

University Administrative Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review and Reflection

Hui Zhou ¹, Chalermapol Tapsai²

^{1,2}College of Innovation and Management, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand
E-Mail: s63484945091@ssru.ac.th¹, chalermapol.ta@ssru.ac.th²

Abstract

This paper systematically reviews research on the impact of university administrative leadership styles on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), focusing on the theoretical frameworks, mediating mechanisms (e.g., organizational commitment, psychological capital), and contextual moderators (e.g., organizational culture, institutional environment). It identifies key progress in understanding how transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles influence OCB dimensions (altruism, conscientiousness, etc.) in higher education settings. The review also highlights limitations in cultural adaptability, dynamic tracking, and the neglect of China's university-specific governance structures. Finally, it proposes future research directions to address these gaps, aiming to provide theoretical and practical insights for optimizing university leadership and promoting positive organizational behavior.

Keywords: University administrative leadership; Leadership styles; Organizational citizenship behavior

Introduction

In recent years, China's education industry has witnessed remarkable growth, with significant progress in areas such as the popularization of education, improvement of educational infrastructure, and enhancement of teaching quality. The gross enrollment rate of preschool education reached 91.1% in 2023, and that of higher education hit 60.2%, both achieving the goals of the "14th Five-Year Plan" ahead of schedule. Meanwhile, the education market continues to innovate, and digital transformation is accelerating, bringing new opportunities and challenges to educational institutions. Amidst this backdrop, the role of university administrative leadership in managing and driving the development of higher education institutions has become increasingly crucial.

University administrative leadership styles play a pivotal role in shaping the organizational environment and the attitudes and behaviors of faculty and staff. Different leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, and servant leadership, have distinct impacts on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior, which refers to discretionary actions that employees take beyond their formal job requirements, can significantly contribute to a positive work environment, enhanced teamwork, and improved institutional performance. Understanding the relationship between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior is essential for promoting effective management in universities.

Research has shown that transformational leadership can inspire employees to go beyond self-interests and work towards common goals, thereby increasing organizational commitment

and fostering organizational citizenship behavior. Transactional leadership, while effective in ensuring compliance, may have a different impact on emotional attachment and commitment. Servant leadership, focusing on serving the needs of others, can create a supportive environment that encourages employees to engage in citizenship behaviors. Additionally, factors such as communication, trust, and fairness also play important roles in this relationship.

Moreover, organizational culture acts as a moderator in the relationship between leadership styles, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. A positive and supportive organizational culture can amplify the positive effects of leadership, strengthen employee commitment, and encourage citizenship behaviors. In contrast, a negative culture may dampen these relationships. Therefore, exploring how organizational culture influences these relationships is crucial for universities to cultivate a favorable work environment and achieve their educational and strategic objectives. This review and reflection aim to synthesize existing research findings, identify research gaps, and provide insights for future studies and practical management in universities.

Literature Review on Leadership Styles

The Essence and Core Characteristics of Leadership

Leadership, as a dynamic process guiding organizational members to achieve goals, fundamentally revolves around activating individual and team potential through diverse influences. From a goal-oriented perspective, leadership serves as an operational guide that simplifies pathways and clarifies directions for members. For example, managers decompose complex tasks to provide teams with clear execution frameworks. From a behavioral influence dimension, leaders must alter member behavior patterns through communication and motivation—such as inspiring employees to take initiative through role modeling (Xu Shunwang et al., 2013). At the organizational level, the ultimate goal of leadership is to foster Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): leaders promote voluntary contributions beyond job responsibilities by establishing visions and enhancing member trust (Asbari, 2020), with this influence permeating not only task allocation but also organizational culture shaping.

The effectiveness of leadership depends on balancing power and responsibility. Leaders require legitimate authority to drive decision-making—such as the scheduling power of middle managers in hotel service processes—while also earning member recognition through personal charisma and expertise, such as building emotional connections by addressing employees' career development concerns (Xu Shunwang et al., 2012). This integration of "hard power" and "soft influence" positions leadership as a bridge between organizational goals and member needs—ensuring task efficiency while stimulating intrinsic motivation (Çelik et al., 2015).

Leadership requirements vary significantly across organizational contexts. In innovative enterprises, leadership must prioritize fostering exploration—for instance, Google's "20% free work time" policy encouraging employee innovation. During crises, leadership emphasizes rapid decision-making and authority concentration, as seen in hospital managers' emergency resource allocation during the pandemic. This contextual adaptability highlights that leadership is not a fixed model but a flexible system requiring dynamic adjustment based on organizational goals, member characteristics, and external environments (Purwanto, 2020).

The theoretical evolution of leadership research has shifted from "trait theory" to "behavioral theory." Early studies focused on innate leader characteristics (e.g., confidence, decisiveness), while modern theories emphasize the learnability of behavioral patterns. For

example, transformational leadership's systematic vision communication and employee development mechanisms make leadership a teachable management skill (Lee et al., 2018). This shift provides a theoretical basis for organizational leadership training, driving management practices from "talent selection" to "capability development."

Theoretical Categories and Practical Characteristics of Leadership Styles

(1) Transformational Leadership: Vision-Driven Growth Management

Transformational leadership centers on stimulating member potential and organizational innovation, operating through a mechanism of "value resonance—cognitive upgrading—behavior change." Leaders Give meaning to daily tasks by articulating clear organizational visions (e.g., "making it easy to do business anywhere"), linking individual work to broader goals (Yumi Yodogawa et al., 2016). In practice, this style functions through four dimensions: inspiring vision delivery through passionate communication, intellectual stimulation via challenging problems, personalized care tailoring development paths to employee traits, and reward systems recognizing innovative outcomes (e.g., public acknowledgment, career advancement) (Aolunyang, 2021).

Transformational leadership thrives in R&D teams and startups. Steve Jobs, for example, united Apple's team around the "Think Different" philosophy, encouraging engineers to push technological boundaries. This approach not only yielded disruptive products like the iPhone but also shaped a culture of excellence (Lee et al., 2018). While its strength lies in sustained innovation, it demands high communication and resource integration capabilities from leaders; overly abstract visions without concrete support may confuse members (Chiang & Wang, 2012).

(2) Transactional Leadership: Contract-Oriented Efficiency Management

Transactional leadership operates on an "equitable exchange" logic, driving task completion through clear responsibility-contract and reward-penalty mechanisms. Leaders predefine performance goals (e.g., quarterly KPIs for sales teams) and offer bonuses or recognition as incentives for goal achievement (Purwanto et al., 2020). Emphasizing rule transparency and measurable outcomes, this style suits standardized processes and clear-task environments, such as manufacturing line management or call center performance control (Liu Tingyang et al., 2017). While effective for short-term goal attainment, over-reliance on material incentives may erode intrinsic motivation, fostering a utility istic "checklist mentality".

Implementing transactional leadership requires fairness. A logistics company, for instance, improved delivery efficiency through direct "dispatch volume-salary commission" linking but had to address route allocation disparities to avoid employee resentment. This style can complement transformational leadership—ensuring basic task fulfillment while using vision to guide employees toward higher goals, balancing "efficiency" and "effectiveness" (Aolunyang, 2021).

(3) Charismatic Leadership: Personality-Driven Emotional Management

Charismatic leadership's core lies in leaders' personal traits—confidence, influence, and vision. Through words and deeds, these leaders convey unique charisma, eliciting emotional identification and willingness to follow, as seen in Tesla's Elon Musk attracting global talent with his "Mars colonization" vision (Xu Shunwang et al., 2012). During crises or transformations, this style quickly unites teams—for example, a leader rallying morale through passionate speeches to drive strategic shifts amid corporate bankruptcy risks.

However, charismatic leadership carries risks of "over-reliance on personal authority." Organizations lacking institutional frameworks may face strategic discontinuities or cultural

collapse when leaders depart. For example, a startup's "flat management" culture disintegrated after its founder left, causing team coordination chaos (Kuri & Kaufman, 2020). Thus, charismatic leadership must integrate with organizational structure optimization, converting personal influence into systematic competitiveness through talent pipelines and process standardization.

Theoretical Framework and Influence Mechanisms of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

(1) Evolution of OCB Definitions and Multidimensional Structures

OCB's concept originated from Katz's (1964) focus on "extra-role behaviors," later systematically defined by Organ (1988) as "voluntary, non-contractual behaviors enhancing organizational effectiveness." Its classic five-dimensional model includes altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship (e.g., adapting positively to policy changes), courtesy (e.g., proactive work handovers), and civic virtue (Zhang & Liao, 2009). Subsequent research expanded OCB into "organization-focused (OCBO)" and "individual-focused (OCBI)" dimensions (Williams & Anderson, 1991), with Ma et al. (2013) adding a "customer-focused (OCBC)" dimension to emphasize employees' proactive service optimization (e.g., restaurant staff offering personalized menu suggestions).

OCB's core traits are "non-mandatoriness" and "outcome ambiguity." Unlike job responsibilities, OCB is not directly driven by performance evaluations, and its impacts are often difficult to quantify—yet crucial for long-term organizational health. For example, R&D staff sharing technical insights voluntarily may not count toward KPIs but accelerates team knowledge accumulation and innovation capacity (Tan et al., 2019). This "intangible value" makes OCB a key indicator of organizational culture health.

(2) Driving Factors of OCB: A Social Exchange Theory Perspective

Social Exchange Theory (SET) explains OCB as a reciprocal response: employees repay perceived organizational or leadership "goodwill" (e.g., fair treatment, career support) through OCB, forming a "give-receive" cycle (Abdou et al., 2022). For instance, after a company introduced flexible working hours, employees voluntarily extended overtime during project critical phases, reflecting gratitude for organizational trust. This exchange encompasses not only material benefits but also emotional support and value alignment—transformational leaders arouse OCB by meeting employees' psychological needs through personalized care (Bernato, 2019).

Conversely, unfair organizational environments (e.g., autocratic leadership, biased rewards) diminish SET willingness and OCB levels. Studies show that in bureaucratic enterprises, employees tend to "follow rules strictly," refusing extra-role tasks (Fahmi, 2020). This underscores the need for transparent promotion systems and employee participation in decision-making to create positive feedback loops.

(3) Multidimensional Impacts of OCB on Organizational Effectiveness

OCB enhances organizational effectiveness through three pathways: First, at the interpersonal level, altruism and courtesy foster teamwork and reduce communication barriers. For example, cross-departmental information sharing shortens decision-making cycles and improves efficiency (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Second, at the organizational level, civic virtue and conscientiousness strengthen systemic resilience—employees proactively monitoring risks can prevent crises (Cetin et al., 2015). Third, in external interactions, customer-focused OCB (OCBC) directly improves service quality—airline crew voluntarily providing extra care for special passengers enhances brand loyalty (Tan et al., 2019).

Empirical studies link high OCB levels to better employee retention and customer satisfaction (Kasa & Hassan, 2015). Haidilao, for example, empowers staff to make autonomous decisions, triggering OCB such as impromptu performances for customers, which differentiates its service and boosts repeat patronage above industry averages.

(4) The Correlation Mechanism Between Leadership and OCB

Leadership styles significantly predict OCB. Transformational leadership arouse OCB through "vision resonance—emotional identification—voluntary dedication." For example, leaders promoting "sustainable development" visions may inspire employees to adopt green office initiatives (Lee et al., 2018). Transactional leadership indirectly drives OCB by clarifying "extra effort-extra reward" rules, such as "innovation awards" for improvement proposals (Liu Tingyang et al., 2017). Charismatic leadership leverages personal appeal to evoke responsibility—team leaders participating in public welfare activities may inspire employees to organize community services (Kuri & Kaufman, 2020).

Contextual differences shape these relationships: transformational leadership is more effective in knowledge-intensive organizations, while transactional leadership suits labor-intensive settings (Aolunyang, 2021). Individual differences (e.g., achievement motivation, organizational commitment) also moderate impacts—high achievers respond better to transformational visions, while employees with low belongingness are more sensitive to transactional rewards (Ocampo et al., 2018).

Literature Review on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) originated from Katz's (1964) recognition of "innovative and spontaneous behaviors" beyond formal job requirements, which are critical for organizational efficiency (Katz & Kahn, 1965). Organ (1988) formalized OCB as voluntary, non-contractual behaviors that systematically enhance organizational functioning, identifying five core dimensions: altruism (e.g., senior employees mentoring newcomers), conscientiousness (exceeding performance expectations), sportsmanship (positive adaptation to organizational changes), courtesy (proactive task handovers to prevent disruptions), and civic virtue (engaging in cross-organizational affairs). These behaviors, though unregulated by formal reward systems, foster collaboration, reduce conflicts, and strengthen organizational culture (Organ, 1988; Zhang & Liao, 2009).

Subsequent research refined OCB's structural dimensions. Williams and Anderson (1991) categorized OCB into organization-focused (OCBO)—behaviors prioritizing organizational interests (e.g., advocating for long-term strategic goals)—and individual-focused (OCBI)—actions benefiting colleagues (e.g., sharing workloads during peak periods). Ma et al. (2013) further expanded this framework by introducing customer-focused (OCBC), emphasizing employees' proactive service excellence (e.g., personalizing customer experiences in retail). This evolution reflects the growing recognition of OCB's role in diverse stakeholder interactions, from internal teams to external clients (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Ma et al., 2013).

Organ (1997) redefined OCB as discretionary behaviors that support social and psychological work environments, distancing it from mandatory job duties. Scholars like Podsakoff et al. (2000) traced its theoretical roots to Barnard's (1938) "willingness to cooperate" and Katz's (1964) extra-role initiatives, highlighting its spontaneous nature. Unlike routine tasks, OCB is self-motivated and often unrecognized by formal evaluations, yet it

significantly impacts organizational resilience—for example, employees voluntarily troubleshooting system flaws during non-work hours (Kumar, 2014; Cetin et al., 2015).

The conceptual clarity of OCB has been further solidified by cross-disciplinary research. In service industries, OCBC has emerged as a key driver of customer loyalty, with studies showing that employees' voluntary efforts to exceed service standards directly correlate with repeat business (Tan et al., 2019). In knowledge-based organizations, OCBI and OCBO foster knowledge sharing and strategic foresight, enabling adaptive responses to market changes (Asbari, 2019; Fahmi, 2020). These insights underscore OCB's versatility as both a cultural indicator and a performance enhancer.

Social Exchange Theory (SET) provides a foundational framework for understanding OCB's motivational drivers. SET posits that employees engage in reciprocal exchanges of tangible (e.g., rewards) and intangible (e.g., respect) resources with organizations. When leaders demonstrate fairness, provide career support, or recognize efforts, employees feel obligated to reciprocate through OCB—such as voluntarily mentoring peers or improving workflow efficiency (Abdou et al., 2022; Halbus et al., 2020). This dynamic is particularly evident in organizations with strong trust cultures, where employees perceive their contributions as part of a mutual commitment rather than transactional obligations (Khan et al., 2020).

Leadership styles significantly shape OCB expression. Transformational leaders, by articulating compelling visions and offering personalized support, evoke emotional attachment and inspire OCBO (e.g., employees advocating for sustainability initiatives aligned with the organization's mission) (Quintana et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2018). Transactional leaders, through clear reward structures, may stimulate OCBI or OCBC by linking extra-role behaviors to recognition (e.g., "employee of the month" awards for exceptional customer service) (Liu Tingyang et al., 2017). Charismatic leaders, meanwhile, leverage personal influence to foster civic virtue, such as rallying teams to participate in corporate social responsibility projects (Kuri & Kaufman, 2020; Xu Shunwang et al., 2012).

Organizational context also moderates OCB. In bureaucratic settings with rigid hierarchies, employees may hesitate to exhibit OCB due to fears of overstepping roles or lacking formal recognition (Asbari, 2019). Conversely, flat organizations that value employee autonomy—like tech startups—often observe higher levels of altruism and innovation-driven OCB. Cultural factors play a role too: in collectivist societies, OCBI (team-focused behaviors) is more prevalent, while individualist contexts may prioritize OCBO (strategic organizational contributions) (Sierra & McQuitty, 2005; Ocampo et al., 2018).

The impact of OCB on organizational outcomes is multifaceted. At the micro level, OCBI reduces workplace conflicts and enhances morale, as seen in employees voluntarily resolving interpersonal misunderstandings (Williams & Anderson, 1991). At the macro level, OCBO drives long-term sustainability by encouraging employees to anticipate risks (e.g., identifying market trends outside their job scope) (Kasa & Hassan, 2015). In educational and healthcare sectors, OCB has been linked to higher staff retention and client satisfaction, as employees' discretionary care fosters institutional loyalty (Tan et al., 2019; Bernato, 2019). These findings collectively highlight OCB as a vital yet underrated component of organizational success, requiring strategic nurturing through leadership practices and cultural design.

Literature Review on the Impact of Leadership Styles on OCB

Walumbwa et al. (2005) took local bank employees from the United States and Kenya with large cultural differences as the research object to explore the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The research was conducted in a quantitative way. The results found that leadership style has a strong positive impact on organizational commitment, confirming that leadership style will affect organizational commitment. It also shows that transformational leadership in leadership style can be used as an important leadership management development tool to produce substantial results and can be provided to human resource research and development and human resource management managers or company decision-makers for designing effective leadership training programs to promote social, economic, and political development.

Acar (2012) took a total of 344 employees from 37 logistics companies in Turkey as the research object to explore the impact of organizational culture and leadership style on organizational commitment in the Turkish logistics industry. Taking organizational culture and leadership style as independent variables and organizational commitment as the dependent variable, a questionnaire was distributed to employees in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that leadership style and organizational culture have a positive impact on organizational commitment. The three most common leadership style types in the Turkish logistics industry are charm, intellectual inspiration, and individualized care. These three types are all aspects of transformational leadership. After empirical research and analysis, the above leadership style aspects have a positive relationship with the continuous commitment and normative commitment aspects of organizational commitment. That is, when employees feel that the leadership style of their supervisors matches their expectations, it will be the motivation to support them in achieving their goals, and at this time, employees' organizational commitment will be higher.

Quintana et al. (2015) explored the impact of leadership style on the job performance of hotel employees. Taking leadership style as the independent variable, job performance as the dependent variable, demographic variables as control variables, and different hotel types (chain, independently operated) as moderating variables, data was collected in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that leadership style has a positive impact on employee job performance. Three different leadership styles, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and non-transactional leadership, were used to explore their impact on employee performance. The charm influence and intellectual inspiration in transformational leadership have a significant impact on employee behavior; while the contingent reward and active exception management in transactional leadership have a significant impact on employee behavior. That is, when the leadership style of supervisors can be regarded as a role model at work or supervisors can clearly inform employees of a clear direction, improve employees' work efficiency, which can not only improve job performance but also increase employees' satisfaction with supervisors.

Çelikelal. (2015) explored the relationship between leadership style, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. Taking leadership style as the independent variable, job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and organizational commitment as the mediating variable, data was collected in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that moral leadership in leadership style has a positive impact on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. After empirical research and analysis, we can see the impact of leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Considering this situation, especially in the

hotel industry, leaders and bosses can not only enhance employees' organizational commitment through good leadership behaviors, but on the other hand, the leadership style of supervisors can also influence employees and improve their job satisfaction. In this way, the turnover rate of employees can be reduced.

Muhtasometal. (2017) explored the impact of leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior on organizational culture and employee performance. Taking leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior as independent variables and organizational culture and employee performance as dependent variables, data was collected in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that servant leadership in leadership style has a positive but insignificant impact on organizational culture, indicating that the servant leadership implemented by star hotel managers has failed to establish a strong organizational culture and make the greatest contribution to the company. The indicator variables of servant leadership include listening, emphasizing, healing, persuading, conceptualizing, being conscious, making commitments to people, having vision, service ability, and spirit, not all of which can be applied by star hotel supervisors. Empirical research and analysis have confirmed that not all star hotel supervisors have an educational background and experience related to hotel service business. Each supervisor has a different personality and a tenure of varying lengths. This situation leads to supervisors not being able to implement all the indicators of servant leadership well.

Luo and Law (2017) explored the relationship between leadership style, organizational justice, organizational commitment, and collective identity in hotels and the mediating role of collective identity in the hotel industry. Taking leadership style and work justice as independent variables, organizational commitment as the dependent variable, and collective identity as the mediating variable, data was collected in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that transformational leadership in leadership style has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment, and leadership style can be used as a predictor of organizational commitment. The leadership style of supervisors can affect employees' organizational commitment to the company. Empirical research and analysis have confirmed that leadership style and collective identity have the same impact on organizational commitment. Leadership style has a significant impact on organizational commitment through collective identity. To improve employees' organizational commitment, collective identity is a key factor in the process, and the leadership style of supervisors is a key factor in cultivating employees' organizational commitment.

Lee et al. (2018) took a total of 244 head coaches participating in NCAA Division II as the main research object to explore the relationship between leadership style, emotional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in the relationship between athletic directors and coaches. Taking leadership style as the independent variable, organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent variable, and emotional commitment as the mediating variable, the research was conducted in a quantitative way and questionnaires were distributed through online surveys. The research results showed that transformational leadership is positively correlated with emotional commitment. This result also shows that when coaches identify with the leadership style of supervisors, they can develop an emotional attachment to the organization and a commitment to the organization. The relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment can be explained through the interaction process between leaders and followers. In simple terms, through problem-solving methods and providing individualized care, leaders can inspire subordinates to form a high degree of loyalty and be more loyal to the organization; while emotional commitment is positively correlated with

organizational citizenship behavior. This result shows that when coaches have a high level of organizational commitment, it will be an incentive factor for coaches and their emotional attachment to the organization and other behaviors will lead to organizational citizenship behavior, which will also make coaches more willing to invest time and energy into the organization.

Tan et al. (2019) took a total of 164 employees of a five-star hotel in Malaysia as the research object to explore the relationship between supervisor leadership style, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Taking benevolent leadership as the independent variable, organizational commitment as the mediating variable, and organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent variable, the research was conducted in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that benevolent leadership in leadership style has a significant impact on organizational commitment; leadership style has a significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior through organizational commitment. That is, benevolent leadership will enhance employees' attachment to the company and further improve employees' organizational commitment. After improving organizational commitment, employees will work harder. Benevolent leadership has a significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior through organizational commitment. Because the commitment to the organization is getting higher and higher, and at the same time, under the influence of the leadership style of supervisors, employees will show more and more organizational citizenship behavior.

Dartey - Baah et al. (2019) explored the relationship between leadership style, organizational citizenship behavior, and work participation. Taking transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style as independent variables, organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent variable, and work participation as the mediating variable, data was collected in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that transformational leadership and transactional leadership in leadership style have a positive and significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Empirical research and analysis have confirmed that leaders can increase employees' participation and organizational citizenship behavior through encouragement, motivation, intellectual inspiration, and contingent rewards, and help colleagues and find innovative work methods in their spare time. At the same time, leaders can also establish good relationships with employees.

Pio et al. (2020) took a total of 320 teachers from Christian and Catholic educational foundations in areas such as South Minahasa, Indonesia as the research object to explore the impact of leadership style on organizational culture, organizational commitment, and moral behavior. Taking leadership style as the independent variable; organizational commitment and moral behavior as the dependent variables; organizational culture as the moderating variable, the research was conducted in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that leadership style has a significant impact on organizational culture and leadership style has a significant impact on organizational commitment through organizational culture. That is, spiritual leadership in leadership style has a significant positive impact on organizational culture, and the higher the influence of spiritual leadership, the higher the organizational culture; through organizational culture moderation, the higher the influence of spiritual leadership, the higher the teachers' organizational commitment; empirical research and analysis have confirmed that the level of spiritual leadership will affect the level of organizational culture; at the same time, leadership style and organizational culture have direct and indirect impacts on employees' organizational commitment.

Liu Zhewei and Xie Fuman (2021) explored the relationship between leadership style of supervisors in the education industry and employees' organizational citizenship behavior. Taking leadership style of supervisors as the independent variable, organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent variable, and organizational culture as the mediating variable, the research was conducted in a quantitative way. The research results confirmed that leadership style has a significant positive impact on organizational culture. In the research, it mainly discusses the talents cultivated internally in the organization and creates employees' career visions to enhance their willingness to stay. Supervisors play the role of guiding and appointing employees. Leadership style is divided into four aspects: employee management, customer management, on-site operation, and self-management. Among them, self-management has a significant positive impact on organizational culture. And empirical research and analysis have confirmed that for the chain hotels that are the research objects, in terms of the way supervisors manage employees, a clear work process has been established and employees are given work guidance and encouragement to continuously convey a unique and clear organizational culture.

Development Recommendations

Promote the Diversified Integration of Leadership Styles

University administrative leaders should not be confined to a single leadership style but should integrate different styles based on practical scenarios and needs. For example, when formulating long-term strategic plans, transformational leadership can be employed to clearly communicate the university's development vision, inspire faculty and staff to innovate and dedicate themselves, and motivate them to actively participate in achieving institutional goals. In handling daily administrative tasks and ensuring smooth operations, transactional leadership can be appropriately applied to clarify work tasks and performance standards, ensuring efficient and orderly execution of responsibilities. In teaching reform projects, leaders should both inspire teachers' enthusiasm through painting a vision of reform outcomes (transformational) and reward those with outstanding participation through tangible incentives (transactional), thereby enhancing organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) through dual approaches.

Strengthen the Cultural Adaptability of Leadership Styles

Given the differences in how leadership styles influence OCB across cultural contexts, universities should enhance cultural adaptability training for administrative leaders. Especially in the context of internationalization, higher education institutions face challenges of multicultural integration. Chinese university leaders should inherit and carry forward excellent local cultural traditions while learning and adopting advanced leadership concepts and methods from the West to build a leadership model with Chinese characteristics that aligns with contemporary development needs. In international cooperation projects, leaders must understand and respect cultural differences across nations, adjust their leadership approaches, and encourage cross-cultural team members to exhibit more OCB, thereby improving collaboration effectiveness.

Establish a Dynamic Leadership Style Adjustment Mechanism

Develop a dynamic monitoring system to track real-time changes in the university's internal and external environment, evolving needs of faculty and staff, and the implementation effects of policies, using this information to adjust leadership styles promptly. When the university faces major policy adjustments (such as changes in enrollment policies or disciplinary evaluations), leadership styles should quickly shift from routine management to crisis response and change-driven modes, with enhanced support and communication for

faculty and staff (strengthening transformational leadership). During stable policy implementation phases, leadership can revert to conventional management and incentive models (appropriately applying transactional leadership). Additionally, regularly collect feedback from faculty and staff on leadership styles to form a Positive interaction (benign interaction) and continuously optimize leadership approaches to better promote OCB.

Improve Institutional Safeguards for the Link Between Leadership Styles and OCB

From a systemic perspective, clarify the scenarios, objectives, and expected outcomes for applying different leadership styles to provide clear behavioral guidelines for leaders. Meanwhile, establish an incentive mechanism aligned with OCB, offering material rewards (such as bonuses and research funding support), spiritual recognition (such as honorary titles and public commendations), and career development opportunities (such as priority in promotions and training opportunities) to employees who actively exhibit OCB. Furthermore, improve supervisory mechanisms to ensure fairness in leaders' application of different styles, avoiding issues like abuse of power that could dampen employee morale and the manifestation of OCB.

References

- Abdou, A. H., Hassan, T. H., Salem, A. E., Albakhit, A. I., Almakhayitah, M. Y., & Salama, W. (2022). The Nexus between Environmentally Sustainable Practices, Green Satisfaction, and Customer Citizenship Behavior in Eco - Friendly Hotels: Social Exchange Theory Perspective. *Sustainability*, 14(19), 12791.
- Acar, A. Z. (2012). Organizational culture, leadership styles and organizational commitment in Turkish logistics industry. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 217–226.
- Asbari, M. (2020). Is transformational leadership suitable for future organizational needs?. *International Journal of Social, Policy and Law*, 1(1), 51 - 55.
- Basri, M. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior and its impact on organizational culture. *Journal of Applied Management and Business*, 23(1), 75–92.
- Bernato, I. (2019). The role of leadership in fostering organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business and Management*, 25(4), 45–58.
- Çelik, S., Dedeoğlu, B. B., & İnanir, A. (2015). Relationship between ethical leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction at hotel organizations. *Ege Academic Review*, 15(1), 53–64.
- Cetin, B., et al. (2015). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 214, 536–543.
- Chiang, C. F., & Wang, Y. Y. (2012). The effects of transactional and transformational leadership on organizational commitment in hotels: The mediating effect of trust. *Journal of Hotel and Business Management*, 1(1), 1–11.
- Dartey - Baah, K., Anlesinya, A., & Lamptey, Y. (2019). Leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job involvement. *International Journal of Business*, 24(1), 74–95.
- Halbus, H., et al. (2020). The roles of the physical environment, social servicescape, co-created value, and customer satisfaction in determining tourists' citizenship behavior. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3229.
- Kasa, S., & Hassan, N. (2015). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A case study of selected commercial banks in Addis Ababa. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 6(10), 106–113.

- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral science*, 9(2), 131 - 146.
- Khan, M. A., Ismail, F. B., Hussain, A., & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 2158244019898264.
- Kumar, V. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior: A review. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 135–143.
- Lee, J. J., Jang, J., & Yoon, D. (2018). Transformational leadership, emotional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in athletic director–coach relationships. *Journal of Sport Management*, 32(3), 223–234.
- Liu, Z., & Xie, F. (2021). The relationship between supervisors' leadership styles and employees' organizational citizenship behavior in the education industry. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resources Management*, 5(1), 45–58.
- Luo, Z., Marnburg, E., & Law, R. (2017). Linking leadership and justice to organizational commitment: The mediating role of collective identity in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 29(4), 1167–1184.
- Ma, E., Qu, H., Wilson, M., & Eastman, K. (2013). Modeling OCB for hotels: Don't forget the customers. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(3), 308–317.
- Muhtasom, A., Mus, H. A. R., Bijang, J., & Latief, B. (2017). Influence of Servant Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Organizational Culture and Employee Performance at Star Hotel in Makassar. *Star*, 5(10), 71–88.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97.
- Pio, R. J., Sumayku, S. M., & Mukuan, D. D. S. (2020). Organizational Culture as an Intervening Variable of Spiritual Leadership With Organizational Commitment and Ethical Behavior. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 154(20), 130–135.
- 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.
- Purwanto, A. (2020). The effect of transformational leadership dimensions on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: case studies in private university Lecturers. *Solid State Technology*.
- Purwanto, A., Purba, J. T., Bernarto, I., & Sijabat, R. (2021). Effect of transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitments on organizational citizenship behavior. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, 9, 61 - 69.
- Quintana, T. A., Park, S., & Cabrera, Y. A. (2015). Assessing the effects of leadership styles on employees' outcomes in international luxury hotels. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(2), 469–489.
- Sierra, J. J., & McQuitty, S. (2005). Service providers and customers: social exchange theory and service loyalty. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(6), 392–400.
- Tan, J. X., Cham, T. H., Zawawi, D., & Aziz, Y. A. (2019). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior and the mediating effect of organization commitment in the hotel industry. *Asian J. Bus. Res*, 9(2), 121–139.

- Walumbwa, F. O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J. J. (2005). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and US financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 235–256.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617.
- Xu Shunwang, et al. (2012). [Chinese scholars' research on leadership and organizational citizenship behavior]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Studies*, 15(3), 456–472.
- Xu Shunwang, et al. (2013). [The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behavior]. *Journal of Management Science*, 26(5), 678–690.
- Zhang, Z., & Liao, H. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2), 311–323.