BULLETIN OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRY
(BESTI Journal) | ISSN (e): 3025-5821
Website : https://bestijournal.org/index.php/go/index | Volume 4 No. 4 (2026)

PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AMONG EMPLOYEES OF PT TEUPIN LADA IN EAST ACEH

Fitria Miranda, Azhar, Yanita, Sullaida
Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business
Universitas Malikussaleh, Lhokseumawe, Indonesia
Corresponding Author:azhar@unimal.ac.id

Received: 06/09/2026 | **Revised:** 11/09/2026 | **Accepted:** 30/09/2026 | **Published:** 29/10/2026

Abstract

This study examines the associations of transformational leadership, work-life balance, and organizational commitment with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among employees of PT Teupin Lada, a palm oil processing company in East Aceh, Indonesia. A cross-sectional questionnaire survey yielded 97 usable responses. Thirty items measured the four constructs on five-point agreement scales. Composite scores were reconstructed from the item-level response tabulations printed in the thesis appendix before ordinary least squares estimation. Transformational leadership was positively associated with OCB ($B = 0.528$, $p < .001$), as was organizational commitment ($B = 0.418$, $p = .008$). Work-life balance had a positive coefficient but did not reach statistical significance ($B = 0.241$, $p = .063$). The model explained 54.6% of the variation in OCB, with an adjusted R^2 of .531. Sensitivity analysis retained the leadership finding, while the commitment association remained just below the .05 threshold with HC3 standard errors. These findings support attention to supervisory practices and employee attachment while indicating that work-life balance requires further investigation as an independent predictor. The results describe associations within one company and do not establish causal effects.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior; organizational commitment; palm oil industry; transformational leadership; work-life balance

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) concerns discretionary contributions that support the social and operational functioning of an organization. Helping colleagues, preventing avoidable interpersonal difficulties, and participating constructively in organizational activities can complement the tasks formally assigned to employees. Organ et al. (2006) distinguish these contributions from behavior explained solely by formal job requirements, while Podsakoff et al. (2000) identify leadership and employee attitudes as recurring antecedents in the OCB literature. Understanding these relationships is relevant to workplaces where employees must coordinate across interdependent tasks.

PT Teupin Lada is a private palm oil processing company located in East Aceh, Indonesia. The preliminary observations motivating this study described limited employee initiative beyond formal responsibilities, predominantly one-way supervisory communication, and uneven opportunities to discuss work difficulties with managers. Shift schedules, weekend work, and increased activity during harvest periods also raised questions about employees' ability to manage responsibilities outside work. These observations provided a practical reason to investigate employee perceptions. They were contextual observations rather than independently measured estimates of the prevalence of low OCB.

The study examines transformational leadership, work-life balance, and organizational commitment together as potential predictors of OCB. This specification connects employees' perceptions of supervisors, the compatibility of their work and personal responsibilities, and their attachment to the company. It also allows the association of each predictor with OCB to be assessed while accounting for the other two, rather than relying on separate relationships that may reflect overlapping employee perceptions.

Transformational leadership provides one explanation for discretionary contributions because supervisors can communicate a meaningful purpose, encourage problem solving, and respond to individual employee needs. Bass and Riggio (2006) describe these practices through idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. In Indonesian organizational settings, Nenggor et al. (2022) and Nurjanah et al. (2020) report positive leadership associations with OCB. However, findings from other settings do not always show a statistically distinguishable relationship, as illustrated by Sasongko and Mansyur (2025). The relevance of leadership therefore requires examination within the employment context being studied.

Work-life balance and organizational commitment introduce different considerations. Balance concerns the compatibility of participation and satisfaction across work and nonwork roles, whereas commitment concerns the employee's relationship with the organization (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Positive work-life balance findings in Muliku et al. (2023) and Panie et al. (2025) contrast with nonsignificant findings in Adhiwijaya et al. (2024) and Sasongko and Mansyur (2025). Similarly, Astuti and Amir (2023) report a positive commitment association, while Chabib and Wahyuningsih (2022) find that organizational commitment is not significant in their model. These differences caution against treating the three predictors as universally interchangeable explanations of OCB.

The research problem is whether these relationships are observable among PT Teupin Lada employees when the predictors enter the same regression model. The study addresses three questions: whether transformational leadership is associated with OCB, whether work-life balance contributes a distinct association, and whether organizational commitment remains relevant after the other predictors are considered. Its contribution is a joint assessment in a palm oil processing workplace in East Aceh. The design provides evidence about relationships in the observed workforce; it does not identify the effects of an intervention or establish the direction of causation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social exchange theory and discretionary contribution

Social exchange theory offers a framework for interpreting why employees may contribute beyond immediate contractual requirements. Blau (1964) explains social exchange through relationships involving valued benefits and reciprocal obligations. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) show how this perspective has been applied to workplace relationships involving trust, support, and reciprocity. Under this interpretation, considerate supervision and favorable employment experiences may be accompanied by a willingness to help colleagues and support collective activities. Such contributions can represent an employee's response to the quality of the relationship with supervisors or the organization.

The framework does not imply that every favorable experience must produce OCB. Employees may differ in what they value and in how they respond to organizational treatment. Perceived work-life balance may reflect family arrangements or personal preferences as well as employer support. Commitment can also arise from emotional attachment, perceived costs of leaving, or felt obligation. These distinctions justify estimating separate coefficients. Because reciprocity, trust, and exchange obligations were not directly modeled as mediators, the theory provides an interpretive basis rather than an empirically verified causal process (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior

Transformational leadership emphasizes the relationship between leaders and followers in pursuing shared objectives. Idealized influence concerns a leader's example and perceived trustworthiness. Inspirational motivation concerns encouragement and a clear sense of purpose. Intellectual stimulation involves openness to ideas and alternative solutions, while individualized consideration concerns attention to employee needs and development (Bass & Riggio, 2006). These practices may create conditions in which constructive participation and voluntary cooperation are valued and easier to express.

Nenggor et al. (2022) report a positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB among water utility employees. Nurjanah et al. (2020) also identify a positive leadership relationship in a public-sector organization. Chabib and Wahyuningsih (2022) provide further supporting evidence, although the nonsignificant result reported by Sasongko and Mansyur (2025) shows that the relationship is not uniform across samples. In PT Teupin Lada, leadership is relevant to the observed communication concerns because employees rely on supervisors for direction, feedback, and responses to operating difficulties. The first hypothesis retains an association-based formulation consistent with the survey design.

OPEN ACCESS

H1. Transformational leadership is associated with organizational citizenship behavior among employees of PT Teupin Lada.

Work-life balance and organizational citizenship behavior

Greenhaus et al. (2003) distinguish time balance, involvement balance, and satisfaction balance. This framework recognizes that balance concerns more than the number of hours devoted to a role. Employees may also evaluate whether they can participate adequately in both domains and whether the resulting arrangement is satisfactory. In the present study, the concept is applied to employees' perceptions of work and personal life, including their ability to fulfill responsibilities and enjoy time outside work.

Employees who experience compatible responsibilities may have greater capacity for discretionary cooperation, but the evidence varies across organizational settings. Muliku et al. (2023) and Panie et al. (2025) report significant positive associations with OCB. Adhiwijaya et al. (2024) report a nonsignificant relationship among Generation Z employees, and Sasongko and Mansyur (2025) report a positive but nonsignificant coefficient in an event-organizer sample. These differences make work-life balance an empirical question for a workplace with shift-based operations. They do not justify assuming that a favorable balance score necessarily results in higher OCB.
H2. Work-life balance is associated with organizational citizenship behavior among employees of PT Teupin Lada.

Organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior

Meyer and Allen (1991) distinguish affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. These respectively concern emotional attachment, perceived costs associated with leaving, and a felt obligation to remain. Commitment may accompany OCB when employees identify with organizational goals or regard constructive participation as appropriate. Nevertheless, remaining because leaving is costly is conceptually different from remaining because membership is valued. A combined commitment measure must therefore be interpreted as an overall score rather than as evidence that every component has the same association.

Astuti and Amir (2023) and Ristiana et al. (2024) report positive commitment associations with OCB, whereas Chabib and Wahyuningsih (2022) report a nonsignificant result. These studies support examining commitment alongside leadership and work-life balance while allowing its empirical contribution to differ across settings. The present model treats commitment as an independent predictor and does not test an indirect pathway through commitment.
H3. Organizational commitment is associated with organizational citizenship behavior among employees of PT Teupin Lada.

METHOD

Research design and participants

The study used a quantitative cross-sectional survey of employees at PT Teupin Lada in Blang Gleum Village, Julok District, East Aceh Regency, Indonesia. A census approach was attempted, and 97 usable questionnaires formed the analytic sample. The employee was the unit of analysis. The sample included staff from production, maintenance, sorting, laboratory, administration, and supporting functions. Participation is described in terms of the observed 97 respondents because the available headcount descriptions do not consistently establish a single eligible population denominator.

Questionnaires were distributed directly to employees. The instructions explained the academic purpose of the research, asked respondents to answer according to their experiences, and stated that their answers would remain confidential. The analysis uses coded records and reports only aggregate results. The survey was documented in the 2026 thesis. Demographic information covered gender, age, highest educational attainment, and length of service. These characteristics describe the sample and were not included as regression controls.

Measures and response scale

The instrument contained 30 statements adapted to the study context from the conceptual dimensions summarized in Table 1. Responses used five ordered agreement categories, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores represented stronger endorsement of each construct. Descriptive results are presented as each respondent's average item score, while regression estimates use within-respondent sums. This distinction preserves comparability in the descriptive table and makes the units of the regression coefficients explicit.

OPEN ACCESS

Table 1. Operationalization of the study variables

Variable	Dimensions	Items	Conceptual source
Transformational leadership	Idealized influence; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration	8	Bass and Riggio (2006)
Work-life balance	Time balance; involvement balance; satisfaction balance	6	Greenhaus et al. (2003)
Organizational commitment	Affective; continuance; normative commitment	6	Meyer and Allen (1991)
Organizational citizenship behavior	Altruism; conscientiousness; sportsmanship; courtesy; civic virtue	10	Organ et al. (2006)

Note. Each dimension is represented by two statements. All items use the same five-point agreement response scale.

Verification of composite scores

The thesis appendix (Miranda, 2026) provided 97 numbered response records containing 2,910 item values. These printed values were checked for completeness, permissible ranges, and alignment of row numbers across the four scales. Composite totals were then checked against their component items. The organizational commitment total in 96 records incorporated both the current respondent's six-item sum and the preceding respondent's sum. That column was rebuilt using only each respondent's own six answers. The other three aggregate columns matched their item sums. No tabulated item value was changed or imputed. All reported results use the reconstructed within-respondent scores. Verification was limited to the printed tabulations; the original completed questionnaires and electronic data file were unavailable.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics summarize the respondent profile and scale distributions. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and corrected item-total correlations, where the focal item is excluded from the comparison total. These checks examine whether the items behave coherently within a scale; they do not by themselves establish construct validity. The regression follows the multiple-predictor approach used in the original study and estimates the association of each predictor with OCB while holding the remaining predictors constant (Ghozali, 2021).

$$\mathrm{OCB} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathrm{TL} + \beta_2 \mathrm{WLB} + \beta_3 \mathrm{OC} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

In Equation (1), OCB is the ten-item citizenship total; TL is the eight-item transformational leadership total; WLB and OC are the respective six-item work-life balance and organizational commitment totals; the coefficients express conditional associations; and the error term represents unexplained variation. Ordinary least squares estimates, two-sided t tests, and 95% confidence intervals were calculated from the reconstructed scores using Python numerical and statistical routines. The significance threshold was .05. The overall F test, R^2, adjusted R^2, residual diagnostics, and a targeted HC3 sensitivity analysis were also examined. No mediator, interaction term, or additional predictor was introduced.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent characteristics

Table 2 presents the sample profile. Most respondents were men, the largest age group was 28–37 years, and more than half had worked at the company for four to seven years. Educational frequencies follow the questionnaire output: 44 respondents had completed senior high school. Appendix frequencies were checked to total 97 within each characteristic and used to recalculate percentages.

OPEN ACCESS

Table 2. Characteristics of the respondents

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Men	92	94.8
	Women	5	5.2
Age	18–27 years	18	18.6
	28–37 years	40	41.2
	38–47 years	26	26.8
	Over 47 years	13	13.4
Education	Primary school	20	20.6
	Junior high school	19	19.6
	Senior high school	44	45.4
	Three-year diploma	2	2.1
	Bachelor's degree	12	12.4
Length of service	0–3 years	20	20.6
	4–7 years	53	54.6
	More than 7 years	24	24.7

Source: questionnaire profile output, 2026. N = 97 for each characteristic. Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding.

The findings primarily reflect men's experiences in this workforce. Many respondents had several years of service, but tenure was not tested as a predictor of commitment or OCB.

Descriptive statistics and internal consistency

Table 3 reports means and standard deviations for the average item scores, together with internal consistency results. All four means exceeded the response midpoint of 3. Organizational commitment had the highest mean at 3.704, followed by OCB at 3.680, work-life balance at 3.608, and transformational leadership at 3.568. The means indicate generally favorable self-reported perceptions, although they should not be interpreted as a formal ranking of organizational performance. The scale scores measure different concepts and do not share an externally validated performance benchmark.

Table 3. Scale descriptives and internal consistency

Variable	Items	Mean	SD	Alpha	Corrected item-total r
Transformational leadership	8	3.568	0.670	.889	.606–.725
Work-life balance	6	3.608	0.542	.817	.499–.704
Organizational commitment	6	3.704	0.499	.751	.437–.592
Organizational citizenship behavior	10	3.680	0.543	.887	.546–.687

Note. N = 97. Means and SDs refer to respondent-level average scores on the 1–5 scale. Alpha and corrected item-total correlations were recalculated from the item responses.

Cronbach's alpha ranged from .751 for organizational commitment to .889 for transformational leadership. Corrected item-total correlations were positive for every item, with the lowest scale-specific range found for commitment. These results support the internal coherence of the measures for the present analysis. However, the commitment items represent three conceptually distinct bases of attachment. Acceptable internal consistency does not demonstrate that those bases are identical or that a single aggregate captures their separate implications (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

The item means identify aspects that can inform interpretation without being treated as separate hypothesis tests. Within transformational leadership, openness to new ideas averaged 3.474 and support for employee development averaged 3.485. Both were below the mean for attention to employee needs, 3.649. In the OCB scale,

OPEN ACCESS

willingness to assist colleagues experiencing work difficulties averaged 3.577. These descriptive differences identify topics for managerial follow-up, including employee suggestions, development opportunities, and support for colleagues.

Relationships among the study variables

Table 4. Pearson correlations among the reconstructed scale scores

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Transformational leadership	1.000			
2. Work-life balance	.337	1.000		
3. Organizational commitment	.517	.382	1.000	
4. Organizational citizenship behavior	.689	.408	.555	1.000

Note. N = 97. Correlations use reconstructed within-respondent sums. The lower triangle is shown to avoid duplicating values.

All three predictors were positively correlated with OCB before adjustment. The correlation was largest for transformational leadership (.689), followed by organizational commitment (.555) and work-life balance (.408). The predictors also shared positive correlations with one another. These relationships explain why a bivariate association and a multiple-regression coefficient address different questions. In particular, the positive work-life balance correlation does not establish a distinct association after leadership and commitment are included in the same model.

Regression estimates and hypothesis tests

Table 5 reports the multiple-regression estimates based on the corrected composite scores. Transformational leadership and organizational commitment had positive coefficients with confidence intervals above zero. Work-life balance also had a positive coefficient, but its interval included zero. Thus, H1 and H3 were supported under conventional ordinary least squares inference, while H2 was not supported at the .05 significance level.

Table 5. Multiple regression predicting organizational citizenship behavior

Predictor	B	SE	Beta	t	p	95% CI for B
Intercept	7.215	3.269	NA	2.207	.030	0.723 to 13.707
Transformational leadership	0.528	0.084	.521	6.285	< .001	0.361 to 0.695
Work-life balance	0.241	0.128	.144	1.880	.063	−0.014 to 0.496
Organizational commitment	0.418	0.153	.231	2.729	.008	0.114 to 0.722

Note. N = 97; residual df = 93. B = unstandardized coefficient; SE = conventional standard error; Beta = standardized coefficient; CI = confidence interval. The model uses summed scale scores.

$$\widehat{\mathrm{OCB}} = 7.215 + 0.528\mathrm{TL} + 0.241\mathrm{WLB} + 0.418\mathrm{OC} \quad (2)$$

The overall model was significant, $F(3, 93) = 37.282$, $p < .001$. R^2 was .546 and adjusted R^2 was .531, indicating that the included predictors accounted for approximately 54.6% of the observed variation in OCB before the adjustment for model size. The standard error of the estimate was 3.716 OCB total-score points. The unexplained variation includes measurement error and other influences; its magnitude does not identify the contributions of specific omitted variables.

A one-point difference in the leadership total was associated with a 0.528-point difference in the OCB total, holding the other predictors constant. Corresponding differences were 0.241 points for work-life balance and 0.418 points for commitment. These are score differences, not percentages. Because the predictors have different item counts and distributions, their raw coefficients should not be used alone to rank their relative associations. The standardized coefficients identify leadership as the largest association in this sample. The intercept is a mathematical component of the fitted model rather than an observed baseline, since zero lies outside the possible scale totals.

Model diagnostics and sensitivity

Variance inflation factors were 1.409 for leadership, 1.208 for work-life balance, and 1.461 for commitment, indicating no marked collinearity in this specification. The Shapiro–Wilk residual test gave $W = .991$ and $p = .790$. The studentized Breusch–Pagan test gave $\chi^2(3) = 5.171$ and $p = .160$. These diagnostics did not identify a substantial departure from residual normality or constant variance, although nonsignificant diagnostic tests do not prove that

model assumptions hold exactly. A sensitivity analysis using HC3 heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors left leadership significant ($p < .001$) and work-life balance nonsignificant ($p = .133$). Commitment remained just below .05 ($p = .0495$), with a 95% interval of approximately 0.001 to 0.835. The commitment association therefore warrants more caution than its conventional p value alone suggests. The scoring correction, rather than any change to questionnaire answers, accounts for the difference between the work-life balance conclusion here and the initial tabulation.

Interpretation of the leadership association

Transformational leadership showed the strongest standardized association with OCB in the fitted model. Employees who evaluated their supervisors more favorably also tended to report greater willingness to cooperate, act responsibly, and participate in organizational activities. This pattern is consistent with the findings of Nenggor et al. (2022), Nurjanah et al. (2020), and Chabib and Wahyuningsih (2022). It supports the relevance of leadership perceptions to discretionary behavior in the present company while allowing the magnitude of the relationship to differ from that observed in other organizations.

Social exchange theory provides a plausible interpretation of this association. A supervisor who offers useful guidance, recognizes employee needs, and responds constructively to ideas may be perceived as investing in the employment relationship. Employees may reciprocate through cooperation and contributions that are not specified exhaustively in their job descriptions (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Bass and Riggio (2006) also connect transformational leadership to motivation, intellectual engagement, and individual development. These mechanisms are consistent with the observed pattern, but none was directly measured as a mediator in this study.

The descriptive results provide a more specific basis for discussing leadership practices. Openness to new ideas and support for development received somewhat lower ratings than attention to individual needs. Management could therefore examine whether employees have usable opportunities to propose solutions, receive feedback, and develop skills. Such follow-up is relevant to the preliminary observation of one-way communication. Management can evaluate these practices by recording employee feedback and reviewing changes over time.

The association should also be interpreted in light of how the data were collected. Employees rated both their supervisors and their own citizenship behavior in the same questionnaire. General satisfaction or a favorable response tendency could contribute to both ratings. Conversely, cooperative employees may receive more positive supervisory attention. The cross-sectional design cannot distinguish these possibilities. The stability of the leadership result under HC3 inference strengthens confidence in the statistical association, but it does not remove these limits on causal interpretation.

Interpretation of the work-life balance result

Work-life balance was positively correlated with OCB, but its unique coefficient did not meet the .05 threshold in the multiple-regression model. This distinction is central to the finding. A positive bivariate relationship indicates that the two scores tended to move together. The adjusted coefficient asks whether work-life balance still contributes evidence of an association after the variation shared with leadership and commitment has been taken into account. The estimated coefficient remained positive, but its confidence interval included both negative and positive values.

The result is compatible with the nonsignificant relationships reported by Adhiwijaya et al. (2024) and Sasongko and Mansyur (2025). It differs from the positive and statistically significant findings reported by Muliku et al. (2023) and Panie et al. (2025). Differences in samples, measurement, organizational arrangements, and included predictors may contribute to these contrasting outcomes. The available evidence does not identify which explanation applies in PT Teupin Lada. The appropriate conclusion is therefore insufficient evidence of a distinct work-life balance association in this specification, rather than proof that work-life balance has no relevance to employee behavior.

The content of the work-life balance measure helps clarify this interpretation. Its statements concern employees' perceived ability to divide time, maintain involvement, and feel satisfied across work and personal life. They do not directly measure staffing adequacy, schedule predictability, recovery time, or a formal work-life policy. A favorable individual balance score may therefore arise through different arrangements. Greenhaus et al. (2003) distinguish time, involvement, and satisfaction balance. The present instrument captures these perceived forms of balance rather than the organizational arrangements that may shape them.

OPEN ACCESS

The nonsignificant coefficient should not be used to justify neglecting work-life arrangements. The observations that motivated the research included shift work, weekend duties, and periods of heightened operational demand. The company can examine those conditions as practical workforce issues without claiming that this regression proves a direct OCB benefit. Future research could measure schedule characteristics and work-life balance separately, test a clearly specified mechanism, and collect observations over time. Such designs would provide evidence beyond the conditional association estimated here.

Interpretation of the commitment association

Organizational commitment was positively associated with OCB after leadership and work-life balance were included in the model. This finding is consistent with Astuti and Amir (2023), Ristiana et al. (2024), and Nurjanah et al. (2020). Employees who reported stronger attachment or obligation to the company also tended to report greater discretionary contribution. The result adds evidence from a palm oil processing workplace, while Chabib and Wahyuningsih's (2022) nonsignificant commitment finding shows why the relationship should not be treated as universal.

The aggregate commitment score requires careful interpretation. The instrument combines comfort and pride in membership, perceived difficulty in leaving, and an obligation to remain or reciprocate employment opportunities. Meyer and Allen (1991) distinguish these as different bases of commitment. The coefficient does not establish that emotional attachment, economic dependence, and felt obligation independently contribute to OCB or contribute equally. The positive result concerns their combined score. A future study could retain the three components separately, provided the measurement design and sample support that specification.

Commitment also showed greater sensitivity to the method used to estimate uncertainty. Its conventional p value was .008, but the HC3 result was .0495 and the lower confidence bound was close to zero. HC3 leaves the coefficient unchanged but produces a wider confidence interval, indicating that precision is sensitive to the standard-error estimator. Replication with additional organizations, more observations, and independent behavioral ratings would help assess the stability of this finding. It would also distinguish the value of overall commitment from the contributions of its separate components.

Implications for employee management

The findings give management a basis for prioritizing issues to investigate. Leadership practices are the clearest statistical correlate in the current model. Regular two-way discussions, a consistent response to employee suggestions, and transparent opportunities for skill development correspond to the practices represented in the leadership measure. Supervisors can document whether employees receive responses to concerns and whether development opportunities reach different operating units. The observed association and item ratings provide the basis for these proposed priorities. Commitment-related initiatives can focus on recognition, clear expectations, and realistic development opportunities. Employee consultation can help distinguish valued attachment from necessity or obligation. These different bases of commitment remain relevant when translating the aggregate survey finding into practice (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Work-life arrangements should be reviewed alongside leadership and commitment practices. Managers can seek feedback on schedule communication, changes in workload, and employees' ability to manage personal responsibilities. Evaluation should consider these experiences directly, rather than judging a work-life initiative only by changes in OCB. Citizenship behavior itself should retain its discretionary meaning. Organ et al. (2006) emphasize behavior that extends beyond narrowly specified obligations; treating every additional contribution as a mandatory expectation would change the construct that the questionnaire was intended to capture.

Limitations and directions for further research

The study concerns one company and 97 respondents, with a workforce profile dominated by men. Its findings cannot be generalized automatically to other palm oil companies, industries, or demographic groups. The available employee headcount descriptions are inconsistent, which also limits claims about complete workforce coverage. A study across several companies with clearly documented eligibility and participation would provide a stronger basis for examining variation across operating environments.

All variables were measured by employee self-report at one point in time. Responses may reflect subjective interpretation, social desirability, or common response tendencies. No supervisor-rated OCB, administrative behavioral outcome, or longitudinal observation was available. The model also omitted potential contextual variables and treated each construct as an aggregate. The correction of the commitment totals demonstrates the need for item-

OPEN ACCESS

level verification, while the HC3 results show that the precision of the commitment estimate depends partly on the inference method. Further work should verify scoring, evaluate the measurement structure, and collect independent observations before drawing causal or intervention conclusions.

CONCLUSION

This study examined transformational leadership, work-life balance, and organizational commitment as predictors of OCB among employees of PT Teupin Lada in East Aceh. Analysis of the 97 tabulated response records identified positive associations for transformational leadership and organizational commitment. Work-life balance had a positive coefficient but did not show a statistically significant unique association at the .05 level. The model explained 54.6% of the variation in OCB, with an adjusted R^2 of .531. Leadership had the largest standardized coefficient and retained a clear association in the sensitivity analysis; the commitment result was less precise under HC3 inference.

The findings are consistent with attention to the quality of supervisory relationships and employee attachment, while the work-life balance result calls for more specific measurement and further investigation. Management can use the results to guide employee consultation and the evaluation of supervisory and work-life practices. The evidence remains observational, and the proposed actions require evaluation rather than being treated as proven effects. Accurate composite scoring and a distinction between positive coefficients and statistically supported relationships are essential to interpreting the study.

REFERENCES

Adhiwijaya, A. G. P., Purwaningrum, E. K., & Mariskha, S. E. (2024). The influence of work-life balance on organizational citizenship behavior. KnE Social Sciences, 9(30), 155–163. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i30.17515

Astuti, Y. F., & Amir, D. A. (2023). The effect of person-organization fit, person-job fit, and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior: Evidence from employees in the Indonesia public sector. Diponegoro International Journal of Business, 6(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.14710/dijb.6.1.2023.1-8

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.

Chabib, W. N., & Wahyuningsih, T. H. (2022). Komitmen organisasional, kepuasan kerja, kepemimpinan transformasional dan pengaruhnya terhadap organizational citizenship behavior. Cakrawangsa Bisnis: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa, 3(1), 97–110. https://doi.org/10.35917/cb.v3i1.303

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Ghozali, I. (2021). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26 (10th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63(3), 510–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1(1), 61–89.

Miranda, F. (2026). Pengaruh transformational leadership, work life balance, dan organizational commitment terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada karyawan PT. Teupin Lada Aceh Timur [Undergraduate thesis]. Universitas Malikussaleh.

Muliku, R. E., Dotulong, L. O. H., & Sumarauw, J. S. B. (2023). Pengaruh work life balance, job loyalty, dan job embeddedness terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada PT Semen Tonasa Packing Plant Bitung. Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi, 11(3), 1498–1509. https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v11i3.50714

Nenggor, K., Herawati, J., & Septyarini, E. (2022). Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional dan budaya organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). MANDAR: Management Development and Applied Research Journal, 4(2), 35–45. https://doi.org/10.31605/mandar.v4i2.1688

Nurjanah, S., Pebianti, V., & Handaru, A. W. (2020). The influence of transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitments on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the inspectorate general of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Cogent Business & Management, 7(1), Article 1793521. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1793521

OPEN ACCESS

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Sage Publications.

Panie, W. S., Fanggidae, R. E., Salean, D. Y., & Timuneno, T. (2025). Pengaruh work life balance dan komitmen organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada karyawan PT. Pegadaian Cabang Oesapa Kupang. GLORY Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ilmu Sosial, 6(1), 315–322. https://doi.org/10.70581/glory.v6i1.16641

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. Journal of Management, 26(3), 513–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307

Ristiana, R., Jamaludin, A., & Nandang. (2024). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada bagian cleaning service PT. Gokko Mirai Indonesia. Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan & Bisnis Syariah, 6(9), 5622–5637. https://doi.org/10.47467/alkharaj.v6i9.2473

Sasongko, R. D., & Mansyur, A. (2025). Organizational citizenship behavior: Hubungan work-life balance, transformational leadership, dan organizational justice pada event organizer. Business Management Journal, 21(2), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.30813/bmj.v21i2.8818

OPEN ACCESS