Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

Organizational Justice is a very complicated topic with a lot of confusing terms and distinctions. In the last decade of 20th century the major focus of scientists and researchers has been on the axis of Organizational Justice as an important concept and also as a main research topic in industrial and organizational psychology (Greenberg, 1990). Since a long time, Justice has been one of the most important subjects and concerns of human and intellectuals in various sciences. Justice has an extensive meaning and in each area has its specific usage and in human life, from individual life to complex social organizations, especially government and its official system are considered. Organizational Justice has been developed in recent years which include the Distributive, Interactional, Procedural theories. In recent decades, the Organizational Justice subject has been one of the most referred topics in organizational research and which is researched extensively in the Management, Practical Psychology and Organizational Behaviour Courses. Justice in an organization indicates the equality and consideration of moral behaviour (Corpanzano and Greenberg 1997). Organizational Justice has found an important place because of its relationship with organizational vital processes like: organizational responsibility, oriented citizenship, satisfactions of profession and operation (Colequitt, 2001). Moreover, the recent literature expresses the relationship between Leadership Style, Making Decisions and Organizational Justice (Deluga, 1994). The justice behaviour is a demand of all the employees from organization where they spent their time and energy. These expectations make the leaders have more tendencies to emphasize on fairness observation. The question is what would happen when the managers ignore such expectations? Greenberg concluded that the managers who violate these norms by unfair means of behaviour would create negative reaction among their employees. Thus the reflection of justice in leaders’ behaviour has resulted in creating good circumstances or ambience for both organization and employees (Greenberg, 1993).
2.1. Reviews related to Organizational Justice

Justice is a topic of philosophical research from the age of Plato and Socrates (Ryan 1993). The term Justice means “Oughtness” or “Righteousness”. Justice in the organizations mostly focused on two perspectives, fairness of outcomes and fairness of procedures used to determine that outcomes and these perceptive were called as Distributive Justice (Homans, 1961) and Procedural Justice respectively (Thibaut and Walker 1975).

Historically, the concept of Organizational Justice has originated from the equity theory (Homans, 1961). Basically equity theory states that perceptions of injustice are the source of motivation for individuals (Adams, 1965). This theory also states that people engaged in continual social comparison with their referent individuals. They compare the ratio of their “inputs” and “outputs” with their referent individuals.

According to the Greenberg and Baron (2003) Organizational Justice can be defined as "The study of people’s perceptions of fairness in organization". Since equity theory deals with perceptions of fairness or unfairness, it is reasonable to expect that inequity states may be redressed merely by altering one’s thinking about the circumstances, thus they can come to perceive inequitable situation as equitable, thereby effectively reducing their inequity distress (Greenberg and Baron 2003). Another author Greenberg (1990) stated that Organizational Justice played a vital role in organizational effective functioning (Colquitt et al., Greenberg and Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

Furthermore, Organizational Justice refers to people’s perception of fairness in organizations, consisting of perceptions of how decisions are made regarding the distribution of outcome (Distributive Justice) and the perceived fairness of those outcomes themselves (Greenberg and Baron, 2003). Equity has generally been conceptualized in terms of perceived fairness and operationalized as a three dimensional construct: Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice (Wat and Shaffer, 2005). The word equity connotes feelings of good, just, right and fair, they are deeply embedded in our common heritage (Weller, 1995). If people see a discrepancy between the rewards they are receiving for their efforts when compared to those of others (the rewards-to-work ratio), they will be motivated to put more effort (Altman et.al, 1985). The three referent categories have been classified as
‘others’ include individuals with similar jobs in the same organization and also include friends, neighbours or professional associates, ‘systems’ which is the organizational policies and procedures as well as the administration of the system, and ‘self’ refers to input outcome ratios that are unique to the individual (Robbins, 1992).

In the organizational context, Procedural Justice is considered an important resource in social exchange, where else, Distributive Justice is considered to be more closely related to economic exchange (Loi et al., 2006). Another form of justice that focuses on employees’ perceptions of the quality of the interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of Organizational Procedures is labelled as Interactional Justice (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

Cropanzano et al., (2007) argued that Organizational Justice is a sort of ‘glue’ that allows people to work together effectively, in contrast, injustice is like a corrosive solvent that can dissolve bonds within the community and it is hurtful to individuals and harmful to organization. An immediate implication of inequity can arise in one of three ways: (1) own inequity (the persons’ input-outcome ratio is unbalanced); (2) comparison of inequity (the persons’ input-outcome is balance but it is unbalance when compared with that of another person in similar circumstances); (3) own-comparison inequity (the persons’ input-outcome ratio is unbalance it is also unbalanced with respect to the comparison person) (Weick Dan Nesset, 1968).

What must be remembered about equity theory is that it involves personal perception (Altman et al., 1985). An individual may actually be receiving higher pay than others but believes that he or she is worth even more. Therefore, restoring the balance of employee’s perception is important to reduce social tension in workplace (Weller, 1995).

Experiment by Goodman and Friedman (1968) support this argument and found that employees who are experiencing inequity having high desire to prove their ability by increasing output. Research does not consider how different types of injustice may affect the type of deviance in which an individual is engaged (Ambrose et al., 2002). Therefore, if one’s goal is to promote workplace justice, it is useful to consider them separately and in detail because each component in engendered is distinct ways, arising from different managerial action (Cropanzano et al., 2007).
Justice is considered as a major concern in our daily life, both in home or work related issues especially when decisions are made regarding limited resources. Issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organizations, policy making and policy implications that affect decision maker and the people who are affected from such decisions require special attention in respect of justice (Colquitt, et.al, 2001).

Justice can be seen in different perspectives basically there are two broad perception areas that require attention on justice i.e. organizational psychology perception on justice and social psychology perception on justice. In organizational psychology, the different factors of Justice is the main focus while in social psychology, the main focus is on how people perceive Justice and influencing factors of Justice that affect their judgement (Deluga, 1994).

2.1.1. Reviews related to Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice is concerned about employees’ perceptions of the fairness of the distribution of resources among staff (Greenberg and Baron 2003). It also refers to the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employee receives (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). Therefore, Distributive Justice in perspective, focuses on the fairness of the evaluations received relative to the work performed (Greenberg, 1986).

Cropanzano et.al, (2007) distinguish three allocation rules that can lead to Distributive Justice if they are applied appropriately: equality (to each the same), equity (to each in accordance with contributions), and need (to each in accordance with the most urgency). Distributive Justice is concerned with the reality that not all workers are treated alike; the allocation of outcome is differentiated in workplace (Cropanzano et.al, 2007).

Dailey and Kirk (1992) found that employee may rationalize their desire to quit by finding ‘evidence’ which illustrates how unfairly the rewards are distributed. Furthermore, Distributive Justice seems to play a salient role for employee in evaluating their employing organization. Employee would be more attached to their organization if they cannot obtain the same benefits in another firm (Lee et.al, 2007). It is generally agreed that continuance commitment develops when a person makes
investments, or side-bet, that would be lost if he or she were to discontinue the activity (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Historically, Distributive Justice had been the topic of interest of social psychologists (Steiner and Rolland, 2006). As the name implies Distributive Justice means fairness in the distribution of rewards and benefits. Different researchers defined this dimension of Organizational Justice differently. Distributive Justice can be defined as: "The individual’s perception on whether the gains they earned are distributed fairly. Individuals make judgments on the appropriateness of Justice Distribution by comparing their outcome to their previous outcomes or to the outcomes of the others" (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

According to the Greenberg and Baron (2008) Distributive Justice means "the form of Organizational Justice that focuses on people’s beliefs that they have received fair amounts of valued work-related outcomes (e.g. payment recognition, etc.) ".

A study was conducted by Ang et al, (2003) on two workers groups (one group consisted on workers of Singapore and other was foreign group; Chinese employees working in Singapore) regarding their feeling about Distributive Justice. Foreign workers were not paid fairly according to their work so they showed higher levels of distributive injustice and their productivity reduced because they received less and as a result they produced less. This study showed that how much people were keenly sensitive to the fair and just distribution of resources and rewards. If people feel that their work assignments and rewards to them are fair, they will show more satisfaction to their work. In the business world fast food chain KFC is not only famous due to its delicious chicken and food services but also for the fair performance appraisal systems established for the employees. Company officials are very careful to adhere with Distributive Justice is practice and good performance of employees are fairly rewarded (Greenberg and Baron, 2008).

2.1.2. Reviews related to Procedural Justice

Research on fairness shifted to an emphasis on Procedural Justice in the 1980s (Schminke et.al, 1997). In the organizational context, Procedural Justice is considered as an important resource in social exchange (Loi et.al, 2006). Procedural Justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine the amount of benefits (Folger and konovsky, 1989). Past research demonstrates that Procedural Justice
often is more predictive of a variety of work attitudes, including organizational commitment (Warner et al. 2005). The fairness of the decision making process itself seems to be more important than the actual amount of compensation that is received by individual (Teprstra and Honoree, 2003).

Cropanzano et al. (2007) argued that fair process lead to intellectual and emotional recognition, this in turn, creates the trust and commitment that build voluntary cooperation in strategy execution. This, Procedural Justice Perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluation procedures which are used to determine ratings (Greenberg, 1986).

Folger and Konovsky (1989) found that opportunities for employees to express their feelings when evaluated predicted a measure of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. If the process is perceived as just, employees show greater loyalty and more willingness to behave in an organizational best interest (Cropanzano et al, 2007). Fair procedures let employees feel that they will get a ‘fair share’ from the company and its representatives should they perform well in future (Loi et al, 2006).

As Weiner (1982) suggested that normative commitment develops as a function of socialization experiences, such as societal or familial experience. Employees can develop a sense of obligation to their organization for reasons other than socialization, including the receipt of benefits that invoke a need for reciprocity (Meyer et al., 2002).

Research on Procedural Justice was started in 1970s by Thibaut and Walker (1975). Procedural Justice can be seen as an extension of equity theory in perspective of allocation process (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976). The focus of Folger’s (1977) research was shifted from reaction of people on injustice outcomes to the reaction of people on injustice procedures. Many authors defined Procedural Justice in various ways. Folger and Cropanzano (1998) defined Procedural Justice as “fairness issues concerning the methods, mechanisms, and processes employed to determine outcomes”.

According to Greenberg and Baron (2003), “Employees’ perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcomes they receive” is known to be as Procedural Justice, and also according to Greenberg and Colquitt (2003) Procedural Justice Criteria included following factors: Voice in making decisions,
consistency in applying rules, having accuracy in information, opportunity to be heard, and safeguards against bias.

Procedural Justice has great significance in the organization because according to Greenberg and Beron (2007) fairness did not mean that employees were only interested in fair outcomes (Distributive Justice) but they were also interested in fair processes used in the determination of their outcomes. It was key concern of every organization to maintain Procedural Justice as a regular practice because decisions based on unfair practices were not accepted by employees. In fact in case of procedural injustice people did not only consider their outcomes as unfair but also rejected the entire system by considering that as an unfair behaviour (Greenberg and Cropanzano, 2001). Employees’ tendencies to follow company rules were found to be affected by Procedural Justice Practice therefore top levels officials were advised to promote procedural justice so it would be easy for employees to follow company rules (Greenberg and Beron, 2008). An instrumental model by Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) proposed that Procedural Justice resulted in more controllable and predictable outcomes so it was highly valued.

2.1.3. Reviews related to Interactional Justice

Justice research began to focus on Interactional Justice that focuses on the fairness of the interpersonal treatment the individual receives from the decision maker (Ambrose et.al, 2007). A person is interactionally just if he or she appropriately shares information and avoids rude or cruel remarks and since Interactional Justice emphasizes one-on-one transactions, employees often seek it from their supervisor (Cropanzano et.al, 2007). The perception of the supervisor as supportive and respectful of subordinates’ dignities in the interaction process will improve perceived Interactional Justice and positively influence subordinates’ trust in supervisor (Wat and Shaffer, 2005).

According to Greenberg (1990) Interactional Justice has come to be seen as two specific types of interpersonal treatment; (1) Interpersonal Justice, reflects the degree of which people are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by others; and (2) Informational Justice that focuses on the explanation provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion. Interactional Justice suggests that
perceptions of Procedural Justice can originate from an organization’s procedures and how those procedures are implemented (Tyler and Bies 1990).

Cheng and Stockdale (2003) found that affective commitment was significantly predicted by perceived equity, peer group cohesion, and personal importance. This variables are best to relate to the interactional justice (interactional and informational justice) which help the employee to the perceived equity, strengthen peer group cohesion and feel some recognition from the supervisor. Research on Interactional Justice, that is considered as part of Procedural Justice, was started by Bies and Moag (1986) and Tyler and Bias (1990). Interactional Justice is an important characteristic of successful organizations; it means that employees perceive that they are treated fairly by their supervisors. Quality of treatment received from the supervisor or decision maker is considered as Interactional Justice (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Interactional Justice is also related to proper performance of formal decision-making process. This type of Organizational Justice is defined as: “Interpersonal Justice means people’s perceptions of the fairness of the manner in which they are treated by others (Greenberg and Beron, 2003).

According to Aydin and Kepenekci (2008) Interactional Justice is a compliment of Procedural Justice. Decision making is very important for those who are affected by such decision. One who is taking decision should give respect to others, be truthful, courteous, and ready to give reasonable explanation of his decision and open two way communication (Aydin and Kepenekci, 2008).

According to Greenberg and Colquitt (2005) if boss of an employee explained the situation and reason of layoff of that employee in a careful and sensitive manner, then it resulted in creating the positive feeling in mind of leaving employee, considered that layoff as fair and would not sue that company for wrongful termination. So it explains the importance of Interpersonal Justice, the way you are treated in the organization by others as it is very necessary for the goodwill of the company.

In recent years, Distributive and Procedural Justice have been researched in relation to job satisfaction, selection systems, employee theft, and organizational commitment (Greenburg, 1990). Procedural Justice has also been researched in regards to trust, turnover, strategic decision-making, and job performance (Konovsky
and Cropanzano, 1993). Greenburg and Bies (1990) addressed business ethics and the role that Organizational Justice empirical studies perform in this area of business. Studies have focused on the psychometric, self-reports, and cognitive perceptions of Organizational Justice (Harrison et. al, 1995).

2.2. Reviews related to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Since 1930s Organizational Citizenship Behaviour was a topic of various studies. The significance of “willingness to cooperate” from employees was introduced as addition to the literature of Organizational Behaviour by Chester Barnard. Chester Bernard observed the phenomena of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, which he then termed "extra role behaviours" (Bernard, 1938). His notion that employees demonstrated Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is the earliest example identified in this review.

Katz and Kuhn (1966) defined supra-role behaviours that improved the effectiveness of the organization. In the words of Katz and Kahn (1966) this, "includes any gestures that lubricate the social machinery of the organization and do not directly adhere to the usual notion of task performance". The extra-role behaviours identified include helping other workers with work-related problems, accepting others into the work group without a fuss, either putting up with or minimizing interpersonal conflict in the organization, and protecting and conserving organizational resources. Katz and Kahn coined the term "Citizenship" to represent the workers that displayed these extra-role behaviours.

Managers and executives value employees who display "Citizenship Behaviour" perhaps because they make their job easier. The extra time obtained by management allows the manager to improve the organizational effectiveness by having more time for managerial issues. Bateman (1983) in the seminal article, “Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier”, has mentioned the relationship between affect "Citizenship" began a large series of articles into the topic of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. It is crucial to differentiate clearly between in-role and extra-role behaviours at work. In-role behaviour is a technical performance required by the job. In other words, in-role behaviour is that which acceptable behaviour to management is extra-role behaviour, on the other hand, is referred to as "innovative and spontaneous behaviour". Extra-role behaviours include the in-role behaviour and
extra-role gestures that enhance or improve organizational effectiveness, informal acts of cooperation, goodwill, and helpfulness (Organ and Batman 1983). Some examples of extra-role behaviours are helping to orient new workers in the organization, not abusing the rights of other, and being friendly to the customers. A basic notion underpinning this concept of in-role and extra-role work behaviour is the idea that any employer can be on forced to get a certain degree of work done out of an individual who needs a job, which is the in-role. Thus, Organ (1990) theorized that in-role and extra-role behaviours are influenced by different motivational dynamics. Perhaps in role behaviours or to achieve a certain degree of work from an employee, a manager may be more apt to use extrinsic tactics. While with an employee that is achieving the in-role duty, intrinsic tactics may encourage extra-role behaviour.

Organ (1988) defined Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as, “Organizational Citizenship Behaviour represents individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." Organ then proceeds to define what he meant by discretionary, "We mean that the behaviour is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behaviour is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable".

Organ (1988) provided a multi-dimensional scale of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The scale contained five dimensions that make up the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour construct. The five dimensions identified by Organ are Altruism, Courtesy, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue, and Conscientiousness. Altruism is the category consisting of discretionary behaviours that aim at helping certain people in an organization with a relevant task or workers in the organization before acting, giving advance notice, and passing along the information. Sportsmanship refers to the forbearance of doing some action such as filing petty grievances. Civic virtue is the involvement that the employee shows in the political life of the organization. Finally, Conscientiousness is originally termed general compliance, which involves employees going beyond the minimum requirements of the organization.
Research in the area of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has expanded in the literature since the work of Organ and Batman (1983) in which they used the Job Description Index at two points in time, finding higher correlations than in previous satisfaction-performance studies. Organ and Katherine (1995) conducted a meta-analysis with 55 studies, which showed that job attitudes are robust predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Different task, leadership, cognitive and positive affect studies have also been conducted (Podsakoff and Organ 1990).

Since the term “Organizational Citizenship Behaviour” was coined by Dennis Organ in 1983, the concept has been an important topic of inquiry in business research. Several studies have linked Organizational Citizenship Behaviour to individual success in organizational settings. Unfortunately, argues Allison and Voss (2001), the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour concept has been largely ignored in business education. Their study found a positive relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and two measures of academic performance. These findings suggest a need for business educators to encourage students to engage in these critical behaviours and to find ways to hone the skills of those who currently practice them. One of the primary goals of business schools is to prepare students to meet the challenges of an ever-changing business environment and to prepare them for successful careers in industry.

One way is to ensure they have and are using key skills that have been identified as Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (Allison and Voss, 2000). While schools might not offer courses that specifically teach Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, these critical skills maybe developed in other disciplines and business courses and thus transferred into the workplace. One of the purposes of the current study is to determine if there is a relationship between the level of college education achieved and organizational citizenship behaviours used in the workplace.

Conceptual Development of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour While Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is a relatively new concept in the study of organizational behaviour; literature suggests that an awareness of the concept of citizenship behaviour clearly dates back to ancient Greece. The Athenian style citizen performance was characterized by participatory practices such as community orientation which is the willingness to sacrifice, voluntarily, narrow private interests
for the good of public, at the same time encouraging the highest pursuit of individual excellence which defined the relationship of individual to community.

The citizen is always asking how he can do something good for the community, with the reciprocal expectation that when the community prospers, so will he. The participatory practices in the Athenian society began with voluntary engagement, spirited participation by individuals in the work and decisions of the community (Manville and Ober, 2003, Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch, 1994).

Accepting orders without a fuss, tolerating temporary impositions without complaint, making timely and constructive statements about the work unit or its heads to outsiders and promoting a work climate that is tolerable and minimizes the distractions created by interpersonal conflict are also examples of supra-role behaviours. For lack of a better term, Bateman and Organ (1983) referred to these behaviours as “Citizenship” in a study they conducted on job satisfaction and its relationship to affect and employee citizenship.

According to Organ and his associates, the “good” citizen attends work punctually, helps others, volunteers for non-required activities, makes suggestions, and gives advance notice when unable to attend work, while not engaging in extra breaks, excessive personal phone calls or idle conversation (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983).

In recent years, much interest in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been shown. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been said to enhance organizational performance because they lubricate the social machinery of the organization, reduce friction, and increase efficiency (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour represents individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). Most Organizational Citizenship Behaviour actions, taken singly, would not make a dent in the overall performance of the organization (Organ, 1988b). The effect will be seen with the aggregate summation of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour performed across time and across persons in the group, department, and organization. The most critical element is that these behaviours are defined at face value. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is behaviours that are clearly observable by peers, supervisors, or researchers.
2.2.1. Reviews related to Dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

According to Organ (1988) there are five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, first of all is Altruism which means helping co-workers in their tasks at work, Courtesy means giving respect to others, Sportsmanship is to tolerate less than ideal situations and having positive attitude without complaining, Conscientiousness means doing more than minimum role requirement unrestrictedly in the organization, and Civic Virtue means responsible attitude of the employees towards the betterment of the organization.

The concept, definition, and dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour have since generated considerable interest and criticism. In 1988, Organ provides a working definition of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour which represents individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization.

While the earlier definition of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983) describes five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Altruism, Courtesy, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and Conscientiousness), the review of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour literature reveals there is no clear consensus on the number of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour categories. Podaskoff (2000) found 30 potentially different forms of Citizenship Behaviour in their examination of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour literature while others propose as few as two (Williams and Anderson, 1991). Given the conceptual overlap between the constructs, Podaskoff and his team were able to organize their findings into seven common themes or dimensions: (a) Helping Behaviour, (b) Sportsmanship, (c) Organizational Loyalty, (d) Organizational Compliance, (e) Individual Initiative, (f) Civic Virtue, and (g) Self Development. Of the seven dimensions, helping behaviour has been identified as a significant form of citizenship behaviour by most researchers in the field (Podaskoff, et al, 2000). Helping behaviours (voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of work related problems), by definition, capture the dimensions first described by Organ (1983).

Most of the studies examining the structure of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour agree that it is a multidimensional concept bearing at least two dimensions, a “personal” and an “impersonal” construct (Nikolaou, 2001).
Williams and Anderson (1991) conceptualized these dimensions as two simple categories of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: OCB-I and OCB-O. OCB-I refers to Citizenship Behaviour directed towards individuals whereas OCB-O behaviours are generally directed towards the organizational unit as a whole. Courtesy and Altruism are viewed as mainly benefiting the co-workers, whereas Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship and Civic Virtue are directed at the organization (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

Although findings in the survey of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour literature suggest that most researchers have investigated Organizational Citizenship Behaviour at the individual level of theory, measurement and analysis (Podsakoff et al, 2000), provides a critical review of individual level research) while placing very little emphasis on the unit level of analysis, some have measured Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and organizational effectiveness at the organizational level (Schnake and Dumler, 2003).

Walz and Niehoff (1996) used individual employee ratings to measure the amount of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour within their work unit and found several dimensions of aggregated Organizational Citizenship Behaviour measures to be related to several dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Koys (2001) measured Organizational Citizenship Behaviour at the individual level but then aggregated to the group level for analysis.

Findings from Ehrhart’s (2004) study further support the importance of researching group processes. Ehrhart proposes that managers should be mindful not only of the individual relationship they share with subordinates, but also of how their work groups function as a System of independent relationships. As discussed earlier, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour theory clarity is an important issue (Ehrhart, 2004).

Schnake and Dumler (2003) argue that antecedents occur at the individual, group and organizational levels. While Organizational Citizenship Behaviour occurs at the individual level, it is Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the aggregated form that affects organizational effectiveness. Therefore, the level of analysis, level of measurement and level of theory are extremely important issues in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour research. They further argue that the failure to specify the level(s) to which a theory applies leads, almost invariably, to imprecision within the
theory and confusion during data collection and analysis to test the theory (Schnake and Dumler, 2003).

Negative Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Anti-Citizenship Behaviour); The common theme across most Organizational Citizenship Behaviour literature is that Citizenship Behaviours usually result in desirable outcomes that are beneficial to the worker(s) and/or add value to the organization. On the other hand, it is important to add that recent contributions to the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour literature suggest the consequences of some citizenship behaviour might be regarded as contrary to the conceptualization of the “good soldier syndrome” and some employees might actually engage in “anti-citizenship behaviours”.

Bolino (1999) argues that some Organizational Citizenship Behaviour may be due to impress the management and therefore may be it is to be observed by supervisors. Consistent with this line of thought, some researchers pose that performing tasks in a manner that exceeds expectations can be perceived as an ingratiatory ploy designed to portray oneself as more devoted and trustworthy than one’s colleagues and to obtain favour with an abusive supervisor (Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler and Ensley, 2004).

While generally, people who engage in citizenship are likely to be perceived favourably by their supervisors, peers and others in their organization; often it is difficult to distinguish sincere helping behaviour from self-serving acts of impressing the management. This effect may also inflate the supervisor’s ratings of employee when Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is compared to other ratings (Cardona and Espejo, 2002). Researchers have also found links between perceived fairness, justice and negative supervisory behaviours and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Citizenship Behaviours such as Altruism, Conscientiousness, and Courtesy may be influenced by the perceived fairness of a punishment event (Moorman, 1991; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990). Anti Citizenship Behaviours such as physical avoidance of work, defiance, resistance to authority, aggression, and revenge may be particularly negative outcomes of punishment events (Ball, Trevino and Sims, 1994).
In a study conducted on abusive supervisors (Tepper, et al., 2004), it was observed that when abusive supervision is high, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is negatively related to employee’s job satisfaction whereas when abusive supervision is low, co-workers’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is positively related to employees’ job satisfaction. To that end, a consequence of abusive supervision is the likelihood of it evoking unfavourable Organizational Citizenship Behaviours that can be viewed as self-serving. Even when co-workers perform the behaviours with altruistic intent, abused subordinates are more likely to regard those Organizational Citizenship Behaviours with scepticism and mistrust. The effectiveness of Citizenship Behaviours in organizations can also be influenced by the extent to which the members understand their importance.

In a study conducted on sales people, MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter (1993) observed that the failure on the part of sales managers to make it clear that OCBs are important to them may actually be one of the reasons managers and salespeople disagree so often over performance evaluations, promotional decisions, and other matters.

Additionally, failure of the sales force to understand the importance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour to the overall effectiveness and productivity of the organization as well as their personal evaluations can (a) reduce job satisfaction, (b) undermine their motivation and (c) increase the likelihood of physical or psychological withdrawal. In summary, to minimize or eliminate the negative consequences of unfavourable citizenship behaviours, managers should: consider using punishment only as a last resort due to its possible negative side effects; find ways to moderate the abusive behaviour of supervisors; and must also take steps to ensure that employees are aware that Organizational Citizenship Behaviours are important to them.
2.3. Reviews related to Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Justice perceptions may influence Organizational Citizenship Behaviour by prompting an employee to define his or her relationship with the organization as one of social exchange. In a social exchange process, employees perceiving fair treatment and trust in managers go beyond formal job requirements and voluntarily perform acts which benefit the organization (Deluga, 1994).

Although Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are not completely different and unrelated ideas but have different roots. Organizational Justice is able to elicit Citizenship Behaviours in many cases and Citizenship Behaviours are the mainstay in many organizations with high Organizational Justice. In a recent study conducted by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson and Porter (2001), a meta-analysis of past justice literature linkage with organizational outcomes were investigated. The results suggest that even though different justice dimensions are moderately to highly relate to each other, they contribute incremental variance explained in fairness perceptions (Colquitt et.al, 2001). All the four types of Organizational Justice (Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice, and Informational Justice) and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are correlated (Colquitt, 2001), but they are distinct aspects of Organizational Justice and have been shown to have independent effects (Greenberg, 1993, 1994).

Research constantly shows that individual behaviour in workplace is affected by perception of Organizational Justice (Colquitt et.al, 2001). For example, researchers have found that employees perform Organizational Citizenship Behaviours to their supervisor and organization, and demonstrate higher levels of commitment to their organization and supervisor in exchange for fair treatment, procedures, and outcomes (Bobocel and Holmvall, 1999; Byrne and Cropanzano, 2000).

Moreover, recent research has shown that employee perceptions of both Distributive and Procedural Justice influence Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. That is, if employees perceive the outcomes of their evaluations to be fair or perceive the process by which outcome allocation decisions are made to be fair, they will be likely to reciprocate by performing behaviours to benefit their organization that go beyond the in-role performance of their jobs (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).
Furthermore, Williams et al, (2002) indicated that the likelihood of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours increased when employees’ perceptions of fair treatment by supervisors became more positive.

Farh, Early and Lin (1997) investigated Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in a cross cultural manner. They studied Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in China. The well planned and organized research was composed of two studies, as is this paper. They first developed an etic and emic scale. Then they used the scale to measure Chinese levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and to explore similarities and differences in their Western counterparts. To develop the Chinese Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale [COCB], the researchers used both q-sort and factor analysis techniques to obtain the indigenous scale. The scales were similar in regards to three of the five constructs found in Organ's scale. The three similar or etic dimensions are Civic Virtue, Altruism, and Conscientiousness. The different or emic dimensions found in the study were elements of Sportsmanship and Courtesy, which were not seen by the Chinese as part of the COCB scale.

Farh et.al, (1997) discovered two new factors that apply to the Chinese context, which are interpersonal harmony and protecting company resources. In the findings, the most interesting result was that men in China perceive unfairness much more than women in China do. Understanding whether a Mexican-female maquiladora worker detects more or less fairness than other men in Mexico is of high value and importance for future study. The window of opportunity currently lies in studying Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in an international context. This will extend current research and shed new light on the over debated job satisfaction-performance hypothesis. This type of research will help to understand and explain if job satisfaction produces higher job performance or vice versa along with clearly explaining to manage the enormous need Organizational Justice in the workplace (Farh et.al, 1997).

The influence of different dimensions of Organizational Justice (Procedural, Distributive and Interactional) on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is a widely researched topic and hence explains the importance of Organizational Justice in an organization. A meta-analysis found that Distributive Justice is a crucial predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Colquitt et.al, 2001). Moorman (1991) was
among the first researchers to conduct research on the topic of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. He studied the relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and found the relationship between Procedural Justice and four of the five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. In a social exchange process, when employees perceive fair treatment and trust in managers, they perform voluntarily beneficial acts for the organizations that are not their formal responsibilities (Deluga, 1994). Organizational Justice resulted in employees’ trust in supervisors, which in turn encourages them to show more Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. The effects of fairness and trust in supervisor on the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of academicians among public universities in Turkey are examined by Ertu (2007). Trust in supervisor acted as mediator in the relationship of Organizational justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Aryee et.al, 2002; Ertu, 2007). All dimensions of Organizational Justice (Procedural, Interactional and Distributive Justice) had significant and positive relation with trust in supervisor and trust in supervisor had strong positive impact on both dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCBO and OCBI). When trust in supervisor, as antecedent of OCBO, was added to the equation of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, then the effects of all three dimensions of Organizational Justice on OCBO was decreased to insignificant level. On the other hand, the relationship of two dimensions of Organizational Justice (Distributive and Procedural) and OCBI become insignificant when trust in supervisor was added as antecedent of OCBI. But relationship of Interactional Justice and OCBI remained significant although trust in supervisor as an antecedent of OCBI decreased the effects of Interactional Justice on OCBI. Findings revealed that only Interactional Justice among other dimensions of Organizational Justice was the most important source of trust in supervisors.

A research by Dolan et.al, (2001) showed that Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is linked with Procedural Justice while trust acts as a mediating variable. Organizational Justice has a strong positive effect on Organizational Trust and ultimately on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. By adding Organizational Trust in the relationship between Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, the effect of Procedural Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is reduced. Procedural Justice has both direct and indirect effects on Organizational
Citizenship Behaviour through Organizational Trust because when employees feel that their organization has fair procedures and policies, their trust in that organization increased and they showed more extra role behaviour like Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Williams et.al, (2002) stated that employees showed more Organizational Citizenship Behaviours when they perceive justice treatment by supervisors (Williams et.al, 2002).

Ishak and Alam (2009) conducted a research among non-supervisory employees and supervisors in the banking organizations in Malaysia to see the impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and effects of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) as mediator between Organizational Justice and five dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. They found that there was a crucial role played by Organizational Justice (Distributive, Procedural, Informational, and Interpersonal Justice) in determination of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Altruism, Conscientiousness, Courtesy, Sportsmanship and Civic virtue). Results proved that there was a significant correlation between Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice and only one dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour that was Altruism. There was contribution of Interactional Justice in the performance of Altruism and consideration through LMX. But the contribution of Procedural and Distributive Justice for performing Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among employees was not significant. The results of research were consistent with Social Exchange Theory (Ishak and Alam, 2009).

Williams, Pitre, and Zainuba (2002) stated that when employees perceive fair treatment from their supervisors they were more inclined to show positive behaviours like Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and by controlling demographic variables, if employees perceive Interactional Justice in the organization, they showed behaviours that benefit the organization. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found that there is significant association among Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, trust in organization and manager, satisfaction with job, counterproductive behaviours like negative emotions and conflicts.

Organ (1990) suggested a theoretical basis for the relationship between Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour using equity theory and Blau's (1964) distinction between economic and social exchange. According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), perception of unfair distribution of work rewards
relative to work inputs create tension within an individual, and the individual is
motivated to resolve the tension. If Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is
considered a work input, then employee's response to underpayment could be
decreased in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Organ 1988). Some researchers
(Farh et.al, 1997; George, 1991) found that Distributive Justice is positively
correlated with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, whereas, others found no
relationship between Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
(Moorman, 1999; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). But in this study it has been argued
that there is a significant association between Distributive Justice and Organizational
Citizenship Behaviour.

In a different study, Niehoff and Moorman (1993) examined the results that
monitoring an employee had on the results of an employee choosing to engage in
extra-role behaviours. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and social exchange
theory were studied with 475 hospital employees (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994).
Konovsky and Pugh (1994) wanted to see how trust played a role in Organizational
Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. They found that trust might play a
role in mediating the relationship of Organizational Justice and Organizational
Citizenship Behaviours. Skarlicki and Latham (1996) found in their quasi experiment
that training significantly improved the perceptions of fairness in an employee over
that of an untrained group.

Chegini (2009) found that if employees of an organization feel a sense of
Organizational Justice, it increases their functional ability and they show
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Relationship between three dimensions of
Organizational Justice (named as Distributive Justice, Policy Justice and Interactional
Justice) and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour was measured. All three
dimensions of Organizational Justice were positively correlated with Organizational
Citizenship Behaviour. As there was meaningful relationship among all dimensions
of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour so it is necessary
to make allocation and distribution of resources, policies and procedures making
fairly.
But in Sport Organization the research by Hums and Cheladurai (1994) males and female coaches and principles in the Universities of America were appraised. They noticed that all groups considered necessity, equality in more fairly ways when the resources distributed equally among the athletes. Also they found out that males are more inclined to consider incidental basis of equity more fairly than females; while females are inclined to consider the basis of equality more fairly ways. Also in a research by William H. Fournier (2008) investigated relationship between Communication Satisfaction, Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Staff Perceptions in a Ohio University Environment, The result indicated that there was positive relationship between the Interactional Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (P<0.05, r=0.47), in staff perception.

Ahmadi and Moghimi, (2011) investigated Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour between employees and supervisors in Collage of physical education of Mashhad. The results indicated that Organizational Justice had a significant negative relationship with Sportsmanship and had strong positive impact of Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue, Altruism and Courtesy. It was observed that when interactional between employees and supervisors are in high level, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is positive related to employee’s job satisfaction whereas when interactional between employees and supervisors are in low level, co-workers’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is negatively related to employees’ job satisfaction. Furthermore, when employees believe they are treated fairly, they are more likely to think positively of their work, the outcomes of their efforts, and their supervisor. Therefore, in this context, justice refers to one’s perception of fairness.

Also in another research Rennett I, Tepper (2010) relationship among supervisors and subordinates procedural Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior were appraised. The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between various dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Justice and there was not a significant association among sportsmanship and Organizational Distribution. Also they found out that males are more inclined to consider incidental basis of equity more fairly than females; while females are inclined to consider the basis of equality more fairly.
Talebpour and Raenaei (2009) conducted a research between offices of physical education’s administrator and experts of sport in sport organization. Some results showed that there was not a significant difference in the case of Organizational Justice, Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice. But in case of Distributive Justice there was a statistically significant difference between Scopes of officer and administrator. The results suggest that even though different justice dimensions are moderately to highly relate to each other, they contribute incremental variance explained in fairness perceptions. All the three types of Organizational Justice (Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Interpersonal Justice) are correlated, but they are distinct aspects of Organizational Justice and have been shown to have independent effects. When employees are treated fairly overall in the organization, they feel need of reciprocal response to the organization in positive behaviours. Employees also need Justice in their working environment which in turn motivates them to properly work in organization (Talebpour and Raenaei, 2009).
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