

Impact of Organizational Justice and Leader-Member Exchange Behavior on Turnover Intentions and Extra Role Behavior

Huma Sarar

Department of Management Sciences, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Work occupies a significant place in people's lives, and not only because it provides income, challenges and relationships. The conditions under which people work have profound implications for their physical and emotional well-being (Guest, 2004; Moorman, 1991; Namie & Namie, 2000). The purpose of this project is to investigate the relationship of organizational justice, leader member exchange behavior and organizational citizenship behavior on turnover intentions in banking sector of Pakistan. To investigate the said relationships, 200 questionnaires will be collected from the banking industry of Pakistan. Multiple analyses will be performed including factor analyses, regressions, correlations and other descriptive statistics.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Turnover Intentions, OCB, Leadership, Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

In the literature there are a number of studies that aimed to explain organizational justice as it relates to attitudes and behaviors that are rooted in a specific organizational context. Initially, the study of these conditions focused on the establishment of the scientific definitions of workplace bullying and associated behaviors without paying sufficient attention to the consequences of workplace bullying on both the organization and the individual victims (Bandow & Hunter, 2007; Rayner, & Keashly, 2005; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006). This research study gives special attention to studies that have viewed organizational justice as a violation of the psychological contract as well as studies of the relationship of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Numerous studies have noted the importance of understanding the employment relationships and their consequences on the attitudes and behaviors of employees. There also is a significant amount of research in the literature that is focused on the responses of employees after the breach of the psychological contract from the employer's side. Studies have shown that the breach of the psychological contract is negatively linked to the trust (Robinson, 1996), satisfaction (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994), organizational commitment (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002), perception of the organizational justice and intent to leave the organization (Turnley & Feldman, 2000). Some studies have also shown a positive correlation between the breach of the psychological contract and the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: altruism, civic virtue (Lewis-McClear & Taylor, 1998; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995),

Greenberg (1990) reviewed the literature on organizational justice and noted that "social scientists have long recognized the importance of the ideals of justice as a basic requirement for the effective functioning of organizations and the personal satisfaction of the individuals they employ." He also declared the term justice as the "first virtue of social institutions". In existing literature, organizational justice divided in to three major dimensions e.g., distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Yalmaz & Tasdan, 2009; Martinez-tur et al., 2006). Organizational citizenship behavior was defined by Organ (1988) as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective

functioning of the organization” (P. 4). Organ suggested that there are five key organizational citizenship behaviors: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Forms of organizational citizenship behavior include sharing job knowledge or teaching a coworker new skills; offering suggestions to improve the process of a job; volunteering for extra assignments, attending meetings that are not required by supervisors or working on committees without expecting extra pay; giving up a meal or other breaks to get work done on time; and defending the organization in both internal and external contexts.

Given this theoretical association between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational reputation and effectiveness, there has been a gap in studying organizational citizenship at the organizational level since much research has centered on the antecedents of these behaviors at the employee and individual level only (Organ, 1988; Paillé, 2007; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Spector and Fox (2002) suggested that organizational citizenship behavior would lead to the improvement of the overall organizational performance and effectiveness. However, Aquino and Bommer (2003) proposed that there is a negative correlation between exposure to workplace bullying and organizational citizenship behavior. There has been an insufficient amount of research examining the role played by the occurrence of workplace bullying in organizational citizenship behavior; such a gap needs more attention from researchers to be addressed further (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

After 20 years, Organ et al. (2006) emphasized on building the conceptualization of OCB as per the work suggested by Organ (1998). Podasakoff et al. (2000) argued that empirical researches on the OCB's initial conceptualization did not have any significant impact on task performance and other personnel decisions. Another serious question raised in many researches on the reliability and its helpfulness for the organization (Tepper et al. 2004). Chiaburu and Baker (2006) also criticized on the values of OCB and contended: “...behaviors such as helping colleagues with workloads, attending functions that are not required, and obeying informal organizational norms might be construed as supporting the status-quo and perpetuating organizational procedures and routines that are less-than-perfect for enhanced performance.” Despite of its effectiveness, researchers cannot solve the dispute among the distinction between “in-role performance or in-role behavior” and “extra-role performance or extra role behavior” (Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001), vary in employees (Coyle-Shapiro, Kessler, & Purcell, 2004), time and contexts matters (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995).

Behavioral scientists and managers of corporate world anxiously working on developing the best mechanism of structuring an interesting and learning work environment in the organization which positive influence the outcomes of the employees. Organizational justice influence number of factors related to employees behavior, attitudes and their outcomes but failed to answer the missing literature why the justice perceptions trigger these work related outcomes such as turnover intentions, in-role performance, extra-role performance (OCB) etc. Despite of numerous linkages can include answering this question, but this study only focuses on LMX (Masterson et al. 2000; Cropanzano et al. 2002; Rupp & Cropanzano 2002). This process is regarded as meaningful and salient feature which probably influence the behaviors of the employees.

LITERATURE REVIEW

From the last two decades, researchers give significant importance to determine the employees' perception about the treatment and fairness and their impact on work related behaviors and attitudes. Organizational justice researches proposed that the decision making process, decision taken, the way these decisions have been carried out and decision maker's treatment while taking the decision have a significant impact on the outcomes of individuals' behaviors and their work - related attitudes (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg & Folger, 1983; Bies & Shapiro, 1987). The organizational justice has been repeatedly associated with positive attitudes and behaviors at work, while injustice often leads to negative reactions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Perception of organizational injustice can be an indicator of a hostile work culture, which has consistently shown to be linked to aggressive behaviors and acts in the workplace (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Greenberg & Barling, 1999, Naumann & Bennett, 2000; Neuman & Baron, 1998, Tepper, 2000). These aggressive behaviors may be a collective reaction to unfairness that may lead to organizational opposition to rules that allow a hostile work culture (Dietz, Robinson, Folger, Baron, & Schulz, 2003). In the case of sexual harassment, recent studies have indicated that there is a strong association between organizational behaviors — within which may be a perception of justice — and the

existence of this type of bullying behaviors (Lim & Cortina, 2005; O'Leary-Kelly, Bowes-Sperry, Arens, & Lean, 2009).

Organizational justice theories and empirical studies provide a major, comprehensive framework for understanding and addressing employee perception of justice/injustice in the workplace. Three comprehensive meta-analyses (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002) addressed the big effects organizational justice consistently has on crucial parameters of action by employees. Dealing fairly with staff not only affects the general assessment of the organization, but also concretely influences work attitudes and behaviors (Greenberg, 2004, 2006). Other researchers agreed that positive assessments of procedural justice of an organization lead to a positive overall assessment of the organization. This effect is summarized as justice heuristics (Lind & Taylor, 1998; Lind & Van den Bos, 2002): Employees who perceive their organization as a fair workplace have more trust on their organization and its leadership and are also more willing to follow instructions and to make sacrifices.

Broadly, researchers investigated the two key issues of organizational justice; (1) reactions of the employee's against the received outcomes and (2) the procedures / ways through these outcomes are achieved (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Alternatively, researchers having primarily interest in organizational justice distinguished its conceptualization as the distributive justice and procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990a). Greenberg (1987b) argued that the previous researches only focused on the payment distribution and other work related monetary rewards based on equity theory but the major determination of any outcome incurred by the fairness in procedures have more importance than the actual one (Folger & Martin, 1986; Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Martin & Nagao, 1989; Martin & Bennett, 1996). Fulford (2005) also claimed that overall justice perceptions have significant relationship with the employees' behaviors and attitudes.

The theories on distributive justice include the theory of allocation preference (Leventhal et al., 1980), distributive theory (Homans, 1961), equity theory (Adams - 1965) and theory of judgment model of justice (Leventhal, 1976, 1980). In 1988, Organ declared that "distributive justice is arguments on status, seniority, production, effort, needs and determination of payment" while explaining three major rules of distribution that are equity, justice and needs which are also considered as the distributive dimensions (Koopmann, 2002). In 1975, Thibaut and Walker introduced the term procedural justice during the working on dispute resolution procedures and this justice type described by Moorman (1991) as "the fairness of the procedures used in determining employee outcomes". This type of justice principally focuses on the methods and processes on the base of received outcomes (Ding & Lin, 2006; Farmer et al., 2003). Procedural justice can also be defines as the fairness perception about the regulations for making a specific decision for required outcome (Elovainio et al., 2004; Ding & Lin, 2006; DeConinck & Bachmann, 2005; Aryee et al. 2002; Byrne, 2005; Greenberg, 2001; Greenberg, 2004).

From more than 6 decades, researchers and corporate managers aimed at employees' cooperative behaviors at workplace. In 1938, Barnard claimed that "effective organizations as systems in which individuals cooperate to reach organizational ends". There are number of conceptualization of these cooperative behaviors types like "willingness to cooperate (Barnard, 1938), organizational loyalty (Hirschman, 1970; Hage, 1980), organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1982), and extra-role behaviors (Van Dyne et al., 1995), organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988), contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993), and pro-social organizational behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986)". The research regarding OCB originated in the early era of 1980 (Smith et al., 1983). The scientific literature on organizational citizenship behavior and concepts has grown as more studies have been conducted in the past twenty-five years, and an estimate made by a subject specialist lists nearly 200 articles published between the late 1980s and 2000 (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The role of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) on organizational effectiveness in general and in the higher education sector in particular has been recently a very popular topic in the management literature. Smith et al. (1983) were the first scholars to concentrate on and conceptualize the phenomenon of organizational citizenship behavior and their links to the success and effectiveness of the organization. Researchers have realized that faculty and staff pro-social behaviors influence the productivity and effectiveness of their institutions (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Organ & Lingl, 1995). Dennis Organ's five dimensions (altruism, consciousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue) provide clear and precious evaluation of organizational citizenship behavior (Konovsky & Organ 1996).

Researchers came to justify the growing interest in organizational citizenship behavior by looking at the nature of this concept and its relationship to the dimensions of organizational

effectiveness and productivity (Skarlicki & Latham, 1996; Spector & Fox, 2002; Turnipseed & Rassuli, 2005). Organizational citizenship behaviors are associated with many administrative and organizational concepts such as the trends of the organization, cognition, leadership, and change management. In terms of the nature of organizational citizenship behavior, this behavior is not costly to the organization as it is optional and volunteered by the employee since it is not linked to any type of bonuses or incentives and does not fall under the formal job description. In other words, it is not a part of the official work of the employees. Robbins and Judge (2011) suggested that successful organizations need the type of employees who do more than their regular duties and whose performance exceeds the standard level, especially contemporary organizations that operate in a rapidly changing environment using teams that require cooperation and volunteering by the members (Organ & Lingl, 1995).

Podsakoff et al. (2000) recorded in their meta-analysis that since the first research on OCB, there was a significant increase in publications in OCB in the U.S. However, only 13 research studies were published between 1983 and 1988, while there were 122 research studies in the following six years (p. 514). In addition, Podsakoff et al. noted that the analysis of the literature showed that there were about 30 descriptions and forms of the OCB, which have largely overlapped conceptualizations of the OCB phenomenon based on different theoretical frameworks. Researchers have been studying organizational citizenship behavior from different theoretical perspectives. Some researchers proposed that OCB is based on the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), while other researchers observed OCB from the viewpoint of intra-individual perspectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Barnard (1938) is one of the first to be interested in what he called cooperation behaviors. According to Organ (1988, p.15), the writings of Barnard on the concept of "willingness to cooperate" greatly influenced the work of many theorists up-to-date and this well before the popularization of the doctrines of modern management of human relationships. Barnard became interested in the organization from the perspective of association of cooperative efforts.

Literature on OCB proposed its five sub dimensions: "Altruism", "Conscientiousness", "Civic Virtue", "Sportsmanship", and "Courtesy". Altruism defined by Todd (2003) as the helping behavior of employees through which he /she can help his / her coworker(s). It can also define as "it is concerned with going beyond job requirements to help others with whom the individual comes into contact" (Redman & Snape, 2005). Redman and Snape (2005) defined conscientiousness as employee's discretionary behavior which gives compliance to the rules and regulation, procedures, performance and attendance more than the basic requirement. Civic virtue refers to constructive involvement and responsibility shown by the employees in the organizational political process (Baker, 2005). It is also described as the employee who is responsible his / herself and concerned for the image of the company (Redman & Snape, 2005; Borman et al. 2001; Todd, 2003). Organ (1990) defined sportsmanship as "willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining" whereas courtesy as "reflects checking with co-workers about actions that could affect those co-workers' responsibilities".

In 1977, the pioneered of introducing comprehensive model with explanation of underlying psychological process of withdrawal was Mobley. This decision process of withdrawal proposed by Mobley (1977) was shown in the figure 1, which explained the detailed of employee's dissatisfaction from the job which create negative thinking about his / her current job and turns to quite from the job. In this decision process, numbers of mediated steps were presented in between quitting intentions from dissatisfaction. The first step which creates dissatisfaction in employees is to "thoughts of leaving" which triggers the employees to search new jobs and consider the costs of quitting from the current job. Previous studies noted that HR practices can reduce the turnover intentions of the employees and increased its retention with his / her current organization (for example Vandenberg et al., 1999; Shaw et al. 1998; Way, 2002; D. G. Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Huselid, 1995). In addition, "investments in high-involvement HR practices may foster the emergence of a positive work climate that, in turn, may result in lower turnover" (Way, 2002; Rogg et al., 2001). Affective commitment is also considered as one of the key antecedent of intention to quite behaviors and this statement was also endorsed by the latest meta-analytical reviews in organizational behavior conducted by Meyer et al. (2002) and Griffeth et al. (2000).

Different researches showed that organizational justice and OCB is not different from each other and unrelated ideas but both of these variables have different roots in organizational behavior literature. A recent meta-analytical review was conducted, by the key authors (Colquitt et al. 2001) of

organizational justice and OCB, on past researches of organizational justice with other important individual and organizational level outcomes. Colquitt et al. (2001) summarized their results of their meta-analysis as “the results suggest that even though different justice dimensions are moderately to highly relate to each other, they contribute incremental variance explained in fairness perceptions”. It is the organizational justice which used its power to elicit the citizenship behavior among the employees in different culture and different context and these behaviors are also considered as the foundation of an organization in the presence of high level of organizational justice.

The quality relationship in subordinate and leader usually measured on LMX-7 scale and also showed strong influences on work related behaviors and attitudes. Recently, empirical evidence endorsed the relationship of LMX with OCB (Hackett & Lapierre, 2004; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Wat & Shaffer, 2005). OCB is discretionary behavior involving extra-role performance in the workplace (Organ, 1988). Extra-role performance includes behaviors that go above and beyond the job roles specified by a formal job description. Like LMX, the theoretical basis of OCB is predominantly based on social exchange theory (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1993) posited that employees will reciprocate positive, fair treatment from their superiors by demonstrating OCB in the workplace.

It is widely believed that OCB contributes to the effectiveness and efficiency of a functional organization (Organ et al. 2006). Similarly, one way in which high-quality LMX contributes to organizational effectiveness is through the relational influence, which can motivate the subordinates to engage in behaviors beyond their formal roles at job (Ilies et al. 2007). Therefore, discretionary OCB provides an avenue for subordinates in high-quality LMX relationships to return the benefits offered from the leaders (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). This belief was supported by the meta-analytic mean correlation of 0.32 between LMX and overall OCB (Lapierre & Hackett, 2007). Since OCB is mainly discretionary, the motivational base and predictors of OCB are important issues (Wayne, et al. 2002). One of the primary endeavors of previous research has been to identify and validate predictors of OCB, including various job satisfaction factors, employee attitudes, and personality factors (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Empirical research about the LMX-OCB relationship has attracted extensive attention in the past two decades (Wang et al. 2005; Wayne et al. 2002).

However, the association between LMX and OCB has only been tested with composite scores for each of these two constructs. Even though OCB has been defined as a multi-dimensional construct, no previous studies have tried to interpret the association of LMX with different OCB sub-factors (Organ & Ryan, 1995; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Composite scores do little to illuminate the role that more specific sub-factors play in the correlational relationship among variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006). Finally, Ilies et al. (2007) suggested that it is possible to explain the variability in empirical estimates of the LMX OCB correlation by accounting for differential effects of the various sub-dimensions of the two constructs.

Taking OCB importance into consideration and its beneficial impact, important consequences of the employees and OCB relationship have been found such as withdrawal behaviors and evaluation of the performance. In recent studies, Chen (2005) found incremental variance in the relationship of OCB with job satisfaction, employee turnover and organizational commitment. Podsakoff et al. (2009) reported “negative relationship between OCB and turnover intentions, albeit the correlation was weak, and consequently it was suggested that future research investigate the potential effects of organizational culture on the OCB – turnover intentions relationship”. Dalal (2005) conducted a meta-analytical review and found moderate association among counterproductive behavior and OCB whereas the study of Aryee and Chay (2001) found negative relationship of turnover intentions with OCB. Hence, following hypotheses were designed:

Hypothesis 1: There is negative linkage between distributive justice and turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2: There is negative linkage between procedural justice and turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 3: There is negative linkage between interactional justice and turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 4: There is negative connection between LMX and turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 5: There is negative linkage between OCB and turnover intentions.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study used a non-experimental quantitative positivist approach to examine whether there is an influential relationship between exposure to leader member exchange and perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in the banking industry of Pakistan. The

approach used in this study reflects the underlying positivist objective assumption that views reality as a solid structure, which accordingly boosts an epistemological assumption showing the importance of investigating the nature of relationships among elements in that structure without interference from the researcher to eliminate possibilities of bias (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

This non-experimental quantitative approach is aligned with the nature and purpose of this study as it makes use of digital data collected from the online survey based on structured questionnaires with closed questions and other statistical approaches. Collected data were subjected to structural equation to test relationships between variables in the conceptual model using SPSS 20.0. The use of this method is justified by the complexity of the research model, connecting several simultaneous dependency relationships (Smith, 1983). These models provide regression coefficients gamma to apprehend the relative weight of each individual and organizational determinant in explaining the perception of justice and to measure the performance of organizational citizenship behavior. In this quantitative study, the researcher did not attempt to transform behavior or conditions of investigated variables; rather, the purpose was to measure things as they exist (Vogt, 2007). Quantitative non-experimental research is the best-suited design for measuring and explaining the correlation between exposure to perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior investigated in this study. Quantitative research has been described as the most fundamental research method and also the most established. According to Smith (1983), the quantitative research approach is built around numbers, logic, and objective data that attempt to precisely measure something, such as employee behavior, perception of organizational justice, managers' attitudes, or knowledge, which is the case with this research study.

The target population for this study is employees who are currently working in the selected baking organization of Pakistan, and have been with the same institution for at least one year. New employees who have not completed one year in service were excluded because of their insufficient experience with organizational behavior concepts in their institution. One year is regarded as a reasonable minimum criterion for employees to assess their exposure to perceptions of organizational justice and performance of organizational citizenship behavior in their institution. The selection of the banking industry is appropriate to address the research problem identified in this study since employees in banking industry are particularly at risk of exposure to organizational justice and extra role behavior. A banking industry is assumed to be a complex organization composed of diverse groups that have different relationships to one another, and there are likely to be bullying incidents once in a while. Distributive justice (DJ) responses on 5 items scale as proposed by Price and Mueller (1986). Procedural justice (PJ) was measured on the scale presented by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). For measures LMX, seven items scale was used established by (Graen et al., 1982) which is used to measure the subordinate and leader relationship. Overall OCB was measured on nine items scale. At last, three questions as used to measure turnover intentions from the measures of Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979). The response categories of all questions were "5=strongly disagree, 4 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree".

RESULTS & INTERPRETATIONS

Among 200 respondents, 73% of the respondents were male whereas females were accounted for 27%. Majority of the employees were married 58% and unmarried employees were only 42%. Age was asked on quantitative scale but for analyses purposes age was divided in two main categories as per career cycle stage. 61% respondents were less than 30 years and the percentage of employees who were more than 30 years was 39%. Most of the employees had Master Degree 58% whereas 37% undergraduate degree. Exploratory factor analysis was used for factor loading against each item of all study variables by using principal axis factoring. The factor loading of each item was shown in table 1.

Variable Name	Question Items	Factor Loading	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity
<i>Distributive Justice</i>	DJ1	0.742	0.764	Chi-Square = 469.52 df = 10 Sig. = 0.000
	DJ2	0.668		
	DJ3	0.723		
	DJ4	0.728		
	DJ5	0.665		
<i>Procedural Justice</i>	PJ1	0.458	0.688	Chi-Square = 544.85 df = 15 Sig. = 0.000
	PJ2	0.639		
	PJ3	0.809		
	PJ4	0.794		
	PJ5	0.539		
	PJ6	0.523		
<i>LMX</i>	L1	0.556	0.786	Chi-Square = 614.78 df = 21 Sig. = 0.000
	L2	0.721		
	L3	0.641		
	L4	0.701		
	L5	0.622		
	L6	0.380		
	L7	0.730		
<i>OCB</i>	O1	0.388	0.771	Chi-Square = 777.35 df = 36 Sig. = 0.000
	O2	0.498		
	O3	0.556		
	O4	0.647		
	O5	0.528		
	O6	0.676		
	O7	0.550		
	O8	0.515		
	O9	0.704		
<i>Turnover Intentions</i>	T1	0.795	0.690	Chi-Square = 333.14 df = 03 Sig. = 0.000
	T2	0.833		
	T3	0.836		

Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table # 2 provides the descriptive statistics of study variables with their respective reliability coefficients.

	Minimum Value	Maximum value	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability Coefficient
<i>Distributive Justice</i>	1.80	5.00	3.6124	0.65208	0.75
<i>Procedural Justice</i>	1.50	4.67	3.2935	0.64077	0.70
<i>Leader-Member Exchange</i>	1.57	5.00	3.4981	0.60291	0.74
<i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</i>	2.56	4.78	3.8004	0.52636	0.74
<i>Turnover Intetnions</i>	1.00	5.00	2.6814	0.93587	0.76

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

The table # 3 demonstrate the mean and standard deviation of three variables (LMX, OCB and DJ) and there inter-correlation with each other. Since all study variables have low level of correlations and are linearly associated, so these variables were fir for further regression analyses.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	OCB	LMX	DJ
OCB	3.80	.52	1.00	0.48*	0.43*
LMX	3.49	.60	0.48*	1.00	0.27*
DJ	3.61	.65	0.43*	0.27*	1.00

Table 3. Descriptive and Correlation Statistics

*Significant at 0.001 Level

The table # 4 described the standard deviation and mean (descriptive statistics) and inter-correlation with each other. Since all study variables are linearly associated, so these variables were fir for further regression analyses.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	TI	DJ	PJ
TI	2.68	0.93	1.00	-.33*	-.040**
DJ	3.61	0.65	-.33	1.000	.30*
PJ	3.29	0.64	0-.040**	0.30*	1.000

Table 4. Descriptive and Correlation Statistics

*Significant at 0.001 Level

** Non - Significant at 0.1 Level

Stepwise regression analysis was employed to examine the direct and negative relationship of DJ and PJ with turnover intentions. Table 5 showed the model summary in which only DJ was entered in to the model and showed 11 percent variance in the dependent variable whereas PJ was out from the model summary.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	
1	.331a	.109	.107	.88420	.109	55.252	1	450	.000	1.645

Table 5. Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), DJ

b. Dependent Variable: TI

The following table (table # 6) provides the ANOVA of independent variable and showed the predictive strength of the model where F – statistics is 55.252* (*p<0.001).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	43.197	1	43.197	55.252	.000 ^a
	Residual	351.816	450	.782		
	Total	395.013	451			

Table 6: ANOVA^b

a. Predictors: (Constant), DJ

b. Dependent Variable: TI

Standardized beta coefficient of independent variable DJ was shown in the table 7. The table showed the negative influence of DJ on turnover intentions of the faculty members serving in public and private sector degree awarding institutes and universities. The standardized beta coefficient of DJ is $\beta = -0.33$ ($t = -7.43^*$, $p < 0.001$). Hence, it is proved that DJ has direct and negative influence on turnover intentions whereas PJ was already excluded from the model because of its non-significance relationship with dependent variable (PJ).

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.396	.234		18.756	.000
	DJ	-.475	.064	-.331	-7.433	.000

Table 7: Coefficients^a

a. Dependent Variable: TI

The study hypothesis 2 is to determine the impact of LMX on turnover intentions. When these variables were entered in to the equation, none of them were entered in to the model. Hence, this hypothesis is rejected. The table # 8 described the standard deviation and mean (descriptive statistics)

and inter-correlation with each other. Since all study variables are linearly associated, so these variables were fir for further regression analyses.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	OCB	LMX
OCB	3.80	0.52	1.000	.484*
LMX	3.49	0.60	.484*	1.000

Table 8. Descriptive and Correlation Statistics

**Significant at 0.001 Level*

Stepwise regression analysis was employed to examine the direct relationship of LMX with OCB of the faculty members. Table 9 showed the model summary in which LMX was entered in to the model and showed 24 percent variance in the dependent variable (OCB).

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	
1	.484 ^a	.235	.233	.46102	.235	137.917	1	450	.000	1.808

Table 9. Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMX

b. Dependent Variable: OB

The following table (table # 10) provides the ANOVA of independent variable and showed the predictive strength of the model where F – statistics is 137.92* (*p<0.001).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.312	1	29.312	137.917	.000 ^a
	Residual	95.642	450	.213		
	Total	124.954	451			

Table 10: ANOVA^b

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMX

b. Dependent Variable: OCB

Table 11 showed the standardized beta coefficient of LMX with positive impact on OCB of faculty members employed by higher education institutions. The beta coefficient of LMX is $\beta = 0.48$ ($t = 11.74^*$, $p < 0.001$). Hence, it is proved that LMX has direct and positively related to OCB of faculty members.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.321	.128		18.162	.000
	LMX	.423	.036	.484	11.744	.000

Table 11: Coefficients^a

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

The table # 12 described the standard deviation and mean (descriptive statistics) and inter-correlation with each other. Since all study variables are linearly associated, so these variables were fir for further regression analyses.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	TI	OCB
TI	2.6814	.93587	1.00	-.167*
OCB	3.8004	.52636	-.167*	1.00

Table 12. Descriptive and Correlation Statistics

**Significant at 0.001 Level*

Stepwise regression analysis was employed to examine the negative relationship of OCB with turnover intentions. Table 13 showed the model summary in which OCB was entered in to the model and alone explained showed only 2 percent variance in the dependent variable (turnover intentions).

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	
1	.167 ^a	.028	.026	.92380	.028	12.866	1	450	.000	1.680

Table 13. Model Summary
a. Predictors: (Constant), OCB
b. Dependent Variable: TI

The following table (table # 14) provides the ANOVA of independent variable and showed the predictive strength of the model where F – statistics is 12.86* (*p<0.001).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.980	1	10.980	12.866	.000 ^a
	Residual	384.033	450	.853		
	Total	395.013	451			

Table 14: ANOVA^b
a. Predictors: (Constant), OCB
b. Dependent Variable: TI

Standardized beta coefficient of independent variable OCB was shown in the table 15. The table showed the negative influence of OCB on turnover intentions of the faculty members. The standardized beta coefficient of OCB is $\beta = -0.17$ ($t = -3.58^*$, *p<0.001). Hence, it is proved that the negative relationship of OCB and turnover intentions.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.808	.317		12.010	.000
	OCB	-.296	.083	-.167	-3.587	.000

Table 15: Coefficients^a
a. Dependent Variable: TI

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

This study findings mainly emphasized on “why justice matters” for followers, leaders and higher administration of banking industry operating in Pakistan.. Brockner (2002) and Lind and Tyler (1988) pointed out that “justice perceptions are important as they provide individuals with information about their group membership and status and this knowledge influences how they feel about themselves and behave towards others. And, if leaders can provide fair interpersonal treatment (as well as utilize fair procedures and provide just outcomes to all of their followers), perhaps a greater sense of self-worth and teamwork can be fostered within followers”.

Similarlay, OCB and its meanings like individual instrumentality and role definitions developed firstly in western world (e.g., North America) (Hui et al. 2004). It is also suggested that to incorporate the key component charisma leadership in this model because of its generalizability characteristics in all cultures (House et al. 2004). The study findings may applicable in other cultures but can have moderate relationship because of power distance and traditionally association of that culture (Spreitzer et al. 2005; Farh et al. 2007). Hence, the researchers should take this limitation in to consideration while generalizing this study results in other settings. There will be several assumptions to guide this quantitative descriptive nonexperimental study that consist of three groups of assumptions as follows:

Theoretical assumptions. The theoretical framework of this quantitative study is grounded in the psychological contract theory and will comprise a foundation of physical, psychological, and social complaints of leader member exchange targets as they relate to the levels of perception of organizational justice and performance of organizational citizenship behavior (Fox & Spector, 2005). It is assumed that the three constructs to be investigated in this study (perception of organizational justice, and organizational citizenship behavior) exist and can be measured at the individual and organizational levels.

Topical assumptions. It was noted in the literature that there is need for further research on workplace bullying and its effects on faculty and staff in the higher education sector (Fogg, 2008; Gravois, 2006). In addition, the findings of Keashly and Neuman (2008) emphasized the importance of studying employees in order to comprehend bullying in academic settings and to evaluate the consequences of these behaviors and associated bullying practices more precisely.

Methodological assumptions. The quantitative descriptive non-experimental research approach is the best suited design for measuring and explaining the correlation between exposure to perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior investigated in this study. Smith (1983) concluded that a quantitative research approach is primarily built around numbers, logic, and objectivity of the data in order to measure variables accurately. Smith added that quantitative research is the most appropriate approach to examine organizational concepts such as employee behavior, perception of organizational justice, managers' knowledge or attitudes, which is the case with this research study. In addition, the positivist objective assumption associated with this study boosts an epistemological assumption that shows the importance of investigating the nature of relationships among variables without interference from the researcher to eliminate possibilities of bias (Trochim, 2006, Vogt, 2007).

This limitation may encourage further research in the assessment of categorized workplace bullying and the effect of different workplace bullying categories on the perception of organizational justice and performance of organizational citizenship behavior. The researcher intends to limit the scope of this study to measure the link between workplace bullying in general and the two dependent variables: perception of organizational justice and the performance of organizational citizenship behavior. Further research may need a different design, population and sampling frame to develop and test instruments that would allow measuring different components of workplace bullying.

The last two limitations are common in any research linked to measuring human behavior, and there is no guarantee to overcome the natural or directed changes in the feelings and behaviors of people, which may vary from time to time and are affected by the surrounding environment and day-to-day experience of the participants. However, this quantitative research is assumed to be a positivist approach to social phenomena with a main purpose to project the researcher's findings onto the tested population through an objective process (Smith, 1983; Hitt et al., 1998). Moreover, participants' answers may be biased by the location of each participant in the organization structure. Different areas of work may lead to differing views on organizational justice as well as the performance of organizational citizenship behavior.

Although this is perceived as a limitation, the anticipated variation in the respondents' answers is a good indicator that supports the purpose of this study. Nevertheless, while demographic characteristics will be analyzed along with the participants' answers, the scope of this study will not include all participants' personality traits. Possible crosssectional design of the study by analyzing personality traits may weaken the research design and produce causal inferences. In addition, considering personality traits will require adding them as variables, and accordingly it would be necessary to create a completely different research design and sampling plan.

REFERENCES

- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 267–285.
- Baker, B. (2005). *The Good, the Bad and The Ugly: the Mediating Role of Attribution Style in the Relationship Between Personality and Performance*. North Carolina State University.
- Bakhshi A, Kumar K, Rani E (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(9): 145-154
- Barnard, C.I. (1938), *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

- Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, T., & Motowidlo, S. (2001). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993), "Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance", in Schmitt, N. and Borman, W.C. (Eds), *Personnel Selection*, Josey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 71-98.
- Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. K. (1986). Choice behavior in social dilemmas: Effects of social identity, group size, and decision framing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50,(3), 543-549.
- Brief, A.P. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1986), "Prosocial organizational behaviors", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 710-25.
- Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the influence of outcome favorability. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 58-76.
- Brooks, J.S. and Jean-Marie, G. (2007), "Black leadership, white leadership: race and race relations in an urban high school", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 756-68.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Collard, J. (2007), "Constructing theory for leadership in intercultural contexts", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 740-55.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Yee NG, K. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Judge, T. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 100, 110-127.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 386-400.
- Colquitt, J.A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*, 2nd Edition (pp. 165-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J., Kessler, I., & Purcell, J. (2004). Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behavior: reciprocity or 'It's my job'? *Journal of Management Studies*, 41, 85-106.
- Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 56-88). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. L. (2001). Procedural and distributive justice are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In R. Cropanzano, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 119-151). Standford, CA: University Press.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper., & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-201.
- Ehrhart, M.G. (2004), "Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 61-94.
- Ehrhart, M.G. and Nauman, S.E. (2004), "Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: a group norms approach", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 6, pp. 960-74.
- Elicker, J. D., Levy, P. E., & Hall, R. J. (2006). The role of leader-member exchange in the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management*, 32: 531-551.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M., Steen, N., & Vahtera, J. (2004). Job decision latitude, organizational justice and health: multilevel covariance structure analysis. *Social Science and Medicine*, 58, 1659-1669.
- Elovainio, M., van den Bos, K., Linna, A., Kivimaki, M., Ala-Mursula, L., Pentti, J., et al. (2005). Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public sector employees. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61, 2501-2512.
- Elovainio, Marko; Kivimaki, Mika; and Vahtera, Jussi. 2002. Organizational justice: Evidence of a new psychological predictor of health, *American Journal of Public Health* 92.

Eskew, D.E. (1993), "The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 185-94.

Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcomes relationships: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 715-729.

Farh, J., Earley, P.C., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W. (1990), "Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader equity and task scope versus satisfaction", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 705-22.

Folger, R. (1986). Rethinking equity theory: A referent cognitions model. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*, 145-162. New York: Plenum.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resources Management*. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.

Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. M. Rowland & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3, 141-183.

Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Rheaume, K., & Martin, C. (1983). Relative deprivation and referent cognitions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 172-184.

Fua, S.J. (2007), "Looking towards the source - social justice and leadership conceptualizations from Tonga", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 672-83.

Gellatly, I. R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 469-485.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.

Graen G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9:175-208.

Graen G. B., & Schiemann, W. (1978). Leader-member agreement: A vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, (2), 206-212.

Greenberg, J. (1986b). The distributive justice of organizational performance evaluations. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*, 337- 351. New York: Plenum

Greenberg, J. (1987a). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72,(1), 55-61.

Greenberg, J. (1987b). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12,(1), 9-22.

Greenberg, J. (1990a). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16,(2), 399-432.

Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P. B. Paulus (Eds.), *Basic Group Processes*, New York: Springer Verlag.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463-488.

Hackett, R.D. and Lapiere, L.M. (2004), "A meta-analytic explanation of the relationship between LMX and OCB", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, OB: T1-T6.

Hage, J. (1980), *Theories of Organizations: Form, Process, and Transformation*, Wiley, New York, NY.

Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1990). Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 60-78.

Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1991). General attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An evaluation of a causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 110-128.

Hannam, R. L., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2002). The relationship between extra-role behaviours and job burnout for primary school teachers: A preliminary model and development of an organisational citizenship behaviour scale. In: Shilton, Wendy, Jeffrey and Ruth 2002 Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research, Brisbane, 1e5 December 2002 (pp. 1-17).

Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in China: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 311-321.

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635-662.

- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J.D., & Morgeson, F.P. (2007). Leader-Member Exchange and Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 2690-2777.
- Jablin, F. M. (1979). Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86,(6), 1201-1222.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational Justice and Stress: The Mediating Role of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 395-404.
- Kana, P. and Aitken, V. (2007), "She didn't ask me about my grandma: using process drama to explore issues of cultural exclusion and educational leadership", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 97-710.
- Karambayya, R., & Brett, J. M. (1989). Managers handling disputes: Third-party roles and perceptions of fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32,(4), 687-704.
- Kee, D.M.H., Ansari, M.A. and Aafaqi, R. (2004), "Fairness of human resource management practices, leader-member exchange, and organizational commitment", *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 99-120.
- Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26: 489-511.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976b). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 91-131.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What Should Be Done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza Jr, K., & W. R. Fry (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Eds.), *Justice and Social Interaction*, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Liao, H., & Rupp, D. E. (2005). The impact of justice climate and justice orientation on work outcomes: A cross-level multifoci framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 242-256.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lind, E. A. (2001a). Fairness Heuristic Theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg, & R.
- Lind, E. A. (2001b). Thinking critically about justice judgments. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 220-226.
- Martínez-tur, V., Peiró, J.M., Ramos, J. & Moliner, C. (2006) Justice perceptions as predictors of customer satisfaction: the impact of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 100-119.
- 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*, 43, 738-748.
- McAllister, D.J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E.W., & Turban, D.B. (2007). Disentangling role perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy relate to helping and taking charge. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1200-1211.
- McMahon, B. (2007), "Educational administrators' conceptions of whiteness, anti-racism and social justice", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 684-96.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (2000). HRM practices and organizational commitment: Test of a mediation model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 17, 319-331.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovich, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organisation: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- O'Reilly, C. and Chatman, J. (1986), "Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71 No. 3, pp. 492-9.
- Olsen-Buchanan, J. B. (1996). Voicing discontent: what happens to the grievance filer after the grievance? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 52-63.

- Oplatka, I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42, 385e423.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Price, K. H., Lavelle, J. J., Henley, A. B., Cocchiara, F. K., & Buchanan, F. R. (2006). Judging the fairness of voice-based participation across multiple and interrelated stages of decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 212-226.
- Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P. C. (2004). Gender and Employee Attitudes: The Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 247-258.
- Redman, T., & Snape, E. (2005). I to Wed: The Role of Consciousness Transformation in Compassion and Altruism. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 2.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Roch, S. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organizational justice in an exchange framework: Clarifying organizational justice distinctions. *Journal of Management*, 32: 299-322.
- Rogg, K., Schmidt, D., Shull, C., & Schmitt, N. (2001). Human resource practices, organizational climate, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 27, 431-449.
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 925-946.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Levine, E. D. (2009). What is (or should be) the difference between competency modeling and traditional job analysis? *Human Resource Management Review*, 19, 53-63.
- Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R.C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
- Shaw, J. D., Delery, J. E., Jenkins, G. D., Jr., & Gupta, N. (1998). An organizational-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 511-525.
- Sheppard, B. H., & Lewicki, R. J. & Minton, J. W. (1992). *Organizational Justice: The Search for Fairness in the Workplace*. New York, NY: Macmillan
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 28, 774-780.
- Skarlicki, D. and Latham, G. (1996), "Increasing citizenship behavior with a labour union: a test of organizational justice theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 2, pp. 161-9.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Skrla, L., McKenzie, K.B. and Scheurich, J.J. (2007), "Concluding reflections on 'leadership for learning in the context of social justice: an international perspective'", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45 No. 6, pp. 782-7.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. and Near, J.P. (1983), "Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 653-63.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: the relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 649e659.
- Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 789e796.
- Tepper, B.J. and Taylor, E.C. (2003), "Relation among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 97-105.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Todd, S. (2003) *A Causal Model Depicting the Influence of Selected Task and Employee Variables on Organizational Citizenship Behavior*.
- Trevino, L. & Weaver G. (2001). Organizational justice and ethics program "follow-through": Influences on employees' harmful and helpful behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(4), 651-671.

- Truckenbrodt, Y.B. (2000), "The relation between leader-member exchange and commitment and organizational behavior", *Acquisition Review Quarterly*, Vol. 7, pp. 233-44.
- Turnley, W.H., Bolino, M.C., Lester, S.W. and Bloodgood, J.M. (2003), "The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 187-206.
- Tyler, T. R. (1986). When does procedural justice matter in organizational settings? In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 1-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Van Dick, R. (2004). My job is my castle: identification in organizational contexts. In C. L. Cooper, & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 171-203). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Van Dierendonck, D., Le Blanc, P.M. and Van Breukelen, W. (2002), "Supervisory behavior, reciprocity and subordinate absenteeism", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 23, pp. 84-92.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ellis, B. J. (2004). Job creep: a reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as over fulfillment of obligations. In J. Coyle- Shapiro, L. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 181e205). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of constructive and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108e119.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17, 215e285.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L. and Parks, J.M. (1995), "Extra-Role Behaviors: In Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity (A Bridge over Muddied Waters)", in Staw, B.M. and Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 215-85.
- Van Dyne, L., Grahm, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement and validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765e802.
- Vandenberg, R. J., Richarson, H. A., & Eastman, L. J. (1999). The impact of high-involvement work process on organizational effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 24, 300-339.
- Wayne, Sandy J., Tetrick, Lois E., Shore, Lynn M., & Bommer, William H. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(June), 590-598.
- Williams, S. (1999). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on performance. *Journal of Psychology*, 133, 183-193.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R. and Zainuba, M. (2002), "Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: fair rewards vs. fair treatments", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 142, pp. 33-45.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Zellers, K.L., Tepper, B.L. and Duffy, M.K. (2002), "Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 6, pp. 1068-76.
- Zellers, K.L., Tepper, B.L., Giacalone, R.A., Lockhart, D. and Jurkeiwicz, C.L. (2003), "Justice and organizational citizenship: interactive effect of impression management motives", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, pp. 1-9.