

The Relationship between Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Study on Saudi Insurance Companies

Mohammed S. Al-Amri¹, Meshal I. Al Hajji² & Ali S. Alawaji³

¹ Department of Management, College of Business Administration, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

² Human Resources Department, Al-Enma bank, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

³ Human Resources Department, Saudi Reinsurance Company, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Mohammed S. Al-Amri, Department of Management, College of Business Administration, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: msruh28@gmail.com

Received: September 18, 2016

Accepted: October 9, 2016

Online Published: October 27, 2016

doi:10.5539/ijbm.v11n11p264

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n11p264>

The researchers thank the deanship of scientific research at King Saud University represented by the College of Business Administration research center for the financial support of this research.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. To achieve this aim, the study utilized a questionnaire consists of two validated and well established instruments. This questionnaire has been distributed to a sample consist of (500) employees of insurance companies. A total of (327) complete questionnaires has been received back at a response rate of 65%. After analyzing data and testing hypotheses, the results indicated that the level of servant leadership in insurance companies is at the middle and the most prominent practices of servant leadership are associated with the dimension of empowerment, while those associated with the dimension of courage was the less common practice. The results also pointed out that the level of employees' organizational citizenship behavior was high. Finally the study revealed that there is a relationship between all the dimensions of servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior except courage dimension. Based on these results, certain recommendations were suggested.

Keywords: servant leadership, empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity and humility, organizational citizenship behavior, and Saudi insurance companies

1. Introduction

In today's dynamic economic scenario, organizations are not only looking for ways to generate profits but also to maintain and/or develop competitive advantages so as to remain in business. As humans are the biggest assets which organizations owns, managers and leaders are not only responsible for developing the strategies for generating more profits but also for making new strategies for maintaining, retaining, developing, motivating and engaging the employees so that all assets of organization are utilized optimally to achieve the goals of the organization (Greenberg, 2011).

Because of its effects on the performance of the organization, leadership has always been an interesting topic for researchers. Ferrari & Vaclavik (2016) suggested that the term leadership has been defined differently by different experts. These differences in the definitions are on account of the characteristics and the dimension of Leadership. It is for of this reason that researchers are still researching on the topic and are coming up with different traits, dimensions and definitions of leadership. Van et al. (2014) suggested that using their leadership skills, leaders develop their influence in the organizations. This influence motivates the employees to follow the leaders' commands. When leaders are able to gain the trust of employees, they become role model for their followers and develop a relationship within the organization and with the customers of organization.

Accordingly, Yoshida et al., (2014) suggested effective leaderships one wherein the leaders develop relationships with the employees in the organizations. This bond of relationship, sometimes emotional in nature, encourage the

followers to work towards certain goal. The relationship between the followers and the leaders have been well researched by many researchers. Chiniara and Bentein (2016) reinforced the definition of leadership given by Drucker, who suggested that the only definition of leader is someone who has followers. However, with the change in dynamic environment in which organizations operate, in last ten years, the definition of leadership has significantly changed. This fact was well documented by Choudhary et al. (2013) who suggested that dictatorial form of leadership is no longer suitable and is not appreciated by the employees & superiors in the organization. The reason being, the organizations have changed as their structures are becoming more and more flat. In these situation's only supportive form of leadership can help organizations in achieving their goals. Abdel-Rahman (2014) suggested that there are six dimensions of servant leadership. They are: empowerment, humility and authenticity, forgiveness, standing back, accountability and courage.

In the 21st century, where organizations are looking to capitalize on competitive advantages and in developing those advantages, leadership based on openness, participation and cooperation are favored. In this form of leadership, all employees are motivated to participate in the decision making process. Hence the role of leaders in an organization is extremely important and in-order to lead by example, they are required to follow the servant leadership style wherein prime purpose of the leader is to serve employees, understand their requirements and empower them.

Further, organizations are looking out for people who do not make themselves slaves of activities mentioned in their job descriptions but go beyond those activities for the benefit of the organization. Such type of behavior of employees is called organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

According to Williams & Anderson, (1991), in the early 1980s, the term OCB was given to Katz's (1964) category of extra-role behaviour (e. g., Bateman & Organ, 1983), and in recent years a formal definition has been offered. OCB represents the behaviours of individuals that goes beyond the formal requirements or official job description, is discretionary in nature, and is not necessarily recognised by the formal reward structure of the organisation (Organ, 1997).

In this study, the servant leadership of leaders are examined to investigate its relationship with organizational citizenship behavior in the insurance sector at Saudi Arabia.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The insurance sector of Saudi Arabia is very complicated and competitive. The competition in this sector has increased in recent years due to the entry of new players. Because of sector's competitive nature, leadership style in the organizations is of prime importance. Further, the voluntary and discretionary behaviors of some employees in the insurance organizations help the effective functioning of these institutions. In order to safe guard their place in their organizations, the employees working in insurance sector have to continuously nurture and train themselves to adjust with the growing demands of the competitive insurance sector.

There is a strict requirement of philosophies which can help organizations in creating and maintaining sustainable competitive advantages. Ja'afaru (2014) suggested that servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior can help organizations in creating and maintaining sustainable competitive advantages. Further, servant leadership may lead to organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

1.2 The Purposes of the Study

The findings of this study may contribute to more improvement in the quality of work in Saudi insurance companies. Due to the lack of studies in this field, the recommendations of this study may be a stimulus for researchers to focus their future researches on this vital area.

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

- Provide an appropriate theoretical framework that illustrates the servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.
- Identify the descending order of the servant leadership dimensions at Saudi insurance companies.
- Evidence indicates that organizational citizenship behavior can influence work related behavior. However, there is no research which attempts to relate organizational citizenship behavior and servant leadership in Saudi Arabia. This study considers whether there is any correlation between the servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.
- It will fill a gap in the research literature on servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

- It is also expected that the result of this study will inform the decision makers in Saudi Arabia about the extent of servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior among employees within the Saudi insurance companies. It also could be of value to the Chamber of Commerce, (the major private agency entrusted with the supervision on Saudi private companies) to better understand human behavior and hence be better able to make recommendations for improving productivity.
- Present proper and effective recommendations to both academicians and human resource practitioners, which will aim at creating in-depth awareness on the realities of the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

1.4 Questions and Hypotheses

The main question of this study is: does the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) contribute to increasing organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city?

Under this main question, there are a variety of sub-questions:

1. How do employees perceive the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) in banks established in the city of Riyadh?
2. What are the main common servant leadership practices in banks established in the city of Riyadh as perceived by employees, and what are the less common practices?
3. According to the employees' point of view, what is the level of organizational citizenship behavior of employees in these banks?
4. Is there any significant correlation relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city?

To answer this question, the researchers used the following statistical 'null hypothesis'. This hypothesis was formulated in the light of theoretical framework, literature review, and the objectives of this study:

H₁: There is no significant correlation relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city.

5. Is there any significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city?

To answer this question, the researchers used the following two statistical 'null hypotheses'. This hypotheses were formulated in the light of theoretical framework, literature review, and the objectives of this study:

H_{2.1}: There is no significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership at a macro scale) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city.

H_{2.2}: There is no significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the dimensions of servant leadership (empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity and humility) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Servant Leadership

Sendjaya and Cooper (2011) define servant leadership as "a holistic, multidimensional approach to leadership that encompasses the rational, emotional, ethical, and spiritual sides of both leaders and followers" (p. 418).

Lad and Luechauer (1998) suggested that "Servant-leaders typically have a passionate zeal for creating a preferred future. Then again, Hitler, Mussolini and Jim Jones all had visions. What differentiates servant-leaders from maniacal dictators is their deep desire to pursue this vision from the basis of humility, empathy, compassion, and commitment to ethical behavior. In short, they articulate a vision and then enable, ennoble and empower those around them to work for the attainment of that vision. In essence, servant leadership represents a pull rather than a push model of vision attainment." The definition given by Lad and Luechauer suggested the difference between a mass Leader and Servant Leader.

The above definitions given by researchers suggests that the concept of servant leadership is simple yet powerful

and has been researched by many researchers in great detail in last 40 years. Simply put, servant leadership may be defined as a moral component present in leader which encourage and enhance moral reasoning in its followers, focus on development of employees not just for the development of the organization but also for the development of employees and is concerned with the success of all stakeholders.

Many organizations have successfully adopted the concept and has validated its practical implications. The term servant leadership is an oxymoron as servant and leader are two extremes. As per Parris & Peachey (2013), in order to meet the goals of the organization, leaders are required to understand the requirements of the workforce by using communication as a tool. The knowledge thus obtained is used for retaining, developing, motivating, engaging and empowering the employees so as to assist them in performing to their fullest potential. They reviewed the research studies published on servant leadership in last 30 years and summarized the developments made in the field of servant leadership. The aim of the servant leader is to *serve*. Using the servant leadership style, leaders gain trust of employees & customers by providing unselfish service to all of them. It helps the leaders in becoming the role model in the organization.

Brubaker (2015) suggested that servant leadership is based on involvement, teamwork and openness. Leaders who follow servant leadership involve their followers in activities of the organization, portray and maintain kind behavior and help others in the organization to learn and grow.

In view of the above, it may be said that servant leadership is different from other forms of leadership as it focuses on forming everlasting relationship with the employees. Parris & Peachey (2013) claimed that there are eight main characteristics of servant leadership. The first characteristic is to listen openly the views of others without interrupting. By listening, information about employees' readiness for doing an activity can be gauged. Second characteristic is to understand and accept others. A servant leader never rejects anybody. Third, having foresight and intuition about probable future actions and action plan to deal with those future events. Institution is also used to fill the gap between the already existing knowledge about an event and what is required for taking an informed decision. Fourth characteristic is about having awareness and perception. It helps the servant leader in understanding the different between the urgent and the important. The fifth characteristic is about the persuasion. The servant leader has highly developed art of persuasion using which the leaders influence its followers. Sixth, the servant leader has the ability to learn, implement and communicate the concepts. Seventh characteristic is about change himself/herself as per the requirement. For servant leader, change starts from with-in not from outside world. The eight characteristic is about having spirit or enthusiasm.

2.1.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was nurtured by Organ in the year 1988 when he tried to establish a relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Subsequently, it was suggested that organizational citizenship behavior is another type of performance which can be differentiated from other forms of performance on the basis of freedom from situation and ability constraints.

The task performance is bounded by upper and lower limits. While the upper limit of task performance is bounded by knowledge, skills and ability of the person, the lower limit is bonded by the fear of losing one's job. This suggests that the person performing the task does not have much room for variation in performance. However, in case of helping a co-worker in the organization there is no dear involved as the task in which person helps the co-worker is not a part of his/her job description.

Organizational citizenship behavior is the kind of behavior portrayed by the employee in the organization wherein the employee goes beyond the activities mentioned in the job description, without expecting anything in return and involves himself/herself in activities of other employees so as to help them and the organization in achieving its goals. Many researchers in the past have studied the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on the organizational performance. Bambale et al., (2012), have suggested that many successful organizations have employees which goes a step further, beyond their own job description, for helping others in the organization. Zehir et al., (2013) suggested that organizational citizenship behavior portrayal by the employees is crucial for the long term survival of an organization as it helps in increasing the efficiency and productivity of the employees and organizations, respectively. As per

Ja'afaru (2014), organizational citizenship behavior is a form of job performance there are three broad categories of job performance namely task performance, extra role performance and counterproductive work behavior. While task performance is related to the tasks/activities mentioned in the job description of the employee, the extra role performance corresponds to the organizational citizenship behavior wherein the employee help others. organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary behavior as the employee cannot be forced for the same. However, that does not mean that such behavior is unselfishly driven. Many researchers suggests that the

organizational citizenship behavior is driven by the ego-centric motives. As organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary behavior, it may not be formally rewarded in the organization under usual situations. However, using advanced approaches such behavior may be factored in while deciding the rewards to employees. There are two forms of organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior of individual (OCBI) and organizational citizenship behavior of organization (OCBO). As the study is focused on the employees working in insurance companies in Riyadh, the OCBO is not relevant. And hence, the relationship between Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior of Individuals has been considered in the study.

2.2 Literature Review

In a study conducted by False and Dan, (2007) to measure evidence of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and servant leader behaviors (SLBs) in three high-performing Catholic parishes. One-on-one interviews, observational techniques and archival research methods. The main findings: the study found evidence of three SLBs and four OCBs. The three SLBs studied here are recognizing, serving and empowering, while the four OCBs are helping, initiating, participating and self-developing. This study also found interaction effects between specific leader and member behaviors and discovered six other characteristics that were associated with these three high-performing parishes.

A study by Triver (2009) aimed at examine the relationships among servant leadership, trust and organizational citizenship behavior. Research was conducted in Northwestern US organizations using three survey instruments. (134) surveys represented the sample. The main findings: positive and medium to strong correlations were found among the study variables. Significantly, trust was shown to completely mediate the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Additionally, evidence of a smaller but significant reverse-causality mediating relationship was found.

In a study organized by Fred et al., (2010) to test the influence of servant leadership on two group climates, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior. The main findings: results from a sample of (815) employees and (123) immediate supervisors revealed that commitment to the supervisor, self-efficacy, procedural justice climate, and service climate partially mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Cross-level interaction results revealed that procedural justice climate and positive service climate amplified the influence of commitment to the supervisor on organizational citizenship behavior.

In a study conducted by David et al. (2013) to examine the relationship between servant leadership of the principal with organizational citizenship behavior and school climate. (708) participants within a random sample of forty-one public high schools in Alabama. The main findings: servant leadership behaviors of the principal are significantly related to the school climate. Findings also reveal that servant leadership behaviors are significantly related to the organizational citizenship behavior within the school.

A study by Bamble (2014) to review the literature on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. The main findings: the search results indicated that six variables including procedural justice climate, regulatory focus, affective commitment to the supervisor, self-efficacy, procedural justice climate, and service climate were found as significant mediators on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

In a study organized by Amos (2014) to analyses the relationships between servant leadership, organizational citizenship behavior and team effectiveness in the South African school system. A non-probability sample of (288) teachers was drawn from (38) schools in the Western Cape in South Africa. The findings emphasize the role played by servant leadership behaviors in promoting positive behaviors and outcomes for teams.

A new study organized by Timothy (2015) aimed at propose and test a moderated mediation model of the effects of servant leadership on two types of organizational citizenship behaviors (altruism and courtesy). The main findings: this study makes an important contribution to leadership theory by better understanding the nature of leader-follower relationships in Africa and the importance of reciprocity in these relationships.

Finally, the study of Bamble et al., (2015) to examine the effects servant leader behaviors on employee organizational citizenship behaviors for the individual among low and middle level employees of utility sector organizations in Nigeria. The main findings: the results provided support for most of the hypothesized relationships except two. Specifically, emotional healing, conceptual skills, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, are significantly and positively related to both.

3. Study's Methodology

This section describes quantitative research design was used in conducting this study. It also describes the

various procedures involved in the data collection and the development of the data collection instruments. The study collects empirical data from primary sources through questionnaire survey. These approaches and the survey responses are explained in more details in this section. It also briefly discusses the method of defining and selecting the research sample.

3.1 Population & Sampling Technique

The unit analysis is individual level. The population of this study consist of all the employees working in Saudi insurance companies. The number of employees was obtained from the human resource department in four different companies (Tawuniya, Tokyo Marine, Saudi Reinsurance, and Malath). Currently, the number of employees is (579) employees. Out of this number, a total of (327) employees are selected at random using simple random sampling to represent the employees of those companies.

3.2 Measuring Instruments

Data was collected by means of a questionnaire designed by the researchers. It consisted of forty (43) items, which were designed according to (likert scale): (always , often, sometimes, rarely, and never), and given the weights (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). The higher the mean, indicates to higher degree of consent on the item. As the questionnaire was divided into three parts as follows:

Part One: it included a number of items that aim to know the personal data of the sample members (3 items), they are: age, years of experience, and scientific qualification.

Part Two: it included a number of items that aim to measure the servant leadership from the perspective of the sample members (23 items). This items has been divided into a set of items, namely: empowerment: measured by items (1-7), authenticity and humility: measured by items (8-14), forgiveness: measured by items (15-17), standing back: measured by items (18-19), accountability: measured by items (20-21), and courage: measured by items (22-23). The (23) items were taken from Abdel-Rahman's study (2014).

Part Three: it included a number of items that aim to measure the organizational citizenship behavior from the perspective of the sample members (20 items). The (20) items were taken from Maharma's study (2008).

3.3 Validity the Tool of the Study

To testify the validity of the study, a number of steps were taken: First: a number of questionnaires were distributed to a number of referees, of professors and specialists in human resources management to assess the questions for accuracy. Based on their recommendations and comments, many modifications were done; some items were deleted, new items were added and other items were rephrased until the questionnaire reached its final form. Second: the statistician reviewed the questionnaire in terms of its format, layout, and whether the type of questions were suitable for statistical analysis. Third: a pilot study with fifty participants was conducted to further ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

3.4 Reliability

To examine the harmony of questionnaire statements, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to calculate the internal consistency of the measuring scales. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values for variables for this study

variables	No. of Items	Alpha
Servant leadership	23	0.91
Organizational citizenship behavior	20	0.89

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Results in table 1. indicate that the reliability coefficient for all variables is not less than (0.60) (Christensen et al., 2015). This means that the study tool is consistent and valid for the purposes of statistical analysis and scientific research. All values of Cronbach's alpha were between (0.89) and (0.91) which means larger than (0.60).

3.5 Statistical Methods Used

The following statistical methods were used for statement attributes of the study sample and for examining the hypotheses of the study: frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviation, and multiple linear regression analysis.

3.6 Limitations of the Study

As is the case with other research studies, the design of the current study is subject to a numbers of limitations that need to be considered.

First, this study is a pioneer investigation in the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in Saudi Arabia. Thus further research is needed to assess the validity of the findings in a wider context. Second, the researchers chose to study employees only in the private sectors, rather than including for example the health sector or the military. The reasons for this delimitation is the private sector is a very important sector for applying the Saudization policy. Also, the government has declared its intention to privatise some of the public sector commercial activities (Ministry of Economy and Planning, 2015-2019). Third, this study was applied in Riyadh city because (1) the majority of the private companies are located in this city (2) constraints of time in data collection and the limitation of financial resources. It is difficult to cover the vast area of Saudi Arabia. Hence the results can only be generalised with caution. Fourth, because of the conservative nature of Saudi society, and because the majority of employees in insurance sectors are males, female employees were not included in the research sample in this study. The sample involved males only.

4. Data Analysis of Results

4.1 The sample of the Study

The sample of the study was consisted of (327) employers from employees who work in “insurance companies”. Table 2 shows the percentage for distributing the individuals of the study according to variable of age. The highest percentage was (51.7%) for the category (30-40) years. Whereas the lowest percentage was (4%) for the category (50 years and above).

Table 2. Distributing the individuals of the sample according to the variable of age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 30 years	90	27.5%
From 30 to less than 40 years	169	51.7%
From 40 to less than 50 years	55	16.8%
From 50 years and above	13	4%
Total	327	100%

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 3. shows the percentage for distributing the individuals of the study according to variable of years of experience. The highest percentage was (56%) for the category (less than 10 years). Whereas the lowest percentage was (11%) for the category (from 20 years and more).

Table 3. Distributing the individuals of the study according to years of experience

Experience	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 10 years	183	56%
From 10 to less than 20 years	105	32.1%
From 20 years and more	39	11.9%
Total	327	100%

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 4 shows the percentage for distributing the individuals of the study according to variable of educational level. The highest percentage was (55.4%) for the category (bachelor). Whereas the lowest percentage was (9.2%) for the category (high school or less).

Table 4. Distributing the individuals of the study according to scientific qualification

Scientific qualification	Frequency	Percentage
High school or less	30	9.2%
Diploma	40	12.2%
Bachelor	181	55.4%
Postgraduate study	76	23.2%
Total	327	100%

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

4.2 Questions and Hypotheses Testing

The main question of this study is: does the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) contribute to increasing organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city? Under this main question, there are a variety of sub-questions:

Question (1): how do employees perceive the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) in banks established in the city of Riyadh?

A Means and standard deviations was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the empowerment dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
1	My boss encourages me to use my skills in work	4.52	0.77	1
2	My boss has a vision in the long run	4.08	0.99	2
3	My boss helps me to improve myself	3.84	1.16	3
4	My boss makes me solve problems by myself instead of just telling me what to do	3.56	1.23	5
5	My boss encourages employees to generate new ideas	3.46	1.32	7
6	My boss gives me power to make decisions which make work easier for me	3.63	1.10	4
7	My boss provides me with many opportunities to learn new skills	3.56	1.14	5

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees Mean for total of the dimension (3.81) Standard Deviations (0.74).

Table 6. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the humility and authenticity dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
8	My boss tries to learn from the criticism he receives by his boss	3.47	1.12	4
9	My boss learns from different perspectives of others and their opinions	3.18	1.27	7
10	My boss shows his real feelings towards his employees	3.66	1.21	1
11	If people expressed their criticism, my boss tries to learn from criticism	3.61	1.15	2
12	My boss learns from criticism	3.22	1.25	6
13	My boss admits committing mistakes in front of his boss at work	3.56	1.21	3
14	My boss is frank in terms of his weaknesses and inability	3.41	1.23	5

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (3.33) Standard Deviations (0.72).

Table 7. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the forgiveness dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
15	My boss does not tolerate others' who offended him at work	3.34	1.30	1
16	It is difficult for my boss to forget mistakes that occurred in the past	3.24	1.09	2
17	My boss keeps criticizing others because of mistakes they had committed previously at work	3.13	1.27	3

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (3.23) Standard Deviations (0.98).

Table 8. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the standing back dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
18	My boss does not seek appreciations and prizes but he does that for others	3.08	1.34	1
19	My boss stands back and attribute achievements to others	2.98	1.32	2

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (3.05) Standard Deviations (0.72).

Table 9. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the accountability dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
20	I am responsible for my performance at work in front of my boss	3.25	1.16	1
21	My boss holds me and my colleagues the responsibility for the way we perform our duties	2.96	1.23	2

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (3.11) Standard Deviations (1.07).

Table 10. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of the courage dimension

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
22	My boss takes risk and does what it takes in his opinion	2.82	1.36	2
23	My boss takes risk even when he is not sure of his boss's support for him	3.05	1.34	1

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (2.93) Standard Deviations (1.16).

Tables (5-10) show the overall means for each dimensions of servant leadership between (2.93) and (3.81). The overall mean for the total servant leadership dimensions is (3.39). This average means that employees perceive the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) in banks established in the city of Riyadh employees tend to neutral degree. Servant leadership dimensions ranking according to overall mean is as follows: empowerment, humility and authenticity, forgiveness, accountability, standing back, and finally courage.

Question (2): what are the main common servant leadership practices in banks established in the city of Riyadh as perceived by employees, and what are the less common practices?

A Means and standard deviations was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 11. Means, standard deviations, and rank of the dimensions of servant leadership

Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Empowerment	3.81	0.74	1
Humility and authenticity	3.33	0.72	2
Forgiveness	3.23	0.98	3
Standing back	3.05	1.00	5
Accountability	3.11	1.07	4
Courage	2.93	1.16	6
Total	3.39	0.70	

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 11. shows that the empowerment was the main common servant leadership practice with overall mean (3.81). However, courage dimension was the less common practice with overall mean (2.93). The overall mean for the total servant leadership dimensions was (3.39).

Question (3): according to the employees' point of view, what is the level of organizational citizenship behavior of employees in these banks?

A Means and standard deviations was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 12. Means, standard deviations, and rank in all items of organizational citizenship behavior

Ser. No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
1	I help my colleagues to do the duties assigned to them.	4.10	0.86	15
2	I do not hesitate to help my colleagues if they have a lot of burdens.	4.26	0.79	11
3	I cooperate with my bosses to do the job in the best way.	4.31	0.78	8
4	I assist and guide clients in order to provide excellent customer service	4.38	0.75	4
5	I help new employees and make them benefit from my experience.	4.49	0.72	2
6	I avoid making problems in work place.	4.45	0.81	3
7	I make sure to prevent problems before it occurs.	4.35	0.74	7
8	I pay attention to the effect of my behavior on others.	4.31	0.79	8
9	I do not breach others' rights.	4.53	0.75	1
10	I do extra work without complaining.	3.73	1.06	20
11	I help others even if it takes extra time.	3.93	0.95	18
12	I take advantage of time to work.	4.01	0.84	17
13	I maintain my company's reputation.	4.37	0.80	5
14	I regularly follow up the announcements, memos, and internal circulars.	4.06	0.92	16
15	I make sure to attend meetings and work-related meetings.	4.16	0.87	12
16	I respect the rules and regulations in force in my company.	4.36	0.78	6
17	I care about the future of my company.	4.29	0.84	10
18	Usually I submit suggestions to improve and develop work.	4.11	0.81	14
19	I volunteer to do more tasks in order to improve the work.	3.90	0.95	19
20	I contribute to problem-solving that faces my company.	4.13	0.84	13

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

The mean of 5 degrees. Mean for total of the dimension (4.21) Standard Deviations (0.52).

Table 12. showed the top three statements are: "I do not breach others' rights" with mean score (4.53), "I help new employees and make them benefit from my experience" with mean score (4.49), "I avoid making problems in work place" with mean score (4.45). Whereas the lowest three statements are: "I help others even if it takes extra time" with mean score (3.93), "I volunteer to do more tasks in order to improve the work" with mean score (3.90), "I do extra work without complaining" with mean score (3.73). The results also found that the level of organizational citizenship behavior (overall mean score was 4.21) was high levels.

Question (4): is there any significant correlation relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city?

To answer this question, the researchers used the following statistical 'null hypothesis'. This hypothesis was formulated in the light of theoretical framework, literature review, and the objectives of this study:

H₁: There is no significant correlation relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city. A correlation was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 13. The results of simple correlation between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour

The Dimensions	The correlation coefficient (r)	Sig. (p value)	Describe the relationship
Empowerment	0.2499	0.01	Positive relationship
Humility and authenticity	0.2308	0.01	Positive relationship
Forgiveness	0.1502	0.01	Positive relationship
Standing Back	0.1144	0.05	Positive relationship
Accountability	0.1398	0.05	Positive relationship
Courage	0.0042	(N. S.)	Non-existent relationship
Total	0.2121	0.01	Positive relationship

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 13 shows that there is a positive relationship between the dimensions: (empowerment, humility and authenticity, forgiveness, standing back, accountability) and between organizational citizenship behavior (p value was statistically significant at the level of $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, and this indicates that the greater the level of the servant leadership of the study in this dimensions lead to increase the level of organizational citizenship behavior. However, relationship was non-exist among the dimension: (courage) and between organizational citizenship behavior (p value was not statistically significant at the level $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, therefore, it indicates that there is no relationship between the level of the study sample in this dimension and their level of organizational citizenship behavior.

The strongest relationships between empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior, and the weakest relationships between courage and organizational citizenship behavior. These results confirm the importance of empowerment in promoting organizational citizenship behavior and at the same time the courage is not promoting organizational citizenship behavior.

In the light of the results of this hypothesis have shown that there is relationships between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. So the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted which state on: there is significant correlation relationship, statistically, at the level of $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city.

Question (5): is there any significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city? To answer this question, the researchers used the following two statistical 'null hypotheses'. This hypotheses were formulated in the light of theoretical framework, literature review, and the objectives of this study:

H_{2,1}: There is no significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership at a macro scale) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city. A linear regression was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 14. The results of simple linear regression of the effect of the servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f	Mean Square	F value & sig.	Multiple coefficient R	correlation	Coefficient determination R ²
Regression	3.918	1	3.918	15.302	0.212		0.045
Residual	83.203	325	0.256	(0.000)			

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 15. Value of constants of the regression equation

Model	B	Std. Error	Value of Beta	t value	Sig.
Constant	3.685	0.138		26.776	0.000
The total of Servant Leadership	0.156	0.040	0.212	3.912	0.000

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Tables (14 and 15) show the calculated F-value is higher than the test significance level $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$, which mean

that there is an effect relationship at the level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership at a macro scale) and organizational citizenship behavior.

The model explanatory power showed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) value = 0.045, which means that the total of servant leadership factor can only explain 4.5% of the variations in organizational citizenship behavior. In the light of the results of this hypothesis have shown that there is significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership) and organizational citizenship behavior. So the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted which stated as “there is significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the practice of administrative leaders (for servant leadership at a macro scale) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city”.

H₂₋₂: There is no significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the dimensions of servant leadership (empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity and humility) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city. A stepwise multiple regression was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Table 16. The results of multiple regression of servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F value & sig.	Multiple correlation coefficient R	Coefficient of determination R ²
Regression	9.492	3	3.164	13.165	0.330	0.109
Residual	77.629	323	0.240	(0.000)		

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Table 17. Value of constants of the regression equation

Model	B	Std. Error	Value of Beta	t value	Sig.
Constant	3.381	0.151		22.390	0.000
Empowerment	0.174	0.052	0.249	3.385	0.001
Courage	-0.112	0.030	-0.251	3.771	0.000
Humility and authenticity	0.148	0.054	0.207	2.761	0.006

Source: from the results of statistical analysis.

Tables (16 and 17) show the calculated F-value significant at the test significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), which mean there is significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the dimensions of servant leadership (empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity and humility) and organizational citizenship behavior. The dimensions: (empowerment, courage, humility and authenticity) entered into the regression equation. Tables (16 and 17) showed that there is a statistically significant impact for practice of the dimensions of servant leadership (empowerment, courage, humility and authenticity) in organizational citizenship behavior (p-value less than 0.05), while the dimensions: (forgiveness, standing back, accountability) did not enter into the next steps of the analysis.

The model explanatory power showed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) value = 0.109, which means that the specific servant leadership dimensions (empowerment, courage, Humility and authenticity) could be explain 10.9% from the variance in the organizational citizenship behavior. The rest of the percentage (89.1%) indicates that there are variables not included in the current study.

In the light of the results of this hypothesis have shown that there is significant effect relationship, statistically between some dimensions of servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. So the null hypothesis is rejected partially in related to (empowerment, courage, humility and authenticity) dimensions, and alternative hypotheses accepted which stated as “there is significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the dimensions of servant leadership (empowerment, courage, authenticity and humility) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city. However, the null hypotheses accepted in related to (forgiveness, standing back, accountability) which stated as “there is no significant effect relationship, statistically, at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), between the dimensions of servant leadership (standing back, accountability, forgiveness) and organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks of Riyadh city.

5. Discussion

When the employees perceive the intentions and the behavior of the leaders as favorable, they tend to follow their commands. However, the organizational culture also play a vital role as the founders of the organizations have their own preference for type of organizational culture which they want to develop within the organization. Consequently, the leaders and the managers in the organizations tend to develop the organizational culture favored by the founders. As there are different characteristics of different organizations, the leadership behavior required for creating trust among employees is different for different organizations.

The behavior which leaders portray in organizations shape the culture of the organization and provide opportunities to employees to portray organizational citizenship behavior. The employees exhibit self-sacrifice only when he/she has contact with other employees in the organization and if the rules of the organization allows. If the rules of the organizations are inflexible and prevents the employees to socialize with others, it is highly unlikely that employee will exhibit organizational citizenship behavior.

Leadership has crucial impact on the behavior which employees portray in organizations. Servant Leadership is one of the approach based on the oriented leadership. As per Drucker, (1999), a good organization is one which has servant leadership as its characteristic. The studies conducted by many researchers in the file of servant leadership during 1993-2001 have focused primarily on how servant leadership can be put to action in organizations. As per Gucl and Gegec, 2012, and Vondey, 2010, there exists significant relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this study are in agreement with the findings of the said researchers. Specifically, the six dimensions of servant leadership namely empowerment, humility and authenticity, forgiveness, standing back, accountability and courage have been used to establish the relationship between the variables (Abdel-Rahman, 2014). However, one of the theoretical arguments it was discussed by Berryman (2001), who concluded that servant leaders are able to inspire others to voluntary action, build teams that sustain competitive differentials, transform multiple personal agendas into collaborative action for good. The findings of this study consistent with the benefit of servant leaderships, the followers are likely to reciprocate the leaders and exhibit high organizational citizenship behavior.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are made hereunder:

1. Empowering employees should be considered by insurance companies' leaders through: obtaining more authority and encourage to perform duties with best skills that they have, which could be helpful in solving problems that they encounter instead of just telling what to do.
2. Leaders should be cooperative in their behavior, and should be smart in dealing with others, especially when the situation require taking the opinions from other. Therefore, leaders should utilize others in helping to generate new ideas with more power that given to employees to be creative in their thinking way. This flexibility motivate the employees to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior. However, leaders at the same time should be responsible to take the risk of their decisions, and should be comfortable toward the employees in all matters.
3. Leaders should facilitate the learning environment as: giving the opportunities to learn, learn from criticism, and support all learning activities with no matter for its either positive or negative results (risk imbedded in such activities). In addition, all learning activities should be integrated toward increase organizational citizenship behavior.

7. Areas for Further Studies

The findings of this study did not cover comprehensively all factors which discuss servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in the Saudi Arabia work organizations. The study provides other areas for the further research including:

- The relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: a public and private sector comparison in Saudi Arabia
- The relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: a male and female sector comparison in Saudi Arabia.
- We suggest for future research investigating the potential moderating and mediating variables of individual behaviors, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, to examine the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

Acknowledgements

The researchers thank the deanship of scientific research at King Saud University represented by the College of Business Administration research center for the financial support of this research.

References

- Abdul-Rahman, T. (2014). Job Satisfaction in Light of Servant Leadership Theory: A Field Study on a Sample of Employees in Public Organizations, Riyadh City, KSA. *Public Administration Journal*, 1(55), 55-100.
- Amos, S. (2014). The Relationship Between Servant Leadership, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour and Team Effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1107>
- Bambale, A. (2014). Relationship Between Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Review of Literature and Future Research Directions. *Journal of Marketing And Management*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Bambale, A., Shamsudin, F., & Subramaniam, C. (2012). Servant Leadership as Employee–Organization Approach for Performance of Employee Citizenship Behaviors in the Nigeria’s Electric Power Sector. *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 3(1), 1-23.
- Bambale, A., Shamsudin, F., & Subramaniam, C. (2015). Effects of Servant Leader Behaviors on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors for the Individual (OCB-I) in the Nigeria’s Utility Industry Using Partial Least Squares (PLS). *International Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 4(6), 130-144 .
- Bateman, T., & Organ, D. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee “Citizenship.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Berryman, A. (2010). *Servant Leadership: Good for You and Good for Your Organization*.
- Brubaker, T., Créature, M., Bocarnea, M., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2015). *Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship in Rawanda: A Moderated Mediation Model*. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 3(2), 27-56.
- Chiniara, M., & Bentein, K. (2016). Linking Servant Leadership to Individual Performance: Differentiating the Mediating Role of Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness Need Satisfaction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 124-141.
- Choudhary, A., Akhtar, S., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of Transformational and Servant Leadership on Organizational Performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of business ethics*, 116(2), 433-440. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1470-8>
- Christensen, L., Johnson, R., & Turner, L. (2015). *Research methods, Design, and Analysis* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- David, L., Judy, G., Roxanne, M., & Philip, W. (2013). Relationships Among Servant Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and School Climate in Alabama High Schools. *The University Of Alabama, Proquest Dissertations Publishing*, 1-113.
- Drucker, P. (1999). *Management Challenges for the 21st Century*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Ferrari, J., & Vaclavik, D. (2016). The Leadership Style of Permanent Deacons: Servant and Transformational Middle–Aged Ministers. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 18(1), 1-10.
- Fred, O., Chad A., & Adegoke, O. (2010). Servant Leadership, Procedural Justice Climate, Service Climate, Employee Attitudes, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Cross-Level Investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 517- 529. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018867>
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in Organizations* (10th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Güçel, C., & Begeç, S. (2012). The Effect of the Servant Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Case Study of a University. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 4(1), 107-116.
- Ja’afaru, B. (2014). Relationship between Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Review of Literature and Future Research Directions. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Katz, D. (1964). The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Lad, L., & Luechauer, D. (1998). *On the Path to Servant Leadership*. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit and Servant-Leadership* (pp. 54-67). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Maharma, T. (2008). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Qatari Governmental Organizations: A Field

- Study. *Public Administration*, 48(2), 161-195.
- Ministry of Economy and Planning, Saudi Arabia. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.mep.gov.sa>
- Organ, D. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: the good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-up Time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-98.
- Parris, D., & Peachey, J. (2013). A Systematic Literature Review of Leadership Theory in Organization Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377-393.
- Sendjaya, S., & Cooper, B. (2011). Servant Leadership Behavior Scale: A hierarchical Model and Test of Construct Validity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(3), 416-436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594321003590549>
- Timothy A. (2015). *Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship: A Moderated Mediation Model of Perceived Leader Effectiveness and Exchange Ideology in Rwanda Falsebrubaker*. Regent University, Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Triver, G. (2009). *Servant Leadership's Effects on Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Argosy*. University/Seattle, Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Van, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., De Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Exploring the Differential Mechanisms Linking Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership to Follower Outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 544-562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014>
- Vondey, M. (2010). The relationships among Servant Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Person-Organization Fit, and Organizational Identification. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 3-27.
- Williams, L., & Anderson, S. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does Servant Leadership Foster Creativity and Innovation? a Multi-level Mediation Mstudy of Identification and Prototypically. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(7), 1395-1404. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.08.013>
- Zehir, C., Akyuz, B., Eren, M. S., & Turhan, G. (2013). The Indirect Effects of Servant Leadership Behavior on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job Performance: Organizational Justice as a Mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 2(3), 1-19.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).