

# The Role of Lecturer Commitment in Determining Organisational Behaviour

Adriani Gunawan\*, Masydzulhak Djamil MZ, Farida Elmi,  
and Setyo Riyanto

## ABSTRACT

**Manuscript type:** Research paper

**Research aims:** This study aims to examine the direct and indirect effects of servant leadership and perceived organisational support on organisational citizenship behaviour through the mediator of lecturer commitment.

**Design/Methodology/Approach:** The research adopts a quantitative approach. Lecturers from private universities in regional higher education service institutions (LLDIKTI) III DKI Jakarta, Indonesia formed the research population. Purposive sampling was employed as the sampling technique. Data collection involved surveys using a questionnaire as the research instrument. Data analysis was conducted using SEM-PLS.

**Findings:** The results demonstrate that servant leadership and perceived organisational support positively and significantly influence lecturer commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. However, lecturer commitment does not significantly mediate servant leadership or perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

**Research limitations/Implications:** Further research could examine other variables that can mediate servant leadership and perceived organisational support on organisational citizenship behaviour.

---

\* Adriani Gunawan is a Student in the Doctoral Program in Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mercu Buana. Email: [adriangunawan123@gmail.com](mailto:adriangunawan123@gmail.com)

Masydzulhak Djamil MZ is a Professor in the Management Studies Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mercu Buana. Email: [masydk@gmail.com](mailto:masydk@gmail.com)

Farida Elmi is a Lecturer in the Management Studies Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mercu Buana. Email: [Farida.elmi@mercubuana.ac.id](mailto:Farida.elmi@mercubuana.ac.id)

Setyo Riyanto is the Lecturer in the Management Studies Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mercu Buana. Email: [Setyo.riyanto@mercubuana.ac.id](mailto:Setyo.riyanto@mercubuana.ac.id)

**Practical implications:** The managerial implication suggests that university management should prioritise servant leadership and lecturer commitment to enhance lecturers' performance of extra roles (organisational citizenship behaviour).

**Originality/Value:** This study shows that lecturer commitment does not significantly mediate servant leadership or perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

**Keywords:** Servant leadership, Perceived organisational support, Organisational citizenship behaviour, Lecturer commitment

**JEL Classification:** D23, O1, O15

## 1. Introduction

Education is the main pillar of the development and progress of a nation. The success of a country lies in its human resources, the quality of which is mainly due to education. Quality education must be supported in terms of adequate human resources, facilities and infrastructure, curriculum, and character development education. This is important to create citizens that are creative, innovative, productive, and able to compete on the world stage in the current globalised digital era. In reality, Indonesia is still quite behind other countries. Based on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) Human Development Index, which ranks educational attainment, health, and per capita income, Indonesia ranks 116th of 189 countries (UNDP, 2020). In addition, according to the Political and Economic Risk Consultant (PERC) survey, the quality of education in Indonesia is ranked 12th out of 12 countries in Asia, one rung below Vietnam (Mubair, 2011;18) This, of course, demands more attention from the government to improve the quality of education in Indonesia.

Among the positive human resource behaviours in the context of an organisation is organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). This also applies to lecturers at universities, both during times of crisis, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, and after. In accordance with OCB principles, the expected contribution from lecturers is not only their in-role, i.e., carrying out the entrusted tasks and obligations, but also extra roles, i.e., making contributions outside of their in-role duties and obligations, or OCB. In the university context, extra roles, namely roles that go beyond the stipulated roles or responsibilities, are actually needed so that these institutions can continue to exist.

OCB is closely related to organisational commitment. In the last two decades, organisational commitment was regarded by researchers as the dominant attitude, and was the subject for many

analyses. The modern attitude toward organisational commitment is multi-dimensional, so researchers focused on different kinds of commitments to specify behaviour in work environments (Liz Dickinson et al., 2009). Commitment is the most meaningful form of organisational duties, and shows a powerful relationship with OCB (Cohen, 2006). Commitment includes staying in the organisation for a long time, accepting organisational norms and values, and widespread participation to reach growth and development (Luthans, 2020). Organisational commitment is one of the more important factors that strengthen OCB (Lepine et al., 2002; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Organisations, especially in undeveloped or developing countries, should provide opportunities for their managers and employees to use their experiences, abilities and potential to improve organisational goals. This cannot be realised until there is a suitable opportunity for OCB and personnel organisational commitment.

OCB is expected to be able to optimise organisational functions to a better level of efficiency and effectiveness (Robin, S. P., and Judge, 2015). In this context, OCB is associated with extra-role tasks (Sadeghi et al 2016; Zeng and Xu 2020; Wang et al. 2021; Ying et al. 2020; Aboramadan et al. 2022). OCB can play a role in increasing employee engagement in the organisation, and can ultimately influence organisational performance (Alkahtani, 2015; Lyu et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2017).

The role of OCB can be seen from its five dimensions, which are positive behaviours that can improve organisational performance. The altruism dimension is the moral will of an employee in encouraging co-workers to complete the work. The courtesy dimension, often called peace-making, is through the behaviour of employees who politely offer to help other employees. The virtue dimension is the voluntarism that emerges to always actively participate in issues that befall the organisation, providing new and innovative ideas for organisational sustainability. The conscientiousness dimension refers to behaviour to improve organisational performance through better methods or ways of working. The sportsmanship dimension allows employees to survive and be tolerant, and prioritise the interests of the organisation when it faces problems (Organ et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2017).

The pre-study was carried out by researchers in 2021 on 46 lecturers at a private university at LLDIKTI III in DKI Jakarta province. The results of the study found that the average value of the five dimensions of OCB was below 4 (agree) on a 1-5 Likert scale. The average value of altruism was 3.84, the courtesy dimension 3.71,

the virtue dimension 3.54; conscientiousness dimension 3.24; and the sportsmanship dimension 3.11. This shows that the lecturers have not reached maximal OCB behaviour. Starting from this pre-study, it is significant to carry out further research, not only regarding a larger number of samples and a more tertiary institutions; but also variables that have been shown in previous studies to affect OCB.

These variables include servant leadership (SL), which has been shown to influence OCB in business organisations (Aboramadan et al., 2022; Zeng & Xu, 2020), ecclesiastical organisations (e.g., Cunningham 2019), social organisations (e.g. Thao and Kang 2020; Ogochi, Kilika, and Oduol 2022), and educational institutions (Chiu et al., 2015; Hanaysha et al., 2022; Qiu et al., 2020). Another variable that influences OCB is perceived organisational support (POS). Research by (Tharikh et al., 2016), (Detnakarin & Rurkkhum, 2019), (Oyewobi et al., 2019), and Asgari et al. (2020) shows that POS positively influences OCB. OCB is also influenced by organisational commitment (OC) variables, such as shown by (Claudia, 2018). In the study, OC uses the lecturer commitment (LC) proxy. This research starts from the problem of lecturers' extra role at a number of universities in DKI Jakarta which is not fully maximised – this extra role is more or less the lecturer carrying out OCB. Therefore, weak extra roles entail weak OCB.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 *The Influence of SL on OCB and OC***

The OCB variable was raised by (Organ et al., 1983), because the conception of organisational performance at the time was not well-defined enough to overcome the problems faced by organisations around the world from the end of the 20th century to the present (Harvey et al., 2018; Organ, 1977; Podsakoff et al., 2000). OCB is assumed to be a research variable that bridges the gap between job satisfaction and organisational performance (Organ, 1977; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

(Shetty, P. K., and Kamath, 2021) show that, both together and individually, SL and OCB can increase productivity in manufacturing industries as well as in higher education institutions. The same was also found by (Canavesi & Minelli, 2022) in Carlo Cataneo University, Italy. The influence of SL on OCB occurs in various fields – business organisations (Aboramadan et al., 2022; Chavaha et al., 2020; Chraim, 2016; Mirshekar, 2017; Ragnarsson et al., 2018; Shafi et al., 2020; Zeng & Xu, 2020) business engineering (Azis et al., 2018); ecclesiastical

organisations (Cunningham, 2019); and social organisations (Ogochi et al., 2022; Thao & Kang, 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). The influence of SL on OCB is also evident in the field of education (Flynn et al., 2016; Kumar et al., 2022; McCann, J., Sparks, 2019; Noland & Richards, 2015; Olsen, 2018; Qiu et al., 2020; Reed, 2015; Sahawneh & Benuto, 2018; Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017).

## 2.2 *The Influence of SL on OC*

SL originated with Robert Greenleaf in 1970 (Langhof & Güldenbergh, 2020). Greenleaf states that a servant leader by nature emphasises the development and benefit of followers and their organisation or community (Greenleaf, 1970; Langhof & Güldenbergh, 2020; Liden et al., 2014). This principle contrasts with the traditional concept of leadership, which is primarily characterised by the accumulation and use of power.

OC has three dimensions. These three dimensions are: the affective dimension (affective commitment), namely the commitment that grows within organisational followers due to the emotional attachment, understanding and involvement of these followers in the organisation; the continuance dimension (continuance commitment), which is related to the expectations of members of the organisation to bind themselves to the organisation through the implementation of tasks in a responsible manner; and the normative dimension (normative commitment), related to the norms or principles that are firmly held by members of the organisation. These principles or norms are usually in the form of values that are upheld by individuals as unique in themselves. (Meyer & Allen, 1991) emphasise that normative commitment is actually a form of moral obligation towards the organisation that grows strong in members of the organisation or employees.

Studies by (Karatepe et al., 2019), (Kauppila et al., 2018), and (Lee et al., 2020) show that SL has an effect on OC. Likewise, (Grisaffe et al., 2016) finds that SL has an effect on OC which occurs hierarchically. The influence of SL on OC occurs in various types of organisations, for example in restaurants (Piong, 2016); business organisations (Asgari et al., 2020; DeConinck & DeConinck, 2017; Detnakarin & Rurkkhum, 2019; Grisaffe et al., 2016; Karatepe et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2016; Schwepker, 2016) educational organisations (Claudia, 2018; Crippen & Willows, 2019; Kauppila et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2020), education and manufacturing industries (Shetty, P. K., and Kamath, 2021), educational and business organisations (Canavesi & Minelli, 2022); financial services organisations (Tharikh et al.,

2016); construction service organisations (Oyewobi et al., 2019) and psychological services (Wang et al., 2021).

### 2.3 *The Influence of POS on OCB and OC*

(Eisenberger et al., 1986) were the first researchers to elaborate on POS in studies of employees' perceptions of management's concern for their contribution to the organisation. POS is the employees' perception of how much the organisation provides support, and cares about their welfare (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). (Asgari et al., 2020) found in their research that there is a positive effect of POS and organisational commitment on OCB. Employees' perceptions of balanced evaluation and rewards from organisational management strengthen their commitment to carry out extra-role tasks responsibly. The same thing was also found by Detnakaran and Rurkkhum (2019), Tharikh et al. (2016), and Oyewobi et al. (2019)

The OCB dimension consists of five parts, namely: altruism, or the desire to carry out extra-role activities, shown by helping co-workers who have not mastered work procedures; courtesy, or growing employee readiness to do work outside working hours; civic virtue, namely providing full support and cooperation for team decisions; consciousness, or the desire to do extra work, spend extra time and provide a positive influence in the work environment; and sportsmanship, or the ability to carry out work without assistance, complete work on time, and work with full calculation (Zhang et al., 2017). Lecturers' POS has a positive effect on OCB, especially in carrying out extra-role tasks responsibly, both in teams and independently (Claudia, 2018). (Crippen & Willows, 2019) research in the field of higher education shows that in the school environment, especially in classrooms, educators can be good stewards of students. (Erdurmazli, 2019) shows that the level of POS and SL behaviour has a positive effect on OCB.

### 2.4 *The Influence of POS and OC*

Kim et al. (2016) conclude that POS and OC have a strong relationship in improving organisational performance. The same was confirmed by (Schwepker & Schultz, 2015) when examining SL and commitment to the realm of values, and (DeConinck & DeConinck, 2017) when researching SL and POS in relation to salesperson turnover from one business to another. Meanwhile, (Claudia, 2018), who examines the influence of POS and the commitment of permanent lecturers at universities, found that a balanced POS

strengthens lecturers to continue working as permanent teaching staff. The four POS dimensions according to (Eisenberger et al., 2016) are: fairness, where the organisation evaluates things objectively and fairly; superior support, where the organisation's superiors make contributions and donations to their subordinates; organisational awards, where the organisation provides appropriate rewards, such as salary, incentives, and leave; and conditions of work, or tasks in accordance with the capacity and expectations supported by employees.

Organisational support theory is used to describe the employees' emotional attachment to their organisation. When employees feel that they are provided with good support from the organisation, they feel a responsibility to repay this, in some form or another. The feeling of obligation increases the employees' commitment to the organisation (Rhoades et al, 2002). In line with organisational support theory, commitment can be identified as the impact of the employees' perceptions regarding organisational support. (Rhoades et al, 2002) find that employees who feel that they have the support of their organisation have a sense of meaningfulness in themselves, which increases their commitment. This commitment ultimately encourages employees to help the organisation achieve its goals and to improve performance expectations, which are noticed and appreciated by the organisation. (Shore & Wayne, 1993) find that POS becomes a predictor of OCB and is positively related to performance and OCB. Workers who feel supported by their organisation reciprocate this feeling, and thus lower the imbalance in the relationship by engaging in citizenship behaviour. Both (Miao & Kim, 2010) and (Chiang & Sheng 2012) also find a significant relationship between POS and OCB. (Chiaburu et al., 2015) state that there is a significant positive relationship between POS and OCB, and the level of the relationship between these two variables depend on the particular cultural setting.

### *2.5 The Effect of OC on OCB and the Role of OC as a Mediator*

In Salehi and (Gholtash., et al 2011) study, the researchers used five OCB questionnaires adapted from (Graham, 1991), encompassing job satisfaction, job burnout, and OC. The results showed that the variables of job satisfaction and OC had a positive effect on OCB, while job burnout had a negative effect. Job satisfaction also has a negative effect on job burnout (Salehi & Gholtash, 2011). (Rifai, 2005), quoting (Meyer & Allen, 2000), said that of the three dimensions of organisational commitment, affective commitment has the strongest positive relationship to OCB, followed by normative commitment,

whereas continuance commitment is sometimes unrelated to OCB.

According to (Rifai, 2005), affective commitment is the strength of the relationship felt by individuals in an organisation. Affective commitment is influenced by the support that employees feel is given in the organisation. Affective commitment reflects the emotional bond of members to the organisation, and naturally, the emotional bonds between members in the organisation will affect this (Colquitt et al., 2009). It can be said that a person's organisational commitment is related to the emotional bond between members and support within the organisation. Based on this definition, OC can be interpreted as a condition for individuals to recognise the organisation and its goals, as well as their own needs, until a desire arises to remain members of the organisation. Therefore, it can be said that commitment does not only arise because of one party, but also when there is support from other or external parties concerned. (Mirabizadeh & Gheitasi, 2012) conclude that educational opportunities, work-life policy, and empowerment activities had strong positive relationship with OC, and OC also influenced OCB accordingly. The commitment of the lecturers continues to have a positive effect on OCB, especially in carrying out extra-role tasks responsibly (Claudia, 2018)

## **2.6 OC Mediating the Influence of SL on OCB**

Servant leaders develop people, share leadership, display authenticity, value people, provide leadership, and build community (Laub, 1999). Similarly, (Wong & Page, 2003) mention that SL is visionary leadership, servanthood, responsible leadership, and courageous leadership, that emphasises honesty, authenticity, power, and pride (vulnerability and humility) and developing and empowering others. To lead a team effectively, SL provides accountability, gives support, emphasises true self-evaluation, fosters collaboration, provides clear information, and values people (Irving & Longbotham, 2007).

Other empirical studies in India (Mathur & Negi, 2014), Kenya (Walumbwa et al., 2010), China (Newman et al., 2017), and Turkey (Güçel, C. & Begeç, 2012) reveal a significant direct influence of SL on OCB. Edurmazli (2019) finds that POS and SL behaviour had a positive effect on both OCB and commitment to the organisation. Chraim (2016) concludes that SL has a positive and significant effect on employee OCB through trust as mediation. The influence of SL on OCB is also proven when the mediator variable is presented, such as psychological ownership (Chavaha et al., 2020; Cunningham, 2019)



## 2.7 OC Mediating the Effect of POS on OCB

(Etzioni, 1982) was the first to examine commitment in the organisational world in 1961. Commitment became a hot topic in the context of management after (Shafiq et al., 1977) elaborated on it in terms of attitude or attitudinal commitment and behaviour or behavioural commitment. In that context, commitment is defined as an attitude that reflects the extent to which a person understands and feels bound to his organisation. In other words, organisational commitment is an attitude and behaviour that reflects the level of belief, recognition, acceptance and attachment to an organisation (Mathis et al., 2021). This definition actually refers to the previous definition put forward by (Griffin et al., 2017) which was later developed by (Dessler, 2019) and (Luthans, 2020) which identifies organisational commitment with the level of employee confidence, acceptance of organisational goals that gives rise to determination and intention to always with the organisation as long as the organisation exists.

## 3. Methodology

The paradigm of this research is positivism (Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, 2018). Meanwhile, the research approach is quantitative, namely, to study theories and concepts by examining the relationships between constructs (Cooper, D. R., and Schindler, 2014). The research method used in this study is a survey (Sekaran, U., and Boeugie, 1993). The research instrument was a closed-ended questionnaire (Cooper, D. R., and Schindler, 2014) and data analysis was carried out in this study using a Likert scale. There were 10 questions for the SL variable, five for POS, seven for LC and nine for OCB. Respondents were all lecturers from private universities in LLDIKTI III DKI Jakarta. In this study, 211 valid responses to the questionnaire were obtained. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling, while analysis was carried out using descriptive analysis, statistical equations and hypotheses. The data was analysed inferentially using partial least square-structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM), which includes evaluation of the outer model, inner model, and hypothesis testing (Hair et al., 2014). The outer model test uses a reflective model evaluation consisting of indicator reliability tests, discriminant validity tests, internal consistency tests, and convergent validity tests (Hair et al., 2014).

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Results

#### 4.1.1 Measurement Model Evaluation

The PLS-SEM analysis consists of the outer model test, the inner model test, and the hypothesis test. The outer model test uses four indicators, namely indicator reliability, discriminant validity, internal consistency, and convergent validity (Hair et al., 2014). The outer model test results are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

**Table 1: Reliability and validity measures**

Construct	Outer loadings	Composite reliability	AVE
Servant leadership			
	SL1	0.674	
	SL2	0.671	
	SL3	0.822	
	SL4	0.613	
Indicators	SL5	0.647	0.910
	SL6	0.679	
	SL7	0.791	
	SL8	0.822	
	SL9	0.836	
	SL10	0.817	0.668
Perceived organisational support			
	POS1	0.838	
	POS2	0.837	
Indicators	POS3	0.853	0.916
	POS4	0.809	
	POS5	0.804	0.687
Lecturer commitment			
	KD1	0.792	
	KD2	0.559	
	KD3	0.761	
Indicators	KD4	0.736	0.807
	KD5	0.692	
	KD6	0.663	
	KD7	0.501	0.583

Construct	Outer loadings	Composite reliability	AVE
Organisational citizenship behaviour			
	OCB1	0.772	
	OCB2	0.771	
	OCB3	0.788	
	OCB4	0.832	
Indicators	OCB5	0.719	0.931
	OCB6	0.797	0.602
	OCB7	0.737	
	OCB8	0.780	
	OCB9	0.781	

Table 2 shows the results of the reliability indicator test using outer loading, which in this study used the outer loading standard of 0.70. The SL variable has 10 indicators (SL1 to SL10), but only five indicators are valid, namely SL3, SL7, SL8, SL9, SL10. The five indicators of POS, namely POS1, POS2, POS3, POS4, POS5 are valid. The LC variable as a proxy for OC only has three valid indicators (KD1, KD3, and KD4) out of seven. Seven of the nine indicators of OCB variables, namely OCB1 to OCB 7, are valid. The results of the internal consistency test show that all variables have a composite reliability value of > 0.60 (Hair et al., 2014), so all variables pass the test. The composite reliability values are 0.910, 0.916, 0.807, and 0.931 respectively for the variables SL, POS, LC, and OCB.

Likewise, the results of the convergent validity test show that all variables have an average variance extracted (AVE) value > 0.50 (Hair et al., 2014), meaning that variables pass the test. The AVE values for the SL, POS, LC, and OCB variables were 0.668, 0.687, 0.583, and 0.602.

The results of the discriminant validity test using the Fornell-Larcker test are presented in Table 3. The Fornell-Larcker value of each of these variables for itself must be greater than the value of the variable for others.

**Table 2: Discriminant validity**

Variable	LC	OCB	POS	SL
LC	0.764			
OCB	0.642	0.776		
POS	0.733	0.742	0.829	
SL	0.729	0.800	0.882	0.818

Table 2 shows that the Fornell-Larcker value of the LC variable to itself is 0.764, greater than the value of the LC variable to others, such as to OCB (0.642), to POS (0.733), and to SL (0.729). The Fornell-Larcker value of the OCB variable to itself is 0.776, greater than the value of the OCB variable to others, such as to LC (0.642), to POS (0.742), but smaller than to SL (0.800). The Fornell-Larcker value of the POS variable to itself is 0.829, which is greater than the value of the POS variable to others, such as to LC (0.733), to OCB (0.742), and to SL (0.818). Lastly, the Fornell-Larcker value of the SL to itself is 0.818, which is greater than the value of the SL variable to others, such as to LC (0.729), to OCB (0.800), but smaller to POS (0.882).

4.1.2 Structural Model Evaluation

Analysis of the inner model (structural model analysis) is to ensure that the structural model built is robust and accurate. The first test of the inner model is the multicollinearity test which in this study uses the variance inflation factor (VIF) value. Table 3 shows the VIF values for all the relationships between the research variables.

**Table 3: Multicollinearity inner VIF value**

Variable	LC	OCB
LC		2.418
POS	4.586	4.998
SL	5.221	5.203

Table 4 shows that the VIF value on the relationship between variables is less than 10. Therefore, in this study there was no phenomenon of two or more independent variables or highly correlated exogenous constructs which could lead to poor predictive ability of the model. The following test of the inner model is about the F<sup>2</sup> value of assessing the magnitude of the influence between variables (Wong, 2013)

**Table 4: F<sup>2</sup> test**

Variable	LC	OCB
LC		0.001
POS	0.082	0.002
SL	0.058	0.139

The  $F^2$  value for LC value for OCB is 0.001 ( $< 0.02$ ) so the effect is considered non-existent or ignored (Sarstedt et al., 2017). The  $F^2$  POS value for LC is 0.082 (between 0.02 to 0.15), which means that the effect is small (Sarstedt et al, 2017). The  $F^2$  value of POS on OCB is 0.002 ( $< 0.02$ ) so that the effect is considered non-existent or ignored. The  $F^2$  value of SL to LC is 0.058 (between 0.02 to 0.15), which means that the effect is small. The  $F^2$  SL value for OCB is 0.138 (between 0.02 to 0.15), which means that the effect is small.

The following test for the inner model is the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ). The  $R^2$  coefficient value of the four dependent variables, namely employee performance, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and work motivation is based on Table 6.

**Table 5: Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ )**

Independent variables	Dependent variable	$R^2$
SL, POS	LC	0.581 (58.1%)
SL, POS, LC	OCB	0.646 (64.6%)

Table 5 shows that SL and POS can simultaneously explain LC of 0.581 or 58.10%. This means that the two independent latent variables can explain the LC of 58.10%. The remaining explanation ( $100\% - 58.10\% = 41.90\%$ ) of LC can be explained by other variables outside the two independent latent variables. The magnitude of the effect of 58.10% is between the effect value of 0.33 and 0.67, thus indicating that the strength of the model is moderate (Sarstedt et al., 2017).

Table 5 shows that SL, POS, and LC can simultaneously explain OCB by 0.646 or 64.6%. This means that the three independent latent variables can explain OCB by 64.60%. The remaining explanation ( $100\% - 64.60\% = 35.40\%$ ) of OCB can be explained by other variables outside of the three independent latent variables. The magnitude of the effect of 64.60% is between the effect value of 0.33 and 0.67, thus indicating that the strength of the model is moderate (Sarstedt et al., 2017).

The result of calculating  $Q^2$  predictive relevance for the influence of SL, POS, and LC on OCB is that the  $Q^2$  value is greater than zero. This shows that SL, POS, and LC have predictive relevance to OCB. Next is the path coefficient value and testing the hypotheses, as presented in Table 6.

**Table 6: Coefficient of influence between variables (path coefficient)**

Hypothesis	Path coefficient	T-statistics	P-values	Conclusion
H1: SL has a positive and significant effect on OCB	0.585	5.752	0.000	Positive and significant influence
H2: SL has a positive and significant effect on OC	0.443	4.473	0.000	Positive and significant influence
H3: POS has a positive and significant effect on OCB	0.173	1.509	0.132	Positive influence, but not significant
H4: POS has a positive and significant effect on OC	0.344	3.566	0.000	Positive and significant influence
H5: OC has a positive and significant effect on OCB	0.081	1.017	0.310	Positive influence, but not significant

The SL path coefficient value for OCB is 0.585 or 58.5%, indicating a positive influence. For every increase in SL by one unit, the increase in OCB is 58.5%. As for the significance test of the effect of SL on OCB with a value of  $t = 5.752$  ( $> 1.96$ ) and a p-value of 0.000 ( $< 0.05$ ), which means that SL has a positive and significant effect on OCB. This means that H1 is proven.

The path coefficient value of SL to LC is 0.443 or 44.3%, indicating a positive influence. For every increase in SL by one unit, the increase in LC increases by 44.3% of that unit. As for the significance test of the effect of SL on LC with a value of  $t = 4.473$  ( $> 1.96$ ) and a p-value of 0.000 ( $< 0.05$ ), which means that SL has a positive and significant effect on LC. This means that H2 is proven.

The path coefficient value of POS to OCB is 0.173 or 17.3%, indicating a positive influence. For every increase in POS by one unit, OCB increases by 17.3% of that unit. As for the significance test of the effect of POS on OCB with a value of  $t = 1.509$  ( $< 1.96$ ) and a p-value of 0.132 ( $> 0.05$ ), which means that POS has a positive but insignificant effect on OCB. This means that H3 is not proven.

The path coefficient value of POS to LC is 0.344 or 34.4%, indicating a positive influence. For every increase in POS by one unit, the LC increases by 34.4% of that unit. As for the significance test of the effect of POS on LC with a value of  $t = 3.566$  ( $> 1.96$ ) and

a p-value of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ), which means that POS has a positive and significant effect on LC. This means that H4 is proven.

The LC pathway coefficient value for OCB is 0.081 or 8.1%, indicating a positive influence. For every increase in LC by one unit, OCB increases by 8.1% of that unit. As for the significance test of the effect of LC on OCB with a value of  $t = 1.017$  ( $< 1.96$ ) and a p-value of 0.310 ( $>0.05$ ), which means that LC has a positive but insignificant effect on OCB. This means that H5 is not proven.

H6 to H7 is a path analysis which requires separate calculations, as shown in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Hypotheses for path analysis models**

Hypothesis	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect	VAF	Conclusion
H6: LC plays a positive role in mediating the influence of SL on OCB	0.443	0.036	0.515	6.990% ( $< 20\%$ )	No mediation
H7: LC plays a positive role in mediating the effect of POS on OCB	0.173	0.028	0.201	13.93% ( $< 20\%$ )	No mediation

The variance accounted for (VAF) value (Hair et al., 2014) is 6.990% ( $< 20\%$ ). This means that in this path analysis model there is no role of the mediator variable or no mediation. This means that the LC variable does not play a role in mediating the influence of SL on OCB. Thus H6 is not proven.

Furthermore, the VAF value is 13.93% ( $< 20\%$ ). This means that in this path analysis model there is no role of the mediating variable or no mediation. This means that LC does not play a role in mediating the influence of POS on OCB. Thus H7 is not proven.

## 4.2 Discussion

### 4.2.1 The Influence of SL on OCB and OC

The results of the study show that SL has a positive and significant effect on OCB. The path coefficient value is 0.585 (58.5%), the highest among the five direct relationships in this study. It means that the results of this study are in accordance with H1, namely that SL has a positive and significant effect on OCB. This is in line with previous studies, including research in the field of education like

(Noland & Richards, 2015), (Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017), (Reed, 2015), (Flynn et al., 2016), (Sahawneh & Benuto, 2018), (Olsen, 2018), (McCann, J., Sparks, 2019), (Qiu et al., 2020), (Chiu et al., 2015), and (Kumar et al., 2022), which prove the effect of SL on OCB.

Since the influence of SL is positive and significant on OCB, it is necessary to know the strongest cross-loading value on the SL indicator on OCB. The three of the seven indicators with the strongest cross-loading values in the SL variable on OCB are SL10 (0.705), SL9 (0.663), and SL3 (0.662). SL10 reads 'My leader makes himself a servant to university stakeholders, lecturers and staff'; SL9 reads 'My leader understands and makes the vision/mission of the university his personal vision'; and SL3 reads 'My leader is able to restore the enthusiasm of the lecturers who are bored with work routines.'

Furthermore, the results of the study show that SL has a positive and significant effect on OC, proxied by LC. The path coefficient value is 0.443 (44.3%), ranking second among the five direct influences. It means that the results of this study are in accordance with H2, namely that SL has a positive and significant effect on OC. The results of this study support previous research, including research in the field of education like Kauppila et al. (2018), Claudia (2018), Crippen and Willows (2019), and (Lee et al., 2020); education and manufacturing, like Shetty and Kamath (2021); and education and business, like Canavesi and Minelh (2021).

Since the influence of SL is positive and significant on LC, it is necessary to know the strongest cross-loading value on the SL indicator on LC. The three of the seven indicators with the strongest cross-loading values in the variable SL to LC are SL3 (0.632), SL6 (0.613), and SL9 (0.612). SL3 reads 'My leader is able to restore the enthusiasm of the lecturers who are bored with work routines'; SL6 reads 'My leader is skilled at persuading followers to implement university policies when articulating opportunities'; and SL9 reads 'My leader understands and makes the vision/mission of the university his personal vision.'

#### *4.2.2 The Influence of POS on OCB and OC*

The results show that POS has a positive but not significant effect on OCB. This means that the results of this study do not support H3, namely that POS has a positive and significant effect on OCB. This differs from a number of previous studies which prove that POS has a positive and significant effect on OCB, such as (Claudia, 2018), (Crippen & Willows, 2019) and (Erdurmazlı, 2019).



Considering that the influence of POS is positive but not significant on OCB, it is necessary to know the weakest cross-loading value on the POS indicator on OCB. The three of the seven indicators with the weakest cross-loading value on the POS variable on OCB are POS1 (0.582), POS2 (0.596), and POS5 (0.599). POS1 reads 'My leader evaluates things objectively and fairly'; POS2 reads 'My leader makes policies based on agreed criteria to avoid being disadvantaged'; and POS5 reads 'I place the university as part of my life and feel proud to continue my journey with this university.'

The results of the study prove that POS has a positive and significant effect on OC proxied by LC. It means that the results of this study do not support H4, namely that POS has a positive and significant effect on OC. The results of this study are in line with the results of previous studies, such as (Schwepker & Schultz, 2015) and (DeConinck et al., 2017)

Since the influence of POS is positive and significant on LC, it is necessary to know the strongest cross-loading value of the POS indicator on LC. The three of the five indicators with the strongest cross-loading values are POS4 (0.645), POS5 (0.639), and POS3 (0.615). POS4 reads 'My leader provides sincere and honest support to me as a lecturer'; POS5 reads 'I place the university as part of my life and feel proud to continue my journey with this university'; and POS3 reads 'My university management provides proper rewards such as salary, incentives and leave.'

#### *4.2.3 The Effect of OC on OCB, and the Role of OC as Mediator*

The results of the study prove that OC proxied by LC has a positive, but not significant, effect on OCB. It means that the results of this study do not support H5, namely that OC has a positive and significant effect on OCB. This differs from (Claudia, 2018), who finds that OC had a positive and significant effect on OCB.

Considering that the effect of LC is positive but not significant on OCB, it is necessary to know the weakest cross-loading value on the LC indicator on OCB. The sequence of the three indicators with the weakest cross-loading value on the LC variable on OCB is KD4 (0.394), KD3 (0.426), and KD1 (0.601). KD4 reads 'I want to continue to join this university'; KD3 reads 'I have a readiness to play an extra role at the university'; and KD1 reads 'I am loyal to the university, because of my attachment to the university's vision and mission.'

The results also show that OC does not play a role in mediating the influence of SL on OCB. The results of this study mean that it does not support H6, namely that OC plays a positive role in mediating

the influence of SL on OCB. But why is this so? According to (Hair et al., 2014) and (Baron & Kenny, 1986), the requirement for a mediating role is that it must have a significant effect on direct relationships (between independent variables on the dependent variable, between independent variables on the mediator variable, or between indirect relationships with the dependent variable). In relation to this, it is known that the effect of SL on OCB is positive and significant, the effect of SL on LC is also positive and significant, but the effect of LC on OCB is positive but not significant, so that the indirect effect (SL path coefficient value to LC multiplied by the LC effect coefficient to the OCB coefficient value) on OCB also has a positive effect but is not significant. Thus, it is understandable if LC does not play a role in mediating the effect of SL on OCB. This means that LC cannot increase the effect of SL on OCB.

Considering that the effect of LC is positive but not significant on OCB, it is necessary to know the weakest cross-loading value on the LC indicator on OCB. The sequence of the three indicators with the weakest cross-loading value on the LC variable on OCB is KD4 (0.394), KD3 (0.426), and KD1 (0.601). KD4 reads 'I want to continue my journey with this university'; KD3 reads 'I have a readiness to play an extra role at the university'; and KD1 reads 'I am loyal to the university, because of my attachment to the university's vision and mission'.

The same result is experienced when OC proxied by LC is positioned as a mediator variable in the context of the influence of POS on OCB. The results show that OC does not play a role in mediating the influence of POS on OCB. The results of this study mean that it does not support the H7, namely that OC plays a positive role in mediating the effect of POS on OCB. It is known that the effect of POS on LC is positive and significant; the effect of LC on OCB is also positive and significant; but the effect of POS on OCB is positive but not significant, so the indirect effect (the POS path coefficient value to the LC multiplied by the LC effect coefficient to the OCB coefficient value) on OCB also has a positive effect. However, the direct effect of POS on OCB, although positive, is not significant. Thus, it is understandable if LC does not mediate the influence of POS on OCB. This means that LC cannot increase the effect of POS on OCB.

Considering that the influence of POS is positive but not significant on OCB, it is necessary to know the weakest cross-loading value on the POS indicator on OCB. The sequence of the three indicators with the weakest cross-loading value on the POS variable

on OCB is POS1 (0.582), POS 2 (0.596), and POS5 (0.599). POS1 reads 'My leader evaluates things objectively and fairly'; POS2 reads 'My leader makes policies based on agreed criteria to avoid aggrieved parties'; and POS5 reads 'I place the university as part of my life and feel proud to continue my journey with this university'.

## 5. Conclusions

The problem with the role of lecturers at private universities at LLDIKTI III DKI Jakarta, Indonesia is related to their relatively weak extra roles. This research examines the effect of SL and POS on OCB directly or through OC mediator variables proxied by LC. The results showed that SL had a positive and significant effect on OCB and LC. POS has a positive and significant effect on LC, but does not have a significant effect on OCB. LC has a positive but insignificant effect on OCB. Meanwhile LC has no role as a mediator, both in the context of the influence of SL on OCB, and in the context of the influence of POS on OCB. The managerial implications of the results of this study are regarding the importance of university management paying attention to SL and LC in an effort to increase the extra role (OCB) of lecturers.

## References

- Aboramadan, M., Hamid, Z., Kundi, Y. M., & El Hamalawi, E. (2022). The effect of servant leadership on employees' extra-role behaviors in NPOs: The role of work engagement. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 33(1), 109-129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21505>
- Alkahtani, A. (2015). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Rewards. *International Business Research*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v8n4p210>
- Amitai, E. (1982). *Organisasi-Organisasi Modern". Terjemahan Suryatim*. UI Press, Jakarta.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.15446/innovar.v30n75.83259>
- Azis, M., Haeruddin, M. I. M., & Azis, F. (2018). Entrepreneurship education and career intention: The perks of being a woman student. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(1).

- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research. Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee “Citizenship”. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255908>
- Burnett, M. F., Chiaburu, D. S., Shapiro, D. L., & Li, N. (2015). Revisiting How and When Perceived Organizational Support Enhances Taking Charge: An Inverted U-Shaped Perspective. *Journal of Management, 41*(7), 1805–1826. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313493324>
- Canavesi, A., & Minelli, E. (2022). Servant Leadership: a Systematic Literature Review and Network Analysis. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 34*(3), 267–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-021-09381-3>
- Chavaha, C., Lekhawichit, N., Chienwattanasook, K., & Jernsittiparsert, K. (2020). The Impact of Servant Leadership on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Psychological Ownership. *Hamdard Islamicus, 43*(1), 2070–2086. <https://hamdardfoundation.org/hamdard>
- Chiang, C. F., & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(1), 180–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.04.011>
- Chiu, C. M., Huang, H. Y., Cheng, H. L., & Sun, P. C. (2015). Understanding online community citizenship behaviors through social support and social identity. *International Journal of Information Management, 35*(4), 504–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2015.04.009>

- Chraim, A. (2016). The Impact of Servant Leadership Behaviors on Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. February.
- Claudia, M. (2018). THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (A Study of the Permanent Lecturers at University of Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin). *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 33(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.17761>
- Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.12.004>
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2009). Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace. In -: Vol. (Issue). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cooper, D. R., and Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business research methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Crippen, C., & Willows, J. (2019). Connecting Teacher Leadership and Servant Leadership: A Synergistic Partnership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.12806/v18/i2/t4>
- Cunningham, M. S. (2019). *Oxymoronic leadership: Can servants lead? The relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment within South Texas churches in the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI) organization*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 13864084)
- DeConinck, J., & DeConinck, M. B. (2017). The Relationship between Servant Leadership, Perceived Organizational Support, Performance, and Turnover among Business to Business Salespeople. *Archives of Business Research*, 5(10). <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.510.3730>
- Dessler, G. (2019). *Fundamental of Human Resources Management 5th edition*. Florida International University, Pearson.
- Detnakarin, S., & Rurkkhum, S. (2019). Moderating Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Human Resource

- Development Practices and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 20(3), 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2019.1647078>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Malone, G. P., & Presson, W. D. (2016). Optimizing perceived organizational support to enhance employee engagement. *Society for Human Resource Management and Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2, 1–22. <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/special-reports-and-expert-views/Documents/SHRM-SIOP Perceived Organizational Support.pdf%0Ahttp://www.siop.org/SIOP-SHRM/SHRM-SIOP POS.pdf>
- Erdurmazlı, E. (2019). On the Servant Leadership Behaviors Perceived in Voluntary Settings: The Influences on Volunteers' Motivation and Organizational Commitment. *SAGE Open*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019876265>
- Flynn, C. B., Smither, J. W., & Walker, A. G. (2016). Exploring the Relationship Between Leaders' Core Self-Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Servant Leadership: A Field Study. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 23(3), 260–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051815621257>
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385031>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The Servant as Leader. *Leadership*, 407–415. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpg85tk.36>
- Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J., and Gully, S. (2017). *Organisational behaviour: Managing people and organisations*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Grisaffe, D. B., Vanmeter, R., & Chonko, L. B. (2016). Serving first for the benefit of others: Preliminary evidence for a hierarchical conceptualization of servant leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 36(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2016.1151303>
- Güçel, C. & Begeç, S. (n.d.). The effect of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour: Case study of a university.

- International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 4, 107–116.
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- Hanaysha, J. R., Kumar, V. V. A., In'airat, M., & Paramaiah, C. (2022). Direct and indirect effects of servant and ethical leadership styles on employee creativity: mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Arab Gulf Journal of Scientific Research*, 40(1), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AGJSR-04-2022-0033>
- Harvey, J., Bolino, M. C., & Kelemen, T. K. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior in the 21st century: How might going the extra mile look different at the start of the new millennium? *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 36, 51–110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120180000036002>
- Iklima, F., & Harmons, C. (2021). Faktor Penentu Transformasi Digital UMKM: Bukti dari Indonesia. *Prosiding Industrial Research Workshop ...*, 4–5. <https://jurnal.polban.ac.id/ojs-3.1.2/proceeding/article/view/2845/2224>
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team Effectiveness and Six Essential Servant Leadership Themes: A Regression Model Based on items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 98–113.
- Johari, S., & Jha, K. N. (2020). *Impact of Work Motivation on Construction Labor Productivity*. 36, 5.
- Karatepe, O. M., Ozturk, A., & Kim, T. T. (2019). Servant leadership, organisational trust, and bank employee outcomes. *Service Industries Journal*, 39(2), 86–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2018.1464559>
- Kauppila, O. P., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., Smale, A., Sumelius, J., & Vuorenmaa, H. (2018). Serving to help and helping to serve: Employee reactions to HR manager servant leadership. *78th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, AOM 2018*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2018.113>
- Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence.

- Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4), 558–583. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2081>
- Langhof, J. G., & Güldenber, S. (2020). Servant Leadership: A systematic literature review – toward a model of antecedents and outcomes. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(1), 32–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002219869903>
- Laub, J. A. (Florida A. U. (Florida A. U. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 60(02), 1–166. [http://www.olagroup.com/Display.asp?page=dissertations\\_theses](http://www.olagroup.com/Display.asp?page=dissertations_theses)
- Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2020). Servant leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12265>
- Lepine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034>
- Liz Dickinson, B., Davis, S., & Wheatley Joanie Sompayrac Beverly Simmons, K. (2009). *An Examination of the Factors Affecting Organizational Citizenship Behavior*.
- Luthans, F. (2020). *Organisational behaviour: An evidence-based approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lyu, Y., Zhu, H., Zhong, H. J., & Hu, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of hostile attribution bias and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.12.001>
- Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J. H., Meglich, P. A., and Valentine, S. R. (2021). *Human resource management*. Singapore: Cengage.
- Mathur, G., & Negi, P. (2014). Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Among Employees of Service Sector



- Environmental medicine: social and medical aspects View project  
 Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour  
 Among Employees of Service Sector. *American International  
 Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences AIJRHASS*,  
*January 2015*, 191–196. <http://www.iasir.net>
- McCann, J., Sparks, B. (2019). The Effects of Leadership Styles on  
 Innovative Work Behavior and the Role of Locus of Control in the  
 Manufacturing Environment. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*,  
*19(1)*, 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jop.v19i1.1092>
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (2012). Commitment in the Workplace: Theory,  
 Research, and Application. *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory,  
 Research, and Application*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231556>
- 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)
- Miao, R., & Kim, H.-G. (2010). Perceived Organizational Support, Job  
 Satisfaction and Employee Performance: An Chinese Empirical  
 Study. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, *03(02)*, 257–264.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2010.32032>
- Mirabizadeh, M., & Gheitasi, S. (2012). Examining the organizational  
 citizenship behavior as the outcome of organizational  
 commitment: Case study of universities in Ilam. *Management  
 Science Letters*, *2(3)*, 951–960. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2012.01.016>
- Mirshekar, S. (2017). Explaining Role of Servant Leadership  
 on Strengthening the Organizational Citizenship Behavior.  
*International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 161. [http://  
 www.internationalresearchjournaloffinanceandeconomics.com](http://www.internationalresearchjournaloffinanceandeconomics.com)
- Mubair, A. (2011). *Permasalahan belajar dan inovasi pembelajaran :  
 Panduan untuk guru, konselor, psikolog, orang tua, dan tenaga  
 kependidikan*. Bandung: Retika Aditama.
- Noland, A., & Richards, K. (2015). Servant Teaching: An Exploration  
 of Teacher Servant Leadership on Student Outcomes. *Journal of  
 the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *15(6)*, 16–38. [https://doi.  
 org/10.14434/josotl.v15i6.13928](https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v15i6.13928)
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment  
 and Psychological Attachment. *The Effects of Compliance*,

- Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 492–499.* <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>
- Ogochi, D., Kilika, J., & Oduol, T. (2022). The effect of servant leadership tenets and perceived impact in a community development context. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478), 11(4), 118–130.* <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i4.1818>
- Olsen, R. D. (2018). Servant leadership in the classroom: Serving adult students while maintaining high academic standards. *Journal of Military Learning, 2(1), 53–65.*
- Organ, D. W. (1977a). A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of the Satisfaction-Causes-Performance Hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review, 2(1), 46–53.* <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1977.4409162>
- Organ, D. W. (1977b). A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of the Satisfaction-Causes-Performance Hypothesis. *The Academy of Management Review, 2(1), 46.* <https://doi.org/10.2307/257604>
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences.* SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Oyewobi, L. O., Oke, A. E., Adeneye, T. D., & Jimoh, R. A. (2019). Influence of organizational commitment on work–life balance and organizational performance of female construction professionals. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 26(10), 2243–2263.* <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-07-2018-0277>
- Piong, C. K. (2016). *Servant leadership, organisational commitment, and perceived organisational support in the restaurant industry.* (Publication No. 147837120)[Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. <https://core.ac.uk/reader/147837120>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26(3), 513–563.* <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Qiu, S., Dooley, L. M., & Xie, L. (2020). How servant leadership and self-efficacy interact to affect service quality in the hospitality industry: A polynomial regression with response surface

- analysis. *Tourism Management*, 78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104051>
- Ragnarsson, S., Kristjánisdóttir, E. S., & Gunnarsdóttir, S. (2018). To Be Accountable While Showing Care: The Lived Experience of People in a Servant Leadership Organization. *SAGE Open*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018801097>
- Reed, L. (2015). Servant leadership, followership, and organisational citizenship behaviours in 9-1-1 emergency communications centers: Implications of a national study. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2(1), 71–94. <https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltlp/vol2/iss1/5>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Robin, S. P., and Judge, T. A. (2015). *Perilaku Organisasi* (Issue 2015020016). Salemba Empat.
- Sadeghi, G., Ahmadi, M., & Yazdi, M. T. (2016). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and market orientation in organizations (case study: Agricultural Jihad Organization of Mazandaran Province). *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14(3), 372–379. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14\(3-si\).2016.10](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.14(3-si).2016.10)
- Sahawneh, F. G., & Benuto, L. T. (2018). The relationship between instructor servant leadership behaviors and satisfaction with instructors in an online setting. *Online Learning Journal*, 22(1), 107–130. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1066>
- Salehi, M., & Gholtash, A. (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction, job burnout and organizational commitment with the organizational citizenship behavior among members of faculty in the Islamic Azad University-first district branches, in order to provide the appropriate model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 306–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.091>
- Schwepker, C. H. (2016). Servant leadership, distributive justice and commitment to customer value in the salesforce. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 31(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-07-2014-0143>
- Schwepker, C. H., & Schultz, R. J. (2015). Influence of the ethical servant leader and ethical climate on customer value enhancing

- sales performance. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 35(2), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2015.1010537>
- Sekaran, U., and Boeugie, R. (1993). Research methods for business: A skill building approach. In *Long Range Planning* (Vol. 26, Issue 2). West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301\(93\)90168-f](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(93)90168-f)
- Shafi, M. Q., Rabbani, S., Alam, R. M., & Gul, S. (2020). Servant Leadership: Impact on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Knowledge Sharing Behavior. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 55(4). <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.55.4.63>
- Shetty, P. K., and Kamath, R. C. (2021). Relationship between servant leadership and perceived organisational support on employees of manufacturing industries and educational institution. *Natural Volatiles and Essential Oils*, 8(4), 1462–1481.
- Shore, L. M. F., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and Employee Behavior: Comparison of Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment With Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 774–780. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.774>
- Sousa, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2017). Servant Leadership and the Effect of the Interaction Between Humility, Action, and Hierarchical Power on Follower Engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y>
- Sudjana, N. dan A. R. (2005). Media Pengajaran. Bandung. Sinar Baru.
- Thao, N. P. H., & Kang, S. W. (2020). When Servant Leaders Inspire Followers to Become Organizational Citizens? Empirical Evidence From Vietnam. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900184>
- Tharikh, S. M., Ying, C. Y., Mohamed Saad, Z., & Sukumaran, K. a/p. (2016). Managing Job Attitudes: The Roles of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 604–611. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(16\)00074-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)00074-5)
- UNDP. (2020). *Human Development Index*.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Peterson, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Hartnell, C. A. (2010). An investigation of the relationships among leader and follower psychological capital, service climate, and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(4), 937–963. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00401.x>

- org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01193.x
- Wang, W., Jian, L., Guo, Q., Zhang, H., & Liu, W. (2021). Narcissistic supervision and employees' change-oriented OCB. *Management Decision*, 59(9), 2164–2182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2020-0048>
- Wong. (2013). Partial Least Square Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using Smart-PLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24(Technical Note 1), 1–32. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268449353>
- Wong, P. T. P. (2003). Servant leadership : An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile. *Paper Presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable at Regent University, 2000*, 1–13.
- Ying, M., Faraz, N. A., Ahmed, F., & Raza, A. (2020). How Does Servant Leadership Foster Employees' Voluntary Green Behavior? A Sequential Mediation Model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), 1792. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051792>
- Zeng, J., & Xu, G. (2020). How Servant Leadership Motivates Innovative Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(13), 4753. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134753>
- Zhang, Y., Guo, Y., & Newman, A. (2017). Identity judgements, work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effects based on group engagement model. *Tourism Management*, 61, 190–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.01.005>

## Appendix

### Research Questionnaire

Dear Mr/Ms,

In the context of compiling a dissertation, the researcher asks for the willingness of lecturers to participate in filling out a research questionnaire for a study on the influence of servant leadership, motivation, and perceived organisational support towards organisational citizenship behaviour, with lecturer commitment as mediator and digital transformation as moderator at LLDIKTI III DKI Jakarta.

The researchers will keep the data provided and the results of this study confidential. This will only be used as material for preparing a dissertation at the doctoral program, Mercu Buana University, Jakarta.

The researcher would like to thank you profusely for your willingness, time, and support in filling out the questionnaire for this research.

God bless,  
Adriani Gunawan

Date and time:

Questionnaire number:

#### *Respondent Data*

*Cross (X) the appropriate column. If you cross incorrectly, circle the wrong column.*

1. Your gender :

- Man
- Woman

2. Your current age:

- $\leq 25$  years
- 26-30 years
- 31-35 years
- 36-40 years
- 41-45 years
- 46-50 years
- $\geq 51$  years

3. Your current level of formal education:
  - Bachelor Strata 2 (S-2)
  - Bachelor Strata 3 (S-3)
  
4. Your length of service at the university where you currently work:
  - $\leq$  3 Years
  - 4-5 Years
  - 6-7 Years
  - $\geq$  8 Years
  
5. Your current lecturer function/academic position (JAFA).
  - No JJA
  - Expert assistant
  - Lecturer
  - Head lecturer
  - Teacher

### Main Survey

*Cross (X) one of the following columns, which, in your opinion, is most appropriate. If you cross incorrectly, circle the wrong column.*

- |   |     |                   |
|---|-----|-------------------|
| 1 | STS | Strongly disagree |
| 2 | TS  | Do not agree      |
| 3 | KS  | Disagree          |
| 4 | S   | Agree             |
| 5 | SS  | Strongly agree    |

No	Code	Statement	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree
<b>Servant leadership</b> (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006)									
1	SL1	My leader genuinely desires to make positive changes in the lives of professors	Strongly disagree						
2	SL2	My leader places the wishes and expectations of followers (lecturers) above his own		1	2	3	4	5	
3	SL3	My leadership restores the enthusiasm of lecturers bored with work routines		1	2	3	4	5	

No	Code	Statement	Scoring scale
4	SL4	My leader has a good understanding of the internal and external situation of the university	1 2 3 4 5
5	SL5	My leader is skilled in mapping the problems that arise in the faculty	1 2 3 4 5
6	SL6	My leader is skilled at persuading followers to implement university policies when articulating opportunities	1 2 3 4 5
7	SL7	My leader can move the entire academic community to contribute directly and positively to their environment	1 2 3 4 5
8	SL8	My leader can instil moral-social values in the academic community	1 2 3 4 5
9	SL9	My leader understands and makes the vision/mission of the university his personal vision	1 2 3 4 5
10	SL10	My leader makes himself a servant to university stakeholders, lecturers and staff	1 2 3 4 5
Perceived organisational support (Eisenberger et al., 2016)			
11	POS1	My leader judges things objectively and fairly	Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
12	POS2	My leader makes policies based on agreed criteria to avoid being disadvantaged.	1 2 3 4 5



No	Code	Statement	Scoring scale				
13	POS3	My university management provides proper rewards such as salary, incentives and leave	1	2	3	4	5
14	POS4	My leadership provides sincere and honest support to me as a lecturer	1	2	3	4	5
15	POS5	I place the university as a part of my life and feel proud to continue to my journey with this university	1	2	3	4	5

---

Lecturer commitment (Griffin et al., 2017)

---

16	KD1	I am loyal to the university because of my commitment to the university's vision and mission	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree
17	KD2	I have a strong determination to make this university a success		1	2	3	4	5	
18	KD3	I have the readiness to play an extra role at the university		1	2	3	4	5	
19	KD4	I want to continue my journey with this university		1	2	3	4	5	
20	KD5	I feel comfortable working at this university		1	2	3	4	5	
21	KD6	I am responsible for the task I am carrying out		1	2	3	4	5	
22	KD7	I have a high appreciation of the values of life through this university		1	2	3	4	5	

No	Code	Statement		Scoring scale					
Digital transformation (Iklima & Harmons, 2021)									
23	TD1	My leadership conditions all lecturers to carry out digital transformation	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree
24	TD2	The division of digital activities within the university is specified and interrelated to enable efficiency and effectiveness in implementing lecturer duties/work		1	2	3	4	5	
25	TD3	Lecturers' difficulties in adapting to the pace of digital transformation can be overcome with training and collaboration between units		1	2	3	4	5	
26	TD4	My leadership conditioned all lecturers to be required to digitise teaching and learning activities		1	2	3	4	5	
27	TD5	Academic activities at the university are implemented regularly, either hybrid or online		1	2	3	4	5	
Organisational citizenship behaviour (Zhang et al., 2017)									
28	OCB1	I desire to play extra roles and engage in extra-time activities, demonstrated by helping less proficient colleagues at work	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree
29	OCB2	I cultivate a willingness to do work outside of working hours		1	2	3	4	5	
30	OCB3	I provide full support and cooperation on team decisions		1	2	3	4	5	
31	OCB4	I empathise with doing things that are extra work		1	2	3	4	5	

No	Code	Statement	Scoring scale				
32	OCB 5	I will complete the task according to company procedures	1	2	3	4	5
33	OCB 6	I will take the positive side of problems that occur	1	2	3	4	5
34	OCB7	I will complete additional work given by my supervisor seriously and on time	1	2	3	4	5
35	OCB 8	I often have good things to say about the university where I work	1	2	3	4	5
36	OCB9	I have a great curiosity to know the developments in the university	1	2	3	4	5

Motivation (Johari, S., & Jha, 2020)

37	WM1	I work to earn a decent living which spurs me to provide service to students	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree
38	WM2	Work benefits such as (salary, bonus and allowances) provided by the university make me work enthusiastically/well		1	2	3	4	5	
39	WM3	I wish to be successful at work by improving my performance		1	2	3	4	5	
40	WM4	Achievement of performance/self-fulfilment is obtained from my current job (position)		1	2	3	4	5	
41	WM5	The achievement of my good performance is inseparable from the public's expectations		1	2	3	4	5	
42	WM6	Enjoying doing work/work tasks is my priority at work		1	2	3	4	5	

No	Code	Statement	Scoring scale				
43	WM7	Achievement of performance/self-fulfilment is obtained from the potential of my talents and skills	1	2	3	4	5
44	WM8	I work hard because the job fits my personal goal/ vision	1	2	3	4	5
45	WM9	The university supports my values and ability to keep growing	1	2	3	4	5