

Servant Leadership: Its Impact on Organizational Commitment and Organization Citizenship Behavior

 Taqwa Hariguna¹

How to cite this article:

Hariguna, T. (2023). Servant leadership: It's impact on organizational commitment and organization citizenship behavior. *Journal of Excellence in Management Sciences*, 3(1), 46–59.

Received: 8 January 2023 / Accepted: 24 March 2023 / Published online: 11 June 2023

Abstract

The purpose of the research examining the impact of Servant leadership on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Since Pakistan is a developing country, and to advance a developed country, education needs to be in major and vital focus. The top 10 universities, chosen from the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan's current list, were investigated. Pal Scale was distributed to the faculty members of the universities (N=322), reporting about their supervisor's leadership style. Moreover, employees were told to address their extra-role behavior, i.e. organizational citizenship behavior, by using the scale developed by Welbourne, Johnson, and Erez (1996). In addition to this, employees evaluated the overall effectiveness by using the organizational effectiveness scale for the Higher Education Institutes of Kwan and Walker. This investigation supported the substantial and significant impact of organizational citizenship behavior on the relationship between Servant leadership and the effectiveness of higher education institutes. Moreover, a direct relationship among variables is also found. Thus, the supervisors must recognize, foster and realize the importance of Servant leadership as this may eventually influence organizational citizenship behavior and the effectiveness of higher education institutes.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Organization Citizenship Behavior, Effectiveness

1 Introduction

From behavioral to contemporary theories and styles, leadership has been intensely studied and researched over the years, as business firms grow with better leaders because they influence employee's mental wellbeing and business growth (Abbas et al. [2022](#); Iorember et al. [2022](#)). Through established leadership theories and appropriate styles, it has provided organizations with

¹Universitas Amikom Purwokerto, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: taqwa@amikompurwokerto.ac

an adequate leadership framework to be run in best possible way for better business environment as leaders decide to adopt green investments, technology acceptance and employees mental health measures (Abbas et al. [2022](#); Mubeen et al. [2021](#); Shahzad et al., [2022](#)).

According to Quick and Cooper ([2009](#)) in the field of positive organizational behavior, leadership plays a pivotal role to get the employees engaged and organizations thrive. Great leaders crafts and articulate vision so their subordinates and create a shared value and build a system and set a path to achieve organizational goals (Banutu-Gomez [2007](#); Kotter [2001](#); Lysova et al., [2019](#)). The recent avoidable financial collapses, mishandled finance related dealings, and corporate greed calls for the need of a more ethical leadership that believes in serving its stakeholders instead of pilfering them. Although some leadership scholars have been calling for attention towards connection between leadership and ethics, but Graham ([1991](#)) and Irving ([2012](#)) suggest that an emerging leadership theory that is linked to virtues, morality, and ethics is servant leadership. Servant leadership promotes pro-social behaviors that benefits others and community as a whole which encompasses a strong ethical component (Ghasemy et al., [2022](#); Khan et al., [2022](#)). These aspects translates into high moral standards that appeals to committed individuals.

Although the term "Servant Leadership" was first introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf almost three decades ago, it is still relatively understudied area, but has achieved much press coverage in recent times. According to Joseph and Winston ([2005](#)) the core of servant leadership theory is to place the interest of subordinate before their own. A handsome number of scholars believe that servant leadership contributes more in development of employee's citizenship behavior and organizational commitment (Aprilda et al., [2019](#); Sendjaya et al., [2008](#)) and in return followers offer their better services to the leadership Winston and Fields ([2015](#)). The said services could be translated into organizational citizenship behavior. Multifaceted nature of organization commitment determine the nature of relationship of employees with their organizations (Ahmad, & Raja [2021](#); Meyer & Herscovitch [2001](#)). Organization commitment is a binding force that make an individual stick to their organizations to perform certain actions (Benkarim, & Imbeau, [2021](#); Meyer & Herscovitch [2001](#)). Affective commitment confine employees' emotional affection to their organizations, continuance commitment is subdivided into two subcomponents (1) the cost of leaving the organization (2) lack of alternatives, while normative commitment is in association of sense of being obligated to stay with the organization. Affective and normative commitment are directly influenced by work socialization experience, while alternative commitment bases upon external contingencies (Marcos et al., [2020](#); Powell & Meyer [2004](#)). As servant leadership are to provide their followers with skillful training, emotional support, and have they actively participate in decision making process which aims to nurturing followers holistically. The term Organizational Citizenship Behavior was first coined in 1970s as a type of worker contribution measured in output (Organ et al., [2006](#); Tsai et al., [2022](#)) and recently became a part of behavioral studies. Helpful and compliance behaviors were always a manager's wish to see in his followers. Helping behaviors are focused on co-workers and compliance behaviors are more in general sense that benefit the whole organization. These behaviors are described as discretionary because these are not a part of employee's defined job responsibilities, but they support organizational effectiveness (Moorman & Blakely, [1995](#); Sharafizad et al., [2020](#)). This kind of behaviors can be called citizenship behaviors.

1.1 Servant Leadership

Servant leadership is relatively a new phenomenon introduced into leadership literature which has not been empirically researched enough Chemers (2000), partly because of self-contradictory nature of its terminology "servant and leader" (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2008). Philosophically, servant leadership style proposes that they are always concerned about their followers and believe in building relationship Owens and Hekman, (2012), put other's needs before their own Greenleaf (1977), they deliberately choose to serve (Burns, 1978), helping others on priority basis Cooke and Rousseau (1988) they focus on assessing the needs of others and serving them Bass (1999) and unequivocally accentuate the needs of the followers (Bayighomog, & Araslı 2019; Patterson, 2003). In progression Spear (1995) identified ten characteristics of servant leadership. These are (1) listening, realizing the importance of communication with people; (2) persuasion, influencing others through arguments instead of power; (3) foresight, foreseeing future through intuition; (4) healing, ability to help; (5) empathy, understanding and accepting how and what people are; (6) awareness, being in state of awake; (7) conceptualization, thinking far ahead of day to day activities; (8) commitment to growth of people, helping people to grow professionally and spiritually; (9) stewardship, prioritizing others' needs over their own (Reinke, 2004); (10) building community, acknowledging the importance of communities in peoples' life. As a result of above characterization, the self-concept of a servant leader emerges and they act according to their self-concepts (Cogswell et al., 2023; Leonard et al., 1995; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998). The self-concept of servant leaders devises a positive behavior pattern that correspond to a positive move towards organizational behavior (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012; Ukeni, 2021). which causes a serving culture within an organization. The serving behavior model earns respect and admiration of followers who try to imitate their leaders' behavior Liden et al. (2014) because leaders serve up as mentor to their followers (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000) who try to copy their leaders' behavior (Lankau & Scandura, 2002). The followership gets even more extensive if a leader possesses desirable behavior and qualities (Einola, & Alvesson 2021; Hannah et al., 2011; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Mayer et al., 2012; Neubert et al., 2008) and perseverance of their leader as a role model (Mayer et al., 2012). The depiction of servant leadership by Patterson's (2003) model begins with "agapao" love that triggers humility and altruism. The term "Agapao love" is derived from Greek which means moral love that translates into doing fair things at the right time and for all the right reasons. In consideration of fairness, Mayer et al. (2008) describe multiple reasons why it is significant for servant leadership, (1) because their sensitivity towards the needs of the followers make them treat their followers interpersonally; (2) servant leaders make sure that their followers make ethical decisions; (3) well-being and growth of the followers is expected to be involved for fair rewards. Servant leadership is directly related to employee's job satisfaction through organizational justice Mayer et al. (2008) and the same was proved by showed Ehrhart's (2004) study. The leadership styles like rewarding, teamwork and empowering brings about a positive impact on worker satisfaction, and worker satisfaction as a result promotes worker loyalty. Business organizations are in quest of leadership that is ethical and more responsible towards society Karakas and Sarigollu (2013) ever since multiple financial scandals displayed corporate greed and selfish management practices (Van Dierendonck, 2011). As every disaster possesses an opportunity as well Livitt et al. (2011) and this seems an obvious choice to look for more ethical leadership since it is positively related with organizational performance (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Watching recent corporate avoidable failures, scholars of leadership domain has shifted their

attention from individualistic leadership styles towards more relevant and relational ones (Avolio et al., [2009](#)). This shift is quite evident in recent empirical and conceptual research on servant leadership (Ehrhart, [2004](#); Graham, [1991](#); Hu & Liden, [2011](#); Schaubroeck et al., [2008](#)). Some scholars believe, rightfully so, that the current research on servant leadership emphasize on outcomes Neubert et al. ([2008](#)) but not on its determinant which is an obstacle for servant leadership concept to become a theory

1.2 Organizational Commitment

According to Joseph and Winston ([2005](#)) the core of servant leadership theory is to place the interest of subordinate before their own. A handsome number of scholars believe that servant leadership contributes more in development of employee's citizenship behavior and organizational commitment Sendjaya et al. ([2008](#)) and in return followers offer their better services to the leadership (Winston, 2003). The said services could be translated into organizational citizenship behavior. Multifaceted nature of organization commitment determines the nature of relationship of employees with their organizations (Ahmad & Raja, [2021](#); Meyer & Herscovitch [2001](#)). Organization commitment is a binding force that make an individual stick to their organizations to perform certain actions (Benkarim & Imbeau, [2021](#); Meyer & Herscovitch [2001](#)). Affective commitment confine employees' emotional affection to their organizations, continuance commitment is subdivided into two subcomponents (1) the cost of leaving the organization (2) lack of alternatives, while normative commitment is in association of sense of being obligated to stay with the organization. Affective and normative commitment are directly influenced by work socialization experience, while alternative commitment bases upon external contingencies (Al-Jabari & Ghazzawi, [2019](#); Powell & Meyer [2004](#)). As servant leadership are to provide their followers with skillful training, emotional support, and have they actively participate in decision making process which aims to nurturing followers holistically. The term Organizational Citizenship Behavior was first coined in 1970s as a type of worker contribution measured in output and recently became a part of behavioral studies (Jehanzeb, [2020](#); Organ et al., [2006](#)).

1.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

As servant leadership is to provide their followers with skillful training, emotional support, and have them actively participate in decision making process which aims to nurturing followers holistically. The term Organizational Citizenship Behavior was first coined in 1970s as a type of worker contribution measured in output Organ et al. ([2006](#)) and recently became a part of behavioral studies. Helpful and compliance behaviors were always a manager's wish to see in his followers. Helping behaviors are focused on co-workers and compliance behaviors are more in general sense that benefit the whole organization. These behaviors are described as discretionary because these are not a part of employee's defined job responsibilities, but they support organizational effectiveness (Moorman & Blakely, [1995](#)). This kind of behaviors can be called citizenship behaviors. According to Organ ([1988](#)), Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is the major element in improving organizational efficiency and effectiveness and adaptability of an organization. Walz & Niehoff ([2000](#)) found that dimensions of OCB enhance organizational performance, efficiency and consumer contentment. Furthermore, OCB relates positively with employees' retention, productivity, profitability, and job performance (Podsakoff et al., [2009](#)). The term Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was introduced by Organ and his companions (Smith et al., [1983](#)). Organ ([1988](#)) defined it as supportive behavior which exceeds the stated job

description. According to Lambert (2013) OCB is an act of job performance which is beyond vital requirements of job and is not an element of formal reward system. Researchers are of the view that organizations hire employees who not only meet their job tasks but also put their time, effort and energy willingly to give their best to make the organization flourish (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

For more than over two decades, OCB has been explored theoretically and empirically in different fields and pro-social organizational behavior, contextual performance, extra role behavior and organizational spontaneity are its related forms (Lang et al., 2012). Different research studies showed that organizational citizenship behavior creates a strong influence in enhancing and maintaining long-term organizational performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). In OCB, employees represent their job and perform their tasks with loyalty and respect and willingly do extra effort to accomplish organizational goals (Abbasi, 2015). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) describes the thoughtfulness of the employee with the organization. It motivates employees to exhibit supportive behavior at their workplace (Zhao et al., 2013). In service organizations, OCB is described as the collaboration of the employee for the satisfaction of the customers, Jung and Yoon (2015). According to Somech and Zahavy (2004) there are three main features of OCB i.e. it is voluntarily based, has multiple dimensions and contributes to the organization. According to Organ (1988), OCB also develops coworker or managerial productivity which in turn is beneficial for the organization. Organ (1988) proposed many dimensions of OCB which incorporate courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship and altruism

1.4 Servant Leadership Dimensions

An inconsistent set of servant leadership define this construct which is being offered by current literature. Our research has been defined and validates dimensions of servant leadership, originally being identified as nine dimensions which were further reduced to seven dimensions. Servant leadership & commitment variables have been assessed in the banking industry employees; as study has been conducted in Pakistani banking industry (mainly population was from Lahore city and some people filled questionnaire online - based multinational and national banks).

Seven Servant Leadership Dimensions

1. Emotional Healing: - An act of personal concerns for others or showing sensitivity
2. Creating Value for the community: - Concern to help others / communities; a consciousness
3. Conceptual Skills: - Effectively support and assist others by possessing strong organizational knowledge
4. Empowering: - Facilities others or immediate deportees by identifying & solving work related problems.
5. Helping subordinates grow & succeed / Putting subordinates first: - Genuine concern for others growth by providing mentoring and assist them when they need help
6. Behaving Ethically: - Treating others fairly, openly and with empathy
7. Relationships / Servanthood: - Building long term relationship with immediate followers and serve them first, even you have to self-sacrifice for your needs.

2 Theoretical justifications

The Social Exchange Theory, as proposed by Blau (1964), offers a theoretical framework that

facilitates a comprehensive comprehension of the dynamic interplay among servant leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

According to the Social Exchange Theory, individuals participate in social relationships and interactions with the anticipation of receiving reciprocal benefits (Emerson, [1976](#)). The theory of servant leadership suggests that leaders who demonstrate behaviors consistent with servant leadership, such as providing support, empathy, and empowerment, promote a positive social exchange environment.

As per the theoretical framework, the employees perceive the actions of a servant leader as advantageous and encouraging, thereby cultivating a feeling of financial obligation and appreciation (Eisenberger et al., [2017](#)). Employees tend to exhibit increased levels of organizational commitment in response to the perceived benefits they receive, as they feel valued and connected to the organization (Meyer & Allen, [1991](#)). Subsequently, the personnel exhibits discretionary actions, commonly called organizational citizenship behavior, as a means of reciprocating favorable interactions and showcasing their dedication.

This theoretical framework suggests that servant leadership is a primary factor that impacts employees' perceptions of social exchanges within the organizational context. The perception mentioned above leads to the development of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is a mediating variable in the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. This phenomenon can be attributed to employees' loyalty to the organization, which motivates them to engage in voluntary activities.

The Social Exchange Theory provides a comprehensive understanding of the relationships among servant leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. The aforementioned objective is attained by placing emphasis on the reciprocal nature of social interactions and the importance of perceived advantages and responsibilities in shaping the behavior of employees.

3 Hypothesis Development

3.1 Link between Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment

The study conducted by Siddiquei et al. ([2021](#)) aimed to examine the impact of servant leadership on organizational commitment in Chinese organizations. The study's findings revealed a significant and positive association between the display of servant leadership conduct and the employees' corporate dedication. The study results suggest that leaders who exhibit characteristics of servant leadership, such as empathy, humility, and empowering behaviors, are more likely to develop a greater level of commitment among their followers.

A study by Van Dierendonck and Nuijten ([2011](#)) investigated the influence of servant leadership on employee commitment in the Netherlands. The study's results indicate a good correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment. The study's authors underscored the significance of incorporating servant leadership principles, which encompass attributes such as altruism, moral conduct, and delegation of power, to foster a favorable impact on employees' sense of affiliation with their organization and their inclination to participate in leisure activities.

Pekerti and Sendjaya ([2010](#)) examined the correlation between servant leadership and

organizational commitment within a group of Indonesian employees. The study's results suggest that the expression of servant leadership behaviors, including empathy, stewardship, and follower empowerment, significantly influenced the degree of commitment demonstrated by employees towards their respective organizations. This research underscores the importance of servant leadership in stimulating organizational commitment by prioritizing followers' growth and well-being.

Drawing upon the findings of contemporary research, servant leadership positively impacts the level of organizational commitment.

H1: Servant leadership has a positive impact on organizational commitment.

3.2 Link between Organizational Commitment and organizational citizenship behavior

Empirical findings suggest that employees' degree of organizational commitment significantly influences their engagement in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Increased levels of organizational commitment positively correlate with a heightened concentration in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).

Podsakoff et al. (2014) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) across multiple sectors. The findings indicate a significant association between an individual's dedication to an organization and their proclivity to participate in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Employees who demonstrate a heightened commitment to their organization are more likely to engage in discretionary behaviors that advance the organization's goals and well-being.

Eisenberger et al. (2017) conducted a study to examine the relationship between organizational devotion and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the healthcare industry. The study's results indicate a significant association between organizational commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The statement posits that employees who demonstrate a strong sense of dedication to their organization are more likely to engage in endeavors that strengthen the organization's overall effectiveness and productivity.

Chiaburu and Thundiyil (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of the existing research and found a significant positive association between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The analysis results indicate that employees with higher levels of organizational commitment are more inclined to exhibit citizenship behaviors, such as aiding colleagues, volunteering for additional tasks, and cultivating a favorable work environment.

Based on the findings of this research, it is plausible to propose that a good association exists between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. When employees develop a strong sense of affiliation, dedication, and devotion to their organization, they are more likely to engage in voluntary behaviors that exceed their formal job duties and positively impact the organization's overall performance.

3.3 The link between Servant Leadership and organizational citizenship behavior

Recent research suggests a positive association between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), suggesting that employees who perceive their supervisors as

possessing servant leadership characteristics are likelier to engage in OCB.

The study conducted by Qiu and Dooley (2022). aimed to examine the influence of servant leadership on the manifestation of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among employees in Chinese organizations. The results suggest that a significant and favorable association exists between implementing servant leadership and displaying organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The research findings indicate that servant leadership, distinguished by enabling employees, offering assistance, and exhibiting attentiveness and empathy, revealed a good correlation with cultivating organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among lower-level workers.

Ehrhart (2020) conducted a research study to examine the influence of servant leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) within the healthcare context. The study results indicate a significant correlation between the practice of servant leadership and the display of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Leaders who exhibited servant leadership qualities such as humility, empathy, and empowerment were more effective in inspiring and motivating employees to engage in voluntary behaviors that ultimately benefit the organization.

The study conducted by Ja'afaru Bambale (2014) examined the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the context of Chinese hospitality employees. The study's results indicate that adopting servant leadership has a favorable influence on employees' Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The study revealed that leaders who demonstrated servant leadership attributes, such as promoting the development of their subordinates' personal and professional skills, distributing resources, and fostering a positive work environment, were more successful in encouraging employees to engage in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

Recent studies suggest that servant leadership has a favorable influence on organizational citizenship behavior. Leaders who adopt a servant leadership approach by emphasizing the welfare of their subordinates, enabling them, and fostering a nurturing work atmosphere are more inclined to motivate their staff to exceed their prescribed job duties and participate in activities that enhance the overall efficiency and operation of the enterprise.

H3: Servant leadership has a positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior.

3.4 The link between Organizational Commitment, Servant leadership, and Organizational Citizenship behavior

Drawing upon previous research, it is probable to propose that the correlation between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is subject to moderation by organizational commitment. The research findings indicate that the manifestation of servant leadership behaviors has a noteworthy influence on the level of corporate dedication exhibited by the workforce. Consequently, this leads to an increase in the level of engagement in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

An empirical investigation conducted by Howladar and Rahman (2021) examined the mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among employees in China. The findings of the study suggest that servant leadership has a positive impact on both organizational commitment and

organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Additionally, the researchers discovered that the organization's responsibility partially mediated the correlation between servant leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The previously mentioned proposal suggests that employees' perception of leaders' practice of servant leadership is positively correlated with their level of organizational commitment, which in turn results in heightened engagement in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

Howladar and Rahman (2021) conducted a study to examine the mediating role of organizational commitment in the association between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) within South Korean organizations. The study's results indicate that the practice of servant leadership was found to have a positive correlation with organizational commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The research findings suggest a mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between servant leadership and OCB. This implies that the level of employees' commitment to the organization significantly impacts their engagement in OCB.

Drawing from the findings of these studies, an explanation can be put forth that organizational commitment can mediate the linkage between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Leaders who adopt servant leadership and demonstrate empathetic, supportive, and empowering behaviors tend to cultivate a strong sense of commitment among their subordinates. This, in turn, motivates employees to engage in discretionary behaviors that are advantageous to the organization.

H4: Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

4 Methodology

4.1 Research Design

The research strategy for this paper is quantitative in nature, it inculcates an objective and systematic procedure of obtaining information about the real world. It helps to determine the relationship among different variables and confirm the findings. In quantitative study, the researcher mostly uses post positivist claims for evolving knowledge (i.e., cause and effect thinking, reduction to specific variables and hypotheses and questions, and the test of theories), employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data. The research design used is explanatory, giving explanation of why and how questions about the current dilemma. Mode of inquiry for this research is deductive as in this approach concept and theories are being tested. Hence, research paradigm selected is positivism which is used for theory testing. Ontology keeping in view positivism (paradigm) is objective reality and epistemology is that reality is there and it has to find out by observation. And the research approach under positivism chosen is Survey method (Questionnaire). The collection of data was done through a close – ended questionnaire which is used as a survey instrument. Target population for this research is commercial banks of Lahore, Pakistan. Sampling frame is the employees of commercial banking sector. Sample Unit of analysis Simple random sampling technique would be followed i.e. questionnaire has been distributed randomly to the employees of banks. Sample Size taken is 208 according to the rule of thumb.

4.2 Scale Measures

We used measurement scale for our questionnaire from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). To study variables, we used scale score by averaging responses pertaining to each measure. For servant leadership measurement scale, an average score has been calculated for every single dimension.

4.3 Items generation

The identification of seven servant leadership has been drawn from the leadership literature. (Accordingly, to authors, they assembled and discussed the dimensions which conducted on servant leadership scales and develop under observation instrument). To keep this research straight & simple, we borrowed already tested instrument and conducted our research by strictly given measurement scale, items and dimension in Pakistani banking industry.

4.4 Participants and Procedure

This study has been consisted / conducted by adopting certain simple methods i.e. “online questionnaire”, questionnaire sent through email”, “hard copies were sent by courier /by hand to different colleagues, friends. We used social media as well as personal relationship in banking sector to fill this instrument. We got 68 online responses and through hard copy 135 responses were collected, so total responding numbers were 209. We can’t exactly predict that how many people were contacted since we used all available resources to get maximum responses. To make this survey / research simple, we have not distinguished our responded by measuring through gender, age, salary and experience.

5 Data Analysis

The collected data through Questionnaire was statistically and graphically analyzed using software SPSS (Statistical Packages for the social sciences) as well as used MS Excel. Reliability would be checked through cronbach alpha. For testing the hypotheses regression analysis has been performed.

5.1 Result

First of all, we checked the borrowed instrument for its reliability and conducted our first test for reliability of overall scale that comprises of 28 items. Then again, we checked reliability of the questionnaire after computing it under three variables.

Table 1: Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.975	28

Cronbach alpha of the entire questionnaire is 0.975 which depict that the reliability of the questionnaire used to conduct the research is highly reliable.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SL	2.95	.695	204
OC	3.31	.719	204
OCB	2.82	.848	204

Descriptive table has shown 2.95, 3.31 and 2.82 mean for SL, OC and OCB respectively. Standard deviation for SL, OC and OCB is .695, .719 and .848 respectively. Secondly, we checked the correlation between all the variables.

Table 3: Correlation

	SL	OC
OC	.921**	
OCB	.914**	.697**

Table above shows strong correlation among the variables which are highly significant too.

Hypothesis 1: SL is positively related to OC.

Table 4: Normality

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.921 ^a	.849	.848	.281	1.785

a. Predictors: (Constant), SL, b. Dependent Variable: OC

Table 5: Anova

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	89.593	1	89.593	1134.748	.000 ^b
	Residual	15.949	202	.079		
	Total	105.542	203			

a. Dependent Variable: OC, b. Predictors: (Constant), SL

Table 6: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.478	.086		5.557	.000		
	SL	.956	.028	.921	33.686	.000	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: OC

The tables above show strong relation between SL and OC. R square of the model is 0.849 that represents the strength of the model. Standardized coefficient beta represents the unit change effect. Thus, 1 unit change in SL leads to 0.921 or 92.1% rise in OC.

Hypothesis 2: SL is positively related to OCB

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.914 ^a	.835	.834	.344	1.699

a. Predictors: (Constant), SL, b. Dependent Variable: OCB

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression		120.942	1	120.942	1022.415	.000 ^b
Residual		23.895	202	.118		
Total		144.837	203			

a. Dependent Variable: OCB, b. Predictors: (Constant), SL

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.454	.105		-4.306	.000		
	SL	1.111	.035	.914	31.975	.000	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

The tables above show strong relation between SL and OCB. R square of the model is 0.835 that represents the strength of the model. Standardized coefficient beta represents the unit change effect. Thus, 1 unit change in SL leads to 0.914 or 91.4% rise in OCB.

6 Discussion

The results of this research provide evidence in favor of the proposition that servant leadership exerts a beneficial influence on organizational commitment. The present finding coincides with prior scholarly investigations that have consistently demonstrated a clear correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment, as evidenced by the works of Siddiquei et al. (2018) and (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten 2011). Servant leadership involves leaders practicing behavior that encompasses empathy, support, empowerment, and a focus on serving others. The behaviors mentioned above contribute to developing a work environment that promotes trust, mutual respect, and a supportive culture within the organization. The positive correlation between employees' perception of leaders who practice servant leadership and their heightened sense of value, care, and connection to the organization leads to increased levels of organizational commitment.

The concept of servant leadership functions as a guiding framework that influences the attitudes and perceptions of employees regarding their organization. Implementing servant leadership within an organization has been found to foster a heightened sense of loyalty, identification, and emotional attachment among employees. The heightened level of dedication can be observed through the individual's eagerness to allocate their time, energy, and assets towards attaining the objectives of the establishment and strengthening its accomplishments. Organizations must acknowledge the importance of fostering servant leadership qualities among their leaders. Implementing training and development programs that prioritize cultivating servant leadership skills can facilitate the creation of a favorable workplace atmosphere that encourages employee dedication and involvement. The results of this research provide evidence in favor of the proposition that organizational commitment positively impacts organizational citizenship behavior. The present discovery coincides with previous studies consistently demonstrating a clear correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Eisenberger et al., 2017; Podsakoff et al., 2014).

Organizational commitment relates to the emotional connection, identification, and allegiance that an employee has towards their employing organization. Enhanced employee commitment is associated with voluntary behaviors that surpass the prescribed job duties and strengthen the overall efficacy and operation of the organization. Organizational citizenship behavior, a discretionary conduct, encompasses various actions such as assisting colleagues, undertaking additional tasks voluntarily, and encouraging a constructive work atmosphere. Individuals who demonstrate high dedication to their employing organization are inclined to experience a feeling of proprietorship and accountability toward the organization's success. The individuals exhibit a high level of motivation to contribute more to their time and effort beyond the minimum requirements. This is due to their perception of themselves as vital to the organization and its objectives.

Organizational commitment is a motivational factor that encourages employees to participate in organizational citizenship behavior. Developing a standard set of values, objectives, and sense of self among employees can promote a greater willingness to expend discretionary effort supporting the organization and its members. The present study's results provide further evidence in favor of

the proposition that servant leadership has a constructive impact on organizational citizenship behavior. The present discovery corresponds to prior studies that have underscored the excellent correlation between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, as evidenced by Howladar and Rahman (2021).

The leadership style of servant leadership prioritizes serving others and developing a supportive work environment and promotes a climate that encourages and facilitates the display of organizational citizenship behavior. Leaders who demonstrate servant leadership qualities have the ability to encourage and stimulate employees to engage in behaviors that are advantageous to the organization voluntarily. Servant leaders promote a psychological safety and trust culture by exhibiting empathy, support, and empowerment. This approach motivates employees to exceed their prescribed duties and contribute to the organization's overall success. Research suggests that employees who perceive their leaders as practicing servant leadership are more inclined to experience a sense of value, support, and appreciation, which in turn leads to a greater propensity to engage in behaviors that foster a positive work environment, assist colleagues, and contribute to the attainment of organizational objectives.

6.1 Implications

The results obtained from this research hold significant implications for both organizations and individuals in leadership positions. Organizations must initially acknowledge the significance of encouraging and developing servant leadership conduct among their leadership cadre. It is recommended that leaders receive encouragement and training to demonstrate servant leadership qualities, including empathy, support, empowerment, and prioritizing the needs of others. Implementing servant leadership principles within organizations can result in increased levels of employee commitment and engagement, ultimately leading to a more devoted and efficient workforce.

Subsequently, it is essential for leaders and managers to give attention to creating conducive work surroundings that encourage the development of organizational devotion. Leaders may increase employees' commitment to the organization by implementing resource provision, recognizing employee contributions, and cultivating a positive organizational culture. Consequently, this will enhance employees' involvement in organizational citizenship behavior, thereby yielding benefits for the organization as a whole.

Moreover, corporations can integrate principles and behaviors of servant leadership into their programs for developing leaders and systems for evaluating performance. Organizations may emphasize the significance of servant leadership behaviors and motivate leaders at all levels to adopt and implement them in their workplace interactions by emphasizing and encouraging such behaviors.

6.2 Conclusions

The current research concludes that empirical evidence supports the positive relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. The results suggest that the implementation of servant leadership has a favorable impact on employees' organizational commitment. This, in return, results in increased participation in organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizations may encourage employee engagement and freedom of choice by implementing servant leadership practices and developing organizational commitment. Implementing servant leadership behaviors, such as empathy, support, empowerment, and a focus on serving others,

promotes an environment of trust, respect, and support, thereby augmenting employees' dedication to the organization. The concept of organizational commitment functions as an intermediary mechanism, facilitating the translation of the favorable effects of servant leadership into increased involvement in organizational citizenship behavior. When employees experience a sense of commitment towards their organization, they display independent actions that surpass their formal job requirements, thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness and functioning of the organization. The results underscore the significance of servant leadership and organizational commitment in encouraging employee engagement, productivity, and organizational effectiveness. Organizations that place a strong emphasis on servant leadership and develop a culture of dedication are appropriate to enjoy the rewards of a committed and engaged workforce that proactively contributes to the organization's prosperity.

7 References

- Abbas, J., & Dogan, E. (2022). The impacts of organizational green culture and corporate social responsibility on employees' responsible behaviour towards the society. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(40), 60024–60034.
- Abbasi, A., Ismail, W. K. W., Baradari, F., Zureigat, Q., & Abdullah, F. Z. (2022). Can organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour reduce workplace deviance? *Intangible Capital*, 18(1), 78–95. <http://doi.org/10.3926/ic.1816>
- Ahmad, M. R., & Raja, R. (2021). Employee job satisfaction and business performance: the mediating role of organizational commitment. *Vision*, 25(2), 168–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262920985949>
- Al-Jabari, B., & Ghazzawi, I. (2019). Organizational commitment: A review of the conceptual and empirical literature and a research agenda. *International Leadership Journal*, 11(1), 78–119
- Aprilda, R. S., Purwandari, D. A., & Syah, T. Y. R. (2019). Servant leadership, organization commitment and job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, 3(4), 57–64.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
- Banutu-Gomez, M. B., & Banutu-Gomez, S. M. T. (2007). Leadership and organizational change in a competitive environment. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 2(2), 69–91.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). On the taming of charisma: A reply to Janice Beyer. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4), 541–553. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00030-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00030-2)
- Bayighomog, S. W., & Arasli, H. (2019). Workplace spirituality–customer engagement Nexus: the mediated role of spiritual leadership on customer–oriented boundary–spanning behaviors. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(7-8), 637–661. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2019.1570153>
- Benkarim, A., & Imbeau, D. (2021). Organizational commitment and lean sustainability: Literature review and directions for future research. *Sustainability*, 13(6), Article e3357. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063357>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row
- Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. Oxford University Press.
- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089->

[2699.4.1.27](#)

- Chiaburu, D. S., & Thundiyil, T. (2019). A meta-analysis of organizational citizenship behavior: Tests of multiple mediations and the role of both contextual and individual-level moderators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(1), 101–124.
- Cogswell, J. E., Marshall, C. J., & Smith, L. D. (2023). The Makings of a Servant Leader: The Role of Personality and Character in Effective Servant Leadership. In S. K. Dhiman., & G. E. Roberts. (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Servant Leadership*. Springer International Publishing.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group & Organization Studies*, 13(3), 245–273.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.
- Einola, K., & Alvesson, M. (2021). When ‘good’ leadership backfires: Dynamics of the leader/follower relation. *Organization Studies*, 42(6), 845–865. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619878472>
- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12318-000>
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335–362. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003>
- Ghasemy, M., Akbarzadeh, M., & Gaskin, J. E. (2022). Being satisfied and serving communities as outcomes of servant leadership in the academic context: Policies based on a multi-level structural equation model. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(1), 69–86.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 105–119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(91\)90025-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(91)90025-W)
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press
- Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Fry, L. W. (2011). Leadership in action teams: Team leader and members’ authenticity, authenticity strength, and team outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 771–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01225.x>
- Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 851–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022465>
- Howladar, M. H. R., & Rahman, M. S. (2021). The influence of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating effect of organizational commitment. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 16(1), 70–83.
- Irving, C. (2012). *Leadership in Higher Education: a longitudinal study of local leadership for enhancing learning and teaching* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Chester.
- Iorember, P. T., Iormom, B., Jato, T. P., & Abbas, J. (2022). Understanding the bearable link between ecology and health outcomes: the criticality of human capital development and energy use. *Heliyon*, 8(12), Article e12611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12611>
- Ja'afaru Bambale, A. (2014). Relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: Review of literature and future research directions. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 5(1).
- Jehanzeb, K. (2020). Does perceived organizational support and employee development influence organizational citizenship behavior? Person–organization fit as moderator. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 44(6/7), 637–657. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-02-2020-0032>
- Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and

- organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 6–22.
- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2015). The impact of employees' positive psychological capital on job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors in the hotel. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(6), 1135–1156.
- Karakas, F., & Sarigollu, E. (2013). The role of leadership in creating virtuous and compassionate organizations: Narratives of benevolent leadership in an Anatolian tiger. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113, 663–678. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1691-5>
- Khan, N. U., Zada, M., Ullah, A., Khattak, A., Han, H., Ariza-Montes, A., & Araya-Castilo, L. (2022). Servant leadership and followers prosocial rule-breaking: the mediating role of public service motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article e848531. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.848531>
- Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do? *Harvard Business Review*, December, 3–12.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The association of distributive and procedural justice with organizational citizenship behavior. *The Prison Journal*, 93(3), 313–334.
- Lang, J. W., Zettler, I., Ewen, C., & Hülshager, U. R. (2012). Implicit motives, explicit traits, and task and contextual performance at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1201–1217
- Lankau, M. J., & Scandura, T. A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 779–790.
- Leonard, N. H., Beauvais, L. L., & Scholl, R. W. (1995, August). A self-concept-based model of work motivation (Paper Presentation). *Proceedings of Academy of management*, (pp. 322–326). Briarcliff Manor
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of management journal*, 57(5), 1434–1452.
- Livitt, A., Hiscock, D., & Piirtoniemi, K. (2011). Opportunity from Catastrophe: A Strategic Approach to Sustainability through Pre-Disaster Recovery Planning (Pre-DRP) (Master Dissertation). Blekinge Institute of Technology, Karlskrona, Sweden
- Lysova, E. I., Allan, B. A., Dik, B. J., Duffy, R. D., & Steger, M. F. (2019). Fostering meaningful work in organizations: A multi-level review and integration. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 110, 374–389.
- Marcos, A., García-Ael, C., & Topa, G. (2020). The influence of work resources, demands, and organizational culture on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors of Spanish Police Officers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(20), Article e7607. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17207607>
- Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(2), 180–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320701743558>
- Mayer, D.M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R.L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 151–171. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.0276>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3), 299–326.
- Mubeen, R., Han, D., Abbas, J., Álvarez-Otero, S., & Sial, M. S. (2021). The relationship between CEO duality and business firms' performance: the moderating role of firm size and corporate social responsibility. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, Article e669715.

- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 16(2), 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160204>
- Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012695>
- Organ, P., & Podsakoff, P. MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage Publications.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington books.
- Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 787–818.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. Regent University.
- Pekerti A. A., & Sendjaya S. (2010). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: Comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(5), 754–780. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003658920>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 40(1), 277–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351–363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262–270. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262>
- Powell, D. M., & Meyer, J. P. (2004). Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65(1), 157–177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00050-2)
- Quick, J. C., & Cooper, C. L. 2009. Authentic leadership as a pathway to positive health. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 453–458. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.561>
- Qiu, S., & Dooley, L. (2022). How servant leadership affects organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating roles of perceived procedural justice and trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 43(3), 350–369.
- Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 5(3), 30–57.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 863–871. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022625>
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management studies*, 45(2), 402–424.
- Shahzad, M., Qu, Y., Rehman, S. U., & Zafar, A. U. (2022). Adoption of green innovation technology to accelerate sustainable development among manufacturing industry. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 7(4), Article e100231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100231>
- Sharafizad, J., Redmond, J., & Morris, R. (2020). Leadership/management factors impact on

- employee engagement and discretionary effort. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 23(1), 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-12-2018-0134>
- Siddiquei, A., Asmi, F., Asadullah, M. A., & Mir, F. (2021). Environmental-specific servant leadership as a strategic tool to accomplish environmental performance: a case of China. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(7), 1161–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-07-2020-0350>
- Smith, C. A. O. D. W. N. J. P., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653–663
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational And Organizational Psychology*, 77(3), 281–298. <https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752709>
- Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: a conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 365–390. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200006\)21:4%3C365::AID-JOB14%3E3.0.CO;2-H](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200006)21:4%3C365::AID-JOB14%3E3.0.CO;2-H)
- Sosik, J.J. & Dworakivsky, A.C. (1998). Self-concept based aspects on the charismatic leader: More than meets the eye. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(4), 503–526 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(98\)90013-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90013-3)
- Tsai, K. C., Chou, T. H., Kittikowit, S., Hongsuchon, T., Lin, Y. C., & Chen, S. C. (2022). Extending theory of planned behavior to understand service-oriented organizational citizen behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article e839688. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.839688>
- Ukeni, I. G. (2021). *Servant leadership and moral reasoning orientation; a quantitative examination of the antecedent and dimensions of servant leadership in contemporary organisations* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Huddersfield.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1228–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of business and psychology*, 26, 249–267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24, 108–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109634800002400301>
- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413–434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135>
- Zhao, H., Peng, Z., & Sheard, G. (2013). Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skill. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.08.006>