



The Relationship between Servant leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Faculty Members

Mohamed Mostafa Mohamed Mostafa*

* Assistant Prof of Fundamentals of Education, Assuit University, Egypt

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between Servant leadership with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of staff members. Servant leadership: a leadership behavior that emphasizes personal growth of followers. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is an organizational construct that describes non-contractual behaviors of staff members that contributes to the success of the organization. The climate of a faculty is defined as the working environment as perceived by the staff members within faculty. The people-centered behaviors of a servant leader promote positive social reciprocal interactions between the members within the organization. These relationships in turn foster organizational citizenship behaviors within a faculty and provide an open/healthy faculty environment. This study utilized data gathered from 332 participants within a random sample of staff members in faculties (Science, Engineering, Arts, Education) at Assuit university, in the South of Egypt. Two reliable instruments were used in this study: Servant Leadership Survey (SLS), Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCB Scale). Results showed that faculties staff members' perceptions of Servant leadership were high. It was found also that there were relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Key words. Servant leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Faculty Members

Introduction

Recently, organizational citizenship behaviors became an important research focus on studies in educational organizations, as witnessed by the increase in the number of publications on the subject. Organizational citizenship behaviors include voluntary behaviors of employees without any official pressure (Organ, 1988).

Employees are not obliged to display such behaviors. Furthermore, they do not get punished when they do not display these behaviors. However, organizations might award such behaviors, because organizational citizenship behaviors make significant contributions, such as extra efforts by employees for successful task fulfillment, help and collaboration with others, reasonable organizational rule and procedure following, and maintenance, support and confirmation of organizational goals (Borman, 2004). The organizational citizenship behaviors of employees play an important role in analyzing and understanding individual attitudes and behaviors in organizations. In this context, the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and various variables has been widely studied. Servant leadership is such prominent variables. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study has been conducted to examine the effect of Servant leadership on the organizational citizenship behaviors of employees. This study aims to examine the effect.

Servant leadership

Greenleaf (1977) was the first to introduce the idea of servant leadership in the article "the servant as leaders". He proposed that a leader should see himself as a servant at first. Servant leadership can be broadly defined as a desire from leaders to motivate, guide, offer hope, and provide an experience by establishing a quality relationship with the followers and subordinates (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002).

Despite the universally acceptance to the definition of servant leadership, the servant-leadership construct has gained considerable popularity mainly over the past 50 years, as an evidence by a large number of practitioner-oriented, servant-leadership articles about this subject (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Dannhauser & Boshoff, 2007; Liden et al., 2008; Parolini, Patterson & Winston, 2009; Sun & Wang, 2009; Van Dierendonck, 2011).

Most of the studies have focused on how servant leadership influences work behavior, on the theoretical development, and measurement of the servant leadership construct (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Van Dierendonck, 2011, Ali, Syed & Arshad, 2013, Bright M., Amos S., 2014)

Servant leadership can be concisely defined by the slogan: “First to serve, then to lead” (Crippen, 2006). Sendjaya & Sarros (2002) pointed out the similar character of servant leadership: The motivational element of servant leadership (i.e. to serve first) portrays a fundamental presupposition which distinguishes the concept from other leadership thoughts. This presupposition forms the mental model of the servant leader that is “I serve” as opposed to “I lead mentality. The primary reason why leaders exist to serve first, not to lead first. To put it differently, the servant leader operates on the assumption that “I am the leader, therefore I serve” rather than “I am the leader, therefore I lead”.

However, the detail definition needs to be traced back to its origin and characteristics such as: “follower-centric, altruistic, moral/ethical and spiritual values” (Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). There are two main constructs of servant leadership .

(1) Ethical behavior

(2) Concern for subordinates (Ehrhart, 2004). Contee-Borders (2003) found that servant leaders are dedicated toward the growth and welfare of people.

Altruism, simplicity, and consciousness is a servant leader’s characteristic (Johnson, 2001). A servant leader has a moral differentiation from transformational leader in sacrifices and altruistic services toward followers high priority needs (Parolini, 2007).

Service appears to be a natural activity of the highly evolved persons who have come to a realization that too much ego and self-focus can stifle and eventually suffocate the best of human nature (Jacobsen, 1999). It is more than an urge to contribute to the progress and well-being of another fellow human being out of a sense of obligation or guilt or an appeal to the ego. It is simply a response to an increasing awareness that there is a genuine human need to give (Jacobsen, 1999), to help and to serve. In other words, the “true leadership emerges when one’s primary motivation is to help others” (Hughes et al., 2009).

Drawn from Greenleaf’s works, ten characteristics of a servant leader can be identified as follows: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others and building community (Crippen, 2006). With these attributes, the leader has moral authority to drive leadership practice. The leader is a “follower of ideas, minister of values, and servant to the staff membership (Sergiovanni, 2006)”. The patterns of behavior are typical of:

- . Having the desire to serve the organization and the members;
- . Using the position to reward good performance;
- . Creating an environment for staff members’ personal growth; and persuading rather than coercing.

To serve is an attitude as well as a choice. According to (Greenleaf ,1991), the servant leader is described as to be servant first and is different from those leaders who act as “leader” first. This is equally important to the servant leader who should be equipped with moral courage. As (Yukl, 2006) puts it, servant leaders stand against the social injustice and inequality, although it is not in the financial interest of the organization.

Moreover, servant leadership is effective in situations where there is mutual understanding and aligned efforts towards the realization of the shared goals or subordinates that are professionally mature and do not take advantage of such a leader who plays a low profile. (Hunter, 2004) names the servant leadership as "The most powerful leadership principle in the world."

Laub(1999) defined servant leadership in terms of six key characteristics: valuing and listening to people; building a collective community whilst displaying personal authenticity; and being able to share and provide leadership as appropriate. On the other hand, this definition is differentiated from other types of leadership in vision. Instead of the vision originating with the charismatic leader figure and being projected onto the followership, in servant leadership it is the leader who supports the vision enunciated by staff members.

Russell and Stone(2002) mentioned nine functional characteristics (vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, empowerment) and eleven additional characteristics of servant leadership. Finally, Patterson's (2003) model includes seven dimensions (agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, service).This study used three dimensions (humility- vision- service) from Patterson's (2003) model.

Patterson (2003), posited that "humility opens the door to vision, but not only vision; it also allows an environment of trust to exist". (Winston,2002) stated that humility is "a peaceful virtue that rejects self-glorification and is an almost social reversal in that it purports the idea of serving". Patterson referenced several authors who came to the conclusion that humility is a virtue which allows servant leaders to connect with their followers by not overestimating their own merits (see Bagger, 2002; Hare, 1996; Harrison, 2002; Lawrence, 2002). Sandage &Wiens(2001) also looked at humility as being focused on others which equates with the primary emphasis of the servant leader as a follower-focused leadership style.

Patterson (2003), stated, "vision for the servant leader refers to the idea that the leader can see a person as a viable and worthy person, believes in their future state, and thus seeks to serve them as such". Winston (2003), while suggesting that the term vision may be the wrong one to use in this context, explained its use by Patterson as the leader need "to find out what the follower wants to do with regard to meeting the follower's needs within the context of the organization".This is more of a concept of getting people in the organization aligned with the values of the organization.

The final dimension is service. Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999); Russell and Stone(2002); Buchen (1998); Wis (2002) and Guillen &Gonzalez (2001) have agreed that service is the core of servant leadership and should be a primary function of leadership. Patterson stated that "the very idea of service is at the heart of servant leadership theory and occurs as the leader serves others, mainly the followers".

Winston(2003) noted that this serving is out of a focus on serving rather than the sense of servitude or requirement to serve. This service by the servant leader is to provide the follower with what he or she needs to accomplish their tasks, visions, or goals.

Organizational Citizenship

The concept of organizational citizenship was first used in the literature by (Bateman and Organ, 1983). According to (Bateman and Organ ,1983), organization citizenship entails behaviors like helping colleagues solve job related problems; accepting orders without any resistance; performing unexpected tasks that pop up at inconvenient times without

complaining; keeping the working environment clean and tidy; talking positively about the business, organization, and managers when having conversations with people outside the organization; creating a work environment where conflicts and distractions are kept to be a minimum, and protecting organizational resources (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

In later studies, Organ (1988) defines organizational citizenship behaviors as those voluntary individual behaviors that are not specifically mentioned by the formal reward system of the organization, but without support the efficient functioning of the organization. Organ's (1988) definition is the one that has gained the most widespread acceptance in the literature, because it captures the essence of the concept of organizational citizenship by covering all voluntary behavior that are not officially sanctioned and not specifically ordered.

According to Organ (1988), organizational citizenship behaviors have three basic characteristics: (1) The behaviors in question are voluntary, (2) they are not directly or explicitly rewarded by the formal reward system of the organization, and (3) As a whole, they contribute to the effective functioning of the organization. To sum up, organizational citizenship behaviors are those behaviors that benefit the organization and that the employees willingly do without any expectation of formal rewards (Yılmaz & C- okluk-Bo" keog" lu, 2008).

Early conceptualizations about organizational citizenship (Smith et al., 1983) tended to study organizational citizenship behaviors under the two headings of "altruism" and "generalized compliance," whereas later studies (Organ, 1988) examined the concept under five separate headings: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. However, there does not seem to be match the literature on the definitions and sub dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors, and different studies (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Graham, 1991) provide different classifications. Still, Organ's (1988) classification, briefly explained in what follows, the one which is the most commonly used.

Altruism refers to all direct or indirect voluntary behaviors displayed by employees with the purpose of assisting colleges in organization-related Conscientiousness dimension involves what can be termed personal effort as well. Conscientiousness is the case when employees show extra effort exceeding what is expected of them to perform certain roles. It means going beyond what is required, and respecting and internalizing the rules of the organization.

Sportsmanship refers to avoid making complaints or expressing discontent when facing problems. It means to avoid displaying negative behaviors.

Courtesy is the case when the employee is in constant communication with people who are likely to be affected by his/her decisions and acts. It is about accepting responsibility and acting responsibly when working in cooperation with colleagues.

Civic virtue refers to taking an interest in what is going on within the organization, in new developments and new policies, and making an effort to improve oneself in these respects. Civic virtue is a measure of employee reactions that lead the organization management to take the right course of action.

Although organizational citizenship behaviors are being studied under these headings, some studies report encountering problems in trying to use these dimensions, failing to identify them as separate dimensions (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). In DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran's (2001) study, which is the first study applying the concept of organizational citizenship in the context of schools, these dimensions were not observed and the concept was treated as a one-dimension. DiPaola and Hoy (2005) attribute this to two factors: The first:

organizational citizenship behaviors have a specific content. The second: state-run faculties are very different from private sector faculties.

The present study also employs a one-dimensional perspective in examining organizational citizenship behaviors.

Aims of the study

This study examined the relationships between Servant leadership and the organizational citizenship behaviors of staff members. Specifically, the study has been conducted to examine the effect of Servant leadership on the organizational citizenship behaviors of staff members. It seeks to give answer to the following questions .

Q1. What are the views of the participants on Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors?

Q2. Is Servant leadership significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors?

Methods

A survey research methodology was employed in the study. A common goal of survey research is to collect data representative of a population. Survey research is a non-experimental, descriptive research method. Surveys can be useful when a researcher wants to collect data on phenomena that cannot be directly observed. Surveys are used extensively to assess attitudes and characteristics on a wide range of subjects.

Participants

participants were 332 staff members in faculties (science, Engineering, Arts, Education) at Assuit university, in the south of Egypt. A total of 410 staff members in these faculties are employed in Assuit University in the south of Egypt. Because of contacting all staff members who constitute the population of the study was not an issue, no sampling was used in the study, and the questionnaire was sent to all staff members who constitute the population. Among these, 382 (93%) were returned.

Scales that were not filled out in line with the instructions provided were also left out, which left 332 (80%) forms to be considered. Among the participants, 25% were female (n=83) and 75% were male (n=249). The age of the participants range from 24 to 54, and their professional experience range from 1 to 30 years. The study aimed to include staff members from different types of faculties (Science, Engineering, Arts, Education).

Tools

The data gathering instrument of the study was represented in the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005). The reliability of the scale is consistently high-range = .86 to .93 (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005).

The original scale for Organizational Citizenship Behavior consists of 12 Likert-type items. The total score is calculated by adding up the scores for individual items. In its original, the scale consists of a single strong dimension. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is $\alpha=0.88$. Items on the scale have the following response types: 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree. The higher the score received from the scale, the more positive Organizational Citizenship Behavior perception is. The scale contains statements such as “Speak in a positive way about the faculty in front of others,” and “Feel with satisfaction for belonging to the profession university teaching”.

The data gathering instrument of the study was represented in the Servant leadership Scale (Patterson, 2003). (Dennis and Winston, 2003) conducted a factor analysis of the SLP and developed a 23-item servant leadership scale that measures three servant leadership attributes of vision, service and humility. The reliability of the scale is consistently high-range = .82 to .92 (Dennis and Winston, 2003).

The original scale for Servant leadership consists of 15 Likert-type items. The total score is calculated by adding up the scores for individual items with the responses 1 – never to 5 – always. The scale consists of three dimensions: “service”, “vision” and “humility”.

The total score received by the respondents from this scale is a measure of their views concerning servant leadership in their faculties. In each factor, higher scores represent higher service, and lower scores represent lower service. Service from the leadership dimension consists of five items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for this dimension is $\alpha=0.73$.

The vision of Leadership dimension consists of five items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for this dimension is $\alpha=0.90$. The humility of Leadership dimension consists of five items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for this dimension is $\alpha=0.79$. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the whole scale is $\alpha=0.88$.

The scale consists of statements such as “My Leader is not seeking recognition or rewards in serving others,” (service); “My Leader's demeanor is one of humility (humility);” “My Leader has asked me what I think the future direction of our faculty should be” (vision).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to examine participants’ views on Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. To analyze the relationship between Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors, simple regression analysis was used. Similarly, to see Servant Leadership is significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior, simple regression analysis was used.

Regression analyze is generally used to predict a dependent variable (in this case, organizational citizenship behaviors) on the basis of independent variable (predictor variable, in this case Servant leadership).

Regression analysis allows inferences on the basis of the significance of the explained variance, and the direction of the relationship between predictor variable and the dependent variable. Because it fits the purposes of the present study better, a Simple regression analysis was used in the study. A correlation coefficient, as an absolute value, 0.70–1.00: high correlation, 0.69–0.30: moderate correlation, 0.29–0.00: low correlation.

Results

This section first presents the views of faculties' staff members on Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Then, it presents findings on whether and to what degree organizational citizenship behavior is predicted by Servant leadership.

Table 1. *Staff members' perceptions of Servant leadership*

Item	Percentage of perception					Mean	Std. dev.
	5	4	3	2	1		
X1	32.4	43.2	5.4	16.2	2.7	3.86	1.14
X2	18.9	48.6	18.9	2.7	10.8	3.62	1.16
X3	13.5	45.9	27	2.7	10.8	3.49	1.14
X4	13.5	48.6	21.6	8.1	8.1	3.51	1.1
X5	24.3	48.6	21.6	2.7	2.7	3.89	0.94
X6	29.7	51.4	16.2	2.7	0	4.05	0.86
X7	27	56.8	10.8	5.4	0	4.05	0.79
X8	24.3	51.4	18.9	2.7	2.7	3.92	0.9
X9	18.9	62.2	10.8	0	8.1	3.84	1.01
X10	24.3	56.8	13.5	2.7	2.7	3.97	0.89
X11	27	48.6	16.2	8.1	0	3.95	0.88
X12	8.1	40.5	35.1	8.1	8.1	3.32	1.03
X13	13.5	43.2	35.1	2.7	5.4	3.57	0.98
X14	13.5	45.9	18.9	18.9	2.7	3.49	1.04
X15	16.2	43.2	27	10.8	2.7	3.59	0.99

Staff members' perceptions of Servant leadership are high. The mean score received for this scale (M=3.74, S=0.99) is closest to the “I agree” response. The item most agreed upon by the participants was “my leader seeks to serve rather than be served” (M=4.05, S=0.86), and the item with the lowest level of agreement was ‘my leader is able to learn from subordinates whom he or she serves’ (M=3.32, S=1.04).

Table 2. *Staff members' perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior*

Item	Percentage of perception					Mean	Std. dev.
	5	4	3	2	1		
X16	29.7	64.9	5.4	0	0	4.24	0.55
X17	40.5	43.2	16.2	0	0	4.24	0.72
X18	40.5	40.5	16.2	0	2.7	4.16	0.90
X19	37.8	43.2	16.2	2.7	0	4.16	0.80
X20	35.1	51.4	8.1	2.7	2.7	4.14	0.89
X21	24.3	67.6	5.4	0	2.7	4.11	0.74
X22	45.9	48.6	5.4	0	0	4.41	0.60
X23	29.7	54.1	13.5	2.7	0	4.11	0.74
X24	18.9	48.6	13.5	13.5	5.4	3.62	1.11
X25	18.9	45.9	16.2	8.1	10.8	3.54	1.22
X26	13.5	29.7	21.6	16.2	18.9	3.03	1.34
X27	16.2	56.8	18.9	2.7	5.4	3.76	0.95
total	78.79		13.05		8.10	3.96	0.88

Staff members' perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior are high. The mean score received for this scale (M=3.96, S=0.88) is closest to the “I agree” response. The item most agreed upon by the participants was “you Feel Satisfied for your belongings to university teaching profession” (M=4.41, S=0.60), and the item with the lowest level of agreement was ‘Make suggestions to improve the academic performance’ (M=3.03, S=1.34).

The second purpose of the study was to find out Relationship between Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 3. The relationship between Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior

Servant leadership	Organizational Citizenship
Vision	0.47**
Service	0.52**
humility	0.45**
Total	0.54**

(**)Letters included refer to the significant predictor with level the spiritually virtual

Table 3 shows that Relationship between Servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. Positive, moderate level, and significant relationships were found to exist between organizational citizenship behavior on the one hand, and Servant leadership (r=0.54), serve (r=0.52), vision (r=0.47), and humility (r=0.45) on the other. The third purpose of the study analyzing the effect relations among the variables the results of tests will be presented as follows:

A-The relationship of the effect of servant leadership on the organizational behavior of citizenship on the overall level.

Table 4. The results of the effect servant leadership in the organizational citizenship behaviors on the overall level.

Dependent variable	Servant leadership			Value F calculated	the spiritually level
	B0	B1	R.²		
Organizational citizenship	2.44 (5.776)	.55 (3.884)	.30	14.40	.001

Table 4 shows that the dimensions of the Servant leadership as explanative variables which as whole affect together the organizational behavior of citizenship spiritually as responsive variable, and this is indicated by the value "f" which is calculated and reached (14.40), and the significance level of it was (0.05) the defining rate (R2) was (0.30) and which indicates that the change in the organizational behavior of citizenship is explained by the dimensions of the servant leadership by a rate (0.30).

Through following up the B factors and their testing, it was clear that B value was (0.55) and this shows that the increasing of the servant leadership for staff members at faculty administration by only are unit leads to the increasing of the organizational behavior of citizenship by a rate (0.55).

B- The effect relationship between the dimensions of the servant leadership on the organizational behavior of citizenship on the minor variables level.

Table 5 shows the effect of the dimensions of the servant relationship represented in (service-vision-modesty) as explanative variables on the organizational behavior of citizenship as a responsive variable at the faculties of study sample, and this is as follows:

Table 5. *The results of the effect of the dimensions of the servant relationship in the organizational citizenship behaviors*

	Servant leadership				R. ²	Value F calculated	The spiritually level
	B0	B1	B2	B3			
organizational citizenship	1.93	0.17 (.56)	0.40 (2.56) ^x	0.19 (0.64)	.38	6.09	0.002

Table 5 shows that there is a spiritual effect, for the leader's vision as explanative variable on the organizational behavior of citizenship as a responsive variable, as the value of B was (0.17) and it is a weak value but it indicates that there is a role for the leader's vision in fulfilling the organizational behavior of citizenship. it has a measure which is lower than the service of the leader and his humility. The spiritual effect of service on the organizational behavior of citizenship through (B) value was (0.40) and it is also a weak value but it has the highest effect on the organizational behavior of citizenship. This indicates the importance of service for staff members and upon which an amount of the organizational behavior of citizenship toward their faculties is resulted in. the table also shows. That there is a spiritual effect for humility on the behavior organizational behavior of citizenship, as the (B)value was (0.19) and it a weak value, while the faculties of study sample can seek to increase the humility and vision their leader for the sake of increasing the organizational behavior of citizenship, besides their loyalty toward faculties can be achieved. These three values can be supported and indicated by (F) its value which is calculated and reached (6.09), its level of significance (.002), and it less than the virtual spirituality level of study (0.05). Upon the previous results, the third question was answered.

Discussion

At this time this study is still the only one that examines the relationships between the constructs of servant leadership and OCB in faculty setting. Results of this study revealed a robust relationship between servant leadership and OCB ($r = .55, p < .01$). One possible explanation is that staff members believe that the servant leader principal is truly concerned for their individual well-being in addition to the well-being of the faculty. This perception may be a result of positive interactions between the principal and staff members. Staff members are keenly aware of the behaviors of a servant leader principal (Taylor, et al, 2007), therefore it may be argued that staff member OCB is affected by the behavior of the faculty principal. My study supports the findings of Taylor et al, (2007).

Cerit (2009) argued that the authenticity of a servant leader leads to more interactions between the servant leader and the followers. Both servant leadership and OCB share a foundation of altruism and a need to serve others. Many individuals choose the teaching profession not because of the financial compensation but rather to provide a needed service to students. Both servant leader principals and teachers strive to serve the needs of the faculty as well as those involved with the process.

Ehrhart (2004) found that interactions between a servant leader and a follower would cause the follower to emulate these interactions with others. This “trickle down” approach increases the collective OCB within the interaction. This was confirmed by Van Dierendock and Nuijten (2011) who opined that servant leaders influence the behaviors and attitudes of their followers which in turn may influence the behaviors and attitudes of their followers toward their leader.

According to Tschannen-Moran (2003), trust is an important factor in OCB. Previous studies (Joseph & Winston, 2005; Sendjaya & Perkerti, 2010) argue that servant leadership

results in higher levels in trust between leader and follower. Furthermore, it was found that as servant leader behaviors increased, the level of leader-follower trust increased (Sendjaya & Perkerti, 2010). While trust was not measured in this study the positive social reciprocity between the principal and teacher would build trust, which would in turn promote OCB.

Regression was used to explore the possible relationships between Servant Leadership and OCB. OCB was regressed onto the independent variable of Servant Leadership. Servant leadership had significant and positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior of the staff members and was the strongest predictor of citizenship behaviors of staff members as measured by the OCB Scale ($\beta = .54, p < .01$). The effect of the variable explained 30% (Adjusted $R^2 = .302$) for the variance for organizational citizenship behavior, as measured by the OCB Scale.

Conclusion

- The topic of the organizational citizenship behavior occupies a great interest by the researchers as it has a great effect on the school success and its continuity in establishing the competitive work as a result to the servant leadership of institution objectives.

- The servant leadership can not be imitated by others .The servant leadership has three dimensions (service-vision-humility) which contribute in establishing the organizational citizenship behavior and is reflected on the institution performance and its success.

-The results of the descriptive analysis of study variables are:

-The agreement of study sample points of view on the existence of the servant leadership.

-The agreement of the points of view of the individuals' points of view on the organizational citizenship behavior.

-The results of the correlation relationship between the servant leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior showed the following:

A-There is a spiritual correlative relation between the servant leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior on the overall level and on the level of the dimensions of the servant leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior.

B-There is a spiritual effect for the servant leadership on the overall level and on the level of its dimensions with every dimensions on its side in the organizational citizenship behavior.

-It is indicated from all the previous results that the servant leadership has the ability to predict the organizational citizenship behavior from the relation and effect. These results came a great to the presentation which the researcher mentioned about the servant leadership and its positive effect on enhancing the organizational citizenship behavior.

References

- Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D.W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organizational Management, 31*(3), 300–326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4),587–595.

- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *American Psychology Society*, 13(6), 238–241.
- Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5, 125.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviors of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 600–623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143209339650>
- Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar S. A. , & Zaheer A.(2013). Impact of Transformational and Servant Leadership on Organizational Performance: A Comparative Analysis, *Journal of Business Ethics*,2(116), 433-440
- Contee-Borders, A. K. (2003). *A case study defining servant leadership in the workplace*. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI No. 3069348.
- Crippen, C. (2006), “Servant-leadership”, *International Journal of Learning*, 13(1),13-18.
- Dannhauser, Z., & Boshoff, A.B. (2007). Structural equivalence of the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire on North American and South African samples. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2, 148–168.
- Dennis, R. and Winston, B.E. (2003), “A factor analysis of Page and Wong’s servant leadership instrument”, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(8), 455-9.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88, 35–44.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relation to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424–447.
- DiPaola, M. F., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational leadership and reform* (319–342). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*,57, 61–94.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(12), 49-72.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249–270.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, 25th anniversary edition. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1991), *The Servant as Leader*, The Robert K. Greenleaf Center, Indianapolis, IN.
- Guillen, M., & Gonzalez, T.F. (2001). The ethical dimension of managerial leadership two illustrative case studies in TQM. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 34, 175.
- Hare, S. (1996). The paradox of moral humility. *American Philosophical Quarterly*,33,235.

- Harrison, W. H. (2002). Prudence and custom: Revisiting Hooker on authority. *Anglican Theological Review*, 84, 897.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R. and Curphy, G. (2009). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*, 6th ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA, 187.
- Hunter, J.C. (2004), *World's Most Powerful Leadership Principle: How to be Become a Servant Leader*, Crown Publishing Group, Westminster, MD.
- Jacobs, G. A. (2006). *Servant leadership and follower commitment*. Proceedings of the 2006 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Retrieved April 7, 2007, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2006/gilbert.pdf.
- Jacobsen, M.E. (1999), *The Gifted Adult: A Revolutionary Guide for Liberating Everyday Genius*, Ballantine Books, New York, NY, 373-374.
- Johnson, C. (2001). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) instrument*. Doctoral dissertation, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Lawrence, L. J. (2002). "For truly, I tell you, they have received their reward" (Matt 6:2): Investigating honor precedence and honor virtue. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 64, 687.
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161–177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- Mahembe, B., & Engelbrecht, A.S. (2014). (The relationship between servant leadership, organisational citizenship behaviour and team effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde*, 40(1), Art. #1107, 10 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1107>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Canada: Lexington Books.
- Parolini, J. L. (2007). *Investigating the distinctions between transformational and servant leadership*. doctoral dissertation thesis, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Parolini, J., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2009). Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 30(3), 274–291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730910949544>
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, ATT 3082719), 16.
- Pekerti, A.A. and Sendjaya, S. (2010), "Exploring servant leadership across cultures: comparative study in Australia and Indonesia", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21 (5), 754-80.
- Russell RF, Stone AG. (2002). A review of servant-leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23:145–157. doi: 10.1108/01437730210424.
- Sandage, S. J., & Wiens, T. W. (2001). Contextualizing models of humility and forgiveness: A reply to Gassin. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29, 201.
- Sendjaya, S. and Sarros, J.C. (2002), "Servant leadership: charting its origin, development, and application in the organization", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9 (2), 57-64.

- Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as an antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(7), 643-663.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2006), *The Principal ship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*, 5th ed., Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Sun, J.M. & Wang, B. (2009). Servant leadership in China: Conceptualization and measurement. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 5, 321-344. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203\(2009\)0000005017](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203(2009)0000005017)
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship in schools: Transformational leadership and trust. In W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools*, 157-179. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant-leadership survey (SLS): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship' behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Winston, B. E. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies, 3.
- Wis, R. M. (2002). The conductor as servant leader. *Music Educators Journal*, 89, 17.
- Yılmaz, K., & Cokluk-Bokeoglu, O. (2008). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 3(5), 775-780.
- Yukl, G. (2006), *Leadership in Organizations*, 6th ed., Pearson, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Appendix A: SLQ (Servant Leadership Questionnaire)

Using a 5 point scale rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire Items:

Service

- My leader is not seeking recognition or rewards in serving others.
- My leader is willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others.
- My leader seeks to serve rather than be served.
- My leader is committed to the concept that leadership is more of responsibility than position.
- My leader is able to learn from subordinates whom he or she serves.

Vision

- My leader has sought my vision regarding the faculty's vision
- My leader has shown that he or she wants to include employees' vision into the firm's goals and objectives

- My leader seeks my commitment concerning the shared vision of our faculty
- My leader has asked me what I think the future direction of our faculty should be
- My leader and I have written a clear and concise vision statement for our faculty

Humility

- My leader does not overestimate her or his merits
- My leader is not interested in self-glorification
- My leader is humble enough to consult others in the faculty when he or she may not have all the answers
- My leader does not center attention on his or her own accomplishments
- My leader's demeanor is one of humility

Appendix B: OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire)

- Speak in a positive way about the faculty in front of others.
- Be discipline to rules and procedures of university work.
- Feel with satisfaction for belonging to the profession university teaching.
- Encourages your colleagues not to be absent from university work except if it is necessary.
- Present suggestions to improve university performance.
- Keep on the public prosperities of your faculty.
- Help your colleagues at their university work.
- Present direction and care for the new staff members at faculty.
- Develop within your colleagues love and brotherhood between one another and university society.
- Accept changes at university work with a good way.
- Do not follow mistakes of your colleagues during work.