

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Demographic Comparison between Local Bankers and Foreign Bankers in Malaysia

Nasina Mat Desa

Senior Lecturer, School of Distance Education, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Muhammad Hasmi Abu Hassan Asaari

Senior Lecturer, School of Distance Education, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Abstract

This noble intention of this paper is to highlight the demographic comparison between bankers in the local and foreign banks in Malaysia, specifically in the state of Perlis, Kedah, Penang, and northern Perak. Three-hundred questionnaires were distributed among the bankers in the above four states. Thus, a good response rate of 61% was clocked by this paper. This paper adapted servant leadership instrument from Van Dierendonck & Nuijten. On the other hand, the organizational commitment had been adopted from Meyer and Allen. This paper provides a good understanding of the servant leadership among bankers of local and foreign banks which could benefit the banks' top management in promoting their employees' productivity and in turn translated into the banks' profitability.

Keywords: *Servant leadership, organizational commitment, banking services, financial sector*

1. Introduction

Employees are one of the important resources of organizations, may it in the manufacturing sector or service sector. Employees are crucial to the organizations as they manage and operate the organizations. They are also determined to ensure the organizations' targets and profits were achieved by end of the accounting year. This also happened to the employees in the banking industry of Malaysia, may it local banks or foreign banks. These banks need their employees to achieve the given targets and determined profits.

Bank employees were expected to deliver their best to customers. They were needed to serve with integrity, proficiency, and professionalism. The banks were needed to seek better ways to maximize employees' work efforts and motivate them to their fullest potential. Therefore, this study intends to understand the servant leadership from the bank employees' perspective. Servant leadership is known to be a highly effective style of leadership for empowering followers (Greenleaf, 1977; Russell, 2001), which can lead to greater motivation, inspiration, commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and job satisfaction. Furthermore, employees who were not just actually perform their prescribed duties but also willing to perform beyond their formal obligations will ensure the effectiveness of organizational performance (Katz & Kahn, 1978). An effective leadership can drive the employees to perform beyond their official job requirements (Taleghani & Mehr, 2013). This was because the leaders are known to have a powerful source of influence on employees' work behaviours (Yukl, 2002). However, the empirical research on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour are scarce and quite new in Malaysia thus required more research being conducted to explore in depth on servant leadership style in this country (Al-Haj, Sarimin, Nasir & Yusof, 2012).

Bank employees' commitment toward their organization was also crucial in order for them to pay attention and to put their full effort into achieving the goals of the organization and nation. Scholars had been reported that the issues on human capital had become one of the many crises faced by the government today. It was due to the conflict in values between employees of different generational groups and lack of strategic planning for acquiring and retaining qualified employees (Douglas, Burrell & Grizzell, 2008).

Various studies had proven the influence of leadership styles on organizational commitment (Kraut, 1970; Newman, 1974; Alley & Gould, 1975; Porter, Campon & Smith, 1976; Gilsson & Durick, 1988; Savery, 1994; Zeffane, 1994; Wilson, 1995; Davenport, 2010). Among various types of leadership, servant leadership was known to be a highly effective style of leadership for empowering followers (Greenleaf, 1977; Russell, 2001) which can lead to greater motivation, inspiration, commitment and job satisfaction. However, research on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment was still limited (Hovieda, Salari & Asemi, 2011; Cerit, 2010; Drury, 2004; Washington, 2007; Barnes, 2011).

Besides, most of the researchers were conducted in western countries among private sector organizations and very few focuses in a developing country (Addae, Parboteeah & Velinor, 2008) such as Malaysia.

This paper intends to highlight the demographic comparison between bankers in the local and foreign banks in Malaysia, specifically in the state of Perlis, Kedah, Penang, and northern Perak.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Servant Leadership

Servant leadership should be considered by the leaders of today's organizations (DePree, 1995; Senge, 1997; Blanchard, 2002; Covey, 2002) as servant leadership can fulfil an organization's need for an ethical and caring type of leadership to meet the demands for more ethical and people-centered management (Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership refers to the leaders who focused on others rather than themselves (Greenleaf, 1977). The primary attention of the servant leader was meeting the needs of their followers (Greenleaf, 1969; 1977).

This servant leadership is based on the dimensions of empowerment, humility, standing back, authenticity, forgiveness, courage, accountability, and stewardship (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Firstly, empowerment is a motivational concept that aims at enabling people and encouraging personal development through fostering a pro-active, self-confident attitude among followers as well as giving them a sense of personal power. Secondly, humility refers to the leader who understands the strong and weak points of a follower, as well as daring to admit that one is not reliable and does make mistakes. Thirdly, standing back is about the extent to which a leader gives priority to the interest of the others first, and gives them the necessary support and credit. Fourthly, authenticity associated with the expressing of one's true self that is consistent with inner thoughts and feelings whether privately or publicly. Fifthly, forgiveness is about being able to forgive when confronted with offences, arguments and mistakes that may lead to an atmosphere of trust where people can feel accepted, who are free to make mistakes and know that they will not be rejected. Sixthly, courage is associated with the action of dare to take risks and to try out new approaches to problem-solving and decision-making. Seventhly, accountability refers to giving out responsibilities and holding people accountable for performance and outcomes to show confidence in them. And finally, stewardship relates to social responsibility, loyalty and teamwork that represent a feeling of identification with and sense of obligation to a common good.

2.2. Organizational Commitment

Allen and Meyer (1996) stated organizational commitment was the psychological relationship between the employees and their organization, which leads their decision to continue their membership and makes them less likely to leave the organization. Employees with organizational commitment will strongly believe and agree with the goals and values of the organization, be willing to work hard and have a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday et al., 1982).

Organizational commitment model that consists of three types of commitment, namely continuance commitment, normative commitment and affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Firstly, continuance commitment referred to the employee's recognition of the costs associated if he or she leaves the organization. This concept referred to the employee's decision of "need(ing) to" remain in an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Secondly, affective commitment referred to the employee's identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization. This concept referred to the employees' decision of "want to" remain in an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). And finally, the normative commitment was called moral commitment as they established a desire to remain in the organization after receiving support and investment from the organization. Moreover, normative commitment reflects the level of obligation that the employee feels to continue within the organization. This concept refers to the employees' decision of "feel(ing) they should" remain in an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

3. Methodology

Three hundred self-administered questionnaires were distributed among bank employees in local and foreign banks who are working in Perlis, Kedah, Penang, and northern Perak. This paper clocked a good response rate of 61%. This paper adapted the servant leadership instrument from Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) that comprised of empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity, humility, and stewardship. On the other hand, the organizational commitment, namely affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment had been adopted from Meyer and Allen (1993).

4. Results and Discussions

4.1. Demographic

Table 1 illustrates the respondents demographic, they were inquired on their gender, ethnic, marital status, age, highest academic qualification, length with the present bank, present designation, length of present designation, present salary, type of bank, and the bank's locality. Majority of the respondents were male, which represented by 53.3% (n=98); and

females were represented by 46.7% (n=86). There were three major ethnic groups in Malaysia, Malay were represented by 58.9% (n=109); Chinese were 20.5% (n=38); and Indians were 20.5% (n=38).

Respondents indicated that they were single at 24.3% (n=45). Sixty-nine percent (n=128) indicated that they were married. Meanwhile, 12 respondents indicated that they were separated or divorced with 6.5% (n=12). Age wise, 19.5% (n=36) respondents indicated that they were aged below 30, 45.4% (n=84) respondents indicated that they were between 31 to 40 years old, 28.1% (n=52) respondents indicated that they were 41 to 50 years old, and 7% (n=13) respondents indicated that they were above 50 years old.

In the work life as the banker, the majority of the respondents (n=53) had been working for more than 7 years. Respondents between 1 to 3 years of service were 26.1% (n=48). Respondents with 4 to 6 years were 20.7% (n=38). Finally, respondents with less than a year working experience were 3.3% (n=6).

Respondents were also inquired on their length of service at the present designation. Bankers with the present position for between 1 to 3 years were 36.1% (n=66). Respondents who worked for 4 to 6 years, and 7 years and above were represented by 29% (n=53), respectively. Finally, respondents who worked below 1 year were 6% (n=11). Majority of the bankers, 70.8% (n=131) were working in the local banks. On the other hand, bankers working with foreign banks were 29.2% (n=54).

Item	n	%
Gender	98	53.3
Male	86	46.7
Female		
Ethnic	109	58.9
Malay	38	20.5
Chinese	38	20.5
Indian		
Marital Status	45	24.3
Single	128	69.2
Married	12	6.5
Others		
Age (years old)	36	19.5
Below 30	84	45.4
31 - 40	52	28.1
41 - 50	13	7.0
Above 50		
Length with the Bank (years)	6	3.3
1 and below	48	26.1
1 - 3	38	20.7
4 - 6	92	50
7 and above		
Length at Current Designation (years)	11	6
1 and below	66	36.1
1 - 3	53	29
4 - 6	53	29
7 and above		
Bank Type	131	70.8
Local	54	29.2
Foreign		

Table 1: Respondents Demographic

4.2. Mean Comparison Analyses

Mean comparison analyses were conducted between employees of local banks and foreign banks, male and female, and single and married. Moreover, comparisons were also made between ethnics and length of services among employees of local banks and foreign banks.

4.2.1. Comparison between Local Bank and Foreign Bank Employees

The mean comparison between servant leadership and organizational commitment between local and foreign banks employees are shown in Table 2. The top three servant leadership components were examined. The local bank employees indicated their order of empowerment (mean=4.80), accountability (mean=4.77), and stewardship (mean=4.49). On the other hand, the foreign bank employees indicated their order of accountability (mean=4.95), empowerment (mean=4.88), and stewardship (4.72). Overall, foreign bank employees had a higher mean as compared to local bank employees in terms of their

servant leadership components. Meanwhile, both employees of local and foreign banks indicated their bottom two components of servant leadership were authenticity and courage. The local bank employees means were higher than foreign bank employees.

Pertaining to organizational commitment components, local bank employees indicated their order of normative commitment (mean=4.44), affective commitment (mean=4.18), and continuance commitment (mean=4.06). Meanwhile, the foreign bank employees indicated their rank order of normative commitment (mean=4.45), continuance commitment (mean=4.29), and affective commitment (mean= 4.19). Overall, the means were not much difference in the value among employees of local and foreign banks.

Bank Employees					
Local Bank	Mean	SD	Foreign Bank	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.80	0.97	Accountability	4.95	1.10
Accountability	4.77	0.95	Empowerment	4.88	1.03
Stewardship	4.49	0.99	Stewardship	4.72	1.12
Normative Commitment	4.44	0.49	Normative Commitment	4.45	0.47
Affective Commitment	4.18	0.69	Continuous Commitment	4.29	0.42
Continuous Commitment	4.06	0.49	Affective Commitment	4.19	1.04

Table 2: Overall Mean Comparison between Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

The mean comparison had indicated that local and foreign bank employees could be distinguished on their servant leadership; namely, empowerment, standing back, accountability, forgiveness, courage, authenticity, humility, and stewardship in relation to organizational commitment; namely, affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Foreign bank employees indicated their readiness on the top management's placement of responsibility and accountability on them. Whereby, this was not much appreciated by local bank employees on their perception of responsibility and accountability. Although empowerment is rank highest by local bank employees, the reception of it was valued higher by foreign bank employees on the encouragement of personal development and sense of personal power. Interestingly, the loyalty and teamwork shown by foreign bank employees were valued higher as by local bank employees. On the other hand, the organizational commitment between local and foreign bank employees indicated not much difference in their preference. Both bank employees indicated that they will continue to work with the present bank. Furthermore, both bank employees indicated that they were attached to the present bank and taken into consideration of cost on leaving their present banks.

4.2.2. Comparison between Male Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

The mean comparison was done between male employees of local and foreign banks are shown in Table 3. Local banks' male employees indicated empowerment (mean=4.84), accountability (mean=4.75), and stewardship (mean=4.49) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.43), affective commitment (mean=4.20), and continuance commitment (mean=4.05) as their important concerns. Meanwhile, foreign banks' male employees ranked accountability (mean=4.93), empowerment (mean=4.89), and stewardship (mean=4.71) as their important concerns. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.49), continuance commitment (mean=4.23), and affective commitment (mean=4.22), and as their important concerns. Overall, foreign banks' male employees shown higher mean values as compared to local banks' male employees.

Male Bank Employees					
Local Bank	Mean	SD	Foreign Bank	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.84	0.94	Accountability	4.93	1.00
Accountability	4.75	0.97	Empowerment	4.89	0.98
Stewardship	4.49	0.97	Stewardship	4.71	1.08
Normative Commitment	4.43	0.53	Normative Commitment	4.49	0.49
Affective Commitment	4.20	0.77	Continuous Commitment	4.23	0.38
Continuous Commitment	4.05	0.46	Affective Commitment	4.22	1.02

Table 3: Mean Comparison between Male Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

4.2.3. Comparison between Female Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

The mean comparison was done between female employees of local and foreign banks are shown in Table 4. Local banks' female employees indicated accountability (mean=4.80), empowerment (mean=4.75), and stewardship (mean=4.50) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.45), affective commitment (mean=4.16), and continuance commitment (mean=4.08) as their important concerns. Meanwhile, foreign banks' female employees ranked accountability (mean=4.97), empowerment (mean=4.87), and stewardship (mean=4.72) as their important concerns. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.41), continuance commitment (mean=4.36), and affective commitment (mean=4.16), and as their important concerns. Overall, foreign banks' female employees shown higher mean values as compared to local banks' female employees.

Female Bank Employees					
Local Bank	Mean	SD	Foreign Bank	Mean	SD
Accountability	4.80	0.94	Accountability	4.97	1.22
Empowerment	4.75	1.01	Empowerment	4.87	1.12
Stewardship	4.50	1.03	Stewardship	4.72	1.19
Normative Commitment	4.45	0.46	Normative Commitment	4.41	0.46
Affective Commitment	4.16	0.61	Continuous Commitment	4.36	0.46
Continuous Commitment	4.08	0.52	Affective Commitment	4.16	1.09

Table 4: Mean Comparison between Female Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

4.2.4. Comparison between Single and Married Employees of Local and Foreign Banks

The mean comparison was done between single and married employees of local and foreign banks are shown in Table 5 and 6. Foreign banks' single employees indicated empowerment (mean=5.17), accountability (mean=5.16), and stewardship (mean=5.04) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.41), affective commitment (mean=4.41), and continuance commitment (mean=4.32) as their important concerns. Meanwhile, foreign banks' married employees ranked accountability (mean=4.83), empowerment (mean=4.71), and stewardship (mean=4.60) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.48), continuous commitment (mean=4.28), and affective commitment (mean=4.08) as their important concerns. These were followed by local bank married employees indicated accountability (mean=4.83), empowerment (mean=4.71), and stewardship (mean=5.32) as their important concerns on servant leadership. On the other hand, the organizational commitment they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.48), continuous commitment (mean=4.25), and affective commitment (mean=4.08). Finally, married employees of local banks indicated their concern on servant leadership as empowerment (mean=4.82), accountability (mean=4.78), forgiveness (mean=4.47). Whereby for organizational commitment, they ranked normative commitment (mean=4.49), affective commitment (mean=4.18), and continuous commitment (mean=4.01).

Interestingly, the overall comparison between single and married of local and foreign banks indicated that foreign banks' single employees had the highest means in rank comparison with married foreign banks' employees, married local

banks' employees, and single local banks' employees. The single foreign banks' employees could be seen as young, energetic, and full of enthusiasm for their work. Whereby, single local banks' employees had the lowest means in comparison as they are still looking for the best employment and evaluating their present choice of employment.

Single Employees					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Accountability	4.74	1.28	Empowerment	5.17	0.73
Empowerment	4.73	1.16	Accountability	5.16	0.72
Stewardship	4.69	1.17	Stewardship	5.04	0.86
Normative Commitment	4.29	0.55	Normative Commitment	4.41	0.39
Continuous Commitment	4.19	0.43	Affective Commitment	4.41	1.05
Affective Commitment	4.17	0.77	Continuous Commitment	4.32	0.42

Table 5: Mean Comparison between Single Employees in Local and Foreign Banks

Married Employees					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.82	0.91	Accountability	4.83	1.21
Accountability	4.78	0.83	Empowerment	4.71	1.10
Forgiveness	4.47	1.04	Stewardship	4.60	1.23
Normative Commitment	4.49	0.47	Normative Commitment	4.48	0.51
Affective Commitment	4.18	0.67	Continuous Commitment	4.28	0.42
Continuous Commitment	4.01	0.50	Affective Commitment	4.08	0.92

Table 6: Mean Comparison between Married Employees in Local and Foreign Banks

4.2.5. Comparison between Employees' Ethnicity of Local and Foreign Banks

Mean comparison was done between Malays, Chinese, and Indians employees of local and foreign banks are shown in Table 7, 8, and 9. Foreign banks' Chinese employees indicated accountability (mean=5.27), empowerment (mean=5.16), and stewardship (mean=4.90) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated affective commitment (mean=4.55), normative commitment (mean=4.47), and continuous commitment (mean=4.39) as their important concerns. Meanwhile, foreign banks' Indians employees ranked accountability (mean=5.02), empowerment (mean=4.97), and stewardship (mean=4.78) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.46), continuous commitment (mean=4.28), and affective commitment (mean=4.28) as their important concerns. These were followed by local bank Chinese employees indicated accountability (mean=4.97), empowerment (mean=4.88), and stewardship (mean=4.77) as their important concerns on servant leadership. On the other hand, the organizational commitment they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.36), continuous commitment (mean=4.27), and affective commitment (mean=4.15).

Malays employees of foreign banks indicated their concern on servant leadership as forgiveness (mean=4.80), accountability (mean=4.59), and empowerment (mean=4.54). Whereby for organizational commitment, they ranked normative commitment (mean=4.43), continuous commitment (mean=4.22), and affective commitment (mean=3.77). Malays employees of local banks indicated their concern on servant leadership as empowerment (mean=4.80), accountability (mean=4.75), and forgiveness (mean=4.50). Whereby for organizational commitment, they ranked normative commitment (mean=4.46), affective commitment (mean=4.18), and continuous commitment (mean=4.00). Indians employees of local banks indicated their concern on servant leadership as empowerment (mean=4.67), accountability (mean=4.63), and stewardship (mean=4.63). Whereby for organizational commitment, they ranked normative commitment (mean=4.45), affective commitment (mean=4.22), and continuous commitment (mean=4.11).

The overall comparison between ethnic of local and foreign banks indicated that foreign and local banks' Chinese employees had the highest means of rank comparison with other ethnics. Interestingly, Chinese bank employees in the local and foreign banks indicated the similar view on their servant leadership concerns namely, accountability, empowerment, and stewardship.

Malays Employees					
Local Bank	Mean	SD	Foreign Bank	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.80	0.91	Forgiveness	4.80	1.39
Accountability	4.75	0.87	Accountability	4.59	1.11
Forgiveness	4.50	1.01	Empowerment	4.54	1.12
Normative Commitment	4.46	0.49	Normative Commitment	4.43	0.48
Affective Commitment	4.18	0.61	Continuous Commitment	4.22	0.42
Continuous Commitment	4.00	0.49	Affective Commitment	3.77	1.03

Table 7: Mean Comparison between Malays Employees in Local and Foreign Banks

Chinese Employees					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Accountability	4.97	1.06	Accountability	5.27	1.11
Empowerment	4.88	0.99	Empowerment	5.16	1.03
Stewardship	4.77	0.91	Stewardship	4.90	1.15
Normative Commitment	4.36	0.41	Affective Commitment	4.55	1.10
Continuous Commitment	4.27	0.34	Normative Commitment	4.47	0.48
Affective Commitment	4.15	0.72	Continuous Commitment	4.39	0.46

Table 8: Mean Comparison between Chinese Employees in Local and Foreign Banks

Indians Employees					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.67	1.23	Accountability	5.02	1.03
Accountability	4.63	1.19	Empowerment	4.97	0.91
Stewardship	4.63	1.28	Stewardship	4.78	0.97
Normative Commitment	4.45	0.59	Normative Commitment	4.46	0.47
Affective Commitment	4.22	1.04	Affective Commitment	4.28	0.91
Continuous Commitment	4.11	0.58	Continuous Commitment	4.28	0.39

Table 9: Mean Comparison between Indians Employees in Local and Foreign Banks

4.2.6. Comparison between Employees Length of Service of Local and Foreign Banks

Mean comparison was done between Malays, Chinese, and Indians employees of local and foreign banks are shown in Table 10, 11, and 12. Foreign banks' employees with 4-6 years of service indicated accountability (mean=5.53), empowerment (mean=4.47), and stewardship (mean=4.97) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.78), affective commitment (mean=4.50), and continuous commitment (mean=4.40) as their important concerns. Followed by local banks' employees with a 4-6 year of service ranked their servant leadership as empowerment (mean=4.97), accountability (mean=4.73), and forgiveness (mean=4.62). Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.71), affective commitment (mean=4.19), and continuous commitment (mean=4.11) as their important concerns.

Meanwhile, foreign banks' employees with more than 7 years ranked accountability (mean=4.89), empowerment (mean=4.79), and stewardship (mean=4.69) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated continuous commitment (mean=4.29), normative commitment (mean=4.26), and affective commitment (mean=4.16) as their important concerns. These were followed by local bank employees with more than 7 years indicated accountability (mean=4.89), empowerment (mean=4.81), and stewardship (mean=4.48) as their important concerns on servant leadership. On the other hand, the organizational commitment they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.44), affective commitment (mean=4.22), and continuous commitment (mean=3.97).

Moreover, local banks' employees with less than 3 years ranked empowerment (mean=4.72), accountability (mean=4.65), and

stewardship (mean=4.65) as their important concerns on servant leadership. Whereby on organizational commitment, they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.27), continuous commitment (mean=4.21), and affective commitment (mean=4.11) as their important concerns. These were followed by foreign bank employees with less than 3 years ranked accountability (mean=4.65), empowerment (mean=4.64), and stewardship (mean=4.57) as their important concerns on servant leadership. On the other hand, the organizational commitment they indicated normative commitment (mean=4.47), continuous commitment (mean=4.21), and affective commitment (mean=4.03).

Less than 3 Years of Services					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.72	0.98	Accountability	4.65	1.23
Accountability	4.65	1.08	Empowerment	4.64	1.05
Stewardship	4.65	0.99	Stewardship	4.57	1.18
Normative Commitment	4.27	0.49	Normative Commitment	4.47	0.49
Continuous Commitment	4.21	0.34	Continuous Commitment	4.21	0.28
Affective Commitment	4.11	0.58	Affective Commitment	4.03	0.90

Table 10: Mean Comparison for Less than Three Years of Service in Local and Foreign Banks

4-6 Years of Services					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Empowerment	4.97	0.67	Accountability	5.53	0.61
Accountability	4.73	0.86	Empowerment	5.47	0.50
Forgiveness	4.62	0.96	Stewardship	4.97	0.99
Normative Commitment	4.71	0.34	Normative Commitment	4.78	0.33
Affective Commitment	4.19	0.52	Affective Commitment	4.50	0.86
Continuous Commitment	4.11	0.43	Continuous Commitment	4.40	0.45

Table 11: Mean Comparison between Four to Six Years of Service in Local and Foreign Banks

More than 7 Years of Services					
Local Banks	Mean	SD	Foreign Banks	Mean	SD
Accountability	4.89	0.85	Accountability	4.89	1.10
Empowerment	4.81	1.02	Empowerment	4.79	1.13
Stewardship	4.48	1.08	Stewardship	4.69	1.16
Normative Commitment	4.44	0.50	Continuous Commitment	4.29	0.49
Affective Commitment	4.22	0.80	Normative Commitment	4.26	0.43
Continuous Commitment	3.97	0.56	Affective Commitment	4.16	1.22

Table 12: Mean Comparison for More than Seven Years of Service in Local and Foreign Banks

5. Conclusion

This paper provides a better understanding of the right leadership in fostering bank employees' commitment, especially in the banking sector. The results of this study also hope to improve the leader-follower relationship and allow more leaders to realize the benefits of using servant leadership in increasing their relationship with their subordinates, influencing the subordinates' positive job behaviour as well as increasing their subordinates' satisfaction and commitment with their job, department, and organization.

Furthermore, this study also aims at assisting the human resource department of local and foreign banks to conduct proper leadership training to their employees. This would promote new ideas for them to apply servant leadership training to improve the leadership skills among leaders that may lead to rising up bank employees' organizational commitment.

6. Acknowledgement

The author would like to acknowledge the funds provided under the Short Term Grant (No. 304.PJAUH.6313046) by University Sains Malaysia.

7. References

- i. Addae, H.M., Parboteeah, K.P., & Velinor, N. (2008). Role stressors and organizational commitment: public sector employment in St Lucia. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6), 567-582.
- ii. Al-Haj, B.K., Sarimin, R., Nasir, N.H.M. & Yusof, M.Z. (2012). Servant leadership style: A case study of the government agency in Malaysia, UMT 11th. *International Annual Symposium on Sustainability Science and Management*, Terengganu, Malaysia, 9-11 July 2012.
- iii. Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J.P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- iv. Alley, W. & Gould, R.B. (1975). Feasibility of estimating personnel turnover from survey data: A longitudinal study, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooke Air Force Base, TX, October.
- v. Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D.W. (2002). *Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes?* NebGuide G02-1481-A. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.
- vi. Barnes, L.L. (2011). *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: an empirical investigation of the effects of servant leadership in distance education programs.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.
- vii. Blanchard, K. (2002). *Foreward: The Heart of Servant -Leadership.* In L. C. Spears & M.
- viii. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on Leadership: Servant-Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 9-12.
- ix. Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers' organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(3), 301-317.
- x. Covey, S. (2002), *Servant-leadership and community leadership in the twenty-first century*, in Spears, L. (Ed.), *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century*, Wiley, New York, NY, 27-34.
- xi. Brian Davenport, B. (2010). *Servant-leadership and coaching*, The Pacific Northwest Regional Conference on Servant Leadership. Available at: http://works.bepress.com/brian_davenport/12/
- xii. DeCotis, T. and Summers, T. (1987), A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment, *Human Relations*, 40(7), 445-70.
- xiii. DePree, M. (1995). *Forward.* In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- xiv. Dierendonck, van D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267.
- xv. Dierendonck, van D., & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant leadership: An introduction.* In D. Van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research.* Palgrave Macmillan: London.
- xvi. Douglas, V., Grizzell, B., & Burrell, D. (2008). *A Phenomenological Study of Self-Identified Servant Leaders*, *Journal of Business & Leadership*, 4, 12pp.
- xvii. Drury, S.L. (2004). *Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Empirical Findings and Workplace Implications*, *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable – August 2004.* Available at: http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2004pdf/drury_servant_leadersh ip.pdf
- xviii. Eisenberger R., Huntington, R, Hutchison, S., & Sowa D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- xix. Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- xx. Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D. & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42–51.
- xxi. Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-72.
- xxii. Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1), 61–81.
- xxiii. Greenleaf, R.K. (1969), *Leadership and the individual: the Dartmouth lectures*, in Frick, D.M. and Spears, L.C. (Eds), *On Becoming a Servant Leader*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 284-338.
- xxiv. Greenleaf, Robert K. 1977. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- xxv. Hoveida, R., Salari, S. & Asemi, A. (2011). A study on the relationship among servant leadership (SL) and the organizational commitment (OC): A case study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(3), 499-509.
- xxvi. Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on salesperson's turnover intention. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 29(4), 351-366.
- xxvii. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, 2ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- xxviii. Koopman, P. L. (1991). Between control and commitment: management and change as the art of balancing. *Leadership and OD Journal*, 12, 3-7.
- xxix. Kraut, A.I. (1970). *The Prediction of Employee Turnover by Employee Attitudes*, American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.
- xxx. Laub, J. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument*, Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University.
- xxxi. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177.
- xxxii. Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace, theory, research and application*. California: Sage.
- xxxiii. Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- xxxiv. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- xxxvi. Mowday R., Porter L. & Steers R. (1982). *Employee- organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- xxxvii. Newman, J.E. (1974), "Predicting absenteeism and turnover: a field comparison of Fishbein's model and traditional job attitude measures", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, December, 610-15.
- xxxviii. Niehoff, B.P., Enz, C.A., & Grover, R.A. (1990). The impact of top-management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15(3), 337-352.
- xxxix. Wong, P.T.P. & Page, D. (2000). Servant leadership: An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile, *Servant Leadership Roundtable*, October 2003, 1-13.
- xl. Lyman, P.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- xli. Lyman, P.W., Crampon, W.J., & Smith, F.J. (1976). Organizational commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 87-98.
- xlii. Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- xliii. Russell, R.F. & Stone, A.G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-147.
- xliv. Russell, R.F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 76-84.
- xlv. Savery, L.K. (1994). The Influence of the Perceived Styles of Leadership on a Group of Workers on their Attitudes to Work, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 15(4), 12-18.
- xlvi. Searle, T.P. (2011). *A Multilevel Examination of Proactive Work Behaviors: Contextual and Individual Differences as Antecedents*, Theses, Dissertations, & Student Scholarship: Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication Department. Paper 20. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecdiss/20>
- xlvii. Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- xlviii. Senge, P.M. (1997). *The Fifth Discipline, Measuring Business Excellence*, 1(3), 46-51.
- xlix. Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 25(3/4), 349.
- l. Taleghani, M. & Mehr, R.R. (2013). The relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour in executive organizations of Guilan Province. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research* 3(1), 910-917.
- li. Washington, R.R. (2007). Empirical relationships between theories of servant, transformational, and transactional leadership. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- lii. Wilson, P.A. (1995). The effects of politics and power on the organizational commitment of federal executives, *Journal of Management*, 21(1), Spring, 101-18.
- liii. Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5 ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- liv. Zeffane, R. (1994). Patterns of Public and Private sector employees, *Human Relations*, 47(6), 977-1010.