and maximize the population’s representative sampling. It is also to improve the ability to generalize the results. The research started with a theoretical foundation, followed by hypothesis generation, sample data collection, and confirmation of the analytical results by applying the Rasch Model approach and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis.

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The study used judgmental non-probability sampling, which chooses persons most conveniently located or in the best position to provide the necessary information. It is used when there is a lack of reliable data on population size and location. The researcher uses purposive sampling to pick sampling units based on experience and judgment. A Google Forms survey questionnaire was used to collect data. The respondents worked for a variety of businesses. The sample size should be "ten times the largest number of formative indicators used to measure one construct." Another option is "ten times the largest number of inner model paths directed at a specific construct in the inner model," whichever is larger ([22]). As a result, the minimum number of participants for this study is 130. Nonetheless, 221 people completed the survey form, meeting the minimum sample size required. The survey questionnaire data was processed using SMARTPLS 3.2.9 software and WINSTEPS 5.2.1.0 software.

Since the research instruments used will provide ordinal data, the Rasch model is the best tool for quantitative analysis in human sciences [23], [24]. According to the measurement model, Rasch model analysis is based on probability and consistently predicts respondents’ responses to all items. Ordinal data, such as Likert rating scale item scores, are converted to an interval scale known as “unit of opportunity logarithms” (logit) via the Rasch Model [23], [24]. Rasch Model Analysis can also help reduce biased answers on self-report questionnaires [23], [24]. Structural equation modeling (SEM) with second order confirmatory factor analysis is the second analysis method. The initial stage of this second-order test is the examination of the latent construct dimensions to the indicators. The research is then carried out from the latent to the dimensional construct. A repeated indicators technique, also known as a hierarchical component model, is used in this method [25], [26].

4 Findings and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

The study wants to evaluate sustainability leadership among employees in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia. It is a one-dimensional study that is also a descriptive quantitative study. It took about six months to complete the research, from February to June 2022.

This study used a quantitative design to conduct empirical research. All items were graded on a five-point Likert scale, one indicating strongly disagree and five indicating strongly agree. The questions used to measure sustainability leadership were adapted from [11], and consisted of 13 indicators.

The sampling technique used in this study was non-probability sampling with a purposive sampling
technique, that is, a sampling technique with specific considerations. The selected sample is adjusted to particular criteria due to concern. This study uses the sample chosen as employees living in Tangerang and Jakarta.

There are 62% male and 38% female employees as the respondents. Their age ranges from 19 to 30 years old for 54.3%, and 31 to 50 years old for the rest. Their educational level is 84.1% bachelor's degree and the rest diploma. 93.2% of respondents have less than five years of experience. Their functional level is 86.4% staff up to management.

As the data was collected through personal references or self-report questionnaires, Rasch Model Analysis, specifically Person Measure Analysis used to test for the responses’ bias. The test found that only 191 responses are bias-free because the MNSQ value is higher than 0.5 and lower than 1.5 [23], [24]. The data collected from the questionnaire was processed using Rasch Model analysis with WINSTEPS 5.2.1.0 software.

4.2 The Rasch Model Analysis

The sustainability leadership instrument’s reliability (Table 1) suggests that all replies are very good (0.85), and the research instrument items are excellent (0.95). Furthermore, both research instruments have a very high Cronbach alpha (0.87). It implies that these values are responsible for the high correlations between the items and the respondents’ responses [23], [24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Leadership</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85 0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The validity test results (Table 2) indicates there are no outliers items since all the logit value is between 0.5 logit and not above 1.5 logit [23], [24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic Love</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following analysis is a Person Wright Map. Item-person map (or Wright Map or Variable Map) is a tool in Rasch model measurement that provide a comprehensive outlook of the data [23], [24].
Table 3. Sustainability Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sustainability Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>My company has a sustainable vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>AL1</td>
<td>The current company leaders have integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>AL2</td>
<td>The current company leaders are honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>AL3</td>
<td>The company is loyal to its employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>I actively participate in achieving the company's sustainable vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Sustainable vision is my commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Sustainable vision appeals to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>I fully support the success of the company's sustainable vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>I support achieving a sustainable vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>A sustainable vision inspires my best performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>AL5</td>
<td>The company pays attention to its employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>I am committed to the company's sustainable vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>AL4</td>
<td>The current company leaders dare to stand up for employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. SEM Reliability Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (&gt;0.6)</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (&gt;0.6)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for Sustainability</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with second-order confirmatory factor analysis

According to [25], the loading factor should be more than 0.70. The reliability of internal consistency must then be assessed. Two indicators corroborate this: composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha. The value must be equal to or greater than 0.50 [25], [26]. An indicator of convergent validity is the average variance extended (AVE). The lowest and maximum threshold values are 0.50 and higher [25], [26]. Table 4 show the outer-loading value and the reliability and validity scores that meet the measurement's standards.

Based on the results of the loading factor (table 4), it can be seen that all indicators have a value of > 0.70 after removing two indicators, namely AL2, H2, H4, and V4, which have a loading factor <0.70 (Hair). Therefore, it implies that all of the indicators are valid.

Table 4. SEM Validity Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Loading Factor (&gt;0.6)</th>
<th>AVE (&gt;0.5)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>AL1</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL3</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL4</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL5</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for Sustainability</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL7</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Second-order Outer Loading Results.

Referring to the results of the outer loadings (Table 6), all construct indicators in the model are valid with the resulting T-Statistics values >1.96 and are significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value results (Table 5), all constructs are greater than 0.50, indicating that they meet the requirements for construct validity. It is also supported by the Composite Reliability (CR) value which is greater than 0.70, implying that all construct indicators are reliable.

Table 7. Second-order Path Coefficients Results.

It means that vision, hope, and altruistic love have all proven to be significant facets of sustainability leadership. In other words, all first-order constructs are dimensional constructs that form sustainability leadership constructs.

4.4 Theoretical Implication

The Second Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis SEM analysis results show that hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are statistically significant. Therefore, it implies that vision, hope, and altruistic love significantly impact sustainability leadership. The research findings align with the previous research findings about sustainability.
leadership dimensions: vision, hope, and altruistic love [11].

Referring to the item measure analysis of The Rasch Model method, employees recognize that their organizations have a sustainable goal, including the triple bottom line. However, according to the item measure, employees believe that their present leaders still lack the confidence to stand up for their people. In other words, their current leaders still have less altruistic love.

According to the item measure analysis, employees acknowledge current leaders' integrity and honesty. They also like that their present leaders are committed to their staff. However, according to the research findings, employees are not committed to or interested in the company's sustainable goals. Furthermore, they do not completely support attaining a company's sustainable objectives.

According to the item measure analysis, employees believe that with sustainable goals, companies will care for and pay more attention to their people through altruistic love. They hope that their current leaders are honest, trustworthy, and devoted to their subordinates. They also hope that by sustainable goals, present leaders will be more willing to stand up for employees and devote better confidence to stand up for their people. In other words, employees believe that their present leaders still lack the social aspect of the triple bottom line.

5 Conclusion

This study is a groundwork research on leadership for sustainability. The purpose of this study is to analyze the leadership for sustainability measurement from the viewpoint of Indonesian employees by adopting spiritual leadership. The findings revealed that the three research hypotheses were significantly supported. First, vision significantly influences sustainability leadership; hope significantly influences sustainability leadership. The last one, altruistic love significantly influences sustainability leadership.

According to the item measure analysis in Rasch Model analysis, employees are aware that the business has a sustainable vision. Nonetheless, they remain oblivious to its impact. It is supported by statistics revealing that employees understand their current leaders' unwillingness to discussing workplace difficulties.

5.1 Research Limitation

The study still needs improvement. Further work is required to explore the effectiveness of sustainability leadership on individual and organizational performance. Examining human needs related to leaders' exchange view is also beneficial. It will also be helpful to examine sustainability leadership in other sectors. For example, hospitality or the public service sector heavily depends on human resources as their primary intangible assets. It still needs further tests related to the influence of leadership for sustainability on employee outcomes and employee morale on social and environmental issues related to sustainability. This research will be further enriched by incorporating elements of organizational culture and teamwork in supporting leadership for sustainability.
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