

## THE EFFECT OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: A PERSPECTIVE OF LEADERS

Ana Mariana<sup>1</sup>, Bram Hadiano<sup>2</sup>, Sindri Budianti<sup>3</sup>

Management Department, Economics Faculty, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, INDONESIA.

<sup>1</sup>ana.m4riana@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>tan\_han\_sin@hotmail.com, <sup>3</sup>budianti.sindri@gmail.com

### Abstract

*This study wants to investigate and analyze the effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The population of this study comes from 130 leaders in the association of the Indonesia young entrepreneur in Bandung. By the Slovin formula, furthermore, 98 persons get obtained as the sampling representing the total population. Also, this study uses a survey method to collect data. The variance-based structural equation model (SEM) performs to analyze the research variables related to data. As soon as testing the research hypothesis statistically and discussing its result, this research infers a positive effect of servant leadership on OCB. It implies that the leaders can apply the servant leadership principle to make their subordinates contributing voluntarily to the organization.*

**Keywords:** organizational citizenship behavior, servant leadership

### INTRODUCTION

The tight rivalry among the companies makes them empower and optimize the resources to create their sustainability (Ardana, Mujiati, & Utama, 2012). One of the resources owned by the company is employees (Noermijati, 2015). Furthermore, Ardana et al. (2012) explain that they have to get managed to reach the goals of the company. To support this condition, moreover, the company should make employees work willingly without official compensations. This condition happens if the leader successfully creates citizenship behavior for the employees (Organ, 1988).

Several studies try to connect some leadership styles with this behavior statistically. They conclude that this behavior can get affected by transformational leadership positively (Djalali, Janavi, & Farid, 2017; Asgari, Mezginejad, & Taherpour, 2020) and transactional leadership negatively (Asgari et al., 2020). The other studies find that OCB can stand influenced by autocratic and democratic leadership both positively (Yesuraja & Yesudian, 2013) and negatively (Malik, Saleem, & Naeem, 2016), and laissez-faire leadership negatively (Malik et al., 2016). Furthermore, Ariani (2014) proves that supportive leadership has a positive effect on OCB.

Unlike them, this study uses another leadership style, i.e., servant leadership. In this style, according to Barbutto & Wheeler (2006), the leader performs as a servant for their subordinates. Therefore, his or her efforts are to satisfy and develop them, commit to giving them the best service. In the relationship with OCB, some scholars successfully prove that OCB can get built by this leadership style (Mathur & Negi, 2014; Razvi, Butt, Hashmi, & Mahmood, 2015; Harwiki, 2016; Sandara & Suwandana, 2018; Amir, 2019). However, other researchers cannot verify this relationship (Prabowo & Setiawan, 2013; Khiabani, Abdizadeh, & Baroto, 2016; Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, & Sendjaya, 2017).

This study is present to overcome the contradiction of those previous research results. Besides, the uniqueness of this study is due to the utilization of the leaders. It differs from the other research utilizing the employee as the research object (Prabowo & Setiawan, 2013; Mathur & Negi, 2014; Razvi et al. 2015; Harwiki, 2016; Khiabani et al., 2016; Newman et al., 2017; Sandara & Suwandana, 2018; Amir, 2019). By considering two conditions, this study examines the effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior by utilizing the perception of the leaders in the association of the Indonesia young entrepreneur in Bandung.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

By exhausting the white-collar employees of the banking and insurance sector in Gwalior, the study by Mathur & Negi (2014) shows that a positive association happens between servant leadership (SL) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Correspondingly, Razvi et al. (2015) find this positive sign when they investigate the relationship by utilizing the employees in the hospitality industry in Pakistan. Likewise, by using the thirty employees and ten managers of the Women Cooperatives in East Java, the research of Harwiki (2016) affirms that servant leadership becomes the affecting factor of OCB with a positive sign. The similar effect also gets confirmed by Sandara & Suwandana (2018) when they study the forty-four employees work at the Asa Seminyak Village, Bali, and Amir (2019) when investigating the 238 workers in the firms in Java, Sulawesi, Kalimantan, Sumatera, Papua, and other small islands. By referring to these previous research results, the first research hypothesis we propose is as follows.

H<sub>1</sub>: A positive effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior is available.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Variable position and measurement**

In this study, the employed variables are servant leadership performing as the determinant and organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent. By denoting Barbuto & Wheeler (2006), servant leadership (SL) gets measured by five dimensions consisting of altruistic calling (AC), emotional healing (EH), wisdom (W), persuasive mapping (PM), and organizational stewardship (OS).

- A. The dimension of altruistic calling has four indicators; they are as follows: the interest of the employees is above mine (AC1), I always do everything to serve employees (AC2), I sacrifice my concern to fulfill the needs of employees (AC3), I beat my assignment to achieve the needs of employees (AC4).
- B. The dimension of emotional healing has four indicators. Firstly, I can help employees with distressing experience (EH1). Secondly, I assist in helping employees with a personal problem (EH2). Thirdly, I can heal employees emotionally (EH3). Finally, I can restore employees having a hard feeling (EH4).
- C. The dimension of wisdom has five indicators. The first is that I can be alert to something happens (W1). Additionally, I can anticipate the impact of the decision on something (W2). Next, I own the capability of awareness about something that happens (W3). Then, I can affect something that will occur (W4). Lastly, I can know something that will appear (W5).

- D. The dimension of persuasive mapping has four indicators: I can give a strong reason for employees to conduct something (PM1), I can motivate employees to have big dreams about the organization (PM2), I can induce employees to execute something (PM3), I can persuade employees easily (PM4).
- E. The dimension of organizational stewardship has five indicators: the organization is essential to perform a moral character in society (OS1), the organization is necessary to serve as a society hopes (OS2), the organization is necessary to contribute something to society (OS3), I can motivate employees to possess the community spirit in a place of work (OS4), I can prepare the organization to have the prospect (OS5).

By indicating Hoofman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr (2007), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) owns five dimensions covering altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

- A. The dimension of altruism consists of five indicators: my employees help each other with a heavy workload (ALT1), my employees are always ready to assist people around them (ALT2), my employees share information with their unattended friends in the organization (ALT3), my employees get prepared to help persons with working problems (ALT4), the orientation of my employees is to aid new their co-workers in the organization, although their help does not get needed (ALT5).
- B. The dimension of conscientiousness has four indicators. Firstly, my employees are carefully at work (CONS1). Secondly, my employees always do the job of getting the right compensation (CONS2). Thirdly, my employees work at the workplace beyond the standard (CONS3). Finally, my employees never take extra breaks during the works (CONS4).
- C. The dimension of sportsmanship has five indicators: my employees are not the complainer needing extra attention (SPORT1), my employees do not spend much time complaining about unimportant things (SPORT2), my employees do not make the problem more prominent in the workplace (SPORT3), my employees do not look for mistakes when working (SPORT4), my employees do not search for the fault of the leaders in the workplace (SPORT5).
- D. The dimension of courtesy has five indicators: my employees attempt to avoid problems among their co-workers (COURT1), my employees contemplate the effect of actions on their colleagues (COURT2), my employees protect the rights of their colleagues (COURT3), my employees prevent the issue with their colleagues (COURT4), my employees realize that their action influences what their colleagues do (COURT5).
- E. The dimension of civic virtue has four indicators: my employees join the meetings held in the workplace (CV1), my employees attend the optional meeting, although it is necessary (CV2), my employees attend the dispensable meetings, but they help create the organization's image (CV3), my employees read and track the information from an announcement, memo, and others related to the meetings (CV4).

### **The Sampling and Data Collection Method**

The population consists of an object owning the specific quality and characteristics for the scholars to learn (Sugiyono, 2012). In this research context, the intended is 130 leaders in the association of the Indonesia young entrepreneur in Bandung. To decide the number of samples (n) to indicate the total population; consequently, we employ the formula of Slovin by the 5% error margin (e) to calculate them, as seen in the first equation.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

By denoting the formula in equation one cited in Suliyanto (2009), the total samples are  $\frac{130}{1 + 130(0.05)^2} = \frac{130}{1.325} = 98.11 \approx 98$  persons. For assuring the randomness of this taking procedure, the random value resulted from Microsoft Excel, as enlightened by Hartono (2012), gets operated.

To collect data, likewise, this study uses the survey method. According to Hartono (2012), this method counts on distributing questionnaires. Collecting data get started from June until July 2019. Furthermore, the leaders as the samples can select the answer of the indicators in Table one and two based on their preference by the Likert scale with five points, between one to reflect the strongly disagree response, and five is for the strongly agree response.

### Method of Data Analysis

We use the structural equation model (SEM) based on the variance to analyze the data. This method gets selected because of two conditions. Firstly, the servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior as the research variable are latent, as Ghazali (2008) explains. Secondly, the number of samples is 98, suitable for the sample range required by Ghazali (2008), from 30 to 100 for this model. Furthermore, the SEM in this research can get seen in the second equation.

$$OCB = \gamma_1.SL + \zeta_i \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

To determine the accuracy of the answers of the respondents, we use the confirmatory factor analysis based on the average variance extracted (AVE) and the loading factors.

- If AVE and loading factor are higher than 0.5, the answers meet the discriminant and convergence validity, respectively.
- If AVE is lower than 0.5, the answers do not accomplish the discriminant validity. Therefore, convergence validity has to get checked. The indicators with the loading factor below 0.5 have to get eliminated to attain the validity test requirement.

To determine the consistency of the respondent answers, we use composite reliability analysis by following this rule.

- If the composite reliability coefficient surpasses 0.7, the answer of the respondents is consistent.
- If the composite reliability coefficient is lower than or similar to 0.7, their response is inconsistent.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### The Result of Validity and Reliability Test

Servant leadership has five dimensions, i.e., altruistic calling (AC), emotional healing (EH), wisdom (W), persuasive mapping (PM), and organizational stewardship (OS). After removing the invalid answer of the respondents, we present the final validity and reliability test result in Table 1.

1. Altruistic calling has two valid indicators, i.e., AC1 and AC3. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.719, higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.848, respectively, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient

is 0.868, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

2. Emotional healing has three valid indicators, i.e., EH1, EH3, and EH4. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.574, that is higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.772, 0.716, and 0.783, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.802, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.
3. Wisdom has four valid indicators, i.e., W1, W2, W4, and W5. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.6, higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.745, 0.769, 0.781, and 0.801, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.857, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.
4. Persuasive mapping has four valid indicators, i.e., PM1, PM2, PM3, and PM4. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.580, higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.750, 0.824, 0.622, and 0.833, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.845, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.
5. Organizational stewardship has four valid indicators, i.e., OS2, OS3, OS4, and OS5. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.501, higher than 0.5. Also, they accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.755, 0.621, 0.632, 0.805, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.799, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

**Table 1. The value of the loading factor, the average variance extracted, the composite reliability coefficient for the indicators of each dimension of servant leadership**

| Indicators                        | Dimension |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                   | AC        | EH    | W     | PM    | OS    |
| AC1                               | 0.848     |       |       |       |       |
| AC3                               | 0.848     |       |       |       |       |
| EH1                               |           | 0.772 |       |       |       |
| EH3                               |           | 0.716 |       |       |       |
| EH4                               |           | 0.783 |       |       |       |
| W1                                |           |       | 0.745 |       |       |
| W2                                |           |       | 0.769 |       |       |
| W4                                |           |       | 0.781 |       |       |
| W5                                |           |       | 0.801 |       |       |
| PM1                               |           |       |       | 0.750 |       |
| PM2                               |           |       |       | 0.824 |       |
| PM3                               |           |       |       | 0.622 |       |
| PM4                               |           |       |       | 0.833 |       |
| OS2                               |           |       |       |       | 0.755 |
| OS3                               |           |       |       |       | 0.621 |
| OS4                               |           |       |       |       | 0.632 |
| OS5                               |           |       |       |       | 0.805 |
| Dimension                         | AC        | EH    | W     | PM    | OS    |
| AVE                               | 0.719     | 0.574 | 0.600 | 0.580 | 0.501 |
| Composite reliability coefficient | 0.836     | 0.802 | 0.857 | 0.845 | 0.799 |

**Source: Modified Output of Warp PLS 7.**



Organizational citizenship behavior has five dimensions, i.e., altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue. Once removing the invalid answer of the respondents, we present the final validity and reliability test result in Table 2.

**Table 2. The value of the loading factor, the average variance extracted, the composite reliability coefficient for the indicators of each dimension of organizational citizenship behavior**

| Indicators                        | Dimension |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                   | ALT       | CONS  | SPORT | COURT | CV    |
| ALT1                              | 0.806     |       |       |       |       |
| ALT2                              | 0.752     |       |       |       |       |
| ALT3                              | 0.703     |       |       |       |       |
| ALT4                              | 0.854     |       |       |       |       |
| ALT5                              | 0.644     |       |       |       |       |
| CONS1                             |           | 0.678 |       |       |       |
| CONS2                             |           | 0.804 |       |       |       |
| CONS3                             |           | 0.806 |       |       |       |
| CONS4                             |           | 0.534 |       |       |       |
| SPORT1                            |           |       | 0.602 |       |       |
| SPORT2                            |           |       | 0.795 |       |       |
| SPORT3                            |           |       | 0.751 |       |       |
| SPORT4                            |           |       | 0.657 |       |       |
| SPORT5                            |           |       | 0.756 |       |       |
| COURT1                            |           |       |       | 0.690 |       |
| COURT2                            |           |       |       | 0.827 |       |
| COURT3                            |           |       |       | 0.797 |       |
| COURT4                            |           |       |       | 0.872 |       |
| COURT5                            |           |       |       | 0.837 |       |
| CV1                               |           |       |       |       | 0.792 |
| CV2                               |           |       |       |       | 0.765 |
| CV3                               |           |       |       |       | 0.782 |
| CV4                               |           |       |       |       | 0.799 |
| Dimension                         | ALT       | CONS  | SPORT | COURT | CV    |
| AVE                               | 0.571     | 0.510 | 0.513 | 0.651 | 0.616 |
| Composite reliability coefficient | 0.868     | 0.802 | 0.839 | 0.903 | 0.865 |

**Source: Modified Output of Warp PLS 7.**

Altruism has five valid indicators, i.e., ALT1, ALT2, ALT3, ALT4, and ALT5. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.571, which is higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.806, 0.752, 0.703, 0.854, and 0.644, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.868, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

Conscientiousness has four valid indicators, i.e., CONS1, CONS2, CONS3, and CONS4. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.510, higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.678, 0.804, 0.806, and 0.534, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.802, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

Sportsmanship has five valid indicators, i.e., SPORT1, SPORT2, SPORT3, SPORT4, and SPORT5. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.513,

which is higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.602, 0.795, 0.751, 0.657, and 0.756, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.839, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

Courtesy has five valid indicators, i.e., COURT1, COURT2, COURT4, and COURT5. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.651, which is higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.690, 0.827, 0.797, 0.872, and 0.837, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.903, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

Civic virtue has four valid indicators, i.e., CV1, CV2, CV3, and CV4. These indicators attain the discriminant validity, reflected by the AVE of 0.616, which is higher than 0.5. They also accomplish the convergence validity, reflected by the loading factor of 0.792, 0.760, 0.782, and 0.799, which is higher than 0.5. Additionally, the composite reliability coefficient is 0.865, exceeding 0.7; it means the answers of the respondents to these indicators are consistent.

### **The result of the model estimation**

Table 3 presents the estimation result of the structural equation model based on variance. Servant leadership has a positive sign of a path coefficient of 0.836, with the probability of the t-statistic below 0.0000.

**Table 3. The model estimation result**

| Independent Variable | Path Coefficient | The standard error of the path coefficient | t-statistic | Probability |
|----------------------|------------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| SL                   | 0.836            | 0.080                                      | 10.417      | <0.000      |

**Source: Modified Output of Warp PLS 7.**

To test the null hypothesis in this study, furthermore, the probability of t-statistic below 0.0000 gets compared with the 5% significance level ( $\alpha$ ). Because this probability is lower than 5%, the null hypothesis gets refused. In its place, the alternative one, stating a positive effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior is available, gets recognized.

### **DISCUSSION**

Based on the statistical test of the hypothesis, servant leadership positively affects organizational citizenship behavior. This situation means this style is valuable to encourage the employees to have the firm as the second home. The employees will do their best for the firms without expecting financial rewards when this type of leadership gets applied. This positive effect is in line with the study of Mathur & Negi (2014), Razvi et al. (2015), Harwiki (2016), Sandara & Suwandana (2018), and Amir (2019). To implement this condition, the leaders have to consider some actions related to the indicators in the dimensions of servant leadership, as shown below.

- In association with altruistic calling, the leaders have to place the interest of the employees above theirs. Also, they should sacrifice their want to fulfill the needs of their employees.
- In linking to emotional healing, the leaders have to help employees with distressing experience, heal employees emotionally, and restore employees owning a hard feeling.

- c. In relating to wisdom, the leaders have to be ready to respond to something that will happen soon.
- d. Linked to persuasive mapping, the leaders have to affect the employees to contribute to the development of the organization.
- e. Associated with organizational stewardship, the leaders have to make their organization serve the community hopes, give something to society. Additionally, they should be able to stimulate their employees to possess the spirit in the workplace and develop the ideas to create the prospect of the organization.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The purpose of this study is to prove and analyze the effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior based on the perception of the leaders in the association of the Indonesia young entrepreneur in Bandung. After discussing the result of the statistical hypothesis, this study concludes that a positive effect exists. It means servant leadership is useful to induce the behavior of the employees to own their organization.

This study gets done with some limitations, such as total samples and determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, the next scholars have the opportunity to overcome them by following some recommendations.

- a. They can select another object as their population having a large number of respondents. By using it, they can apply the conclusion on the broader scope.
- b. They can add the other determinants of organizational behavior in their study models, such as employee empowerment, worker engagement, and organizational commitment.

## [1]. REFERENCES

- [2]. Amir, D. A. (2019). The effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: The role of trust in leader as a mediation and perceived organizational support as a moderation. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, 1(1), 1-16.
- [3]. Ardana, I. K., Mujiati, N. W. & Utama, I. W. M. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (1 ed.). Yogyakarta: Grha Ilmu.
- [4]. Ariani, D. W. (2014). Relationship leadership, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 4(8), 74-90.
- [5]. Asgari, A., Mezginejad, S., & Taherpour, F. (2020). The role of leadership styles in organizational citizenship behavior through the mediation of perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. *Innovar*, 30(75), 87-98.
- [6]. Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 300-326.
- [7]. Djalali, M. A., Janavi, C. T., & Farid, M. (2017). The relationship between transformational style and organization commitment with organizational citizenship behavior on officers. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 6(11), 17-21.
- [8]. Ghozali, I. (2008). *Structural Equation Modeling: Metode Alternatif dengan Partial Least Square* (2 ed.). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.



- [9]. Hartono, J. (2012). *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis: Salah Kaprah & Pengalaman-pengalaman* (5 ed.). Yogyakarta: Badan Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- [10]. Harwiki, W. (2016). The impact of servant leadership on organization culture, organization commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee performance in woman cooperatives. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 283-290.
- [11]. Hoofman, B. J., Blair, C., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555-566.
- [12]. Khiabani, M. M., Abdizadeh, M., & Baroto, M. B. (2016). Identifying the impact of spiritual leadership on organizational citizenship behavior in the Iranian healthcare industry. *British Journal of Economics, Management, and Trade*, 11(1), 1-15.
- [13]. Malik, S. Z., Saleem, M., & Naeem, R. (2016). Effect of leadership styles on organizational citizenship behaviour in employees of telecom sector in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 54(2), 385-406.
- [14]. Mathur, G., & Negi, P. (2014). Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior among employees of service sector. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 191-196.
- [15]. Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(1), 49-62.
- [16]. Noermijati, N. (2015). Peran kepemimpinan transformasional dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan moderasi masa kerja. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Perbankan*, 19(2), 326-335.
- [17]. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- [18]. Prabowo, V. C., & Setiawan, R. (2013). Pengaruh servant leadership dan komitmen organisasional karyawan terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada Blue Bird Group Surabaya. *Agora*, 1(3), 1521-1532.
- [19]. Razvi, S. S. H., Butt, P., Hashmi, M. S., & Mahmood, H. K. (2015). The relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, the mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Science International (Lahore)*, 27(3), 2405-2407.
- [20]. Sandara, P. A. G., & Suwandana, I. G. M. (2018). Pengaruh servant leadership dan empowerment terhadap organizational citizenship behaviour pada karyawan Asa Villa Seminyak. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 7(1), 29-55.
- [21]. Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi (Mixed Method)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [22]. Suliyanto. (2009). *Metode Riset Bisnis*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit ANDI.
- [23]. Yesuraja, I. M., & Yesudian, B. J. (2013). A study on leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior among supervisors. *PARIPEX: Indian Journal of Research*, 2(12), 140-142.