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Chanakan Chavaha¹, Nutnapha Lekhawichit², Krisada Chienwattanasook³*, Kittisak Jermsittiparsert⁴,⁵,⁶

Abstract: The main purpose of the study is to explore the nexus between the Servant leadership and organizational citizenship. In addition to that the study has examined the mediating role of psychological ownership in the relationship between the servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. For present study, 65% response rate was obtained. For analyzing the research hypothesis, we started by performing the validities and reliability tests. For this purpose, we estimated the measurement and the structural models using Smart PLS 3.1.2 software. The findings of this research have indicated and shown that the physiological ownership mediates the relationship between the recommendation and mediation for analyzing other moderators in the light of OCB which would be further improved significantly. Organizational citizenship behavior could take part in the firm’s success through promoting better use of scarce resources, enhancing co-worker and managerial productivity, reducing variability of performance, strengthening the organization’s capability to attract and retain better workers, enabling better adaptation to environmental changes and improving coordination.
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1. Background

Organizational effectiveness is one of the significant topic of research between organizational practitioners and theorist. One of the good system for gaining organizational effectiveness is by the support of workers that develops willingness among them to conduct their job beyond their particular responsibilities and routine activities regarding their job, which is known as discretionary behaviors or extra-role (Ozyilmaz, Erdogan, & Karaeminogullari, 2018). Numerous researches that have been conducted on the behavior of employee’s discretionary work indicates the significance of this concept for acquiring the success among firms. In the earlier research various construct about the behaviors of discretionary employee work has
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been presented, for instance extra role behavior, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), pro-social organizational behavior and the contextual performance. Ozyilmaz et al. (2018) described the concept of OCB which gained much attention than the various constructs of discretionary employee behaviors.

The behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) that are not essential to put in the execution for workers, but rather it is useful for goal attainment and for the organization’s effectiveness (Ozyilmaz et al., 2018; Aeknarajindawat & Jermsittiparsert, 2020). On the other hand, Ozyilmaz et al. (2018) described the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as a behavior which is actually discretionary, indirect or explicitly identified through the system of formal reward, and in the aggregate encourages the effective operations of the firm”.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are generally conducted by the workers for the firm’s motivation although they might not lead towards the worker’s benefits directly. Although, Ozyilmaz et al. (2018) recognized that OCB might have a cumulative impact along with advantages for a single worker and that single worker would be seeking for long-term advantages. The workers OCB supports firms indirectly or directly. Direct organizational advantages consists of employee’s punctuality, volunteerism, active participation in organizational affairs, unusual employee attendance to an important meeting and the assistance among co-workers. According to Thakre and Mayekar (2016), indirect advantages such as lubricating the social machinery of the firm. Azmi, Desai, and Jayakrishnan (2016) also claimed that for strong organizational social systems the discretionary behavior is very important. The researcher highlighted that firm attain a minor unplanned act of selfless sensitivity, unrewarded contribution, cooperation through a measure of systemic resilience.

Workers showed OCBs in different conditions. Workers revealed OCBs when they want to support their co-workers who had face issues while conducting their duties; the situation when they showed perseverance and endurance while conducting their responsibilities regarding their works; when they spend more time while attaining their goals; when they avoid doing or saying things that fade the reputation of their firm; when they show extra concern about success of their companies and when they perform in their job beyond requirements (Ozyilmaz et al., 2018).

The above conditions showed that OCB may possibly support in various methods to enhance the performance of the organization. Kandeepan (2016) examined that OCB has the capability to improve performance of a firm by increasing efficiency, through lubricating the social machinery of the firm and reducing friction. The study represents that OCB might be a significant resource to enhance the firm’s performance in difficult conditions of job which demands team oriented job activities (Putri, 2019).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is considered as one of the behavior which have an extra-role that has been getting huge amount of research work and the firms who are successful they motivate the workers to perform beyond the general work responsibilities (Putri, 2019). One of the important variables that generate an impact on the worker’s OCB is Leadership style. The importance of leadership styles that have gained empirical attention
related to OCB for many years includes charismatic leadership, transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Putri, 2019; Sechudi & Olivier, 2016).

Very few numbers of research have referred the impact on OCB by the servant leadership regardless of its significant role in current business companies (Tripathi & Kohli, 2017). The researchers defined the servant leadership as a leadership style that ranks the interests of followers beyond the personal interest of leader. According to a research that has developed a concept regarding servant leadership according to which it might be extra beneficial for organizational citizenship behaviors because it offers emphasis on authentic leadership, follower development, shared leadership and community building (Cunningham, 2019). The top parameter of servant leadership is that the followers are more possibly like servants themselves. Setyaningrum (2017) claimed that the main aim of servant leader’s impact is not to instruct other fellows but somewhat stewardship by the followers themselves, to facilitate service and offer motivation. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as the follower’s service to others and the maintenance of firm’s capitals could be developed in this behavior.

Among the previous researches that have been carried out the noticeable research in which it has been tried to examine the impact on OCB by the servant leadership (Tripathi & Kohli, 2017). The researcher claimed that servant leadership is indirectly effect by OCB, specially their conscientiousness and helping behavior. In addition to this, Setyaningrum (2017) claimed the impact of moderators such as commitment to the supervisors, procedural justice climate, service climate and self-efficacy on the association among organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and servant leadership.

The findings of this research has indicated and shown that the PHYSO mediates the relationship between the recommendation and mediation for analyzing other moderators in the light of OCB which would be further improved significantly. Other various research reported by the researcher Setyaningrum (2017) who presented that OCB significantly and partially correlated with the servant leadership. However, despite the latest research work on OCB and servant leadership still there are certain limitations in thus research, therefore further research is required for better knowledge and recognition of link and endorse more about the vital association among the OCB and servant leadership through study about their link in a various perspectives.

2. Hypothesis Development

In certain research work the scholars had investigated association among the OCB and servant leadership (Amir, 2019; Chiniara & Bentein, 2018; Muhdar, 2018; Newman, Schwarz, & Cooper, 2017; Yang, Liu, & Gu, 2017). Newman et al. (2017) was the first researcher who researched about the relationship among OCB and servant leadership with a sample data of 298 USA workers of a grocery departmental stores. He had examined a framework in which the context regarding procedural justice climate which was postulated as a moderator among the OCB and servant leadership. The researcher pointed out about the indirect link which is significant among the OCB and servant leadership in which the procedural justice climate act as a mediating effect.
Chiniara and Bentein (2018) also investigated about the relationship between the servant leadership and OCB, through which it was determined that regulatory focus had a mediating effects and the research was carried out through the data collected from 229 full time US employees such as accountants, underwriters, and loan and first-grade teachers. The researchers were investigated about two styles of leadership that included servant leadership and initiating structure and in the presence of positives regulatory focus that effects the link on OCB by the servant leadership. Moreover, the findings described the important differential influences on OCB, the effects on servant leadership support and develop the behaviors further than the initiating structure.

Chiniara and Bentein (2018) presented more evidences from earlier research work regarding the linkage among employee citizenship behaviors and servant leadership, the relationship has been studied by the researcher using a data of sample 298 USA students from a Midwestern university. They presented that at a single level servant leadership develops unique support additionally to the LMX and transformational leadership during discussion regarding the community citizenship behaviors. Staats (2016) claimed that there is difference among LMX, servant leadership and transformational leadership.

Servant leadership exclusively described the organizational commitment, community citizenship and in-role performance, it recommended that this type of leadership shows an important concern which is in favor of wide firm constituencies and the wide-range of community. The work done by Chiniara and Bentein (2018) has a significance since he explained the relationship among OCB and leadership after the research study between 815 workers of seven multinational organizations in Kenya.

According to the researchers who have investigated the degree at which workers attitudes such as self-efficacy, affective commitment to the supervisor and the two particular kinds of climates such as service climate and procedural justice climate, these climates act as a moderator among OCB and servant leadership. The findings represented the contribution of significantly positive and indirect effect on OCB by the servant leadership.

Researcher showed an important support in the earlier research through representing the capability of servant leadership and its guaranteed effects on the service climate, supervisor, procedural justice climate and self-efficacy who in return encourage the worker OCBs. Therefore, the research as previous researches have limitations regarding the relationship among servant leadership and OCB. One of the drawback regarding the limited generalization such as all the data collected were from the multinational organizations. Hence, it’s very difficult to describe the link among organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in public and local organizations and the servant leadership.

Hence, similar research work is required in various cultural perceptions and work settings. Contrary to this history Chughtai (2016) claimed about the research work with various cultural and organizational settings for enhancement of knowledge regarding servant leaders that these are either less or more effective for impacting the OCB workers. Another researcher Muhdar (2018) examined the relationship among OCB and leadership with a data sample of 114 that was gathered through different industries in United States to examine the
mediating effect among organization and person and the effect of organizational identification on the association among servant leadership and OCB.

The results showed that servant leadership had a direct but partial effect on worker OCB. Moreover, results showed that there is a positive mediating influence of person and organizational relationship and the effect of organizational identification on the association among OCB and servant leadership. Muhdar (2018) discussed about the limitations about the usage of parameters such as servant leadership by allowing for only four items out of the total 28 items as identified by Chiniara and Bentein (2018).

Similarly, to acknowledge this limitations, the researcher Vonday has himself recommended that for the future reference and for further research work Chiniara and Bentein (2018) apply implement holistically. Yang et al. (2017) recognized the strength as of mediating functionality for servant leadership in the association among process clarity, team performance, goal, team OCB and team potency. They represented that the servant leadership acts as a strong moderator in the link among team OCB, goal, team potency, process clarity and the team performance. Their research work played a significant role for research and practical work due to the reason it has offered a new significant role of servant leadership for developing an efficient team OCBs.

During recent time’s research conducted by the researchers, Hanse, Harlin, and Jarebrant (2016) reported that from an online survey of 135 members regarding servant leadership from Netherlands along with a concept of generating new instrument of servant leadership along with examining its symmetric strength to anticipate about few outcomes by the follower.

The results showed that there are eight degrees along with a total number of 30 items. These degrees consists of humility, standing back, stewardship, accountability, authenticity, empowerment, courage and forgiveness. Further significant part is the findings which described that servant leadership predicts the follower OCB significantly.

Most importantly, the degree of accountability of the servant leadership has demonstrated a strong mediating association with civic virtue dimension of OCB. Additionally, humility dimension of servant leadership demonstrated a mediating strong influence on altruism, civic virtue and in the framework of OCB taking charge of dimensions. Specifically, the findings more illustrate that the leader turn out to be like forgiving, the followers reduce actions regarding political practices of the firm.

In addition to this, Shah, Batool, and Hassan (2019) examined through research survey from 67 management employees and teachers of Turkish private university with the intentions to identify the impact of servant leadership influence on OCBs. The findings represented that supporting dimensions of servant leadership framework and vision have significant and positive influence on civic virtue dimensions and sportsmanship of OCB. However recently, Amir (2019) examined through a study of 337 American workers from a retail shops to investigate the influence of servant leadership, agreeableness, service climate for group and single level and extraversion on followers supporting behavior and their intent to leave their position or job.
The findings of this research represented the significantly positive direct and indirect impact of servant leadership on OCB-I that is task-focused. Particularly, the findings describes the effect of servant leadership per unit-level on supporting for the facilitating behavior between colleagues by the service climate impact positively. Despite of enhancement in new dimensions of servant leadership, this research work support the earlier research work, for instance it describes the impact of servant leadership by the service climate on OCB that have been examined in the literature by the researcher Chughtai (2016).

Therefore, it might be referred to as beneficial due to the reason that it could offer further validating proves regarding the indirect impact on OCB by the servant leadership in a latest research of US. However, the earlier researches have investigated the indirect link among the organizational citizenship behavior and servant leadership, more research literature are required to describe the effects of moderating variables which have influenced for improved OCB.

Chughtai (2016) suggested that more studies are required to further investigate servant leadership and OCB with reference to the situations and processes which supports servant leadership more efficiently. In the same way, Muhdar (2018) suggested for further studies to be conducted on the linkage of leader and follower that might be important to increase the people’s knowledge about the follower's support which is worthy and distinct towards firms. Indarti, Fernandes, and Hakim (2017) reported after more research about a mechanism by which organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is significantly influenced by the servant leadership.

According to these recommendations, the recent research presented to examine the impact of psychological ownership as a moderator on the association among OCB and servant leadership. In the presence of this context, the following hypothesis is stated:

Hypothesis 1: There is a positively significant link among organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and the servant leadership (SL).

Hypothesis 1a: CONSK has significant impact on the OCTB.

Hypothesis 1b: EML has significant impact on the OCTB.

Hypothesis 1c: EMPWR has significant impact on the OCTB.

Hypothesis 1d: HSO has significant impact on the OCTB.

Ainsworth (2020) carried out a research to develop the empirical association among OCB and psychological ownership between the US cooperative organization members with the sample size of 797. The findings presented that the extra role behavior (OCB) is significantly and strongly anticipated by the psychological ownership. Additionally, the findings presented the supremacy of psychological ownership above the satisfaction level while anticipated the extra role behavior (OCB). Moreover, the findings also discovered the vital role of moderator influence of organizational commitment on the postulated association among the extra role behavior (OCB) and the psychological ownership. Ainsworth (2020) also contributed in this research and their results showed some validity with certain limitation in various sectors for instance, the work setting which are public sector or for-profit sector.
Thus, Ainsworth (2020) recommended the further research for: (1) examination of previous history of psychological ownership (2) similar research work conducted in various work settings for instance for-profit and public companies.

Andiyasari, Matindas, and Riantoputra (2017) reported a research by using a data of 800 American supervisors and assistant (1) to investigate the links of employee attitudes with the psychological ownership such as organization-based self-esteem, organizational commitment and the job satisfaction (2) to examine the links among work behavior such as organizational citizenship and performance with the psychological ownership.

They represented that there is an important positive relationships present among the psychological ownership and the work behavior such as performance and organizational citizenship. Dawkins and Tian (2017) also supported with his research work in generating the theory regarding concept of firm’s psychological ownership.

In the research of 85 assistant and some managers from American based accounting company which had two franchises to represent the work attitude in relation with psychology of individuality such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and examine the results of psychological ownership on positive firm’s performance such as extra-role and in-role behaviors. The results demonstrated that organizational- based and job-based forms of psychological ownership do not effect significantly on supporting or voice extra-role behaviors (OCB).

The results are unpredictable by keeping in mind that earlier researches indicated an important linkage among the citizenship behaviors and psychological ownership (Ainsworth, 2020; Andiyasari et al., 2017). On a wider vision, Ainsworth (2020) stated the significant association among general extra-role behaviors and the psychological ownership.

Furthermore, Andiyasari et al. (2017) presented the important linkage among the OCB and organization-based psychological ownership.

Consistent findings were reported by the researcher Çelik (2018) by the study of data sample of 283 workers who are on full-time job in manufacturing company of metallic plating in United States. The findings represented a significant association among OCB-I and OCB-O, Promotive psychological ownership, job satisfaction, workplace deviance, employee commitment and intentions to stay. Promotive psychological ownership comprise of four different degrees such as self-identity, self-efficacy, sense of belongingness and accountability. They also investigated that psychological ownership is influenced by the transformational leadership. According to the above discussed results the researcher Avey and his colleagues recommended the requirements for further research work to discuss about the earlier study regarding psychological ownership variables, hence representing a better foundation for the recent research to investigate the potentiality of servant leadership as a previous study of psychological ownership.

Currently, Garas, Mahran, and Mohamed (2018) investigated around the methods of in-house management of brand which is responsible for worker’s reorganization along with the consequent positive attitudes and corporate brand and for consumer’s satisfaction the maximum support of behaviors. By mean of various stages of research the data gathered from
samples consists of 933 customers from 26 hotels, 453 workers and 172 supervisors in Taiwan, the scholars examined the connections of brand psychological ownership between employees and behavior of employee brand citizenship and connection between brand-centered HRM. The findings of in line category modeling represented that brand psychological ownership which is experienced by workers had shown a positive impacts on worker’s brand citizenship behaviors. Moreover, the findings, at the disturbing level represented that worker brand psychological ownership partially moderate the link among employee brand citizenship behaviors and brand-centered HRM. The empirical and theoretical research work explained by the researcher based on the psychological ownership results, the following hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis 2: There is a significantly positive link among organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and psychological ownership (PO).

3. Psychological Ownership as Potential Mediator
According to recent research, psychological ownership is represented as a moderating factor which mediates the link among OCB and servant leadership. Earlier researches have investigated the link among OCB and psychological ownership, but the psychological ownership act as a predictor factor of OCB. Up till now none of the literature has reflected psychological ownership as a mechanism for improving the influence of servant leadership on OCB. Matilainen, Koch, and Zivojinovic (2019) justified the role of psychological ownership as a potential mediator. The researchers in their research have presented that psychological ownership might be a state of important psychological state which intervenes the impact of job design on the work performances and individual. Job design has some fundamental targets for enhancing both individual and firm’s aims. The concerns for personal success and their firm’s prosperity is the reason behind the servant leader’s ethical egalitarian, the right suggestion that they would be more worried about efficient design of job and balance efficiently. Hence, it might be a hypothesis that psychological ownership could be used as a moderating factor among OCB and servant leadership. The next suggestion about the potential of psychological ownership in the recent research are presented by Ainsworth (2020) and Dawkins and Tian (2017).

The researchers examined the influence of psychological ownership on work performances such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB they also claimed that this influence is direct in nature, Ainsworth (2020), suggested that further study by the researchers targeted on the previous historical results regarding psychological ownership for the reason that they demonstrated that OCB is significantly affected by the psychological ownership and it is at a high level of satisfaction while predicting the OCB. In the same way, Dawkins and Tian (2017) suggested that the further research might be acknowledge the single variables that would impact the growth of psychological ownership.

Furthermore, the action of intervening might be maintained through the social learning and social exchange theories (Ahn, Lee, & Yun, 2018; Aryati, Sudiro, & Hadiwidjaja, 2018). According to the social exchange theory manager’s mainly focus for improvement and progress of colleagues (servant leadership), might be a feeling of ownership that grows for
the company (psychological ownership) such as interchange and positive behaviors of manager’s which in result encourages the OCB’s outcome.

However, the OCB developed among workers may be because of satisfaction level with the style of leadership in the company and the sense of ownership developed among the company workers during their general routine associations with the managers. In the same way, according to the social learning theory which described what any person would seek from their environment regarding their attitudes and behaviors, followers try to be like their leaders and want to learn from them. Specially, servant leader’s acts as a model for the followers, they are inclined to invite large amount of followers that their behavior is already investigated and possibly as an imitative (Ling, Lin, & Wu, 2016). Hence, according to the earlier study and the current studies demonstrated that, the potential of intervening of psychological ownership is developed on the association among the OCB and servant leadership.

In the same way, the theories related to social exchange and social learning develop a vast research and the possible relationship among psychological ownership and servant leadership. According to the previous study it is postulated as:

Hypothesis 3: There is a positively significant link among organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and the psychological ownership (PHYSO)
Hypothesis 3a: CONSK has significant impact on the psychological ownership (PHYSO)
Hypothesis 3b: EML has significant impact on the psychological ownership (PHYSO)
Hypothesis 3c: EMPWR has significant impact on the psychological ownership (PHYSO)
Hypothesis 3d: HSO has significant impact on the psychological ownership (PHYSO)
Hypothesis 4: The psychological ownership (PHYSO) act as a significant mediating factor on the link among organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and the servant leadership.
Hypothesis 4a: Psychological ownership (PHYSO) mediate the relati0nship between CONSK and OCTB.
Hypothesis 4b: Psychological ownership (PHYSO) mediate the relati0nship between EML and OCTB.
Hypothesis 4c: Psychological ownership (PHYSO) mediate the relati0nship between EML and OCTB.
Hypothesis 4d: Psychological ownership (PHYSO) mediate the relati0nship between HSO and OCTB.

4. Methodology
In this study we employed the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 for the data screening and statistical data analysis to address the proposed questions in this research. Both statistical techniques, i.e. descriptive and inferential statistics were used in this study. A 7-point Likert scale was adopted and further categorized into five categories. Thus, the mean values were classified following the Akter, Fosso Wamba, and Dewan (2017) study. According to Dawes classification, if mean value falls within 1.00 -2.20 then it indicates very
low mean; if it falls within 2.21 – 3.40 category then it is indicative of low mean value; while if the mean value falls within 3.41 – 4.60 then it represents moderate mean value, whereas, if the mean value falls in other classes i.e. 4.61-5.80 and 5.81 – 7.00 then it indicates high and very high mean values, respectively. Through conducting a survey, we distributed 500 questionnaires and 345 of them were sent back from the respondents. However, only 320 of these 350 questionnaires were valid and have been further used for data analysis.

5. Analysis
The PLS-SEM estimation begins with the determination of outer or the measurement model, which includes certain criteria. As per Akter et al. (2017) recommendation, for loadings and path-coefficients estimation, Smart PLS 3 was employed in this study to perform a correlation and multiple regression analyses. Generally, the average variance extracted values (AVE) for all the constructs as well as the bootstrapping procedure are performed by using the Smart PLS-3. Moreover, scholars also suggest that PLS-3 can be adopted for estimating the complex model (Basheer, Hafeez, Hassan, & Haroon, 2018; Hair, Hult, & Ringle, 2016; Ramayah, Cheah, & Memon, 2018), therefore, in this study we adopted PLS-3 as this study involves 4 second-order constructs. In addition, the adoption of this software is also important because all the items in this study were either reflective or formative, which cannot properly be handled by any other software (Basheer, Siam, Awn, & Hassan, 2019; Ramayah et al., 2018). Moreover, this software also keeps account of the measurement errors. For this study, the model was statistically analyzed to check the existing relations between the variables involved in this research (Ramayah et al., 2018). So, in order to ascertain the interrelationship between variables and to measure variables, we used PLS technique. Besides, this technique also helps in performing the importance-performance matrix analysis (IPMA) in PLS-SEM.
At the stage of measurement or outer model assessment, the latent variables (i.e. unobserved and observed variables) were estimated as well as the relationship between these variables (Hafeez, Basheer, & Rafique, 2018; Henseler, Hubona, & Ray, 2016; Singh & Prasad, 2018). Afterwards, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine the items’ reliability and the constructs’ validity (discriminant and convergent validities). Besides, the composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) values were also computed for present research. The composite reliability (CR) is expected to have above 0.70 value, while 0.50 or above value is required for the AVEs to be acceptable (Hafeez et al., 2018; Henseler et al., 2016).

Table 2: Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>(AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSK1</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSK2</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSK3</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSK4</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML1</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML2</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML3</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML4</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR1</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR2</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR3</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR4</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTB9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYHSO7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On the other hand, the recommended range for Cronbach alpha coefficient is 0.70 or above (Henseler, 2018; Henseler et al., 2016). The discriminant validity is shown in the table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSK</th>
<th>EML</th>
<th>EMPWR</th>
<th>HSO</th>
<th>OCTB</th>
<th>PHYSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the reliability and validity of outer model were ascertained, we moved to the next step i.e. structural model estimation. Therefore, besides computing the CI index for exogenous constructs, we observed the VIF value, and tolerance value, to perform multi-collinearity test.

In this test, the exogenous constructs show the extent of variance or tolerance that are unexplained by the independent variables in the model. VIF refers to the variance inflating factor, which is defined as ‘the extent of an overall change in variance due to relationship between the independent variables’. Whereas, in case of formative models, the collinearity is generally observed with the help of a conditional index (CI) (Hair, Matthews, Matthews, & Sarstedt, 2017; Henseler, 2018; Henseler et al., 2016; Ong & Puthe, 2017). If the tolerance level turns out to be 0.2 or less, then the value of VIF will turn out to be equal or above 5. On the contrary, if the value for conditional index (CI) is above 30, then it indicates the presence of multicollinearity problem existing between the variables. The results shows that each tolerance value is greater than 0.20, and less than 5 values are obtained for VIF, and less than 30 values are obtained for all the CI value. It thus indicates that the problem of multicollinearity exists in this study.
The structural model reflects the dependent relationships in the model by connecting the observed constructs with the hypothetical model (Hair et al., 2017). Relationships and the linkage between the model constructs are well represented by the structural model. In structural model estimation, we performed the hypothesis testing and measured the relationship between the variables. This model is analyzed mainly to determine the coefficient of determination, the structural model’s significance and relevance, the collinearity issues, effect sizes. Once the collinearity test is done, we performed the bootstrapping procedure to obtain the t-statistics and respective standard errors. Since PLS-SEM is a non-parametric approach, therefore it is important to measure the accuracy of PLS estimates. In addition, these estimates also help in determining the significance of path-coefficients (Hair, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2019). The results of the direct paths are shown in the table 4. The results indicate that all the paths except EMPWR -> OCTB, and EMPWR -> PHYSO are significant.

Table 4: Direct Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>(O)</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(STDEV)</th>
<th>(O/STDEV)</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSK -&gt; OCTB</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSK -&gt; PHYSO</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML -&gt; OCTB</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML -&gt; PHYSO</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.675</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR -&gt; OCTB</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPWR -&gt; PHYSO</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO -&gt; OCTB</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>2.777</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO -&gt; PHYSO</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>2.836</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO -&gt; OCTB</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>44.372</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of indirect paths (mediation) are shown in the table 5. The findings indicate that all the paths except the EMPWR -> PHYSO -> OCTB are significant and positive.
### Table 5: Mediation

|     | (O) | (M) | (STDEV) | (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-----|-----|-----|---------|--------|----------|
| CONSK -> PHYSO -> OCTB | 0.294 | 0.293 | 0.079 | 3.736 | 0.000 |
| EML -> PHYSO -> OCTB | 0.245 | 0.245 | 0.066 | 3.722 | 0.000 |
| EMPWR -> PHYSO -> OCTB | 0.073 | 0.078 | 0.098 | 0.737 | 0.230 |
| HSO -> PHYSO -> OCTB | 0.254 | 0.251 | 0.092 | 2.777 | 0.003 |

The Coefficient of determination (R²) represents all the independent or exogenous constructs involved in the model. The items in this study were used to measure the coefficient of determination, which explain whether the model is a good fit. R-square value ranges from 0 - 1. This criterion is considered as an ideal criterion for measuring predictive ability of the model.

### Table 6: Coefficient of determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCTB</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predictive relevance test was also performed for determining the predictor variables in the SM. This measure also helps in estimating the relevance of each observed reflective construct and is regarded as an additional measure for ascertaining the goodness of fit. Afterwards, a blindfolding method was also performed for calculating the Q-square value through a cross-validated redundancy approach. This approach is used for measuring the model’s predictive relevance, elements of path model, and the predicted eliminated data (Hair et al., 2019).

### Table 7: Q-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSO</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>Q² (=1-SSE/SSO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCTB</td>
<td>1953.000</td>
<td>799.098</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSO</td>
<td>1302.000</td>
<td>585.439</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Conclusion

This research work approaches the psychological ownership as a mediator on the association among behaviors of five servant leadership frameworks such as conceptual skills (CONSK), emotional healing (EML), helping subordinated grow and succeed (HSO), and empowerment (EMPWR) in the same way the citizenship of two companies.

The definition of Emotional healing is that an individual’s capability to offers emotional help to the workers who are not able to achieve their goals, targets and associations. It is the capability of an individual to understand that when and how they could offer help to their employees (Baldomir & Hood, 2016). Leaders who are hired for the purpose to support in emotional healing should be highly concerned and are great listeners. They also offer work conditions which are in favor for workers to describe their issues regarding job and individually.
The results offer support for the hypothesis as per its expectation. As administrators enhance the level of emotional healing to their employees, the employees as a result react by enhancing the support behavior to the colleagues and supervisors.

The mutual behavior of workers are dependent on the social exchange (Ahn et al., 2018; Aryati et al., 2018). Social exchange theory stressed that the employees are psychologically obliged and thus in return they will be bounded to give advantages to the leader in non-material or material way through which they were getting benefits (Ahn et al., 2018; Aryati et al., 2018). Although, the positive dependable association with the social learning theory describes that the behaviors which are adopted by the individuals showed that they are seeking from the firm’s environment. The recent research showed that, the members could have showed the relationship OCB-I in their efforts to imitate the managers for emotional counselling in which managers put their extra hard work, regeneration of hope, preaching the gospel of patience and emotional healing which gave confidence between the colleagues and workers. However, the reason due to which managers would pay and contribute in terms of more hard work beyond their responsibilities towards jobs such as to support their colleagues and other workers to resolve their complex and technical work related issues, as result the employees showed the same behaviors through paying more attention and efforts towards their work and to support their company (OCB-O). This research work supported the earlier research regarding servant leadership-OCB (Chiniara & Bentein, 2018; Muhdar, 2018; Newman et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2017).
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