International Journal of Business and Quality Research

https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Organizational Culture and Leadership Style on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment

Muh. Faisal Widad[1], Thatok Asmony[2], & Isra Dewi Kuntary Ibrahim[3]

[1,2,3]Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mataram,, Indonesia

Corresponding author: faisalwidad22@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the direct relationships of organizational culture and leadership style with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and evaluates organizational commitment as a mediator among employees of the Mataram City Trade Office, Indonesia. Using a quantitative associative design, the study surveyed all 62 civil servants through a census and analyzed questionnaire responses with partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Organizational culture (β = 0.257, p = 0.115) and leadership style (β = 0.199, p = 0.367) had positive but statistically nonsignificant direct relationships with OCB. Both organizational culture (β = 0.240, p = 0.037) and leadership style (β = 0.679, p < 0.001) positively predicted organizational commitment, which in turn predicted OCB (β = 0.399, p = 0.035). Commitment did not significantly mediate the culture–OCB relationship (β = 0.096, p = 0.168), but its indirect role in the leadership–OCB relationship was marginal at the 5% threshold (β = 0.271, t = 1.964, p = 0.050). The model explained 62.9% of OCB variance. These findings emphasize the importance of commitment in translating leadership into discretionary helping and involvement, while also highlighting measurement-validity issues requiring caution.

Keywords: ***Organizational Culture; Leadership Style; Organizational Citizenship Behavior; Organizational Commitment; Mediation; Public Sector***

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to voluntary contributions that extend beyond formally prescribed job requirements yet facilitate organizational functioning. Such behavior includes helping colleagues, exceeding minimum expectations, tolerating routine difficulties, preventing interpersonal conflict, and participating responsibly in organizational life (Organ et al., 2006). These discretionary contributions are particularly relevant to public agencies, where service continuity and coordination often depend on cooperation across formal administrative boundaries. Although public servants

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

are assessed against specified duties, informal assistance can help maintain responsive and reliable services.

Organizational culture may establish the social norms through which employees interpret whether supportive behavior is valued. Shared assumptions, values, and practices provide a framework for cooperation and collective identification (Schein, 2010), while organizational behavior literature links culture to members' work attitudes and commitment (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Leadership style similarly matters because managerial decisions, communication, encouragement, and example can shape employees' willingness to contribute beyond assigned duties (Yukl, 2013; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Yet neither cultural values nor favorable leadership practices automatically translate into discretionary conduct in every organizational setting.

Prior findings remain mixed. Rahmawati et al. (2023), Lestari et al. (2021), and Reyfaldi et al. (2023) associated a supportive organizational culture with stronger OCB, whereas Kurniawan et al. (2019) considered organizational commitment as an intervening mechanism. Regarding leadership, Munawar et al. (2023) and Gemina et al. (2024) reported relationships involving OCB, while Harwiki (2016) demonstrated that such connections can differ across organizational contexts. Divergent results are also apparent for organizational commitment and OCB, including positive findings in Halimsetiono and Santosa (2021) and differing outcomes discussed by Riska and Idrus (2024). These variations justify examining the mechanisms through which culture and leadership become extra-role behavior.

Organizational commitment represents employees' attachment to, identification with, and sense of obligation toward an institution. It is conceptually distinct from culture and leadership because it concerns the employee–organization bond rather than attributes of the organization or its managers (Luthans, 2015; Colquitt et al., 2016). Recent studies have investigated commitment as an intermediary connecting leadership and culture with OCB (Gemina et al., 2024; Hermanto et al., 2024; Dewi & Riana, 2025). However, the extent to which the same mediating mechanism applies to both predictors may depend on the organizational context and quality of the measurement model.

The Mataram City Trade Office provides a useful setting for testing these relationships among public servants. Preliminary interviews described employees' willingness to help colleagues beyond formal assignments, participate in organizational activities, and maintain collaborative routines. The agency also operates through administrative and field-based work units, making cooperative behaviors consequential for everyday public service. Nevertheless, these observations alone cannot distinguish the direct contributions of culture and leadership from the potential indirect contribution of organizational commitment.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

This study therefore analyzes seven proposed relationships: the direct effects of culture and leadership on OCB; the effects of culture and leadership on commitment; the effect of commitment on OCB; and the two indirect paths through commitment. By surveying the complete staff population of one municipal agency, the study offers contextual evidence regarding how psychological attachment may link the organizational environment to voluntary public-sector behavior. It also identifies implications for management practice and discusses methodological conditions under which the findings should be interpreted.

THEORETICAL REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB comprises discretionary actions that enhance the social and psychological environment of work, although they are not necessarily captured by formal reward systems (Organ et al., 2006). Five frequently used dimensions are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism reflects helping coworkers; conscientiousness refers to exceeding minimum work standards; sportsmanship concerns tolerating inconvenient conditions; courtesy involves consideration and conflict prevention; and civic virtue denotes responsible participation in organizational affairs. The present research adopts these dimensions, emphasizing that OCB is not synonymous with assigned task performance.

Organizational Culture and OCB

Organizational culture encompasses shared assumptions that guide collective interpretations and conduct (Schein, 2010). Consistent with Robbins and Judge (2019), this study represents culture through innovation and risk taking, attention to detail, outcome orientation, people orientation, team orientation, aggressiveness, and stability. These dimensions may create a climate in which voluntary assistance and organizational participation become expected social practices. Evidence from Rahmawati et al. (2023), Lestari et al. (2021), and Reyfaldi et al. (2023) supports a positive association, although results across settings are not uniform (Kurniawan et al., 2019).

H1: Organizational culture has a positive and significant relationship with OCB.

Leadership Style and OCB

Leadership style concerns the pattern of behaviors through which supervisors guide and influence employees (Yukl, 2013). The operational indicators in this study encompass decision-making ability, motivating ability, communication, and the ability to direct subordinates, aligned with the operational measurement framework. Supportive and

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

credible leaders may encourage cooperation by cultivating trust, recognizing contributions, and clarifying shared goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Newstrom, 2011). Empirical analyses by Gemina et al. (2024), Munawar et al. (2023), and Khafifah and Subroto (2024) suggest potential links to citizenship behaviors, although the relationship may not be universal (Harwiki, 2016).

H2: Leadership style has a positive and significant relationship with OCB.

Culture and Leadership as Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment signifies the psychological bond that supports employees' continued identification with an institution (Luthans, 2015; Colquitt et al., 2016). The three components are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Culture may deepen such attachment by creating value congruence and belonging (Schein, 2010); evidence of culture–commitment relationships has been reported by Erdi et al. (2022), Komariyah et al. (2023), and Kayani (2023), although some results remain context-dependent (Jazilah, 2023). Leaders may strengthen commitment through clear communication, fair direction, and personal support (Yukl, 2013), consistent with studies by Syarief et al. (2017), Setiawan et al. (2024), and Putri and Kasmiruddin (2025).

H3: Organizational culture has a positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment.

H4: Leadership style has a positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment and OCB

Commitment can provide employees with reasons to contribute beyond mandated duties, particularly when they identify strongly with organizational objectives. Employees who experience emotional attachment and responsibility toward their workplace may become more inclined to help colleagues and participate constructively in institutional activities (Luthans, 2015; Organ et al., 2006). Positive associations have been described by Halimsetiono and Santosa (2021), Siswondo et al. (2022), and Nyagin et al. (2025), while Riska and Idrus (2024) provides a contrasting empirical context.

H5: Organizational commitment has a positive and significant relationship with OCB.

The Mediating Role of Commitment

Mediation addresses whether culture or leadership is associated with OCB partly through a preceding relationship with organizational commitment. Shared cultural norms may reinforce employee attachment, which may subsequently foster discretionary

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

cooperation; leader behaviors may similarly strengthen attachment before employees demonstrate greater voluntary initiative. Studies by Gemina et al. (2024), Apriliyanto and Sugiarto (2025), and Kartini et al. (2024) address culture-related pathways. Leadership-related pathways have been examined by Dewi and Riana (2025), Hermanto et al. (2024), and Zhou and Tapsai (2025). The indirect paths must be evaluated separately rather than inferred solely from significant constituent direct effects (Zhao et al., 2010).

H6: Organizational commitment significantly mediates the relationship between organizational culture and OCB.

H7: Organizational commitment significantly mediates the relationship between leadership style and OCB.



Figure 1. Conceptual Research Framework

Source: Authors' conceptualization. H6 and H7 denote the two specific indirect paths.

METHOD

Research Design, Setting, and Participants

The study used a quantitative associative design with questionnaire-based measurement to examine direct and mediated relationships among organizational culture (X1), leadership style (X2), organizational commitment (Z), and OCB (Y). The research setting was the Mataram City Trade Office, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The defined population consisted of 62 civil servants, comprising 33 permanent civil servants (PNS) and 29 government employees working under employment agreements (PPPK). A census procedure included all 62 employees rather than selecting a statistical sample (Iba & Wardhana, 2023; Sugiyono, 2013). Because the study is cross-sectional and observational,

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

the structural paths should be interpreted as statistical associations rather than definitive causal effects.

Measurement and Data Collection

Primary data were obtained using a structured questionnaire with a five-point Likert-type response scale. Organizational culture was originally assessed through 30 items representing seven dimensions; leadership style through 12 items corresponding to four operational dimensions; organizational commitment through nine items across affective, continuance, and normative commitment; and OCB through an initial set of 18 items representing five dimensions. During model respecification, OCB1 was eliminated, leaving 17 OCB indicators. The operational dimensions were informed by established measures of OCB, culture, leadership, and commitment (Organ et al., 2006; Robbins & Judge, 2019; Kartono, 2018; Luthans, 2015). Preliminary interviews and organizational documentation informed the study context; statistical results were obtained from the survey responses.

Data Analysis and Measurement Assessment

The data were processed using SmartPLS with partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The measurement assessment evaluated convergent validity via outer loadings and average variance extracted (AVE), discriminant validity via Fornell–Larcker comparisons and cross-loadings, and construct consistency via Cronbach's alpha and the reported rho_A/composite-reliability column. The inner model was assessed using R^2, adjusted R^2, f^2 effect sizes, and the reported Stone–Geisser Q^2 statistics. Bootstrapped direct and specific indirect effects were evaluated through path coefficients, t statistics, and p values at an approximately 5% two-sided significance level (Hair et al., 2017; Ghozali & Kusumadewi, 2023). The indicators and model estimates were reported using the analysis outputs and accompanying hypothesis interpretations.

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics

All 62 employees were included in the survey analysis. Most respondents were male (74.2%). The modal age ranges were 36–45 and 46–55 years (32.3% each); the largest tenure group had worked for 5–10 years (27.4%). These figures describe the workforce of this specific agency, not the demographic profile of public servants more broadly.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Table 1. Respondent Profile (N = 62)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	46	74.2
	Female	16	25.8
Age	Below 25	2	3.2
	25–35	15	24.2
	36–45	20	32.3
	46–55	20	32.3
	Above 55	5	8.1
Tenure	Below 5 years	15	24.2
	5–10 years	17	27.4
	11–15 years	9	14.5
	16–20 years	14	22.6
	Above 20 years	7	11.3

Source: Authors' survey data, 2026; percentages may differ by 0.1 percentage point due to rounding.

Descriptive Assessment of the Constructs

The overall mean scores indicated favorable perceptions across the constructs: leadership style (3.79), organizational culture (3.72), OCB (3.66), and organizational commitment (3.52). Within OCB, conscientiousness scored highest (3.75), whereas altruism was lowest (3.53). For culture, outcome and team orientations each averaged 3.80; the comparatively lowest scores were aggressiveness and stability (3.64). Decision-making was the highest leadership dimension (3.83). Normative commitment exceeded affective and continuance commitment, although the differences were modest.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Table 2. Construct-Level Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Items reported	Mean	Thesis classification
Organizational culture	30	3.72	Strong
Leadership style	12	3.79	Effective
Organizational commitment	9	3.52	High
Organizational citizenship behavior	17 retained	3.66	High

Source: Authors' survey data, 2026; category labels translated from the questionnaire classifications.

Table 3. Mean Scores by Dimension

Construct	Dimension	Mean
Culture	Innovation and risk taking	3.69
Culture	Attention to detail	3.73
Culture	Outcome orientation	3.80
Culture	People orientation	3.73
Culture	Team orientation	3.80
Culture	Aggressiveness	3.64
Culture	Stability	3.64
Leadership	Decision-making ability	3.83
Leadership	Motivating ability	3.76
Leadership	Communication ability	3.80
Leadership	Directing subordinates	3.78
Commitment	Affective commitment	3.49
Commitment	Continuance commitment	3.48

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Construct	Dimension	Mean
Commitment	Normative commitment	3.59
OCB	Altruism	3.53
OCB	Conscientiousness	3.75
OCB	Sportsmanship	3.62
OCB	Civic virtue	3.71
OCB	Courtesy	3.65

Source: Authors' survey data, 2026. Scores use a five-point Likert scale.

Measurement Model Assessment

Reported AVE values exceeded 0.50, supporting convergent validity under the accepted AVE criterion. Internal-consistency measures were also high. However, Cronbach's alpha exceeded 0.98 for several constructs, which may signal overlapping or redundant items and merits further scrutiny. Moreover, the supplied Fornell–Larcker matrix reveals a discriminant-validity concern: the correlation between leadership style and organizational commitment is 0.855, exceeding the square root of AVE for commitment (0.812). Contrary to the original narrative's blanket conclusion, discriminant validity is therefore not fully established by this criterion. An additional heterotrait–monotrait ratio (HTMT) assessment and, if available, the original indicator data are advisable.

Table 4. Convergent Validity and Internal Consistency

Construct	AVE	Cronbach α	Reported rho_A / reliability
Organizational culture	0.787	0.991	0.992
Leadership style	0.854	0.984	0.985
Organizational commitment	0.660	0.935	0.940
OCB	0.770	0.981	0.983

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output, 2026. The final reliability column reproduces the reported rho_A-labelled statistic.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Table 5. Fornell–Larcker Matrix

Construct	Culture	Leadership	Commitment	OCB
Culture	0.887			
Leadership	0.736	0.924		
Commitment	0.740	0.855	0.812	
OCB	0.699	0.730	0.760	0.878

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output, 2026. Diagonal: square root of AVE. Leadership–commitment correlation exceeds the commitment diagonal.

Structural Model and Predictive Relevance

Organizational culture and leadership style jointly accounted for R^2 = 0.758 of organizational commitment (adjusted R^2 = 0.750), while culture, leadership, and commitment together accounted for R^2 = 0.629 of OCB (adjusted R^2 = 0.610). The Q^2 values were positive for both endogenous constructs, 0.482 for commitment and 0.463 for OCB. The f^2 analysis showed the largest practical contribution for leadership style in predicting commitment (f^2 = 0.872); the other reported path-level f^2 values ranged from 0.026 to 0.109. The Q^2 figures describe the blindfolding-based relevance metric from the structural estimation and do not independently establish out-of-sample forecasting performance.

Table 6. Structural Model Summary

Endogenous construct	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Q^2
Organizational commitment	0.758	0.750	0.482
OCB	0.629	0.610	0.463

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output, 2026.

Table 7. Predictor Effect Sizes (f^2)

Predictor → Outcome	f^2	Interpretation
Culture → Commitment	0.109	Small
Leadership → Commitment	0.872	Large

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

Predictor → Outcome	f^2	Interpretation
Culture → OCB	0.074	Small
Leadership → OCB	0.026	Small
Commitment → OCB	0.104	Small

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output, 2026. Effect-size classifications follow conventional f^2 thresholds.

Direct Path Hypotheses

Bootstrapping indicated that the positive culture–OCB (β = 0.257, p = 0.115) and leadership–OCB (β = 0.199, p = 0.367) paths were not statistically significant. In contrast, culture and leadership both positively predicted commitment (β = 0.240, p = 0.037; β = 0.679, p < 0.001), and commitment positively predicted OCB (β = 0.399, p = 0.035). Thus, H1 and H2 were not supported, whereas H3, H4, and H5 were supported by the reported two-sided tests. The culture-to-commitment coefficient (β = 0.240) is consistent with its standard error (0.115), t statistic (2.088), and specific indirect effect (0.240 × 0.399 ≈ 0.096).

Table 8. Bootstrapped Direct Relationships

Hyp.	Structural path	β	t	p	Result
H1	Culture → OCB	0.257	1.577	0.115	Not supported
H2	Leadership → OCB	0.199	0.903	0.367	Not supported
H3	Culture → Commitment	0.240	2.088	0.037	Supported
H4	Leadership → Commitment	0.679	6.723	< 0.001	Supported
H5	Commitment → OCB	0.399	2.114	0.035	Supported

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output and hypothesis interpretation, 2026.

Indirect Effects and Mediation

The culture → commitment → OCB path was positive but not significant (β = 0.096, t = 1.379, p = 0.168), leaving H6 unsupported. The leadership → commitment → OCB path was positive (β = 0.271), with t = 1.964 and a narrative-p = 0.050. This is a borderline result at the nominal 5% significance threshold, so H7 should be described cautiously rather than as definitive mediation. Because the t statistic is close to 1.96, the significance decision is

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

sensitive to the exact underlying bootstrap distribution and rounding. Together with the nonsignificant direct leadership path, the reported findings are consistent with a possible indirect-only pathway, subject to verification of the original bootstrap output and discriminant validity.

Table 9. Specific Indirect Effects

Hyp.	Indirect relationship	β	t	p	Decision
H6	Culture → Commitment → OCB	0.096	1.379	0.168	Not supported
H7	Leadership → Commitment → OCB	0.271	1.964	0.050	Borderline

Source: Authors' SmartPLS output and accompanying hypothesis interpretation, 2026. The H7 estimate is borderline at the 5% level.

DISCUSSION

Organizational Culture and OCB

The positive but nonsignificant culture–OCB path implies that stronger shared norms were not reliably associated with discretionary conduct after accounting for leadership and commitment in this office. This result differs from positive findings reported by Rahmawati et al. (2023), Lestari et al. (2021), and Reyfaldi et al. (2023), yet it is compatible with the broader observation that cultural effects may depend on intervening employee attitudes. A culture of cooperation and shared responsibility may establish favorable conditions without necessarily generating extra-role behaviors. The descriptive responses also identify relatively weaker perceptions concerning organizational recommendation and willingness to address additional challenges, suggesting that formal espousal of shared values may not be sufficient to produce visible discretionary initiative.

Leadership Style and OCB

Leadership style likewise had a positive but nonsignificant direct relationship with OCB. Although effective decision making and communication may help coordinate formal work, the observed pattern does not show a statistically dependable direct link to extra-role action. This contrasts with the positive leadership–OCB associations described by Munawar et al. (2023) and Gemina et al. (2024), while reinforcing the value of testing context-specific mechanisms (Harwiki, 2016). In a structured public office, leadership may operate primarily

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

by cultivating employees' identification with the agency rather than by directly prompting volunteerism.

Culture, Leadership, and Organizational Commitment

The culture–commitment relationship was significant but smaller than the leadership–commitment relationship (β = 0.240 versus β = 0.679). Cultural alignment appears relevant for strengthening employees' attachment to the agency, echoing Schein's (2010) account of shared assumptions and empirical work by Erdi et al. (2022), Komariyah et al. (2023), and Kayani (2023). More strikingly, the large leadership coefficient and f^2 (0.872) suggest that employee perceptions of managerial direction and support were closely associated with commitment. This is broadly consistent with Yukl (2013), Bass and Riggio (2006), Syarief et al. (2017), and studies addressing leadership and commitment by Setiawan et al. (2024) and Putri and Kasmiruddin (2025). Nevertheless, association does not establish the timing of these mechanisms, and strong correlations among constructs warrant methodological caution.

Organizational Commitment and OCB

Commitment was a positive and significant predictor of OCB (β = 0.399, p = 0.035). Theoretically, individuals who identify with an organization may be willing to help peers, remain conscientious, and participate in its collective life (Organ et al., 2006; Luthans, 2015). The result is aligned with findings concerning commitment and citizenship behavior in Halimsetiono and Santosa (2021), Siswondo et al. (2022), and Nyagin et al. (2025), although Riska and Idrus (2024) illustrates that the association is not uniform. The descriptive profile indicates that normative commitment was slightly stronger than affective and continuance commitment, suggesting a meaningful sense of obligation alongside more moderate emotional attachment.

The Different Mediation Patterns

The specific indirect effect of culture through commitment did not achieve statistical significance. Accordingly, the results do not justify claims that commitment mediates the culture–OCB relationship in this sample, even though culture is associated with commitment and commitment with OCB separately. This distinction is crucial because a statistically meaningful mediation effect must be tested on the indirect product itself (Zhao et al., 2010). The result differs from pathways reported in Gemina et al. (2024), Apriliyanto and Sugiarto (2025), and Kartini et al. (2024), suggesting that shared values may not be sufficiently translated into voluntary conduct through commitment alone.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

For leadership, the indirect coefficient was positive and the reported t statistic was only marginally beyond the conventional 1.96 cutoff. This pattern can be interpreted as potential indirect-only mediation when the indirect confidence interval excludes zero. The more defensible interpretation is provisional evidence of a leadership → commitment → OCB pathway, pending confirmation of the underlying p value and a stronger discriminant-validity assessment. Such a pathway is compatible with mediated leadership findings by Dewi and Riana (2025), Hermanto et al. (2024), and Zhou and Tapsai (2025). It should not be overstated: the significance decision is sensitive to rounding, and commitment was highly correlated with leadership in the Fornell–Larcker matrix.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The principal theoretical contribution is that organizational culture and leadership did not exhibit statistically significant direct paths to OCB, even though both related positively to commitment. The two candidate indirect mechanisms did not behave identically: culture showed no significant mediation, while leadership showed only borderline indirect evidence. Consequently, organizational commitment merits attention as a potential mechanism but cannot be characterized as a uniformly established mediator of both antecedents.

For public administrators, the findings suggest complementing formal culture-building activities with concrete leadership practices that help employees feel recognized, informed, and involved. The Mataram City Trade Office may strengthen two-way communication, employee participation in problem solving, fair acknowledgement of initiative, and consistent supervisory support. Because altruism was the lowest-rated OCB dimension, managers could also encourage cross-unit assistance, knowledge exchange, and constructive collaboration. Such recommendations are consistent with the descriptive evidence, but their effect should be evaluated prospectively rather than assumed from a cross-sectional model.

CONCLUSION

Using census data from 62 employees of the Mataram City Trade Office, this study found positive but nonsignificant direct relationships between organizational culture and OCB and between leadership style and OCB. Culture and leadership were positively associated with organizational commitment, and commitment was positively associated with OCB. Organizational commitment did not significantly mediate the culture–OCB relationship. The indirect leadership–OCB association through commitment was positive but marginal at the 5% threshold. The model explained 62.9% of variance in the measured

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

OCB construct, underscoring the potential relevance of commitment and suggesting that leadership-related pathways may deserve particular managerial attention.

Recommendations

Managers should prioritize clear communication, constructive feedback, equitable involvement, and support for employees' organizational attachment. Organizational values should be enacted in day-to-day collaboration rather than treated only as formal statements. Future evaluations should monitor helping behavior and participation over time and distinguish voluntary extra-role contributions from prescribed job responsibilities.

Limitations and Further Research

The investigation concerned one municipal agency, relied on self-reported survey responses, and included only 62 participants. A cross-sectional design does not establish causal order or rule out common-method bias. The high reliability coefficients may reflect item redundancy. More importantly, the leadership–commitment correlation exceeded the square root of AVE for commitment, suggesting incomplete discriminant validity. The borderline indirect effect should be reassessed against bootstrapped confidence intervals before drawing a firm mediation conclusion. Consequently, replication with verified SmartPLS outputs, HTMT confidence intervals, larger multi-agency samples, and longitudinal or multi-source designs is strongly recommended. Additional antecedents such as organizational justice, perceived support, and job satisfaction may help account for remaining OCB variance.

REFERENCES

Apriliyanto, Y. A., & Sugiarto, A. (2025). Komitmen organisasi sebagai pemediasi pengaruh budaya organisasi dan kepuasan kerja terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Jurnal Nusantara Aplikasi Manajemen Bisnis, 10(1), 18–31. https://doi.org/10.29407/nusamba.v10i1.22134

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2016). Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace. McGraw-Hill Education.

Dewi, I. G. C., & Riana, I. G. (2025). The mediating role of organizational commitment in the influence of transformational leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (A

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

study at Mercure Bali Hotel). International Journal of Management Research and Economics, 3(2), 284–292. https://doi.org/10.54066/ijmre-itb.v3i2.3404

Erdi, H., Bambang, R., & Kulsum, U. (2022). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi dan kinerja karyawan Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Lampung Selatan. Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manajemen, 8(2), 571–572. https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.8.2.565

Gemina, D., Yuningsih, E., & Putri, A. K. (2024). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) based on leadership style and organizational culture with organizational commitment as an intervening variable. International Journal of Applied Economics, Accounting and Management (IJAEAM), 2(6), 525–542. https://doi.org/10.59890/ijaeam.v2i6.2705

Ghozali, I., & Kusumadewi, K. A. (2023). Menggunakan program SmartPLS 4.0 untuk penelitian empiris. Yoga Pratama.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Sage.

Halimsetiono, E., & Santosa, W. N. (2021). Komitmen organisasi karyawan dan pengaruhnya terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora, (2), 6977. https://doi.org/10.24123/soshum.v2i2.4082

Harwiki, W. (2016). The impact of servant leadership on organization culture, organizational commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and employee performance in women cooperatives. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 219, 286287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.04.032

Hermanto, Y. B., Srimulyani, V. A., & Pitoyo, D. J. (2024). The mediating role of quality of work life and organizational commitment in the link between transformational leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Heliyon, 10(6), e27664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27664

Jazilah, K. (2023). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi melalui motivasi kerja. Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 11(2), 452.

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Kartini, T., Yuningsih, E., & Nida, K. N. (2024). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) karyawan berbasis efikasi diri dan budaya organisasi dengan komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel intervening. Journal of Management Small and Medium Enterprise, 17(3), 1287–1300.

Kartono, K. (2018). Pemimpin dan kepemimpinan: Apakah pemimpin abnormal itu? RajaGrafindo Persada.

Kayani, B. N. (2023). Impact of organisational culture on organisational commitment: Evidence from Pakistan. Journal of Accounting, Business and Management (JABM), 30(1), 86. https://doi.org/10.31966/jabminternational.v30i1.793

Khafifah, L. E., & Subroto, S. (2024). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, budaya organisasi dan employee engagement terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Multiplier: Jurnal Magister Manajemen, 3(2), 140–152. https://doi.org/10.24905/mlt.v3i2.55

Komariyah, I., Prayudi, A., Edison, E., & Laelawati, K. (2023). The relationship between organizational culture and competence with organizational commitment in employees of BUMD Binjai, North Sumatra. Jurnal Riset Bisnis dan Manajemen, 16(2), 210–218. https://doi.org/10.23969/jrbm.v16i2.7572

Kurniawan, R., Rosita, S., & Chairunnisa, F. (2019). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior dengan komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel intervening. Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen, 7(3), 155–164. https://doi.org/10.22437/jdm.v7i3.16808

Lestari, N. W., Indriati, I. H., & Basri, A. I. (2021). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi, budaya organisasi, dan kepemimpinan terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Aktiva: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis, 1(1), 35–43.

Luthans, F. (2015). Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach (13th ed.). Information Age Publishing.

Munawar, F., Ependi, M., & Wildan, M. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) dimediasi dengan komitmen organisasi: Studi pada tendik UIN Bandung. Komitmen: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, 4, 115–124. https://doi.org/10.15575/jim.v4i2.27932

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Newstrom, J. W. (2011). Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Nyagin, S. A., Julaibib, & Ariani, L. (2025). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior pada pegawai instansi X Kota Banjarbaru. Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis (JEMB), 4(2), 515–520. https://doi.org/10.47233/jemb.v4i2.3495

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/978145223108

Putri, D., & Kasmiruddin. (2025). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap komitmen organisasi melalui motivasi kerja sebagai variabel intervening. ECo-Buss, 7(3), 17. https://doi.org/10.32877/eb.v7i3.1451

Rahmawati, R., Ashari, M. R., Juniar, A., & Sofyaun, A. (2023). Organizational culture and organizational commitment to Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Edunomika, 7(2), 4–5.

Reyfaldi, M., Kurniawan, A. W., & Dipoatmojo, T. S. P. (2023). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior pada PT. Bujaya Karya Makmur. Pinisi Journal of Art, Humanity & Social Studies, 3.

Riska, M., & Idrus, I. (2024). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja, komitmen organisasi dan reward terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) pada karyawan BPS Kota Parepare. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 5, 148.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). Pearson.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership. Wiley.

Setiawan, A., Hermawati, A., & Guniarto. (2024). Analisis pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan motivasi berprestasi terhadap komitmen organisasi dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening. Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen (JIM), 10, 139–140.

Siswondo, S., Sudrajat, D., Solahudin, A., & Wibowo, S. N. (2022). The influence of organizational culture and organizational commitment on OCB (Organizational

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Citizenship Behavior) employees. Daengku: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation, 2(5), 741748. https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.daengku1277

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D. CV. Alfabeta.

Syarief, A., Maarif, M. S., & Sukmawati, A. (2017). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi dan perilaku kewargaan organisasi. Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi, 8, 184–185.

Yukl, G. A. (2013). Leadership in organizations. Pearson.

Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. Journal of Consumer Research, 37(2), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1086/651257

Zhou, H., & Tapsai, C. (2025). The impact of university executive leadership style on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The mediating role of organizational commitment and the moderating effect of organizational culture. Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review, 5, e07122. https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v5.n07.pe07122

Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.