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Abstract
This study explores the role of organizational citizenship behavior as a mediating variable to the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment among Bahraini managers. Organizational citizenship behavior was in debate regards it is positive and negative consequences through the literature, most of the studies support the conclusion of organizational commitment that leads to organizational citizenship behavior, other studies support the opposite. However, the mediating relationship of organizational citizenship behaviors between leadership styles and organizational commitment is not developed by previous studies. Therefore, the use of the mediating variable gives more insight into the relationship between the dependent and independent variables and contributes to the clarity of conclusions. This study found that leadership presents a positive significant relationship with organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational citizenship behavior positively and significantly affects organizational commitment and partially mediates the relationship between the two variables.
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1. Introduction
Leadership behaviors were found to be positively linked with high-performance ratings, overall satisfaction and commitment, better objective performance, and satisfaction with supervisor (Graen et al., 1982; Vecchio & Godbel, 1984; Duchon et al., 1986; Nystrom, 1990; Liden et al., 1993). Therefore, organizational citizenship behavior may be related to those tasks that are not part of job performance, but they are highly required by the organization (Schnake, 1991). Previous studies have driven the relation model between leadership and organizational citizenship behavior by considering trust, job satisfaction personal identification, motivation, goal commitment, work engagement, efficacy, and procedural justice as mediators (Kim, 2012), as well as studies asserted that the organizational citizenship behavior practice leads and cause the organization commitment. Taking into consideration the undeniable relationship between leadership and organizational commitment as well as organizational citizenship behavior, there are also studies by Zayas-Ortiz, Rosario, Marquez, and Gurneiro (2015) that emphasized the relationship between organizational citizenship with organizational commitment. According to Aydoğan (2010), it is found that employees who developed organizational and/or professional commitment are more likely to perform organizational citizenship behavior compared to the ones that did not and that employees will be committed to their organizations because of the opportunities they are offered, and this commitment becomes organizational citizenship behavior with the time which contributes to the organization itself (Bolat & Bolat, 2008). Those studies agree with the conclusion of Mena (2015) the generally accepted view in the study of organizational behavior that organizational citizenship behavior considered the causal effect of organizational commitment, and that most of the studies are supporting that relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, and that organizational citizenship behavior is antecedents of organizational commitment (Mathieu &Zajac, 1990; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997; Tepper, 2004; Mena, 2015; Rauf, 2016; Traiyotee et al, 2019). However, Mena (2015) added that besides that most of the studies support the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, some studies support the opposite of organizational citizenship behavior leading to organizational commitment, and that was in line with the study of Rauf (2016). Further, Mena (2015) added that a study by Tepper et al. (2004) found that organizational citizenship behavior does affect the attitudes of fellow employees positively and consequently enhances the organizational loyalty and commitment among organization members.
Revising all these significances in the organization's success and competitive advantages acquiring, increase the motivation for identifying a model that can link these variables together in one model that can describe the relationships among them. There is very little research available from the literature that examines the links between leadership behavior and employee's satisfaction and organizational commitment (Mosadeghard & Ferdosi, 2013), even those studies are conducted or based on western countries (Mosadeghard & Ferdosi, 2013; Jogulu & Wood, 2008). However, studies that investigate job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment ignore the analysis of leadership behavior.

2. Research Context

2.1 Relationship between Leadership and Organizational Commitment

According to Mowday et al. (1982), leadership has been considered a determinant organizational factor of organizational commitment. Previous studies revealed that leadership does impact the organization's performance and effectiveness in different ways, and therefore leadership has been a source of debates and studies by different researchers. According to Horner (1997), different theories exist to define the leadership role and relationship to organizational effectiveness, including Fred Fiedler's theory of leadership contingency model theory, and the vertical dyad linkage theory which is called the leader-member exchange theory (Graen, 1976). To examine the effect that leadership would have or impact organizational commitment in any organization we need to examine the different leadership theories. According to Bolden et al. (2003), there is an evolving series of schools of thought starting from the Great Man and trait theories to the transformational leadership theories, which are considered early theories that tend to focus on the characteristics and behaviors of successful leaderships. The later theories emphasize the consideration of the role of followers and the contextual nature of the leadership.

Previous studies confirm that leadership styles and organizational commitment have a strong positive relationship and impact on organizational commitment (Ismail et al., 2011; Tremblay, 2010; Lo et al., 2009; Erkutlu, 2008; Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008; Lee, 2005; McGuire & Kennerly, 2006; Chen, 2002; Arnold et al., 2001).

2.2 Relationship between Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

According to Velickovska (2017), leaders who take care of the interpersonal relationship at work and the satisfaction of employees will find the chance to develop organizational citizenship behavior within the organization. Previous studies revealed that leadership behavior and organizational citizenship behavior have a positive relationship and link with high-performance ratings, overall satisfaction and commitment, better objective performance, and satisfaction with supervisor (Graen et al., 1982; Vecchio & Godbel, 1984; Duchon et al., 1986; Nystrom, 1990; Liden et al., 1993; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Therefore, organizational citizenship behavior may be related to those tasks that are not part of job performance, but they are highly required by the organization (Schmack, 1991). Another study also demonstrates a positive impact of supportive leadership on the deployment of organizational citizenship behavior by subordinates (LePine et al., 2002) and the development of organizational citizenship behavior norms and practices in groups (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004), Organ et al. (2006) found in an empirical study that all researchers observed the association between leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship behavior.

2.3 Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment

In the study of organizational citizenship behavior and its relationship to organizational commitment, many of the researchers and scholars found that employees who developed organizational and/or professional commitment are more likely to perform organizational citizenship behavior compared to the ones that did not (Aydoğan, 2010) and that employees will be committed to their organizations because of the opportunities they are offered, and this commitment becomes organizational citizenship behavior during the time which contributes to the organization itself (Bolat & Bolat, 2008). Therefore, there is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment as most the studies present (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Feather & Rauter, 2004; Nguni et al., 2006; Bolat & Bolat, 2008) while some studies did not conclude such a relationship between an organizational commitment (Tansky, 1993; Mercan, 2006). However, researchers concluded different impacts, while studies confirm that organizational commitment impact or positively linked to organizational citizenship behavior and therefore considered as its predictor (Meyer and Allen, 1990; Ensher et al., 2001; Gautam et al., 2005; Haigh and Pfau, 2006; Liu, 2009; Lavelle et al., 2009; Ng and Feldman, 2011; Morin et al., 2011; Chen and Kao, 2012; Islam et al., 2012). While several authors (Shore & Wayne, 1993; Tepper, 2004; Mena, 2015; Rauf, 2016; Traytoe et al., 2019) concluded that a positive and negative relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment as well different consequences of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational commitment were reported.
2.4 Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediator Variable in Organizational Behavior Literature

Different researchers performed studies to test the mediation effect of organizational citizenship behavior on different aspects. A literature review by Harikaran and Thevanes (2018: p.26) to test the relationships among work-life balance, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational performance, stated that "most studies neglect the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior in the relationship between work-life balance and organizational performance", and concluded that, their review suggests the presence of positive relationships among the reviewed concepts, and that further their review tested the relationship of work-life balance, organizational performance, and organizational citizenship behavior and concluded that organizational citizenship behavior mediates the relationship between work-life balance and organizational performance. A study by Sugianingrat et al. (2019) was they test the mediation effect of organizational citizenship behavior on employee engagement dimensions on employee performance in a non-star hotel in Bali, Indonesia one of the world's tourist destinations. The study supported 150 respondents who are an employee at that hotel, and the concluded that organizational citizenship behavior was able to partially mediate the relationship. Andrew and León-Cázares (2015; p.73) suggested that organizational behavior may have a little effect on organizational effectiveness, and "argued that organizational citizenship behavior plays a mediator role between leadership styles, public service motivation and perceived organizational performance". In their study "Mediating Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: Empirical Analysis of Public Employees" conducted in Mexico, the study results concluded that the empirical analysis shows that organizational citizenship behavior performs a mediator role between public service motivation and public organization performance. Another study by Islam et al. (2012) investigated the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior between organizational learning culture and knowledge sharing in Malaysia, the study tested data of 402 employees results in a greater indirect impact of organizational learning culture on knowledge sharing via organizational citizenship behavior, and that organizational citizenship behavior performs as a mediator between the variables in this relationship. Other studies that confirmed the mediation role of citizenship behavior; Ariffin (2014) also confirmed a mediation role of citizenship behavior between organizational identity and organizational employer branding, and Kesen (2016) between organizational identification and individual creativity.

Additional to those studies, few studies were found that test the mediation effect of organizational citizenship behavior on the relationship between different variables including transformational leadership style and organizational commitment were found; the first study by Rita et al. (2018) the study examined the relationship between five variables; transformational leadership, organizational commitment, motivation, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee performance and test the moderation effect of organizational citizenship behavior. The study was performed at the district secretariat in Pupua province in Indonesia. The result of the study confirms that the moderation role of organizational citizenship behavior doesn’t significantly affect the relationship between organizational commitment, transformational leadership, work motivation, and employee performance, however, the organizational citizenship behavior plays a mediator role and can strengthen the effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on organizational performance. A recent study by Traiyottee et al. (2019) with the focus target population of 4,088 employees of pt gas station in the northeast, Thailand. The study tests the significant influence of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational commitment and the mediation role of organizational citizenship behavior in the relationship between quality work-life and organizational commitment and concluded that organizational citizenship behavior statistically has a significant positive influence on organizational commitment, that organizational citizenship behavior performs as a mediator in the relationship between quality work-life and organizational commitment.

2.5 Research Framework and Hypothesis

Figure 1 depicts the research framework of the study between leadership styles, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational commitment. Moreover, the study's hypotheses were listed below;

\[ \text{H}_1: \text{Leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment.} \]
\[ \text{H}_2: \text{Leadership has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior.} \]
\[ \text{H}_3: \text{Organizational citizenship behavior has a positive effect on organizational commitment.} \]
\[ \text{H}_4: \text{Organizational citizenship behavior has mediation between leadership and organizational commitment.} \]
3. Research Method
3.1 Research Design
This study involves leaders working in both the public and private sectors in the Kingdom of Bahrain. The study targets a population of employees working at different managerial levels in the private and public sectors. The research data was collected using a questionnaire. A total of 1,000 online surveys were distributed to respondents by the author. The introduction to the questionnaire explains the purpose of the research. Confidentiality was guaranteed to the participants. The total number of surveys collected by participants was 333 from the sample frame. Data were entered and coded in Excel.

3.2 Measure
To explore the role of organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator to the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment, the respondents were asked to answer a survey questionnaire that is consists of 72 questions divided into three parts, each part of the questionnaire represents a different instrument. Leadership was measured through Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X-Short version), the organizational commitment was measured through the revised 1993 Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993), and organizational citizenship behavior was measured by Podsakoff et al. (1990) OCBS. The questionnaire used a 5-point Likert scale (where were used for expressing 1-Strongly Disagreed and 5-Strongly Agree). A pilot study was conducted on 30 participants from both the public and private sectors in the Kingdom of Bahrain to verify the validity and reliability study tool. Cronbach's alpha was used for every variable as depicted in Table 2. The reliability analysis has given the variable factors of leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior with the Cronbach's alpha of 0.761, 0.810, and 0.802, subsequently. Thus, the tools used for the study are reliable based on the above values.

Table 2 Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Data Analysis and Results
4.1 Correlation Analysis
Table 3 depicts a correlation analysis of leadership styles, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.
Participants indicated that leadership had a significant relationship with organizational commitment ($r=0.239$), and a significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior ($r=0.354$). Meanwhile, participants indicated that organizational citizenship behavior had a significant relationship with organizational commitment ($r=0.425$).

### Table 3: Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.239**</td>
<td>0.354**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.425**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05**p<.01.

### 4.2 Regression Analysis

Table 4 depicts the simple regression analysis that was conducted on leadership toward organizational commitment, leadership toward organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational citizenship behavior toward organizational commitment. Participants are found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment ($p<0.000$). As presented, first, leadership accounts for 5.7% of the variation in organizational commitment. The calculated $F$ of 20.085 is significant at an alpha <0.000. The positive beta of 0.239 indicates that leadership has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment. Second, leadership accounts for 12.5% of the variation in organizational citizenship behavior. The calculated $F$ of 47.349 is significant at an alpha <0.000. The positive beta of 0.354 indicates that leadership has a significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Third, organizational citizenship behavior accounts for 18.1% of the variation in organizational commitment. The calculated $F$ of 72.922 is significant at an alpha <0.000. The positive beta of 0.425 indicates that organizational citizenship behavior has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment.

This indicates that there is significant statistical evidence for the positive relation relationship between leadership and organizational commitment, leadership and organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment.

### Table 4: Simple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>LD and OC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LD and OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>OCB and OC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Beta</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Std. Beta</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Std. Beta</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Std. Beta</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistics</td>
<td>20.085</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.349</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LD (Leadership), OC (Organizational Commitment), OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior)

### 4.3 Mediation analysis

To test Hypothesis 4 (H₄: Organizational citizenship behavior has mediation between leadership and organizational commitment), the mediation analysis was done using Baron and Kenny's (1986) approach with the use of multiple regression analysis (Model 2). The mediation analysis of Baron and Kenny (1986) has 4 steps as below:

Step 1 is a simple regression analysis between leadership style and organizational commitment.

### Table 5: Regression Analysis between Leadership and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (Model 1)</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. F</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 depicts the first step of mediation analysis, an unstandardized regression weight of 0.418 for leadership in predicting organizational commitment. Thus, $c=0.418$. The standard error was 0.093, which give $t=0.418/0.093=4.495$ (df=331, $p=0.000$).
Furthermore, the set of data indicated that as the increase of leadership by one unit, the predicted value on organizational commitment increased by 0.418. Thus, the result had satisfied the first condition necessary for mediation.

Step 2 is a simple regression analysis between leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 6 - Regression Analysis between Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 depicts the second step of mediation analysis, an unstandardized regression weight of 0.372 for leadership in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, \( a = 0.372 \). The standard error was 0.054, which gives \( t = 0.372/0.054 = 6.889 \) (df=331, \( p = 0.000 \)). Furthermore, the set of data indicated that as the increase of leadership by one unit, the predicted value on organizational citizenship behavior increased by 0.372. Thus, the result had satisfied the second condition necessary for mediation.

Step 3 is a simple regression analysis between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment.

Table 7 - Regression Analysis between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 depicts the third step of mediation analysis, an unstandardized regression weight of 0.706 for leadership in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, \( b = 0.706 \). The standard error was 0.083, which gives \( t = 0.706/0.083 = 8.506 \) (df=331, \( p < 0.000 \)). Furthermore, the set of data indicated that as the increase of organizational citizenship behavior by one unit, the predicted value on organizational citizenship behavior increased by 0.706. Thus, the result had satisfied the third condition necessary for mediation.

Step 4 is the multiple regression analysis between leadership style and organizational commitment with the mediation of organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 8 - Multiple Regression Analysis between Leadership and Organizational Commitment with Mediation of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 depicts the fourth step Baron and Kenny (1986) and is known as Model 2 (\( c' \)). Model 2 in an unstandardized regression weight of 0.177 for leadership in predicting organizational commitment when controlling organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, \( c' = 0.177 \). The standard error was 0.093, which gives \( t = 0.117/0.093 = 1.258 \) (df=331, \( p < 0.05 \)). This coefficient was not statistically significantly different from zero; however, it had not shown that the coefficient is equal to zero.
Furthermore, with the increased leadership by one unit, while holding constant the effects of organizational citizenship behavior, the predicted value on organizational commitment increased by 0.177 units. However, this difference was not statistically significant. The result had not satisfied the fourth condition necessary for complete mediation. Thus, the result had a partial mediation.

In conclusion, the described findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between leadership and organizational commitment, leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, organizational citizenship behaviors, and organizational commitment. The study established a partial mediation of organizational citizenship behavior to the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment.

In summary, the participants indicated that the hypotheses H₁, H₂, and H₃ were supported, and hypothesis H₄ results in partial mediation. Table 9 depicts the results of the research analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁: Leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂: Leadership has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃: Organizational citizenship behavior has a positive effect on organizational commitment</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄: Leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment with the mediation of organizational citizenship behavior</td>
<td>Partial Mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

This study contributes to the existing literature since the majority of hypotheses have been supported. Besides, the hypotheses agree with the results of the highlighted previous studies. Most importantly, the study followed the instructions highlighted by Baron and Kenny (1986) where the three following regression equations were tested:

The first regression equation is about regressing the mediator (Organizational citizenship Behavior) on the independent variable (Leadership).

The second regression equation is regressing the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment) on the independent variable (Leadership).

The third regression equation is regressing the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment) on both the independent variable (Leadership) and the mediator (Organizational citizenship Behavior).

The study confirmed a partial mediation relationship between leadership, the results reached are worth to be considered valuable to organizations as they might be helpful to consider such a mediation relationship when planning to increase the level of commitment in their succession plans, recruiting plan, training plan, and organization values.

6. Conclusion

This study explores the mediation effect of organizational citizenship behavior on the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment. Also, it intended to find the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment. The study explored that, leaderships positively affect organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, organizational citizenship behavior positively affects organizational commitment, and confirmed the partial mediating of organizational citizenship behavior.

In conclusion, the result of the mediation of organizational citizenship behavior on the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment is in line with previous studies’ results (Rita et al., 2018; Traiyotee et al., 2019).
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