

# An Investigation in to the relationship between Procedural and Interactive Justice with Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Marzieh Heydari<sup>1</sup>, Abbas Gholtash<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty Members, Department of Educational Sciences, Abadeh Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Marvdasht Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran

---

**ABSTRACT**— *The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between procedural and interactive justice with organizational citizenship behavior. The population under study was all faculty members in Public Universities of Isfahan (1745) in 2011-2012 academic years. Using statistical random sampling based on the size of statistical community, 315 faculty members were selected as our sample. The study had a descriptive correlational design and the required data were collected through using the validated form of procedural and interactive justice questionnaire (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) containing 16 questions and reliability coefficient (0.83) and organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire (Podsakoff and McKenzie, 1997) containing 24 questions and reliability coefficient (0.87). The obtained data were analyzed using Pearson's correlation coefficient and stepwise regression. Results showed that there is significant relationship between procedural and interactive justice with organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, procedural justice had been the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. The results of stepwise regression showed that the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the dimension of conscientiousness had been interactive justice and in the dimension of sportsmanship, it had been procedural justice.*

**Keywords**— Procedural justice, Interactive justice, Organizational citizenship behavior, University

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Justice is among the most important conceptions which are explained in political and social subjects. According to Plato, social organization which is civilization symbol will not exist without justice. Organizational justice is a kind of fulfillment in all activities, behaviors and tendencies of organizational individuals (Gladwell, 2005). Organizational justice is a basis for strategic thinking and value management and is also basis of all organizational values and principles. Injustice threatens the organizational permanence and growth which is the inevitable goal of organizational life. One of the main objectives of each principles of organization's effective functioning and active and dynamic organization is enhancing individual individuals' satisfaction. Without providing the background for perceiving justice in organizations providing motivation and leading individuals might be difficult for managers. The term "organizational justice" was coined by Greenberg (1987). He believes that the perception of organizational justice is necessary for better performance of organization and individuals' satisfaction and organizations should make every attempt to achieve this goal. Moreover, the study of organizational justice will explain the behavioral consequences of most consequences of organizations' behaviors (Greenberg, 1987). So, the existence of justice in managers' speech, behavior and manners and ways of distributing organizations' rewards and resources will be effective in adherence and commitment of employees to organization's goals

### 1.1 Organizational justice

Few studies were carried out on justice in organizations in early 1960s and it gained more attention in early 1990s when more in-depth studies resulted to the recognition of its three types: distributive, procedural and interactive: **1) Distributive Justice:** Distributive Justice denotes employees' perceptions of maintaining justice in the distribution of resources and rewards (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). **2) Procedural Justice:** Arguments regarding procedural justice that gained attention from early 1980s (Amirkhani and Pourezzat, 2008) point to individual or people's perceptions of the fair behavior received from the organization (Rezaeian and Rahimi, 2008). Niehoff and Moorman (1993) regard individuals' perceptions of the fairness of organizations' procedures as procedural justice. Rezaeian (2008) believes that people's perceptions play a very important role in procedural justice as it is the case for equity theory and people's

reactions toward these procedures depends on their perceptions of procedures not on the truth value of procedures. Since psychologically people do not behave based on truths, rather they behave in accordance to their perceptions of reality. **3) Interactive Justice:** Interactive Justice attracted Bies & Moag in 1986 for the first time. Based on this dimension individuals are sensitive toward the quality of interactions in personal interactive relations and the constructive dimensions of decision-making (Alavani et al., 2008). According to Niehoff and Moorman (1993), interactive justice points to the interactive behaviors that people perceive in procedures and is transferred from supervisors to their workers. This type of justice is related to some aspects of communication process such as respect and politeness between the addressor and the addressee. In Moorman's view, distributive, procedural and interactive justice are correlated and each one distinctive aspect of organizational justice; in his idea, organizational justice is the sum of distributive, procedural and interactive justice.

## 1.2 Organizational citizenship behavior

Research in OCB has become more popular since the work of Organ (1988), who originally conceptualized OCB as the discretionary behaviors that are exhibited by an individual and not formally recognized by the organizational system, yet that generally facilitate the effective and efficient functioning of the organization to which the individual belongs. Organ later defined OCB more in terms of behavior that facilitates “the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997, p. 91). Both general conceptualizations include the idea of extra role behaviors that are aimed at benefiting the organization to which the individual belongs. Bateman and Organ (1983) define citizenship behaviors to those desired behaviors of employees. One of the most accepted definitions of organizational citizenship behavior is that of Organ (1983) who regards it as a unique, discretionary and beyond one's routine duties which is influential in enhancing the effective functioning of the organization. Williams and Anderson (1991) demonstrated support for a three-factor model of performance, emphasizing two broad categories of OCB (in addition to in-role behavior). Behaviors that target the individual are called OCBI (individual), and behaviors that target the organization as a whole are called OCBO (organization). Podsakoff and McKenzie (1997) introduced five dimensions for organizational citizenship behavior which include altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue. In this article these five dimensions of Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) are sued. So, we go though each dimension briefly here: **1) Civic virtue:** some behaviors like attending extra meetings, supporting developments and changes made by organization's managers and paying attention to one's mails (Organ, 1988). So, a good citizen should not only attend meetings but also express his opinions and have an active role in solving them. **2) Conscientiousness** is a pattern in which organization's members do certain behaviors and go beyond minimally required duties such as levels of attendance, punctuality, conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance (Organ, 1988). **3) Sportsmanship** is regarded as tolerating the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without grievance (Organ, 1990). Podsakoff et al (2000) take " good sports" as "people who not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, but also maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally" (p.517). **4) Altruism** is regarded as effective and beneficial behaviors such as maintaining friendship, sympathy and intimacy among coworkers which directly or indirectly help those with working problems (Eslami and Sayar, 2008). Also it is those voluntary helps toward others with a work problem to avoid further accidents and working problems (Organ, Podsakoff and McKenzie 2006). **5) Courtesy** is the way one behaves with his colleagues, supervisors and organizational addressees. Those who behave in a polite manner with others have high citizenship behavior (Castro, et al. 2004). Considering the importance of maintain justice and fairness in university and the impact it might have on employees and especially faculty members' performances, this study investigated the relationship between procedural justice and interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior from faculty members' viewpoint in public universities of Isfahan.

## 2. RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Given theories of justice are varied and wide-spread. In the last decade, organizational justice became as an important structure and a research scope in the field of organizational/industrial psychology( Gladwell, 2005). Organizational justice is a complicated field which has complex expressions and differences. Anyway, organizational justice infers to individuals fair and ethical behaviors in organizations (Cropanzano, 1993).

With respect to procedural justice, Masterson and et al. (2000) characterized procedural justice as system-focused (Ambrose & Hess, 2001) and found a relationship between systems referenced procedural justice and OCBO. another research on the antecedents of OCB have mostly focused on (a) contextual factors such as organizational characteristics, task characteristics, and leadership behaviors of supervisors and (b) employee-affective factors, such as employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, perception of fairness, and perception of leader support (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). All these factors are based on the principle of reciprocity or social exchange (Kamdar, McAllister, & Turban, 2006), (c) employees' intention for impression management (Bolino, 1999), and (d) employee dispositional factors, such as affective states (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995), equity sensitivity, and the “Big

Five personality factors” (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Little research effort has been devoted to the study of OCB motivation from the perspective of VIM, a motivation theory particularly suitable for behavioral studies in weak situations (Mischell, 1973; Shamir, 1996). Messeer and White (2006) investigating employees' mood on organizational citizenship behavior showed that employees' perceptions of fairness affected their likelihood to perform organizational citizenship behaviors and had a more enduring effect, in comparison to their mood, on increasing their extra role work behaviors. Results of Na'ami and Shekarkan (2006) showed that organizational justice and its three components have significant positive relationship with organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions (altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue) and the three types of organizational justice have significant multiple correlation with organizational citizenship behavior. In a more recent study, Williams, Pitre and Zainuba (2002) found that dimensions of organizational justice have strong positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Sayyar (2007) believes that employees will have loyalty toward the organization when they see that they have social rights which include fair behaviors with employees such as increasing their salary, benefits and social status and they will show citizenship behavior of loyalty type (Eslami and Sayar, 2008). In another attempt, Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff and Blume (2009) pointed to organizational citizenship behaviors with a number of individual-level outputs such as managers scaling of employee's performances, decision-making about reward giving and a number of organizational-level outputs like efficiency, customer satisfaction and relocation at single level. Masterson, Lewis, Goldman and Taylor (2000) and Rezaeian and Rahimi (2008) in their studies found the effect of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior. Rezaeian and Rahimi showed that when employees perceive that the organizational procedures are true, suitable and fair, they will show more organizational behavior.

In this research 3 hypotheses was considered:

1. There is relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior.
2. There is relationship between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.
3. There is relationship between procedural justice and interactive justice with organizational citizenship behavior dimensions

### 3. METHODOLOGY

Since the study's aim is to find the relations between procedural and interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior, the study was applied research and because of the type of data collection it was of descriptive correlational type.

Statistical population of the survey included all faculty members in public universities of Isfahan (1745 persons) in the academic year 2011-2012 that 315 persons were selected as sample through cluster random sampling method proportional to volume of the statistical population.

#### 3.1 Measurement tools

**3.1.1 Organizational justice questionnaire:** to assess organizational justice the validated form of organizational justice questionnaire (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) containing 16 questions that is assessed with its two dimensions of procedural (7 questions) and interactive organizational justice (9 questions) was used. The questions are answered on a 5 point Likert-scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree). The face and content validity of questionnaires were checked by 10 experts of management and its reliability coefficient was 0.87 in Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) study. In this study the reliability coefficient was estimated to be 0.83 based on Cornbrash's alpha for the total questionnaire which shows the reliability and validity of the research instrument.

**3.1.2 Organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire:** Podsakoff and McKenzie's (1997) organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire containing 24 questions with its 5 dimensions altruism (7 items), courtesy (2 items), sportsmanship (4 items), conscientiousness (7 items) and civic virtue (4 items) was used to assess the organizational citizenship behavior. The questions are answered on a 5 point Likert-scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree) and questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 17 are counter-numbered (5=strongly disagree, to 1 = strongly agree). The face and content validity of questionnaires were checked by 7 experts of management and its reliability coefficient was 0.88 in Na'ami and Shekarkan's (2001) study. In this study the reliability coefficient was estimated to be 0.87 based on Cornbrash's alpha for the total questionnaire which shows the reliability and validity of the research instrument.

#### 3.2 Method of data analysis

Correlation analysis was used in this survey to analyze data and study the relationship among research variables (procedure and interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior ) and stepwise regression was applied to predict dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior as dependent variables through procedure and interactive justice as predicting variables.

### 4. RESULTS

In this section first correlation coefficient among research variables, then results of Stepwise regression have been represented.

**Hypothesis1: there is relationship between procedure justice and organizational citizenship behavior.**

**Table 1.** Correlation coefficients between procedure justice and organizational citizenship behavior

Correlation Coefficient	organizational citizenship behavior	
	r	p
<b>Procedural justice</b>	0.23	0.001

According to table 1, the correlation coefficient between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior (r=0.23) is significant at the level of 0.05 Thus, there is significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Hypothesis2: there is relationship between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.**

**Table 2.** Correlation coefficients between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior

Correlation Coefficient	organizational citizenship behavior	
	r	p
<b>Interactive justice</b>	0.21	0.001

According to table 2, the correlation coefficient between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior (r=0.21) is significant at the level of 0.05 Thus, there is significant relationship between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Hypothesis3: there are relationship between procedural justice and interactive justice with organizational citizenship behavior dimensions.**

**Table 3.** Multiple (Stepwise) Regression of predicting organizational citizenship behavior based on procedure justice and interactive justice

	Non-standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficient	t	p
	B	Standard Error	Beta		
<b>Fixed Coefficient</b>	80.1	3.95		20.11	0.001
<b>Procedural Justice</b>	0.44	0.13	0.25	3.05	0.001

According to table 3, procedural justice is the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Based on beta coefficients, when one unit is added to procedural justice, organizational citizenship behavior is added to 0.25 units.

**Table 4.** Multiple Correlation coefficients between procedural justice and interactive justice with organizational citizenship behavior dimensions.

Mode	Criterion Variable	Predicting variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	Sig	Vif
<b>1</b>	<b>sportsmanship</b>	<b>Procedural</b>	0.17	0.02	4.8	0.042	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>conscientiousness</b>	<b>Interactive</b>	0.27	0.07	11.56	0.001	<b>1</b>

Based on table 4, procedural and interactive justice explains 5% variance of organizational citizenship behavior in dimensions of sportsmanship and conscientiousness.

**Table 5.** Stepwise Regression of predicting organizational citizenship behavior dimensions based on procedural justice and interactive justice

Mode	Organizational citizenship behavior dimensions	justice	Non-standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficient	t	p
			B	Standard Error	Beta		
1	Sportsmanship	Fixed Coefficient	11.19	1.45	0.17	7.5	0.001
		Procedural Justice	0.11	0.06		2.01	0.042
1	conscientiousness	Fixed Coefficient	22.01	1.97	0.29	11.01	0.001
		Interactive Justice	0.19	0.06		2.39	0.001

According to table 5, the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the sportsmanship dimension is procedural justice. Based on beta coefficients, when one unit is added to procedural justice, organizational citizenship behavior in sportsmanship dimension is added to 0.17 units. Moreover, the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the conscientiousness dimension is interactive justice. Based on beta coefficients, when one unit is added to interactive justice, organizational citizenship behavior in conscientiousness dimension is added to 0.29 units.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Results revealed that there is significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, hypothesis (1) is confirmed. Results of this hypothesis are consistent with research Masterson and et al. (2000) and Rezaeian and Rahimi (2008). Rezaeian and Rahimi (2008) showed that when employees feel that organization's procedures are true, compatible and fair, they will show more citizenship behavior. Similarly results demonstrate that there is relationship between interactive justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, hypothesis (2) is confirmed. In fact, one of the important factors in establishing organizational citizenship behavior is maintain justice in organizations. Thus, managers of universities should try to increase justice in educational settings. If employees feel that they are behaved fairly, they will do their citizenship behaviors.

Results obtained from stepwise regression showed that the best predictor of organizational citizenship behavior is procedural justice. Moreover, interactive justice is the best predictor of conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behavior (Beta=0.29) and procedural justice is the best predictors for Sportsmanship (Beta=0.17). Niehoff and Moorman (1993) showed that procedural and interactive justice is important predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. The existence of such relationship is based on the view that when employees know their working environment based on fairness and justice, they will naturally behave in a friendly and politely manner with conscientiousness toward colleagues, customers and others.

Based on obtained results, it is suggested that higher education managers to encourage citizenship behaviors should find appropriate backgrounds and manage and strengthen them. Moreover, results of this study showed that procedural justice highly correlates with organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, higher education managers should provide the opportunity for the emersion of organizational justice in educational settings and to develop justice in higher education. Universities should have a fair-based system and with some management actions the emersion of good citizen behaviors in faculty members is strengthened. Moreover, universities should try to increase procedural justice faculty members by making a fair system of salary, income and procedural justice or university managers can give faculty members more authority and control in decision-making processes about income and reward. In addition, by making positive attitudes toward the university and colleagues can increase faculty members' loyalty and fidelity toward the university

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Alvani\_ S. M., Pourezat\_ A. A., & Sayyar\_ A , “Investigating the relationship between organizational justice and commitment” , The Journal of Management and Human Resources in Oil Industry, vol.2 no.3, 30-36. 2003.
- [2] Ambrose\_ M. L., & Hess\_ R. L. “Individuals’ responses to fairness: A consideration of management and marketing models”. Paper presented at the International Roundtable on Innovations in Organizational Justice Research, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. 2001.

- [3] Amirkhani\_ T., & Pourezzat\_ A. A. “A look at the possibility of the development of social capital in the light of organizational justice in government organizations”, *Journal of public administration*, vol. 1 no. 1, 19-32. 2008. (in Persian)
- [4] Bateman\_ T.S., & Organ\_ D.W. “Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship”, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 26, 1983.
- [5] Bolino\_ M. C. “Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? ” *Academy of Management Review*, vol.24, 82-98,1999.
- [6] Castro\_ C. B., Armario\_ E., & Ruiz\_ D. “The influence of employee organizational citizenship behavior on customer loyalty”, *international journal of Service industry management*, vol. 15 no. 1, 276-282, 2004.
- [7] Cropanzano\_ R , “Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management”, 1st Edn., Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, ISBN: 10: 0805810552, 312. 1993
- [8] Eslami, H., & Sayar, H. “Organizational citizenship behavior, ” , *OGH journal*, 37. 2008.
- Gladwell, M.. *Blink*, “The Power of Thinking Without Thinking,1st Edn. ”, Little Brown, Boston, MA., ISBN: 10: 0316172324, 288,2005.
- [9] Greenberg, J. “A taxonomy of organization justice theories”. *Academy of Management Review*, vol.12 no.1, 9-22. 1987.
- [10] Kamdar, D., McAllister, D. J., & Turban, D. B. “ All in a day’s work”: How follower individual differences and justice perceptions predict OCB role definitions and behavior”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 841-855. 2006.
- [11] Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. “Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior”. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253-266,1996.
- [12] Masterson, S. S., Lewise, K., Goldman, B. S., & Taylor, M. S. “Integrate justice and social exchange: the differing effect of fair procedure and treatment on work relationship”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-766, 2000.
- [13] Messer, B. A. E., & White, F. A. “Employees mood, perception of fairness and organizational citizenship behavior”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 4, 97-105,2006.
- [14] Mischell, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality”. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283,1973.
- [15] Naami, A., & Shekarkan, H “Investigating simple and multiple relationships of organizational justice with civic behavior of employees of an industrial organization in Ahvaz”, *The Journal of Educational Sciences and Psychology of University of Ahvaz*,vol. 13no.1, 79-93,2006.
- [16] Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. “Justice as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-56,1993.
- [17] Organ, D. W. “Organizational citizenship behavior: It’s construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, vol. 10 no.2, 85-97,1997.
- [18] Organ, D. W. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*”. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. 1988.
- [19] Organ, D. W. “ The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, in Staw, B. M., Cummings, ” L. L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 12, 43-72,1990.
- [20] Organ, W. P., Podsakoff, M. P., & Mackenzie, B. S, “Organizational Citizenship Behavior, is Nature , Antecedents, and Consequences”. India: A Sage Publication Series. India. (Series in Applied Paperback: 360 pages). ,2006.
- [21] Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. “The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research”, *Human Performance*, 10, 1997.
- [22] Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. “ organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review or the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research” , *Journal of Management*, 26, (3), 513 – 563,2000.
- [23] Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff , P. M., & Blume, B. D. “ Individual and organizational level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122-141. 2009.
- [24] Rezaeian, A., & Rahimi, F. “ Investigating the effectiveness of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior considering the role of organizational justice”. *The Journal of Management Perspective*, 29, 69-87. 2008.
- [25] Shamir, B. “Meaning, self and motivation in organizations”. In R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter, & G. A. Bigley (Eds.), *Motivation and leadership at work* (149-165). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1996.
- [26] Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. “Extra role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.) ”, *Research in organizational behavior*, 17, 215-285, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. 1995.
- [27] Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. “ Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. ” *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617,1991.