Examining the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior at Islamic Azad University in Ardabil Province

Mohammad Roohi, Mohammad Feizi*

Department of Management, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardebil, Iran
*E-mail: m_feizi@yahoo.com

Abstract

This main purpose of this study was examining the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior at Islamic Azad University of Ardabil province. This study is based on a correlation and the statistical population consists of all the academy members as well as employees of Islamic Azad University Branches of Ardebil province. According to Cochran sample volume method, 246 persons have been selected from 1067 persons. In order to collect data, a questionnaire containing 24 questions was designed and distributed among the sample members. Statistical validity is confirmed by the authorities and the reliability coefficients for organizational justice questionnaire 94% and for Organizational Citizenship Behavior questionnaire 93%. The findings showed that there was a significant relationship between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior at Islamic Azad University of Ardabil province.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice, Informational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Introduction

Sometimes employees go the extra mile by actually involving in behaviors not described in their job—and thus it didn't go under the broad heading of task performance. This situation brings us to the typical category of job performance, called citizenship behavior. Citizenship behavior is defined as voluntary employee activities that may or may not be rewarded but that contribute to the organization by improving the overall quality of the setting in which work takes place (Organ, 1988).

Who always maintained a good attitude, even in trying times? We tend to call those people "good citizens" or "good soldiers." (Organ, 1988). High levels of citizenship behavior earn them such titles. Although there are many different types of behaviors that might seem to fit the definition of citizenship behavior, research suggests two main categories that differ according to who benefits from the activity: coworkers or the organization (Coleman & Borman, 2000).

The first category of citizenship behavior is the one with which you're most likely to be familiar: interpersonal citizenship behavior. Such behaviors benefit coworkers and colleagues and involve assisting, supporting, and developing other organizational members in a way that goes beyond normal job expectations (Coleman & Borman, 2000).

Courtesy refers to keeping coworkers informed about matters that are relevant to them. Some employees have a tendency to keep relevant facts and events secret. Good citizens do the opposite; they keep others in the loop because they never know what information might be useful to someone else. Sportsmanship involves maintaining a good attitude with coworkers, even when they've done something annoying or when the unit is going through tough times. Whining and complaining are

contagious; good citizens avoid being the squeaky wheel that frequently makes mountains out of molehills.

Although interpersonal citizenship behavior is important in many different job contexts, it may be even more important in contexts in which employees work in small groups or teams. A team with members who tend to be helpful, respectful, and courteous is also likely to have a positive team atmosphere in which members trust one another. This type of situation is essential to foster the willingness of team members to work toward a common team goal rather than goals that may be more self-serving (MacMillan, 2001). In fact, if you think about the behaviors that commonly fall under the "teamwork" heading, you'll probably agree that most are examples of interpersonal citizenship behavior (LePine & others, 2007).

The second category of citizenship behavior is organizational citizenship behavior. These behaviors benefit the larger organization by supporting and defending the company, working to improve its operations, and being especially loyal to it. Good citizens react to bad rules or policies by constructively trying to change them as opposed to passively complaining about them (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Civic virtue requires participating in the company's operations at a deeper-than-normal level by attending voluntary meetings and functions, reading and keeping up with organizational announcements, and keeping abreast of business news that affects the company. Boosterism means representing the organization in a positive way when out in public, away from the office, and away from work.

Two important points should be emphasized about citizenship behaviors. First, as you've probably realized, citizenship behaviors are relevant in virtually any job, regardless of the particular nature of its tasks, (Motowidlo, 2000) and there are clear benefits of these behaviors in terms of the effectiveness of work units and organizations (Podsakoff & others, 2000). As examples, research conducted in a paper mill found that the quantity and quality of crew output was higher in crews that included more good citizens (Podsakoff, & others, 1997). Research of 30 restaurants also showed that higher levels of citizenship behavior promoted higher revenue, better operating efficiency, higher customer satisfaction, higher performance quality, less food waste, and fewer customer complaints (Walz & Neihoff, 1996). Thus, it seems clear that citizenship behaviors have a significant influence on the bottom line.

Second, citizenship behaviors become even more vital during organizational crises, when beneficial suggestions, deep employee involvement, and a positive "public face" are critical. For example, Southwest Airlines relied on high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors after 9/11. Top corporate leaders worked without pay through the end of 2001, while rank-and-file employees voluntarily gave up days or weeks of paid vacation so that the employee profit-sharing plan could remain fully funded. The end result of this good citizenship was that Southwest suffered no layoffs after 9/11 and was the only major airline to make a profit that year (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2005). From an employee's perspective, it may be tempting to discount the importance of citizenship behaviors—to just focus on your own job tasks and leave aside any "extra" stuff.

After all, citizenship behaviors appear to be voluntary and optional, whereas task duties are not. However, discounting citizenship behaviors is a bad idea, because supervisors do not always view such actions as optional. In fact, research among computer salespeople, insurance agents, petrochemical salespeople, pharmaceutical sales managers, office furniture makers, sewing machine operators, U.S. Air Force mechanics, and first-tour U.S. Army soldiers has shown that citizenship behaviors relate strongly to supervisor evaluations of job performance, even when differences in task performance are also considered (Allen & Rush, 1998). The tendency of supervisors to consider citizenship behaviors in evaluating overall job performance appears to hold even across countries with vastly different cultures (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Indeed, employee citizenship behavior has

been found to influence the salary and promotion recommendations people receive, over and above their task performance (Allen & Rush, 1999). Put simply, it pays to be a good citizen.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are completely voluntarily and personal this mean is persons don't receive reward in acting this Behavior, and don't be punished for unexciting it. In fact citizenship Behavior tells voluntarily actions, inclinations to personnel's dedication to supply comfort and welfare in other people. Beside modern career environments need the personnel that are good citizens which personnel show tendency to extent cooperation and help to peer, employer and customer (Alizdeh, 2009, 2). Personnel who aren't committed to their organization have a withdrawal behavior, which described as some actions which personnel do it refrain to do work (Feizi, Ghaderi and Alizdeh, 2011, 53).

It is often difficult to assess the ability, integrity, and benevolence of authorities accurately, particularly early in working relationship. Justice provides that sort of behavioral evidence because authorities who treat employees more fairly are usually judged to be more trustworthy (Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson, 2010, 125).

Justice reflects the perceived of authority's decision making (Greenberg, 1987, 9). Justice concepts can be used to explain why employees judged some authorities as more trustworthy than others (Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson, 2010, 121). Employees can judge the fairness of an authority's decision making along four dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice.

Distributive justice reflects the perceived fairness of decision making outcomes. Procedural justice reflects the perceived fairness of decision making processes. Interpersonal justice reflects the perceived fairness of the treatment received by employees from authorities. Finally, informational justice reflects the perceived fairness of the communications provided to employees from authorities.

Distributive Justice Rules - *Equity vs. Equality vs. need:* Are rewards allocated according the proper norm?

Procedural Justice Rules - *Voice:* Do employees get to provide input in to procedures? *Correct ability:* Do procedures build in mechanism for appeals? *Consistency:* Are procedures consistent across people and time? *Bias suppression:* Are procedures neutral and unbiased? *Representativeness:* Do procedures consider the needs of all groups? *Accuracy:* Are procedures based on accurate information?

Tab Interpersonal Justice Rules - *Respect:* Do authorities treat employees with sincerity? *Propriety:* Do authorities refrain from improper remarks?

Informational Justice Rules- *Justification:* Do authorities explain procedures thoroughly? *Truthfulness:* Are those explanations honest?

The main subject of this research is significant relationship between details of organizational justice and citizenship behavior, or not, what is the relation between organizational justice and citizenship behavior? For this reason, we investigate organizational justice and citizenship behavior and developed hypotheses:

- There is a significant relationship between the distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

- There is a significant relationship between the procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

- There is a significant relationship between the interpersonal justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

- There is a significant relationship between the informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Methodology

This study has done to examining the relationship organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior at Islamic Azad University in Ardabil province. The population was 1067 employees and faculty members of Islamic Azad University Branches in Ardebil province. We have used Cochran model to determine the sample size of research that were 246 (148 employees and 98 faculty members). We have selected respondents according to simple random sampling from Six Branches of Islamic Azad University in Ardebil province (see table1).

Table 1. Research environment and sample size

Universities	Response	Total	Number of employees	Number of Faculty membership
Ardebil branch	138	147	93	54
Kalkhal branch	30	35	20	15
Parsabad branch	25	29	17	12
Meshkin branch	15	16	8	8
Germi branch	10	15	8	7
Bilesavar branch	4	4	2	2
Total	222	246	148	98

To gathering of data, we used questionnaire which includes a total of 24 items contained in four sections: one on Organizational culture, another on citizenship behaviors and a third on withdrawal behaviors and forth on demographics, respectively. The citizenship behaviors items from Coleman and Borman theory, with 11 items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of this questionnaire has been measured to be a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.93. The organizational justice items from Colquitt and others theory, with 13 items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of this questionnaire has been measured to be a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.94.

Descriptive statistics i.e. frequencies, valid percent, the means, and standard deviations were used to describe data. Pearson Correlation test was also applied to determine whether or not relationships between independent variables and the citizenship behaviors as dependent variable. The data were analyzed using the statistical package for Social Science (SPSS).

Results

A majority of the 222 respondents 65% are males, and the 35% are female. The highest age group of respondents (55%) includes those between 30-40 years and the smallest one those upper 50 years (5%).

Table 2: Profile of the Respondents

		n=1234	%	%
Gender	Males	144	65	65
	Female	78	35	100
	Under 30	33	15	15
Age Groups	30 – 40 years	122	55	70
	41 – 50 years	56	25	95
	> 50 years	11	5	100

Table 3, which present the correlations of distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The results show that distributive justice significantly and highly related with

organizational citizenship behavior. Strong positive correlation was found between this variable (r=0/536) and Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Correlation between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour

		Distributive Justice	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
distributive Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.536**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	222	222
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.536**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	222	222
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 4, which present the correlations of procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The results show that Procedural justice significantly and highly related with organizational citizenship behaviour. Strong positive correlation was found between this variable (r=0/693) and Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4: Correlation between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour

		Procedural Justice	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.693**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	222	222
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.693**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	222	222
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 5, present the correlations of interpersonal justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The results show that interpersonal justice significantly and highly related with organizational citizenship behaviour. Strong positive correlation was found between this variable (r=0/631) and Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 5: Correlation between interpersonal justice and organizational citizenship behaviour

		Interpersonal Justice	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
Interpersonal Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	222	222
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.631**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	222	222
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Finally, table 6 presents the correlations of informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The results show that informational justice significantly and highly related with organizational citizenship behaviour. Strong positive correlation was found between this variable (r=0/577) and Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 6: Correlation between informational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour

		Informational Justice	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
Informational Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.577[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	222	222
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.577[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	222	222
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Conclusions and Suggestions

In this research, we confirmed the relation between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior. The direction of coefficient was positive. Also observed the relationship procedural justice with organization citizenship behavior is highest among other justice dimensions(r=0/693). Finally, some suggestions are given, with regarding to hypotheses test:

- Encourage personnel that get to provide input in to procedures.
- Procedures build in mechanism for appeals.
- Procedures should be consistent across people and time.
- Procedures should be neutral and unbiased.
- Procedures should be considering the needs of all groups.
- Procedures created based on accurate information
- Rewards allocated according the proper norm.
- Authorities treat employees with sincerity.
- Authorities refrain from improper remarks.
- Authorities explain procedures thoroughly for employees and those explanations honest.

References

Alizadeh, M. (2010), Explain the role of organizational culture on organizational citizenship behavior, organizational, Conference of Management of organizational citizenship behavior, Tehran University, School of Management.

Allen, T.D. and M.C. Rush. (1998). The Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Performance Judgments: A Field Study and a Laboratory Experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 247–60

Coleman, V. I.; and W.C. Borman. (2000), Investigating the Underlying Structure of the Citizenship Performance Domain. Human Resource Management Review, 10, 25–44.

Colquitt, J. A, J. A. Lepine, M. J. Wesson (2010). Organization Behavior: Essentials for improving performance and commitment , Mc Graw-hill International.

Colquitt, J. A, J. A. Lepine, M. J. Wesson (2009). Organization Behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the work place , Mc Graw-hill International.

Colquitt, J.A, Lepine j.A, Wesson, M.J. (2011). Organizational behavior management: improving performance and commitment in the work place, Translators: Feizi Mohammad, Ismaeel Qaderi and Mehdi Alizadeh, Mohageg Publishing

Greenberg, J. (1987) Taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12, 9-22.

LePine, J.A., R.F. Piccolo, C.L. Jackson, J.E. Mathieu, and J.R. Saul.(2007). A Meta-Analysis of Teamwork Process: Towards a Better Understanding of the Dimensional Structure and Relationships with Team Effectiveness Criteria. Working Paper, University of Florida.

McGee-Cooper, A.; and G. Looper (2005). Lessons on Layoffs: Managing in Good Times to Prepare for Bad Times. n.d., http://www.amca.com/ articles/article layoffs.html.

Motowidlo, S.J. (2000).Some Basic Issues Related to Contextual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Human Resource Management. Human Resource Management Review, 10, 115–26.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Podsakoff, P.M.; S.B. MacKenzie; J.B. Baine; and D.G. Bachrach.(2000) Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. Journal of Management 26, 513–63.

Podsakoff, P.M.; M. Ahearne; and S.B. MacKenzie (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Quantity and Quality of Work Group Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology 82, 262–70.

Rotundo, M.; and P.R. Sackett. (2002). The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy Capturing Approach. Journal of Applied Psychology 87, 66–80.

Van Dyne, L.; and J.A. LePine (1998). Helping Voice Extra-Role Behavior: Evidence of Construct and Predictive Validity. Academy of Management Journal 41, 108–19.

Walz, S.M.; and B.P. Neihoff (1996). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Their Effect on Organizational Effectiveness in Limited-Menu Restaurants. In Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings, eds. J.B. Keys and L.N. Dosier. Statesboro, GA: College of Business Administration at Georgia Southern University, pp. 307–11.