

# The Effects Of Perceived Organization Justice On Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Of Madda Walabu University Employees

Mulugeta Tesfaye<sup>1</sup>, Dejene Tafa<sup>2</sup>, Ahmed Hussein<sup>3</sup>, Namu Gabisa<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dambi Dollo University, College of Business and Economics, Department of Management, Ethiopia.*

<sup>2</sup>*Madda Walabu University, College of Business and Economics, Department of Management, Ethiopia.*

<sup>3</sup>*Madda Walabu University, College of Business and Economics, Department of accounting and Finance, Ethiopia.*

<sup>4</sup>*Dambi Dollo University, College of Business and Economics, Department of Economics, Ethiopia*

## Abstract

The study investigated the effects of perceived organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) of Madda Walabu University employees. The study employed the explanatory research design to identify the relationship between the two variables. The purpose of this study was to find the effects of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior. In the study both qualitative and quantitative research approaches were used and the population for the study was the employees of Madda Walabu University. To conduct the study both primary and secondary data sources were used and data were collected through questionnaire from sample of 334 target population. The collected relevant data was analysed through the aid of SPSS version 25.0. The statistical tools used for data analysis was linear regression. Distributive organizational justice significantly predicts organizational citizenship behaviour with significance level  $p < 0.048$  which is less than (0.05). The positive significant relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior was observed.

**Keywords:** perceived organizational justice, organization citizenship behavior, Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia

## 1. Introduction

In the era of organizational behavior, organizational perceived justice is defined as a kind of perception that reflects the employees' feelings about decisions, decision makers and managers in organizational settings. In 1987 Greenberg defined organizational justice as the "individuals' perception of fairness in the organization or the employees' perspective in relation to the distribution of available resources" (Devasagayam, 2013). Organizational justice theory has been derived from Adams' equity (or similarity) theory. According to this theory, individuals compare their ratio of inputs to results with that of others

(within or without the organization) and, if they see a kind of inequality in these ratios, they will consider it an organizational injustice. Also, the concepts of social exchange theory have been used in the development of organizational justice theory. According to social exchange theory, people expect to receive fair compensation in any social exchange. Thus, the concept of organizational justice can be used to explain why employees consider some organizations more reliable than others.

Perceived organizational justice has four dimensions as follows: Distributive justice: the fairness of outcomes or allocations that an individual receives. In other words, distributive

justice refers to a person's judgment about the fairness or reasonableness of the allocation of the results. Procedural justice: refers to the fairness of the procedures that are used in decision making about results' allocation. In other words, procedural justice reflects the evaluation of organizational justice in relation to policies and processes. For example, an individual may ask how decisions concerning employees' promotions are made. Distributive justice refers to outcomes (results or ends) while procedural justice refers to means or methods.

Interactional justice: perhaps the most important advance in organizational justice literature is consideration of the importance of interpersonal behaviors in the organization, which is called interactional justice. Interactional justice reflects the employees' evaluation of the fairness of administrators' behavior. According to this definition, employees (in addition to a tendency to get fair results and to ask about the fair procedures for decision making about results allocation) evaluate their managers' behavior and then consider the results of this evaluation in decision making about their social exchange with the organization.

Informational justice: the last dimension of perceived organizational justice. This dimension reflects the employees' perception of their managers' openness and honesty in providing information to them in comparison with others. Also, informational justice reflects the individuals' perception of the fairness of information that is used in organizational decision making. When an individual feel that the organization is dealing with him/her unfairly, he/she is likely to try to reduce his/her inputs through some kinds of behaviors such as absenteeism, reduced organizational commitment, turnover, and deviant behaviors with this assumption that social exchange with the organization has been damaged. In contrast, if an employee feels that he/she is treated fairly, he/she will have better performance.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has its origins in the early research of Bateman & Organ, (1983), Smith et al., (1983), and Organ, (1988). Bateman & Organ, (1983), described OCB as an altruistic behavior that is directly and intentionally directed towards helping a specific person. An understanding of OCB was limited only to helping behavior towards an individual in the organization. Smith et al., (1983) labelled extra-role behavior as "supra-role behavior"- behavior that cannot be prescribed or required in advance for a given job. They gave examples of supra-role behavior as helping co-workers with a job-related problem; accepting orders without a fuss; promoting a work climate that is tolerable and minimizes the distractions created by interpersonal conflict. In addition, they coined the term "citizenship behavior" to describe the supra-role behavior. Smith et al., attempted to investigate the determinants of Citizenship-Behavior by analyzing the determinants of altruistic behavior. This implied that until then citizenship-behavior was seen in the lights of altruism. They also developed a scale to measure citizenship behavior. The scale had 16 items which loaded on two factors; altruism and generalized compliance. Generalized compliance included impersonal form of conscientiousness that did not provide immediate aid to a particular person, rather indirectly helped other in the system. Example of generalized compliance item is; gives advance notice if unable to come to work.

Organizational citizenship behavior, because of its importance in the survival and performance of organizations, is currently one of the most widely studied topics in the field of organizational behavior. Therefore, many studies have already been done on the factors related to organizational citizenship behavior and its consequences. In this study, we attempt to investigate the possible relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Several studies have shown that employees' perception of organizational justice has an effect on many variables such as job attitudes, performance, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, trust in management and organization, intention to leave the job, and the organization's social responsibility. It should also be noted that perceived organizational justice is a kind of perception, and thus it can be affected by the perceiver's personal and demographic characteristics, needs, values and ethical frameworks. That is why it is said that the results of studies on perceived organizational justice that have been done in one society cannot be generalized to other communities and cultures. Therefore, different studies are necessary in any society. Thus, the aim of this study is to assess the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University.

Nowadays organizations for succession need employees who engage in extra-role behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Chien, 1988). During recent decades OCBs has become one of the most important variables at workplace researches (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad & Samah, 2008). As (Asgari et al, 2008), OCBs historically is defined as discretionary behaviors that are not explicitly recognized by organization, but enhance the organizational performance by contributing to its social and psychological environment. In essence, it could be said that OCBs are behaviors in which employees engage in them beyond their formal role requirements (Chien, 1988). The empirical findings suggest that OCBs are related with many individual and organization-level constructs such as organizational performance and effectiveness (Paille, 2009). Three dimensions of OCBs are helping behaviors, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Helping behaviors is being helpful to coworkers or other people with little interest in being rewarded for one's efforts. Sportsmanship is refraining from

complaining about trivial matters, and civic virtue is responsible participation in the social life of the organization such as staying up-to-date with important issues of the organization (Miao & Kim, 2010). One variable that could be possibly linked to OCBs is the perceived organizational justice (Organ & Moorman, 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). In previous researches, researchers have used perceived organizational justice dimensions as antecedents of OCBs. The social exchange and equity theories suggest that OCBs are social responses to supervisors' and/or coworkers' behavior as well as a possible reaction of the individual to the behavior of his or her superior or to other motivation-based mechanisms in the workplace. Although studies have demonstrated that OCBs has a positive relationship with organizational performance (Podsakoff et al, 2000), but most OCBs studies have been conducted in the western countries (Lievens & Anseel, 2004; Paille, 2009). In Madda walabu University also due to the employee's perception about organizational justice there is employee's job dissatisfaction and low performance which resulted in high turnover and absenteeism. The data from Madda Walabu University human resource department shows that in 2010 and 2011 the number of employees turnover was 238 from both academic staff and supportive staff. Thus, the aim of this study is to assess the effects of perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University. Therefore, the Specific objectives are;

To examine the effects of distributive justice on organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University

To investigate the effects of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University

To investigate effects of interactional justice on organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University

To examine the effects of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior of employees of Madda Walabu University

### Research Hypotheses

- a. H<sub>1</sub>: there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and organization citizenship behaviour
- b. H<sub>2</sub>: there is a positive relationship between procedural justice and organization citizenship behaviour
- c. H<sub>3</sub>: there is a positive relationship between interactional justice and organization citizenship behaviour
- d. H<sub>4</sub>: there is a positive relationship between informational justice and organization citizenship behavior.

### 2. Materials and Methods

In this study the explanatory research design was used with quantitative and qualitative approaches of data collection because the study aims to analyze the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Both primary and secondary data source were used in this study. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaire and secondary data were obtained by reviewing documents. The sample size of 334 employees was taken by employing the combination of stratified and simple random sampling from the total employees of Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia.

The reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha whereby for the judgment for the instrument to be deemed reliable the constructs must attain alpha equal to or greater than 0.7( $\alpha$

$\geq 0.7$ ). The data collected were analyzed by using an inferential statistic, particularly multiple regression analysis to measure the relationship between the variables of the study; whereas the descriptive analysis such as frequencies, percentages and mean was used to deal with the qualitative.

### 3. Results and Discussions

The study findings show that 54.7% of the respondents were male and 45.3% of them were female. This shows that there are more male employees than female in the University. Depending on age category 44.3% of the respondents found in the age group of 31-40 whereas 33% of respondents found between age group of 41-50 followed by 21% of below 30 age group and 1.3% of respondents are above 51.

In terms of level of education 43% of the respondents were bachelor of art degree whereas 30% of were masters holders and 24% and 2.7% of the respondents diploma holders and PhD holders respectively. This shows that majority of the employees of the university are bachelor of art degree followed by master's degree holders. With regard to staff category 42% of them were supportive staff whereas 28.3% of the participants were academic staff and 22% and 7.3% of the respondents were clinical and technical staff respectively.

Table 3.1 Results of regression analysis for distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior

The table shows regression analysis results for distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior

#### ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.052	1	.052	3.948	.048 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3.895	297	.013		
	Total	3.946	298			

a. Dependent Variable: organizational citizenship behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive justice

As indicated in table 3.1 organizational justice significantly predicts organizational citizenship behaviour since significance level is 0.048 which is less than (0.05). This shows that

employees are more likely to involve in organizational citizenship behaviour when they perceive high level of organizational justice in their organization.

#### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.948	.021		45.839	.000
Distributive justice	.013	.007	.115	1.987	.048

a. Dependent Variable: organizational citizenship behavior

Table 3.2 Results of regression of analysis of procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior

The table shows regression analysis results for procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior

#### ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.049	1	.049	3.763	.053 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	3.897	298	.013		
Total	3.947	299			

a. Dependent Variable: organizational citizenship behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Procedural Justice

As indicated in the above table 3.7, there is no significant relationship between procedural

perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

#### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.942	.024		39.366	.000
Procedural Justice	.014	.007	.112	1.940	.053

a. Dependent Variable: organizational citizenship behavior

Table 3.3. Results of regression of analysis of interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior

The table shows regression analysis results for interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.086	1	.086	6.628	.011 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3.861	298	.013		
	Total	3.947	299			

a. Dependent Variable: organizational citizenship behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional justice

As indicated in the above table, like distributive justice there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.929	.023		39.741	.000
	Interactional justice	.018	.007	.148	2.574	.011

a. Dependent Variable: org citizenship behavior

Table 3.4. Results of regression of analysis of informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

This table shows the regression analysis of informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.048	1	.048	3.643	.057 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3.899	298	.013		
	Total	3.947	299			

a. Dependent Variable: org citizenship behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Informational Justice

As it is shown in the above table, informational justice was insignificant in predicting organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.952	.020		48.659	.000

Informational Justice	.012	.006	.110	1.909	.057
-----------------------	------	------	------	-------	------

a. Dependent Variable: org citizenship behavior

#### 4. Conclusions

The results showed that unlike other organizational justice dimensions distributive organizational justice significantly predicts organizational citizenship behaviour since significance level is 0.048 which is less than (0.05). This shows that employees are more likely to involve in organizational citizenship behaviour when they perceive high level of organizational justice in their organization.

In this view, the researchers find out the predictive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in Madda Walabu University. As the theoretical position taken by the researchers, organizational justices will significantly related to organizational citizenship behaviour was confirmed by empirical studies. Analysis of results shows that employees' decision to engage in OCBs is inclined more by their perception of interactional justice than the distributive and procedural justice in Madda Walabu University.

#### References

- Bateman, T.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.
- Chin, W. W. (1998). Commentary: Issues and opinion on structural equation modeling.
- Cho, J., & Kim, S. (2009). Procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: a social identity motive. *International Journal of Business Research*, 9(6).
- Chua, R. Y. J., Ingram, P., & Morris, M. W. (2008). From the head and the heart: Locating cognition-and affect-based trust in managers' professional networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(3), 436-452.
- Churchill Jr, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, 16(1).
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1183-1206.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: a meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 386-400.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Crosby, F. (1976). A model of egoistical relative deprivation. *Psychological review*, 83(2), 85.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349.

13. Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(4), 265-279.
14. Deutsch, M. (1985). Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective.
15. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
16. Frazier, M. L., Johnson, P. D., Gavin, M., Gooty, J., & Snow, D. B. (2010). Organizational justice, trustworthiness, and trust: A multifocal examination. *Group & Organization Management*, 35(1), 39-76.
17. Gabarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal behavior: Communication and understanding in relationships*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
18. Gabarro, J. (1978). The development of trust and expectations. In A. G. Athos & J.
19. Ganster, D. C., Hennessey, H. W., & Luthans, F. (1983). Social desirability response effects: Three alternative models. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 321-331.
20. Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270.
21. Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories, the *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1): 9-22
22. Greenberg, J. (1993). The Social side of Fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational Justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* pp 79-103. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
23. Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R., & Tatham, R. (2006) *Multivariate data analysis*. (6th edition). Pearson education Inc.
24. Holste, J. S., & Fields, D. (2010). Trust and tacit knowledge sharing and use. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(1), 128-140.
25. Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.
26. Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 531-546.
27. Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1989). *LISREL 7: A guide to the program and applications* (Vol.2). Chicago: Spss.
28. Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral science*, 9(2), 131-146.
29. Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
30. Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 60-84.
31. Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual review of psychology*, 50(1), 569-598.
32. Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131.
33. Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63(4), 967-985.
34. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Springer.



35. Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., &Patil, A. (2006). Common method variance in IS research: