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The Mediating Effects of Ethical Climate on the Relationship between Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

This study examined the relationship between servant leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as mediated by ethical climate. One hundred and twenty-three leader-follower dyads participated in a survey conducted in eight of the top 45 high-performing firms listed in the Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX). Competing model analyses using structural equation modelling (SEM) suggested that individuals’ perceptions of ethical climate mediated the influence servant leaders have on followers’ citizenship behaviour. Another contribution the study makes is evidence that servant leadership is applicable in a collectivistic context. The study implications and future research directions are discussed in the concluding part of the paper.
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Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), also called extra-role behaviour by leadership scholars (e.g., Van Dyne & LePine 1998), is defined as behaviours that are performed voluntarily and not related to employees’ formal jobs, yet contribute to a more effective running of organisation (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie 2006). Some empirical research has reported that citizenship behaviour has positive correlations with leadership (Gelfand, Erez & Aycan 2007) and organisational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie 1994).

Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) argued that the understanding of citizenship behaviour varies among people and is subjective in nature. Certain behaviours associated with extra-role behaviour in one context might be considered as in-role behaviour in other contexts. Despite substantial studies in the United States (US) context, studies of citizenship behaviour in cultures outside the US are limited (Lievens & Anseel 2004). This is an important oversight, as calls for OCB studies in specific cultures, particularly in Asia, South America, and other developing countries highly recommend such research (Tsui, Nifadkar & Ou 2007) in order to expand current understanding and knowledge of the role of contextual factors on OCB (Gelfand et al. 2007).

The study had two aims. First, to test whether servant leadership behaviour and ethical climate are able to predict employees’ citizenship behaviour. More specifically, the current study hypothesises a mediating role for ethical work climate in the link between servant leadership and OCB. Second, to
investigate whether servant leadership is implicitly applicable in non-Western contexts, particularly in a collectivistic culture.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Culture of Indonesia

With an estimated total population of over 240 million people, Indonesia is noted as the fourth largest populated country in the world after China, India, and the United States and a country with diverse ethnic groups. According to the major census in 2000, the major ethnic groups were recorded as Javanese (40.6%) and Sundanese (15%), which both live predominantly in Java Island, followed by Madurese (3.3%), Minangkabau (2.7%), Betawi (2.4%), and many other ethnics. Pekerti and Sendjaya (2010) argued that due to the multi-ethnic background of Indonesia, it is difficult to describe the absolute self-identity of what it means to be Indonesian. However, since over 50% of Indonesia’s population are people from Java and Sunda backgrounds, both cultures clearly influence the culture of Indonesia. For example, the culture of pursuing and maintaining harmonious relationship with others, called rukun, is an important value in this society (Noesjirwan 1978), thus influencing the cultural orientation of Indonesia (Pekerti & Sendjaya 2010). For the sake of rukun, people may be expected to ‘sacrifice’ their personal interests for the interests of group or society. Magnis-Suseno (1997) also found other key Javanese and Sundanese cultural values that influence the Indonesian culture including politeness, societal ranks, and group conformity. These salient cultural values confirm Indonesia as a collectivistic society which also promotes power distance, a group and family orientation, and a humane orientation.

That Indonesia is a collectivistic society with high power distance was confirmed in the Global Leadership and Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) Study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta 2004). In a high power distance culture, the relationship between leaders and followers is distant and organisations are usually managed through a highly hierarchical structure (Offermann & Hellmann 1997). GLOBE’s findings also reported that Indonesians had a strong spirit of togetherness.
and high orientation towards others (Gupta, Surie, Javidan & Chhokar et al. 2002), and hence in this culture citizenship behaviour may be anticipated to be visible and prevalent.

**Servant Leadership, Ethical Climate, and Citizenship Behaviour**

The initial concept of OCB was introduced by Organ (1988). The concept, nevertheless, has been formulated by many scholars (e.g., Farh et al. 1997; MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter 1991; Moorman & Blakely 1995; Van Dyne, Graham & Diener 1994; Van Dyne & LePine 1998; Van Scotter & Motowidlo 1996; Williams & Anderson 1991). Citizenship behaviour is defined as ‘individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of organisation’ (Organ et al. 2006: 3). Common citizenship behaviours include altruism (or helping behaviour), civic virtue, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and courtesy (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter 1990).

Previous research, which is now widely accepted, indicates that Organ’s (1988) OCB taxonomy can be distinguished into OCB Individuals (OCBI) and OCB Organisation (OCBO) (Williams & Anderson 1991). OCBI is individuals’ extra-role behaviour toward others members in the organisation such as altruistic and courtesy behaviour. On the other hand, OCBO is individuals’ discretionary behaviour that supports organisational interests, and comprises behavioural dimensions such as sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and courtesy (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac & Woehr 2007).

The concept of servant leadership (Greenleaf 1977) has currently drawn attention from leadership scholars (Sendjaya & Sarros 2002; Stone, Russell & Patterson 2004). According to Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santtora (2008), servant leadership behaviour is commonly reflected in voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. Servant leadership introduces a spirit of serving others by putting the needs of followers as the top priority. Servant leadership promotes acts of serving others, involvement of organisational members in decision-making processes, more sensible concern toward community well-being and empowerment of members’ potential (Spears 2004). In servant-led organisations,
leaders focus not only on their own interests, but, more than that, on the interests of their followers. To attain this mission, servant leaders genuinely become ‘servants’ to others (Sendjaya & Sarros 2002).

Servant leaders build personal relationships with their followers in which personal persuasion and leading-by-example work as dominant approaches (Spears 2004). In addition, servant leaders contribute to establishing ‘a culture of serving others, both within and outside the organisation’ (Liden, Wayne, Zhao & Henderson 2008: 17). Since the key tenets of serve-first, serve community and encourage employees to display service are distinctive features of servant leaders (Liden et al. 2008), the practice of ‘serving others’ can be prevalent in meaningful relationships among leaders and followers. Both leaders and followers take initiatives to serve others, and this is much in line with the notion of extra-role behaviour.

Meanwhile, organisational ethics has been highly recommended as a key element of contemporary organisations. This also corresponds to studies reporting that an ethical environment is needed to support organisational performance (Victor & Cullen 1988), and the ethical behaviours of organisational members contribute to business profitability (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl & Baumhart 2003).

Victor and Cullen (1988) reported that an employee’s ethical behaviours are influenced by the organisation. Other factors that may affect ethical behaviour include personal characteristics, situational factors, organisational factors, industry factors (Ford & Richardson 1994; Fritzsche 1995), and individual values (Giacalone, Jurkiewicz & Deckop 2008). Furthermore, Arnaud (2006) concluded that ethical environment within an organisation is a critical factor affecting employees’ ethical behaviour. More specifically, Leung (2008) found that climate regarding ethics, particularly benevolent and individual dimensions of the climate fostered citizenship behaviour. This study therefore proposes the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1: Servant leadership will be positively related to the ethical climate within an organisation.

Hypothesis 2: Servant leadership will be positively related to followers’ OCB directed toward individuals (OCBI) and the organisation (OCBO).

Hypothesis 3: Ethical climate will be positively related to followers’ OCB directed toward individuals (OCBI) and the organisation (OCBO).

The Mediating Role of Ethical Climate

The mediating effect of perceived climate regarding ethics in the servant leadership-citizenship behaviour relationship is based on our understanding that a climate which proactively fosters an ethical environment may transmit the influence servant leaders have on their followers’ behaviour and performance. According to Ciulla (1995, 2005), good leaders should be both effective and ethical. This is to say that leaders being productive and efficient alone is insufficient. Leaders also need to deeply value ethical principles and practice them in their actions and decisions. In particular, she argued that both transformational and servant leadership theories emphasize the importance of ethics in leadership directly or indirectly. Theoretically, transformational leaders increase followers’ level of morality, and support moral climate within the organisation. However, transformational leaders may employ ethically ambiguous means in their efforts to achieve organisational goals. In fact, transformational leaders may abuse their power to compromise ethical standards and manipulate followers for the sake of organisational success (Whetstone 2002).

Unlike transformational leadership, servant leadership is proposed as a leadership style that has more promise for increasing ethical practices in organisations (Giampetro-Meyer, Brown, Brown & Kubasek 1998). The acts of servant leaders are driven by ethically sound principles that benefit not only the organisation, but also followers. More specifically, ethical behaviours are highly endorsed and applied by servant leaders in day-to-day organisational practices. Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) added that servant leadership distinguishes itself from widely known
transformational leadership in two ways: (1) its sensitivity to the needs and welfare of stakeholders within an organisation and the outside community and (2) its strong engagement with moral reasoning.

In servant-led organisations, leaders also place a strong emphasis on their followers’ well-being (Graham 1991; Smith et al. 2004). Additionally, Sendjaya et al. (2008: 403) argued that ‘Unlike transformational leadership whose primary concern is “performance beyond expectations”, the *sine qua non* of servant leadership is followers’ holistic moral and ethical development’. Graham (1991: 116) also emphasized that ‘Servant-leadership takes a further step because it encourages followers not only in intellectual and skill development, but also enhances moral capacity reasoning’. Given that servant leadership is highly recognized for its emphasis on moral reasoning and ethics, a climate that values ethical principles highly may transmit the transforming influence of servant leaders on employees’ citizenship behaviour. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 4: Ethical climate will partially mediate the relationship between servant leadership and followers’ OCB directed toward individuals (OCBI) and the organisation (OCBO).*

**METHODS**

**Sample and Procedure**

The sample for the study comprised employees and managers working in eight highly-performing firms from telecommunications, banking and financial services, mining, and manufacturing sectors. All eight firms are part of the *LQ45 Companies*, a register of the top 45 top-performing companies listed in the Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX) as measured by their outstanding financial performance and corporate governance. Each of these firms employs more than 10,000 employees. After gaining permission from each respective director, we distributed questionnaires with the assistance of their human resources division. A classic back-to-back translation (Brislin 1980) was employed to translate the original measures into *Bahasa* (Indonesian language) for the purpose of
meaning equivalence. We also inserted a cover letter explaining the purpose of our study. In summary, we received complete responses of 123 supervisor–subordinate dyads who worked in the same work-unit. Participants’ confidentiality was assured.

Measures

For our study, we used the following measures.

**Servant leadership.** We used the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale (SLBS; Sendjaya et al. 2008) to evaluate employees’ perceptions on their supervisors’ leadership behaviour. The measure uses a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The internal consistencies of the six dimensions were as follows: Voluntary subordination ($\alpha = .84$), authentic self ($\alpha = .77$), covenantal relationship ($\alpha = .72$), responsible morality ($\alpha = .84$), transcendental spirituality ($\alpha = .75$), and transforming influence ($\alpha = .83$).

**Ethical climate.** The Ethical Climate Questionnaire (ECQ; Victor & Cullen 1988) was used to identify employees’ perceptions of ethical work climate. This measure is the most widely used instrument for measuring ethical climate, and has a 6-point scale (0 = completely false, 5 = completely true). Internal reliability of the five dimensions was as follows: Law and code ($\alpha = .78$), rules ($\alpha = .70$), caring ($\alpha = .60$), independence ($\alpha = .61$), and instrumentality ($\alpha = .62$).

**Citizenship behaviour.** We used the OCB measure developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990), perhaps the most often used in the literature. Supervisors were asked to rate their followers’ citizenship behaviour on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly agree”). The alpha reliability for the subscales are as follows: Conscientiousness (.69), civic virtue (.60), courtesy (.75), altruism (.73), and sportsmanship (.73).

Data Analysis

To test our hypothesised model, we followed Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two-step process of analysis. In the first step, we tested the distinctiveness of measures by testing the measurement
models. We conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for testing the construct distinctiveness of servant leadership, ethical climate, OCBI, and OCBO. We also compared our baseline (or primary) model with other competing models. In the second step, we used structural equation modelling (SEM) to evaluate the structural model. We followed Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang and Chen’s (2005) procedures to test our hypothesised model. Against our baseline model, we also developed and tested other alternative models. Both the first and second steps were conducted with AMOS 17 (Arbuckle 2008).

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

The CFA results are displayed in Table 1. Our baseline model, i.e. four-factor model, provided a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 151.74; df = 83; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .93$). We also tested two alternative models. In Model 1, a three-factor model, we merged OCBI and OCBO into one factor ($\chi^2 = 181.25; df = 86; RMSEA = .09; CFI = .92; TLI = .90$). For Model 2, also a three-factor model, we loaded servant leadership and ethical climate into a single factor ($\chi^2 = 253.56; df = 86; RMSEA = .13; CFI = .86; TLI = .83$). Both Model 1 and 2 were poorer than the baseline model. On the basis of the change in $\chi^2$ value and fitness index, the results indicated that our baseline model was satisfactory and acceptable, suggesting that our hypothesised four factor model was appropriate.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations of each measure. Servant leadership was rated relatively high by subordinates (Mean = 3.73). In general, the participants perceived that ethical work climate was relatively moderate (Mean = 3.80). Regarding the two types of citizenship behaviour, OCBI was rated high by supervisors (Mean = 5.70), while OCBO was lower (Mean = 4.63). Additionally, servant leadership correlated significantly with ethical climate ($r = .19, p < .05$), OCBI ($r = .41, p < .01$), and OCBO ($r = .24, p < .01$). Ethical climate also correlated significantly with OCBI ($r = .28 (p < .01$), but no significant correlation with OCBO was found ($r = .16, n.s.$).
Hypothesis Tests

The results of the univariate correlations among latent variables provided preliminary support to Hypothesis 1, 2 and 3 (see Table 2). Servant leadership had a significant correlation with ethical climate ($r = .19, p = < .05$), and thus provided good support for Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2, which predicted a positive relationship ($p = < .01$) between servant leadership and OCBI and OCBO ($r = .41$ and .24, respectively), was supported. Hypothesis 3 was also partially supported as climate regarding ethics was positively correlated with OCBI ($r = .28, p = < .01$), but not with OCBO ($r = .16, n.s.$).

Table 3 presents comparison of various competing models. Hypothesis 4, which tested the partial mediating role of ethical work climate in the relationship between servant leadership, OCBI, and OCBO, was supported. Our baseline model, Model 1, supported our hypothesised mediating effect of ethical climate. In this primary model, we drew paths from servant leadership to ethical climate, and from ethical climate to OCBI and OCBO. As there were no paths from servant leadership to ethical climate, OCBI, and OCBO, this is a full mediation model. Results revealed this model fit the data satisfactorily ($\chi^2 = 176.92; df = 97; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .92$). Against Model 1, we also developed other nested models. Model 2 was identical with the baseline model except we added one direct path from servant leadership to OCBI ($\chi^2 = 171.72; df = 96; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .92$). In Model 3, we added a single path from servant leadership to OCBO ($\chi^2 = 176.26; df = 96; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .94; TLI = .92$). Finally, for Model 4, we specified two direct paths from servant leadership to OCBI and OCBO ($\chi^2 = 160.08; df = 95; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .95; TLI = .93$). When we compared the value of $\chi^2$ between baseline model and full model i.e., Model 4, we identified significant difference ($\chi^2 = 16.84; df = 2$). The results therefore suggested that Model 4 best fit our data indicating that ethical climate partially mediated the relationship between servant leadership and both OCBI and OCBO.

We also tested other alternative models by changing the order of the constructs, following the recommendations of Wang et al. (2005). These models were not nested within previous models. In Model 5, we tested whether servant leadership mediated the relationship between ethical climate and
both OCBI and OCBO. The result was satisfactory ($\chi^2 = 168.62; df = 97; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{CFI} = .94; \text{TLI} = .93$). However, this model was not our point of interest and might have little support from current theories. For Model 6 and 7, we merged OCBI and OCBO into one factor and both served as predictors. More specifically, in Model 6, we modelled the influence of both OCBI and OCBO on ethical climate with servant leadership as mediator. Although all fit indexes for Model 6 were reasonably good ($\chi^2 = 168.62; df = 97; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{CFI} = .94; \text{TLI} = .93$), the path between servant leadership and OCBO was not significant. When we modelled Model 7, in which ethical climate mediated the relationship among OCBI, OCBO, and servant leadership, the model fit the data poorly ($\chi^2 = 176.20; df = 97; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{CFI} = .94; \text{TLI} = .92$). This model, nevertheless, failed to produce a significant regression coefficient between ethical climate and OCBO. Finally, Model 8, which linked servant leadership and ethical climate (was combined into one factor) and OCBI and OCBO (was also merged into one factor) fit the data even more poorly ($\chi^2 = 237.12; df = 96; \text{RMSEA} = .11; \text{CFI} = .89; \text{TLI} = .86$). Moreover, in this model, the two paths from servant leadership to OCBI and OCBO were found to be non-significant. In conclusion, Hypothesis 4, which predicted a partial mediating role for perceived climate regarding ethics in the relationship between servant leadership and citizenship behaviour, received firm support.

As shown in the full model in Figure 1, the regression coefficient of the path from servant leadership to ethical climate was significant ($\beta = .25, p = < .05$). The coefficients of the two paths from ethical climate to OCBI ($\beta = .32, p = < .01$) and OCBO ($\beta = .21, p = < .05$) were also significant. We also regressed two paths from servant leadership to OCBI and OCBO, and found that they were also significant ($p = < .001$) with $\beta = .40$ and $\beta = .31$ respectively.

**DISCUSSION**

Our study examined the mediating role of organizational ethical climate on the relationship between servant leadership and citizenship behaviour. As we expected, the study confirmed that servant leadership and ethical climate positively correlate with employee citizenship behaviour, both OCBI and OCBO, which confirmed previous studies (Ehrhart 2004; Liden et al. 2008; Walumbawa, Hartnell...
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& Oke 2010). This is theoretically consistent as in their efforts to consider followers’ needs and interests beyond their own, servant leaders engage in serving behaviour toward their followers, inspiring followers to imitate these acts. As a result, it is likely that citizenship behaviour may permeate the workplace.

In addition, our study confirmed the positive influence of servant leaders on the ethical climate in an organisation. This was predicted because, as we discussed earlier, servant leadership endorses moral responsibility and ethical actions to be applied in organisation (Graham 1991; Sendjaya & Sarros 2002). A climate concerning the importance of ethical principles and behaviour encourages individuals to think and act beyond themselves. More importantly, in such a climate, people start to consider acts which benefit other people and the organisation. For example, if the corporate climate endorses the importance of the value of obeying company rules or policies, employees are likely to be more mindful of how their behaviour may affect other co-workers (courtesy behaviour), or employees may tend to avoid taking extra breaks (conscientiousness behaviour). This finding is congruent with research findings showing that ethical climate positively impacts employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviour (Leung, 2007).

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The study has several implications. First, our findings implied the applicability of servant leadership in another context, in this case, a collectivistic culture. House and Aditya (1997) argued that effective leadership is determined by the cultural norms in which leaders take up their leadership role. For instance, studies found that paternalistic leadership (see Pellegrini & Scandura 2006 for further explanation of the concept) better fit collectivist cultures such as Asian, Middle-Eastern, and Latin American cultures (Lee 2001; Low 2006; Martinez & Dorfman 1998; Pellegrini & Scandura 2006; Shahin & Wright 2004; Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen & Wakabayashi 1990). Corroborating previous studies finding that servant leadership is practised among leaders in Australia and Indonesia (Pekerti and Sendjaya 2010) as well as in the United States and Ghana (Hale & Fields 2007), our findings confirm it also fits with the Indonesian culture. Hence, organisations operating in a collectivist
culture have strong assurance to adopt servant leadership behaviour for higher employee performance. This might also imply that servant leadership is likely to be a universal leadership style applicable in various contexts, much like transformational leadership (e.g., Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Rich 2001; Schlechter & Engelbrecht 2006). Second, our findings suggest that in order to foster citizenship behaviour among organisational members, it is important for leaders to apply, model, and encourage servant leadership at all levels through formal and informal means such as leadership development and mentoring programs.

Limitations and Future Research

This study clearly has some limitations. First, the sample of the study (e.g., 123 matched supervisor–follower dyads) may potentially be a noted limitation as it was generated from only leading firms, which may hinder the generalizability of the findings. However, it is also important to note that our sample was from eight different companies and diverse sectors. Second, we realise that the constructs of servant leadership, ethical climate, and citizenship behaviour are individuals’ perceptions and thus may be misinterpreted by respondents. To reduce this inherent limitation, we used different sources in the study. We asked followers about their supervisors’ leadership behaviour, whereas supervisors rated their subordinates’ performance, i.e., citizenship behaviour. We believe future research should address these relationships using a larger sample size involving other non top-performing companies to participate in future studies. Testing the multi-level effects of servant leadership, ethical climate, and citizenship behaviour is also highly recommended as individual behaviour can be viewed as a multi-level phenomenon (Redman & Snape 2005).

As we used a sample from a collectivist culture, future research should be extended into other cultures before solid conclusions can be drawn. We also agree with the suggestion provided by Walumbwa and his colleagues (2010) that it is worthwhile for future studies to consider cultural aspects in the relationship between servant leadership and citizenship behaviour. Morrison (1994) argued that people in different cultures may perceive citizenship behaviour differently. Including pertinent cultural dimensions such as power distance, individualism – collectivism, performance orientation, or
humane orientation (Hofstede 2001; House et al. 2004) to the current model as moderators may provide great insight and more complete explanations about the links among servant leadership, ethical climate, and citizenship behaviour.
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### TABLE AND FIGURE

#### TABLE 1: Comparison of Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline model (Four factors)</td>
<td>151.74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Three factors: OCB Individuals and OCB Organisation were merged into one factor)</td>
<td>181.25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29.51**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 (Three factors: Servant Leadership and Ethical Climate were merged into one factor)</td>
<td>253.56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101.82**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p = .01$**
### TABLE 2: Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Servant Leadership</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethical Climate</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCB Individuals</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OCB Organisation</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a n = 123 matched supervisors – subordinates dyads; measures’ reliability coefficients are in parentheses along the diagonal.

*p = < .05

**p = < .01
### TABLE 3: Comparison of Structural Equation Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models and Structure</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Baseline): SL $\rightarrow$ EC $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>176.92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: SL $\rightarrow$ EC $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO and SL $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>171.72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: SL $\rightarrow$ EC $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO and SL $\rightarrow$ OCBO</td>
<td>176.26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4: SL $\rightarrow$ EC $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO and SL $\rightarrow$ OCBO + OCBO</td>
<td>160.08</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.84&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5: EC $\rightarrow$ SL $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO</td>
<td>168.82</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6: OCBI + OCBO $\rightarrow$ SL $\rightarrow$ EC</td>
<td>168.62</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7: OCBI + OCBO $\rightarrow$ EC $\rightarrow$ SL</td>
<td>176.20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 8: SL + EC $\rightarrow$ OCBI + OCBO</td>
<td>237.12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>SL: Servant Leadership; EC: Ethical Climate; OCBI: OCB Individuals; OCBO: OCB Organisation

<sup>b</sup>Baseline model

<sup>*</sup>$p = .05$

<sup>**</sup>$p = .01$
FIGURE 1: Results on Mediating Effects of Ethical Climate

- Servant Leadership → Ethical Climate: \(r = .25^*\)
- Ethical Climate → OCB Individuals: \(r = .40^{***}\)
- Ethical Climate → OCB Organisation: \(r = .31^{***}\)
- Servant Leadership → OCB Organisation: \(r = .32^{**}\)
- OCB Individuals → OCB Organisation: \(r = .21^*\)

*p = < .05
**p = < .01
***p = < .001