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Abstract:  
This research aims to examine and analyze the effect of servant leadership, organizational commitment, personality type on organizational citizenship behavior employees of Property Company. The object of this research is employees who works at Property Company. This study was conducted on 101 respondents using a quantitative descriptive approach. The results of this study show that the servant leadership variable has a significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment has a significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior and personality type has a significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. The approach used in this study is the Structural Equation Model (SEM) with a Smart-PLS analysis tool. Therefore the results of this research state that there is a joint effect between servant leadership, organizational commitment and personality type variables on organizational citizenship behavior at Property Company.
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1. Introduction  
Human resources are the company’s most important asset for his role as the subject of implementing the policy and operations of the company. The resources owned by companies such as capital, methods and machines could not provide optimum results if not supported by human resources that have optimum performance. According Syamsuddinor (2014), human resource is one of the major capital in an organization, which can provide invaluable contribution in achieving the strategic objectives of the organization. Good organizational planning would be supported by the ability of human resources in carrying out its work, so that in the process these objectives will not have much of a problem, (Soelton, 2018), (Ramli et al, 2019) and (Jumadi et al, 2018)

The element of human resource management is an individual who is a manpower company. Thus the focus of the study by human resources is an issue that affects the human labor. Human resources are not well managed will affect turnover intention in a company. Turnover or turnover of labor is a concrete manifestation of turnover intention which can be a serious problem for the company or organization, particularly if the exit is a workforce that has the skills, abilities, skilled and experienced or workers who occupy a vital position in the company, so as to disturb effectiveness of nets companies (Soelton and Atnani, 2018).

According Rival (2013), turnover intention factors are workload, long work, social support and compensation. But in fact, turnover intention that at some companies are also affected by several other factors. Turnover intention is defined as a mediating factor between the attitudes that affect the intention to leave the company and actually left the company (Yucel, 2012), turnover intention is an intention to leave the company voluntarily and could affect the status of the company and will certainly affect the productivity of employees (Issa et al., 2013). Turnover intention is the level of behavioral tendencies that are owned by employees to find new jobs elsewhere or plan to leave the company within three months ahead.
With that a company needs to pay attention to the factors that influence the turnover intention not to increase. Some companies have increased turnover intention that it is difficult to achieve organizational goals. And one of these companies, namely The Indonesia Railway Industry. Based on secondary data resignation of employees of The Indonesia Railway Industry, continues to increase four (4) years. Based on Figure 1.1 can be calculated percentage of the resignation of employees are encouraged in 2015 by 5% in 2016 decreased to 3% in the year 2016 again decreased to 1% and in the year 2018 increased again back to 7% with an average of resignation of the employee for 4 Last year at 4% per year. Factors to be increased turnover intention that the pressure felt by employees caused by organizational factors. A wide variety of factors that make cause turnover intention, Nurhayati (2017), Soelton et al (2018), Rahmawati and Amir (2013)

According to Acker (2009) Providers of mental health care often consider cost effective approach of care managed as an intrusion that does not correspond with their concern for the welfare of clients such as helping clients to live successfully in their communities, improve their social skills, and provide them with the necessary services and resource. Accept (2013) Job Insecurity as an inability to maintain continuity in working conditions threatened. Job Insecurity can appear when there is a gap between the level of security expected and actual experience regarding security felt by someone. Soelton and Riyadhus (2018) stress should be seen from the case by case which occurred on the sufferer if the excess will cause employees under pressure, because no longer able to cope with a task too heavy. Stress experienced employees will hurt the company because the resulting productivity may decline. Mashlac and Leither (2016), burnout is a psychological syndrome that arises from prolonged stress caused by interpersonal problems at work. Condition burnout will also affect the decline in labor productivity and work performance and change attitudes of individuals in the work environment such as the withdrawal of labor by keeping a distance (decrease intensity to relate well with clients or co-workers), more absences and have a higher turnover than other workers. Burnout happens in the long term it will experience fatigue, causing productivity (Soelton et.al 2018).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is free individual behavior, which is not directly or explicitly recognized by the rewards system and in promoting the effective functioning of the organization (Nurhayati et al, 2016), or in other words, OCB is employee behavior that exceeds the mandatory role, which is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system is an optional behavior that is not part of an employee's formal work obligations, but supports the effective functioning of the organization.According to Organs in Titisari (2014), definition Organizational Citizenship Behavior is an individual contribution that exceeds the demands of the role at work. Organizational Citizenship Behavior this involves some behavior helping others, volunteering for extra tasks, complying with rules and procedures at work. According to Organ et al, In Titisari (2014), there are five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior:

2.1.1. Altruism

This dimension leads to giving help that is not an obligation that is borne. An indicator of this dimension is the presence of behaviors that help coworkers who are unable or colleagues who have difficulty working.

2.1.2. Conscientiousness

The behavior is shown by trying to exceed what is expected by the company. This dimension reaches far above and far ahead of the call of duty. An indicator of this dimension is the ability of employees to complete work / tasks before the deadline.

2.1.3. Sportsmanship

Behavior that tolerates less than ideal conditions in an organization without raising objections. Someone who has a high level of sportsmanship will promote a positive climate among employees, employees will be more polite and cooperate with others so that it will create a more pleasant work environment.

2.1.4. Courtesy

Someone who has this dimension is someone who respects and cares for others.

2.1.5. Civic Virtue

Behavior that indicates responsibility for organizational life (following changes in the organization, taking initiatives to recommend how the organization’s operations or procedures can be improved, and protecting resources owned by the organization). This dimension refers to the responsibility given by the organization to a person to improve the quality of the work that is occupied.

2.2. Servant Leadership

According to Sendjaya (in Astohar, 2012), Servant Leadership as a natural expression of servanthood behavior in a servant leader, trying to be responsible not only to the people they lead but also to others. The concept of Servant Leadership was first introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf in 1977. Servant leaders according to Northhouse (in Astohar, 2012), are approaches that pay attention to the problems of their subordinates, empathize with them, and develop them. According to Spears (in Rakasiswi, 2017), said that the leader who serves is a leader who prioritizes subordinates and
consciously brings aspirations and encouragement in leading others that starts with the natural feelings of someone who wants to help and prioritize the interests of subordinates for the achievement of organizational goals.

Laub (in Martha et al., 2017), argues that Servant Leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that prioritizes the development of subordinates compared to the interests of leaders. This means leadership that serves to promote community development through power sharing, community development, leadership practices, leadership for the benefit of subordinates, the entire organization, and customers or partners of the organization. According to Barbuto and Wheeler (in Astohar, 2012), the dimensions and indicators of Servant Leadership are:

2.2.1. Altruistic Calling
Altruistic is a voluntary action to help others without expecting anything in return. Servant-leader describes the work that exists as a service to the group and people served, the service itself is an award for a servant leader.

2.2.2. Emotional Healing
When people feel frustrated with the work done, it can affect future commitments to the organization. With the commitment of a servant leader in facilitating emotional healing needed to increase the enthusiasm of subordinates from the disappointment experienced, can move forward and develop together in achieving organizational goals.

2.2.3. Wisdom
The ability to see what is desired in the present situation and provide solutions for how to achieve it. Servant-leader has wisdom and empowers it in the people around him.

2.2.4. Persuasive Mapping
Leaders influence those around them not through formal office, but through personal ability in persuasion. Persuasive mapping helps others to see the big picture and find ways to achieve goals.

2.2.5. Organizational Stewardship
Servant leader as a long-term minded and planning organization manager illustrates the extent to which leaders prepare organizations to make positive contributions to their environment such as through community service programs and community development and encourage higher education.

2.2.6. Humility
Is an attitude of humility by showing respect for employees and recognizing employee contributions to the company.

2.2.7. Vision
The extent to which leaders seek the commitment of all members of the organization to a shared vision by inviting members to determine the future direction of the company and achieve company goals.

2.2.8. Service
The extent to which service is seen as the core of leadership and leaders show their service behavior to subordinates.

2.3. Organizational Commitment
According to Grusky (in Kurniawan, 2015), defining Organizational Commitment is the nature of the relationship between organizational members and the system as a whole. Organizational Commitment is trust and strong acceptance of organizational values, willingness to work hard, and maintain membership in the organization concerned, which means there is a strong desire from members to remain in the organization or psychological ties to the organization (Kurniawan, 2015).

Furthermore Stevens et al., In Titisari (2014), suggested that the concept of organizational commitment can be divided into two categories, namely the exchange approach and the psychological approach. The exchange approach holds that commitment is the result of transactions between the organization and its members or in this case employees. The main emphasis of this exchange approach is the strengths and weaknesses received by employees as a result of the transaction. According to Steers (in Mira et al., 2012), states three factors that influence employee commitment to the organization:

- Employees’ personal characteristics include tenure in the organization, and the different needs and desires of each employee.
- Job characteristics, a case of tasks and opportunities to interact with colleagues.
- Work experience, such as the reliability of the organization in the past and the way other workers expressed and discussed their feelings about the organization.

Furthermore according to Minner (in Mira et al., 2012), states four factors that influence employee commitment to the organization:

- Personal factors, such as age, sex, level of education, work experience and personality.
- Structure characteristics, such as the size of the organization, the shape of the organization, the presence of the union, and the level of control exercised by the organization of employees.
- Job characteristics, such as the scope of work, challenges in work, role conflict, the level of difficulty in work.
• Work experience of an employee is very influential on the level of employee commitment to the organization. According to Meyer Allen (in Nurandini and Lataruva, 2015), defining there are three dimensions and Indicators of Organizational Commitment:
  • Affective Commitment is commitment as a bond or emotional involvement in identifying and engaging in the company. An indicator of this dimension is that there are employees who are loyal to work at the company and will do the best for the company.
  • Continuous Commitment is an individual commitment based on consideration of what must be sacrificed if leaving the company. The indicator of this dimension is the existence of employees who stay in the company because they are afraid of not getting another job and staying because of the salary received.
  • Normative Commitments are individual beliefs about responsibility towards the company. Indicators of this dimension are employees who feel obliged to be loyal to the company and feel that the company has become part of their lives.

2.4. Personality Type

According to Feist in Titisari (2014), personality is a relatively permanent pattern of traits, and a unit character that provides consistency as well as individuality for one’s behavior. Traits contribute to individual differences in their behavior, consistency of behavior over time and the behavior of the behavior in each situation. Character may be unique or common to some groups of people or may be owned by all humans but the pattern is always different for each individual. Furthermore Robbins (in Purwanti and Nurhayati, 2016), defines that personality is a dynamic organization in an individual's psychological system in determining how to adapt uniquely to the environment the individual is in. In addition, Robbins added that personality as a whole way how individuals react and interact with others.

Meanwhile according to Suryabrata (in Wahyudi et al., 2017), defining personality is an attitude, expression, feeling, temperament, characteristics and also a person’s behavior. The attitude of feelings of expression and temperament will manifest in one’s actions if faced with certain situations. Everyone has behavioral tendencies that apply consistently in dealing with the situation at hand, so that it becomes his personal characteristic. In the opinion of Robbins and Judge (in Purwanti and Nurhayati, 2016), personalities are divided into two types namely:

2.4.1. Type A personality

This personality type has the following characteristics:
  • Always moving, walking and eating quickly.
  • Feel impatient with the values at which most events occur
  • Struggling to think or do two or more things continuously
  • Obsessed with success rates is measured by how much results have been achieved.

2.4.2. Type B Personality

This personality type has the following characteristics:
  • Never feel pressured by feeling rushed, because of limited time and impatience.
  • Feel no need to show or discuss their success except in circumstances that are forced and because of the demand for the situation.
  • Playing for fun and relaxation compared to showing their superiority at any cost.
  • Can relax without feeling guilty.

Based on research conducted by Robbins and Judge (2017), the dimensions and indicators of Personality Type are:

2.4.2.1. Conscientiousness (Accuracy)

Dimensions that indicate a measure of reliability. Those with positive scores on this factor are reliable, organized, responsible, achievement oriented, and persevering. Conversely, the low-tailed one is easily transferred, irregular, and unreliable. Careful individuals have responsibilities and are more likely to involve themselves in their various work tasks.

2.4.2.2. Extraversion (Extra)

Indicator of broad insight (extraversion), respondents get a moderate value (enough) for the ability to empathize with the feelings of others. Employees with broad insight personality (high extraversion) are active, full of energy and enthusiastic employees and have a high sense of kinship, which will encourage employees to work for their institution.

2.4.2.3. Agreeableness (Agreement)

Agreeableness also called social adaptability or likability which indicates a friendly attitude, has a personality that always succumbs, avoids conflict, and is helpful. Employees with high levels of agreeableness are better able to mobilize social support and resources to be directly involved in their work roles and will not be involved in organizational deviations and are motivated to resolve problems and conflicts (Robbins and Judge, 2017).

2.5. Conceptual Framework

Based on the previous description, the following model (chart) illustrates the conceptual framework of influence between research variables.
2.6. Research Hypothesis

Servant Leadership significant positive effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior the employee. Organizational Commitment has a positive and significant effect on the employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Personality Type positive and significant effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior the employee.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research design used by the authors in this study uses quantitative research. According to Sugiyono (2008), quantitative research can be interpreted as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to examine certain populations or samples, sampling techniques are generally carried out randomly, data collection using research instruments, quantitative / statistical data analysis with the goal is to test the stated hypothesis. In this study, the independent variable is servant leadership, organizational commitment and personality type, while the dependent variable is organizational citizenship behavior. The instrument used for data collection is a questionnaire submitted to employees. The questionnaire was distributed to 135 employees of Property Company. The population in this study were employees of Property Company as many as 135 employee respondents. This study uses the Slovin formula to measure how many samples taken from a population of 135 employees. Data analysis and interpretation for research aimed at answering research questions in order to reveal certain phenomena. The structural analysis is used to analyze data Equation Modeling (SEM) of PLS 3.0 statistical software in models and hypotheses assessments structural equation models.

4. Result and Discussion

| Variable                  | Indicator | Outer Loading | Information |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Servant Leadership        | S2        | 0.618         | Valid       |
|                           | S3        | 0.703         | Valid       |
|                           | S4        | 0.775         | Valid       |
|                           | S5        | 0.784         | Valid       |
|                           | S6        | 0.572         | Valid       |
|                           | S7        | 0.624         | Valid       |
|                           | S8        | 0.511         | Valid       |
|                           | S9        | 0.631         | Valid       |
|                           | S10       | 0.546         | Valid       |
|                           | S11       | 0.677         | Valid       |
|                           | S12       | 0.654         | Valid       |
|                           | S13       | 0.654         | Valid       |
|                           | S14       | 0.654         | Valid       |
| Organizational Commitment | OC1       | 0.821         | Valid       |
|                           | OC2       | 0.906         | Valid       |
|                           | OC3       | 0.906         | Valid       |
|                           | OC4       | 0.553         | Valid       |
|                           | OC5       | 0.519         | Valid       |
| Personality Type          | PT1       | 0.650         | Valid       |
|                           | PT2       | 0.719         | Valid       |
|                           | PT3       | 0.838         | Valid       |
|                           | PT4       | 0.605         | Valid       |
|                           | PT5       | 0.743         | Valid       |
|                           | PT6       | 0.795         | Valid       |
|                           | PT7       | 0.784         | Valid       |
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | O1 | 0.698 | Valid |
|                           | O3        | 0.742         | Valid       |
|                           | O4        | 0.498         | Valid       |
|                           | O5        | 0.867         | Valid       |
|                           | O6        | 0.849         | Valid       |
|                           | O10       | 0.861         | Valid       |

Table 1: Convergent Validity Test Results (Modification)
The result of the modification of the convergent validity test can be seen that all indicators have met the convergent validity because it has a loading factor value above 0.50 and thus all indicators for the measurement of the research construct are valid. If all indicators have a loading factor above 0.50 then the proposed measurement model has the potential for further testing.

| Variable                      | AVE  |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Servant Leadership            | 0.562|
| Organizational Commitment     | 0.578|
| Personality Type              | 0.544|
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 0.583|

*Table 2: AVE Test Results*

| Variable          | Organizational Citizenship Behavior | Organizational Commitment | Personality Type | Servant Leadership |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 0.764 |                           |                 |                    |
| Organizational Commitment         | .696 | 0.760                     |                 |                    |
| Personality Type                | .682 | 0.592                     | 0.737           |                    |
| Servant Leadership             | 0.720 | .651 | .687 | 0.749             |

*Table 3: Discriminant Validity (Fornell Lacker Criterion) Test Results*

From Tables 4.12 and 4.13 it can be concluded that the square root of the average variance is extracted (For each construct greater than the correlation between one construct and the other constructs in the model. AVE values based on the table above, it can be concluded that the constructs in the estimated model meet the discriminant validity criteria $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$)

| Variable                      | Cronbach’s Alpha | Composite Reliability | Information |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Servant Leadership            | 0.863            | .888                  | Reliable    |
| Organizational Commitment     | .803             | 0.867                 | Reliable    |
| Personality Type              | .858             | .892                  | Reliable    |
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 0.850 | .891                   | Reliable    |

*Table 4: Composite Reliability and Cronbach’s alpha test results*

Based on Table 4 that the results of testing composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha show satisfactory values, because all latent variables have composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha value ≥ 0.70. This means that all latent variables are said to be reliable.

| Endogenous Variables | R-square |
|----------------------|----------|
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 0.710    |

*Table 5: MEndogenous Variable Value R^2*

5. Hypothesis Test

After testing the suitability of the model it can be tested on the hypothesis. The research hypothesis testing was conducted using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method with PLS 3.0 software. The basis for taking the hypothesis is done by comparing the t-table with the t-count at alpha 0.05 (5%) = 1.96. If the t-table is less than alpha 1.96, the hypothesis is not accepted or rejected, and vice versa if the t-table> 1.96, then the hypothesis is accepted or there is a significant influence between the two variables

| Hypothesis Test | Original Sample | Standard Deviation | T-Statistics | P Values | Information |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|
| Servant Leadership $\rightarrow$ Organizational Citizenship Behavior | .204 | 0.234 | 2,435 | 0.000 | Positive - Significant |
| Organizational Commitment $\rightarrow$ Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 0.564 | .321 | 4,660 | 0.000 | Positive - Significant |
| Personality Type $\rightarrow$ Organizational Citizenship Behavior | .167 | 0.275 | 1,991 | 0.002 | Positive - Significant |

*Table 6: Hypothesis Testing Results*
5.1. The Influence of Servant Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Based on the hypothesis test in this study the results obtained T-statistic value of 2.435, the original sample value is 0.204, and a P Values value of 0.000. The T-statistic value is greater than the T-table value of 1.96, the original sample value shows a positive value, and the P Values value is less than 0.05, these results indicate that servant leadership positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Katz &Kahn (1978) (in Mira & Margaretha, 2012) stated that to achieve an effective organizational function requires employees who not only perform roles determined by superiors but also involve behaviors that go beyond formal obligations. The effective organizational function is in accordance with the OCB concept introduced by Stamper and Dyne in Titisari, (2014), which states that the willingness of employees to exhibit behavior or roles that exceeds company demand is determined by managerial and employee perceptions about employee performance and responsibilities often non-uniform and employee perceptions of responsibility and performance determined by job satisfaction. Rakasiswi and Rahyuda research results (2017).

Effect of Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Based on the hypothesis test in this study the results obtained T-statistic value of 4.660, the original sample value is 0.564, and a P Values value of 0.000. The T-statistic value is greater than the T-table value of 1.96, the original sample value shows a positive value, and the P Values value is less than 0.05, these results indicate that organizational commitment positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Robins &Judge (in Kurniawan, 2015) stated that Organizational Citizenship Behavior can arise from various factors in the organization, including because of job satisfaction and employee commitment. When employees feel satisfied with what is in the organization, then employees will provide maximum and best performance results. Likewise, with employees who have a high commitment to the organization, will do anything to advance the company because they believe and believe in the organization where the employee works (Luthan, 2005) (in Kurniawan, 2015). Albert Kurniawan's research results (2015) show that affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This shows that when employees already have these three dimensions of high organizational commitment to the company, employees with all their heart have satisfaction at work and are willing to do

5.2. Effect of Personality Type on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Based on the hypothesis test in this study the value obtained T-statistic of 1991, the original sample value is 0.167, and the P value of 0.002. The T-statistic value is greater than the T-table value of 1.96, the original sample value shows a positive value, and the P Values value is less than 0.05, these results indicate that personality type positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Organin Titisari (2014) argues that individual differences are predictors that play an important role in employees so that employees will show Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), so that each employee will show the personality possessed to display Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Personality basis to show Organizational Citizenship Behavior is to reflect the characteristics / traits of employees' cooperative, helpful, caring and responsible responsibilities to the work. The results of this study are in line with the research of Connect and Iring (2014) and Wahyudi et al., (2017), showing that the personality of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness has a positive and significant influence on Organizational Citizenship Behavior on employees.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

6.1. Conclusion

Servant leadership significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior on employees of Property Company. This means that if the leader has a leadership attitude that serves, it will increase the attitude of organizational citizenship behavior of employees.

Organizational commitment significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior on employees of Property Company. This means that if organizational commitment is high, the organizational citizenship behavior of employees is high.

Personality type significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior on employees of Property Company. This means that if the employee's personality type is good, then the employee will create

7. Recommendation

Leaders should be able to map (mapping) problems in the company well, such as directly involved in daily activities that run in the company to find out what problems occur in the company and leaders must be able to find the best solution for every problem that occurs in the company so that the wheels the company is going well.

Companies must maintain employees who have high competence, by giving rewards, holding family gathering activities out of town and by increasing health facilities from BPJS into quality health insurance for employees who excel in order to increase organizational commitment and provide loss to employees when leaving the company.

Employees should improve their personality by mingling with other employees, following personality training activities and conducting counseling guidance to improve personality to be more extraverted (open) to reduce passivity in themselves and be able to communicate when working in teamwork.

Employees should not complain at work, if there is a problem with work, it should be discussed with superiors or coworkers so that the solution to each of these problems can be solved and company productivity goes well.
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