The role of commitment to supervisor on organizational justice and citizenship among Iranian employees

Reza Shojaeian[1], Bahareh Salari[1], Anahita Salari[2]

[1] Applied & Science University, Kazeroon Center, Iran; [2] Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The current study examined the relationship between commitment to supervisor, organizational justice, and organizational citizenship behavior among Iranian employees working at private and public companies. 160 employees from various organizations across industries were used to test the hypotheses in this study. Participants completed three questionnaires related to the variables in this study. Results were in congruity with the findings of the previous research, that organizational justice was positively correlated with both commitment to supervisor and organizational citizenship behavior. The results of the current study have important implications for organizations in that the impact of the relationship formed between a supervisor/manager and their employees can have far reaching implications for overall organizational functioning and ultimately organizational profitability.

Keywords: organizational justice, commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, supervisor.

Introduction

Researchers have been studying organizational justice for more than 40 years and have found numerous established relationships between justice and various organizational outcomes, including but not limited to: organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Bateman & Organ, 1983). However, research has yet to explore how the relationships traditionally found between these variables might impact an employee's commitment to his supervisor. Reichers (1985) introduced the idea of multiple commitments in an organizational setting, and additional research has been conducted by Chen, Tsui, and Farh (2002), and Clugston, Howell, and Dorfman (2000). The importance of understanding the complex relationships that exist between organizational justice and various aspects of organizational behavior will benefit organizations by helping top leadership provide managers with more effective training on how to deal with decisions in a just manner.

Studies have shown that a focus on organizational justice increased perceived levels of fairness within the organization, which resulted in positive impacts on business outcomes associated with extra-role behaviors and increased commitment on the part of employees (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ, (1990) noted that "the incentives that attract people to organizations are not the same as those that sustain technical excellence in performance, and different still are those motives that underlie spontaneous gestures of cooperation among participants" (p. 705). Based on this conclusion, this current study explored the impact of commitment to supervisor and organizational justice in an attempt to further explain what motivates employees to perform extra-role behaviors and remain with the organization.

Organizational justice

Justice is an important construct in nearly every aspect of an individual's life. It shows up early in the complaints of young children, who say, "but,

Corresponding author: Reza Shojaeian, Applied & Science University, Kazeroon Center, Iran. E-mail: Shojaeian_reza@yahoo.com.

that's not fair," and continues into adult work life. Employees do not want to feel taken advantage of or cheated; therefore, the importance of an employee's perceptions of being treated fairly should not be overlooked or dismissed by organizations and leaders. Over the last three decades, the notion of fairness, or justice, has become an increasingly visible construct in the social sciences (Colquitt, 2001). According to Colquitt *et al.* (2001), "justice in organizational settings can be described as focusing on the antecedents and consequences of two types of subjective perceptions: (a) the fairness of outcome distributions or allocations and (b) the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcome distributions or allocations" (p. 425), with the former being referred to as distributive justice and the latter known as procedural justice.

Since its introduction, researchers have studied organizational justice from many different frameworks, theories, models, and perspectives in an attempt to find the best conceptualization for it. According to Colquitt (2001), researchers studied organizational justice in its infancy by using the two-factor model of organizational justice endorsed by Folger and Konovsky (1989), Greenberg (1990), and McFarlin and Sweeney (1992). The two-factor conceptualization consists of distributive justice (e.g., person-referenced outcomes like pay satisfaction) and procedural justice (e.g., organizational referenced outcomes like organizational commitment).

Colquitt *et al.* (2001) tested the organizational justice dimensions against a number of organizational outcomes. They found that distributive justice had a high correlation with withdrawal, trust, and organizational commitment, a moderate correlation with organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at the organization (OCBOs), and a weak correlation with organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at the individuals (OCBIs). Furthermore, they found that procedural justice highly correlated with organizational commitment and trust, moderately correlated with withdrawal and OCBOs, and weakly correlated with OCBIs. These researchers also explored the correlations with outcomes and interpersonal and informational justice; they found that interpersonal justice moderately correlated with OCBIs and weakly correlated with withdrawal, while informational justice moderately correlated with organizational commitment, OCBIs, and withdrawal and weakly correlated with OCBOs.

While debate surrounding the dimensions of organizational justice persists, researchers commonly accept that justice is evaluated based on the behavior(s) of two sources: the organization and the leader (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001). Cobb, Folger, and Wooten (1995) noted that, "when leaders are seen as acting fairly, followers are more likely to emulate that behavior in their dealings with others" (p. 144); they also theorized that, when leaders "often personify the organization for many of their followers, subordinates are likely to assess their value to the organization by the treatment they receive from them" (p. 144). Furthermore, Masterson *et al.* (2000) believed that the literature suggested that 'justice perceptions are important inputs into employees' judgments of the quality of their exchange relationship with their supervisors and organizations" (p. 740), and "employees perceive acts of fairness to be contributions that enhance the quality and desirability of their ongoing relationships" (p. 740).

Organizational justice researchers have explored many of the relationships that exist between justice and various behavioral outcomes of importance to the organization. However, while researchers like Masterson *et al.* (2000) have purported that supervisors play an important role in how employees form perceptions of justice, research has not specifically explored how employees' commitment to their supervisor may impact or moderate the relationship that exists between organizational justice and outcome variables like organizational citizenship behaviors and intentions to leave. The current research attempted to fill this void in the organizational justice literature by making commitment to supervisor a key variable of interest.

Commitment

Global competition is a reality for today's businesses, and, in order to remain competitive, organizations must find ways to retain and motivate skilled employees. The research literature has focused on organizational commitment for more than 50 years because researchers (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Williams & Anderson, 1991) and organizations believe that commitment is a desirable attribute, which increases organizational effectiveness. Iverson and Buttigieg (1999) reported that literature on organizational commitment "suggests that individuals who are organizationally committed are less likely to be absent and to voluntarily leave their organizations" (p. 307). In addition, Redman and Snape (2005) noted that "organizational effective-

ness will be enhanced where organizations are able to elicit high levels of commitment from their employees, since committed employees show higher work effectiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour, and lower absence and turnover" (p. 301).

Regardless of the variation in conceptualization of organizational commitment by researchers, Wasti (2003) found an "increasing consensus that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct" (p. 304), including affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Researchers consider affective commitment to be the most desirable form of commitment because it is based on an emotional attachment, which leads to positive behavioral outcomes performed by the employee for the benefit of the organization (e.g., citizenship behaviors and employee performance). Furthermore, affective commitment had "the strongest and most consistent relationship with desirable outcomes" (Wasti, 2003, p. 304). Continuance commitment is considered to be the most undesirable form of commitment because it is based on the idea of sunken costs, in which an individual remains with the organization based on the costs they would incur uponleaving (Clugston *et al.*, 2000).

Commitment to supervisor

Recently, researchers began to explore commitment in reference to multiple commitment foci (Clugston *et al.*, 2000). Because the organization is an abstraction for many employees, it "is represented in reality by co-workers, superiors, subordinates, customers, and other groups and individuals that collectively comprise the organization" (Reichers, 1985, p. 472). Thompson and Heron (2005) state:

A growing literature from a number of diverse fields, such as knowledge management, innovation and organizational behaviour, emphasizes the important part played by the quality of employee-manager relationships in creating the context within which employee behaviour and attitudes are fostered. (p. 399)

For the purposes of this study, the facet of importance was an employee's commitment or loyalty to his supervisor. This construct was hypothesized to be critical to the performance of OCBs due to the proximal impact of immediate supervisors on employees and their daily working environment. According to Porter, Lawler, and Hackman, (as cited in Gregersen, 1993), elements that are "proximal to an individual's immediate work environment can exert a strong influence on behavior such as ex-

trarole behavior" (p. 34).Gregersen (1993) found that "commitment to supervisors was significantly related to extra role behavior for respondents with more than 2 years of organizational tenure" (pp. 42-43). On the contrary, Becker (1992) found that foci of commitment (e.g., top management, supervisor, and work group) helped to predict satisfaction and intent to quit but did not aid in the prediction of pro social organizational behavior.

Chen *et al.* (2002) explored the importance of commitment to supervisor and the impacts it had on work outcomes in the relationship-oriented Chinese culture. Chen *et al.* (2002) postulated that loyalty to supervisor may extend beyond identification and internalization in a highly relationship-oriented context because of social norms. Attachment may arise out of: attraction based on familiarity, frequent interactions, common identity, indebtedness toward another individual for favors, or role obligation to an authority figure. Studies that have explored the meaning of loyalty to boss from theChinese perspective (Cheng; Lee; & Zhou, as cited in Chen et al., 2002) suggested that the concept of commitment, or loyalty, to supervisor is broader and more congruent with the original formulation of organizational commitment, in that the concept focuses attention on "the employee's behavioural tendency to exert extra effort, to be dedicated and to be faithful" (Chen et al., 2002, p. 341). Chen et al. (2002) concluded that "loyalty to supervisor seems to be more important than organizational commitment in accounting for employee's in-role and extra-role performance" (p. 352). However, the researchers further hypothesized that the stronger effects of loyalty to supervisor on employee outcomes could be a pan cultural phenomenon and suggested that research should be conducted in different cultural contexts, both indigenous and comparative.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

OCBs fall into a larger category referred to by some researchers as extra-role or pro social behavior. According to Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (as cited in Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005), OCBs "have emerged as a popular area of study during the past 20 years" (p. 259). Katz and Kahn, (as cited in Deluga, 1995) notedthat "extra-role behaviors are crucial for organizational effectiveness, because organizations cannot anticipate with perfect accuracy all those activities essential for reaching objectives" (p. 1). According to Organ (1990), OCBs "are work related activities performed

by employees; such behaviors increase organizational effectiveness but are beyond the scope of job descriptions and formal, contractual sanctions or incentives" (p. 33). Furthermore, OCBs are beneficial and desirable from an organizational perspective, but managers have difficulty eliciting their occurrence or punishing their absence through contractual arrangements and formal rewards because the behaviors are voluntary (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). Literature has also purported that "OCB may be an important factor in employee and organizational performance (Koys, as cited in Kueh & Al-Busaidi, 2002).

OCB literature has identified and focused on four categories of antecedents: individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). While various researchers in numerous contexts have studied each of these categories, for the purpose of this study, the antecedent of interest was leadership behavior. According to Podsakoff *et al.* (2000), "leaders play a key role in influencing citizenship behavior" (p. 519), and "employees who believed that their supervisor personally treated them fairly appeared to be more likely to exhibit citizenship behaviors" (Moorman, 1991, p. 853). Consequences of OCB include their effects on managerial evaluations of performance and judgments regarding pay raises and their effects on organizational performance. Specifically, it is assumed, and general support exists for the idea that:

To date, researchers have thoroughly explored the various antecedents and consequences ofOCB. Specifically, "research results from studies throughout the 1990s and early 2000s have confirmed the robust relationship between perceptions of fairness and OCB performance" (Blakely *et al.*, 2005, p. 260). However, research has neither directly tied the individual level variable of commitment to supervisor to the performance of OCBs nor explored how commitment to supervisor may impact or moderate antecedents ofOCB (e.g., organizational justice). The current study examined these issues by measuring and testing the potential moderating nature of commitment to supervisor in the relationship of organizational justice and the performance of OCBs.

Statement of Problem
Perceptions of injustice lead to loss of motivation, poor employee and organizational performance (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001), minimizing or with-

holding of extra role behaviors (Greenberg, as cited in Tepper & Taylor, 2003), and withdrawal from the organization (Colquitt et al., 2001). Managers and supervisors play such visible roles in an employee's work life that they have either a positive or negative impact on employees. The interactions that employees have with their supervisor shape the role and value that the individual employee holds to the organization. Therefore, the role of the supervisor in moderating the effects of organizational justice, and citizenship behaviors requires further exploration and review. A better understanding of the supervisor's role in the relationships between these variables could help to focus management training that leads to improved working relationships and increased employee and organizational performance.

Objective of the study
The objective of this study was to identify the relationships that may exist between the commitment an employee feels toward their supervisor and their perceptions of justice, and their willingness to perform extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors to the benefit of the organization. The main goal of the study was to explore the impact of commitment to supervisor in determining the performance of specific behaviors (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviors) on the part of employees.

Research Questions and Hypotheses
The current research attempted to answer the following four questions:

Q1: Is there a relationship between organizational justice and employees' commitment to their supervisors?

Q2: Does commitment to supervisor correlate with organizational citizenship behaviors?

Two hypotheses were generated from the aforementioned research questions.

H01: There is no relationship between organizational justice and employees' commitment to their supervisors.

H02: There is no relationship between commitment to supervisor and organizational citizenship behaviors

Methodology

Participants
The participants for this study were randomly selected from various public and private companies and industries in Iran. They worked for different

companies in different industries. Approximately 280 working adults were invited to participate in the study. However, a total of 160 professionals voluntarily participated in this study for further research

Procedure

After the participants were selected, all of them were provided with self-ratings on each section of the survey, regarding their individual perceptions about their working environment in terms of organizational justice, relationship with supervisor, and citizenship behaviors. Participants were asked to complete the survey in their own working environment to minimize the potential for variations in their responses based on extraneous variables such as current mood and/or environment.

Instruments

Data were obtained using three measures: Four-Factor Organizational Justice Scale (Colquitt, 2001), Loyalty to Supervisor Scale (Chen et al., 2002), Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Podsakoff et al., 1990), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1982).

Organizational Justice: The measure of organizational justice, developed by Colquitt (2001), was a 20 item measure that has been used in previous research. The measure looks at the four-factor structure of organizational justice, as suggested by Greenberg (1993). This survey provided scores for distributive, procedural, informational, and interpersonal justice and used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1, "To a Small Extent" to 5, "To a Large Extent". This measure was selected for inclusion in the current study because research has shown this measure to have both construct and predictive validity for commitment and helping behavior (Colquitt, 2001). This measure has reported Cronbach alpha reliabilities ranging from .69 to .93 for the four scales.

Commitment to Supervisor: The measure used to assess the participant's commitment to supervisor was developed by Chen et al. (2002). This scale consists of 17 items that measure: dedication to supervisor, extra effort for supervisor, attachment to supervisor, identification with supervisor, and internalization of supervisor values. The scale has a reported Cronbach alpha ranging from .67 to .79 and used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1, "Strongly Disagree" to 5, "Strongly Agree".

Organizational Citizenship: The measure used to assess the participant's citizenship behaviors

was a 20 item measure developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) that provided scores on the five different facets of OCBs: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. This scale has a reported Cronbach alpha of .90. This survey used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1, "Strongly Disagree" to 7, "Strongly Agree".

Results and Discussion

Hypothesis 1

HI predicted that an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor will be positively related to organizational justice perceptions. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson product-moment correlations. As it is clear from Table 1, the results of the correlation analysis supported this hypothesis. Commitment to supervisor was positively correlated with organizational justice (r=.64). Hence, as predicted, an employee's commitment to his supervisor increased as his perception of organizational justice increased.

Hypothesis 2

H2 predicted that an employee's commitment his/her supervisor will be positively related to the frequency of organizational citizenship behaviors performed by the employee. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson product-moment correlations. By looking at table 1, the results of the correlations analysis supported this hypothesis. Commitment to supervisor was positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior (r = .39). Hence, as predicted, as an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor increased, so did his/her performance of organizational citizenship behaviors.

According to table 1, several significant correlations were identified by Pearson product-moment correlation. However, it could be argued that the correlations that resulted in non-significant values or unexpected directionality were of most interest. When examining the correlations that existed with the organizational justice subscale, distributive justice, two relationships seemed inconsistent with the rest. The first suspect relationship was the negative correlation between distributive justice and the subscale conscientiousness (r = .18). The second inconsistent relationship pertained to the only significant correlation that occurred between the sportsmanship subscale (r = .22) and distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Further, when exploring the commitment to su-

pervisor subscale, extra effort for supervisor, no statistically significant correlations existed with any of the organizational justice subscales or with organizational justice as a whole. However, statistically significant correlations were obtained between extra effort for supervisor and all of the organizational citizenship behavior subscales and with a CB as a whole (r=.57).

Table 1. Pearson Product Moment correlation between outcome variables.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Procedural justice																
Distributive justice	.52															
Interpersonal justice	.51	.29														
Informational justice	.60	.39	.72													
Organizational justice	.81	.69	.73	.81												
Dedication to supervisor	.36	.19	.60	.51	.51											
Extra effort for supervisor	.03	.07	.11	.14	.10	.21										
Attachment to supervisor	.28	.23	.43	.54	.40	.61	.11									
Identification with supervisor	.29	.33	.45	.51	.46	.59	.10	.61								
Internalization of supervisor value	.41	.28	.61	.59	.64	.68	.08	.74	.75							
Commitment to supervisor	.39	.34	.65	.68	.64	.81	.36	.82	.81	.86						
Altruism	.10	.05	.11	.16	.13	.21	.38	.23	.25	.23	.28					
Courtesy	.04	.07	.13	.16	.14	.27	.46	.04	.01	.02	.18	.59				
Conscientiousness	.02	.18	.12	.13	.03	.17	.32	.04	.02	.14	.15	.37	.45			
Sportsmanship	.22	.25	.27	.28	.24	.33	.29	.11	.14	.22	.23	.23	.36	.17		
Civic virtue	.20	.04	.26	.23	.23	.37	.26	.29	.22	.37	.34	.36	.29	.34	.25	
Organizational Citizenship value	.25	.04	.37	.25	.28	.45	.57	.25	.24	.34	.39	.66	.77	.68	.54	.69

When exploring the organizational variable in relation to the organizational citizenship behavior variable, no statistically significant correlations existed between the organizational justice scale and subscales and the organizational citizenship behaviors subscales, altruism, courtesy, and conscientiousness. Further exploration of the organizational citizenship behavior subscale, courtesy, resulted in statistically significant correlations with only two of the commitment to supervisor subscales, extraeffort for supervisor (r=.46, R<.01) and dedication to supervisor (r=.27, R<.01). In addition, the conscientiousness subscale resulted in a statistically sig-

nificant correlation with extra effort to supervisor (r=.32, R<.01). The sportsmanship sub scale obtained statistically significant correlations with all of the commitment to supervisor subscales, except for the attachment to supervisor subscale (r=.11).

In summary, hypothesis one explored the relationship between commitment to supervisor and organizational justice, which was subdivided into four dimensions: procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice, as defined by Colquitt (2001). The results of the current study showed that an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor was related to their

perceptions of justice within the organization; this relationship was positive and statistically significant (r=.64, R<.01), indicating that as scores on one variable increase, so do the scores on the other variable. Thus, as an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor increases, so does the amount of organizational justice he or she perceives in the organization. However, this relationship is a correlation and, thus, causality cannot be assumed. Therefore, it could be that as organizational justice increases, so does the employee's commitment to his/her supervisor.

While organizational justice has been an increasingly visible variable in the literature over the last three decades (Colquitt, 2001), having been studied in relation to various criterion and outcome variables, the current study focused specifically on how an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor impacts the perceptions of justice within the organization, which has been largely overlooked by previous research. The finding in the current research of a strong correlation between commitment to supervisor and organizational justice (r= .64) aids in further conceptualizing the construct and provides practical information that organizations can apply when attempting to improve justice perceptions, which in turn impact a myriad of other behavioral outcomes.

According to Brockner and Wisenfeld, (as cited in Thompson & Heron, 2005), "workers have expectations of what the organization should do in relation to the distribution of resources such as reward, careers and development and when these expectations are not met, they perceive this as injustice" (p. 388). Naumann and Bennett, (as cited in Thompson & Heron, 2005) noted that, "the manager or supervisor is the focal point of interactional justice perceptions and has even been called a 'climate engineer' , because managers shape the meaning employees attribute to organizational phenomenon" (p. 392). Furthermore, Thompson and Heron (2005) purported that the attitudes and behaviors of employees may also be affected by the perceived quality of the relationship between the manager and the employee. This statement is consistent with the work of Bies and Moag, (as cited in Colquitt *et al.,* 2001), who "argued that people draw on interactional justice perceptions when deciding how to react to authority figures (e.g., bosses and supervisors)" (p. 427). Therefore, if, as suggested in the current study, commitment to supervisor impacts organizational justice, which has established

relationships with important organizational outcomes, including but not limited to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and performance (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001), then leadership training that focuses on the importance of the supervisor-employee relationship may have a positive return on investment for the organization.

Hypothesis two examined the relationship between commitment to supervisor and organizational citizenship behaviors, which was subdivided into five dimensions: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. The results of the current study showed that an employee's commitment to his supervisor was related to organizational citizenship behavior; this relationship was positive and statistically significant (r=.39), indicating that as scores on one variable increase, so do the scores on the other variable. Thus, as an employee's commitment to his/her supervisor increases, his/her self-reported organizational citizenship behaviors also increase. However, this relationship is a correlation and, thus, causality cannot be assumed. Therefore, it could be that as organizational citizenship behaviors increase, so does the employee's commitment to his/her supervisor.

According to Redman and Snape (2005), "managers concerned to encourage organizational citizenship and customer-oriented behaviours should note that such behaviours are not necessarily a response to commitment to the organization or top management, but may reflect commitments to more proximal foci" (p. 324); they also note that "organizations seeking to encourage certain forms of citizenship behaviours may need to develop commitment to the supervisor" (p. 324). According to Coff and Rousseau, (as cited in Thompson & Heron, 2005):

> Affective commitment is part of the tie that binds persons and groups to the firm, we observe higher rates of discretionary behaviours that are aligned to the firm's interests, including citizenship behaviour, higher quality of service and innovation. (p. 385)

In addition, the results of the current study are consistent with and add validity to research by George and Jones (1997), who note that people are more likely to help people with whom they have a positive interpersonal relationship and are less likely to help someone whom they dislike or disrespect. The establishment of a relationship between commitment to supervisor and organizational citizenship behavior is important in that it aids in further conceptualizing the construct of organizational citizenship

behaviors, which, according to MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter, (as cited in Lovell *et al.*, 1999) still lacks consensus in the OCB dimensionality literature.

Conclusions and Implications

This study provided support for the role of commitment to supervisor as an antecedent to organizational justice, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, the finding that commitment to supervisor acts as a mediating variable in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors adds to the current literature and knowledge about organizational justice and the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors in the work place.

According to Kidder (2002) "researchers have come to realize that going beyond minimum job requirements, while always beneficial, is an increasingly critical attribute in these days of heightened competition and the global marketplace" (p. 629). The current study added to previously established research, which has shown that behaviors not formally required by the job (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviors) are crucial to overall organizational effectiveness because organizations cannot foresee all possible behaviors required for their success (Borman, &Motowidlo, 1993).

Organization's today are facing many challenges with strong economic pressures to improve profitability while still controlling costs. The results of the current study suggest that managers/supervisors may be able to leverage the relationships they build with their employees to maximize productivity and profit without increasing labor costs. Specifically, the findings from the current study support previous research in suggesting that supervisors may be able to increase the amount of extra-role behaviors performed by employees and improve overall organizational effectiveness while minimizing turnover simply by improving the relationships they cultivate with their employees. Improving supervisor-employee relationships can be done in a number of ways; for example, organizations would benefit from providing supervisors with specific relationship building training. Any number of content areas can provide managers with information useful in cultivating healthy, mutually satisfactory relationships with their employees. Topics such as emotional intelligence, understanding individual personality, team building, conflict management, negotiation,

conducting crucial conversations, coaching/mentoring, and effective performance management techniques can provide managers with valuable information on how to interact more effectively with their employees and to foster an environment conducive to relationship and trust building.

References

BatemanT.S.,&Organ D.W., 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship."Academy of Management Journal, 26(4):587-595.

Blakely G.L., Andrews M.C., &Moorman R.H., 2005.The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors.Journal of Business and Psychology, 20(2):259-273.

Borman W.C., &Motowidlo S.J., 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance.In N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman, &Associates (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 71-98). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA:

Chen Z. X., Tsui A.S., &Farh J., 2002.Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75(3): 339-356.

Clugston M., Howell J.P., & Dorfman P.W., 2000. Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment. Journal of Management, 26: 5-30.

Cobb A.T., Folger R, &Wooten K., 1995. The role justice plays in organizational change. Public Administration Quarterly, Summer, 19:135-151.

Colquitt J.A., Conlon D.E., Wesson M.J., Porter C.O.L.H., &Ng K.Y., 2001. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research.Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3):425-445.

Deluga R.J., 1995. The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior.Military Psychology, 7(1): 1-16.

Farh J.L., Podsakoff P.M., & Organ D.W., 1990. Accounting for citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. Journal of Management, 16: 705-721.

Folger R., &Konovsky M.A., 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to

pay raise decisions. Academy of Management Journal, 32: 115-130.

George J.M., & Jones G.R., 1997.Organizational spontaneity in context.Human Performance, 10:153-170.

Greenberg J., 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow.Journal of Management, 16: 399-432.

Gregersen H.B., 1993. Multiple commitments at work and extrarole behavior during three stages of organizational tenure.Journal of Business Research, 26: 31-47.

Iverson R.D. &Buttigieg D.M., 1999. Affective, normative and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? Journal of Management Studies, 36(3): 307-333.

Kidder D. L., 2002. The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 28(5): 629-648.

Kuehn K.W., & Al-Busaidi Y., 2002. Citizenship behavior in a non-western context: An examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self-reported OCB. International Journal of Commerce and Management, 12(2):107-125.

Lovell S.E., Kahn A.S., Anton J., Davidson A., Dowling E., Post D., &Mason C., 1999. Does gender affect the link between organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation? Sex Roles, 41 (5/6):469-478.

Masterson S.S., Lewis K., Goldman B.M., &Taylor M.S., 2000.Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships.Academy of Management Journal, 48(4): 738-748.

Mathieu J.E., &ZajacD., 1990.A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents,correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment.Psychological Bulletin, 108(2):171-194.

McFarlin D.B., &Sweeney P.D., 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes.Academy of Management Journal, 25: 626-637.

Mowday R.T., Porter L.W., & Steers R., 1982.Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. Academic Press, New York.

Organ D.W., 1990.The subtle significance of job satisfaction.Clinical LaboratoryManagement, 4: 94-98.

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):513-565.

Redman T., &Snape E., 2005. Unpacking commitment: Multiple loyalties and employee behaviour. Journal of Managerial Studies, 42(2): 301-328.

Reichers A.E., 1985. A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment.Academy of Management Review, 10:465-476.

Tepper B.J., & Taylor E.C., 2003. Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors.Academy of Management Journal, 46(1): 97-105.

Thompson M., &Heron P., 2005. The difference a manager can make: Organizational justice and knowledge worker commitment. International Journal of Human resource Management, 16(3):383-404.

Wasti S.A., 2003. Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76:303- 321.

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.