The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Mehrdad Goudarzvand Chegini

Department of Management, Islamic Azad University, Rasht Branch, Iran

Abstract: Problem statement: Organizational justice and its relationship with citizenship behavior is one of the basic and important subjects of successful organizations. In this competitive world, making a sense of organizational justice in staff, increases functional ability and organizational citizenship behavior. **Approach:** This research includes 5 hypotheses which evaluate the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational justice dimensions consist of: organizational justice, distributive justice, policy justice, inter individual justice and informational justice. The present research method is analytical-descriptive and its type is correlation. The method of collecting data is questionnaire. It is also a field research. **Results:** The findings of this research show that all the organizational justice dimensions which were qualified by correlation coefficient test are positively related to organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, the hypotheses were verified. **Conclusion:** Finally, informational justice mechanisms should be planned in a way that policies and relations are made justly.

Key words: Organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, distributive justice, policy justice, inter individual justice, informational justice

INTRODUCTION

Justice is one of the goals which was considered by human beings in ethical, political and social dimensions over the years. Justice is among the most important conceptions which is explained in political and social subjects. According to Plato, social organization which is civilization symbol, will not exist without justice. Certainly, justice cause integrity and organizational justices causes individuals be together in order to work effectively. Instead, organizational injustice destroys organizational integrity[7]. Justice is the center of attention of all humanistic affairs, because people are sensitive to how it is behaved towards justice, deeply. In management, observing and making justice is one of the most important tasks of every manager and every human in each condition. Justice is among the most valuable criteria of social life. It is also basis of all correct behaviors. When justice exists, all the works are done correctly, but people have to get their rights illegally if the justice does not exist.

Fulfillment of social justice is impossible without fulfillment of organizational justice. In fact, organizational justice is a kind of fulfillment in all activities, behaviors and tendencies of organizational individuals. 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.

Organizational justice was developed by west scholars as one of the social justice dimensions in 1970s and now is one of the new subjects related to organizational studies. Abraham Mazlo is one of the most outstanding psychologists in the field of motivation, who set forth a sequence of human needs. Though, in his sequence justice is not important, he was aware of its importance and was informed of injustice consequences. Mazlo introduced justice as an essential need and categorized it with fair, truth and order in the same group. He also, names them as basic preconditions for fulfilling needs.

According to Greenberg[8,9], organizational justice is related to staff perceptions of work fair. In fact, he uses this phrase to explain and to analyze the role of fair in work place. Injustice or discrimination is the basis of all organizational harms, deflections and misdeeds. When injustice appears in different classes and importance of organizational relationships, organization will regress. Unfortunately, increase of injustice or discrimination in all the features of organizational life cripples organizations activities, so they cannot prevent natural and human resources from being dissipated and will be converted to bureaucracy

and deficient organizations. In fact, injustice has a destructive effect on development process, because it eclipses the staff efforts and motivations. Injustice and unfair distribution of organization consequences demoralizes the staff and decreases their effects and activities. So, injustice causes permanence and stability of development process and staff and organization progress. People communications which are on the basis of justice such as mortality, transaction, inter individual relations, individual and society, are directly related to society improvement. Justice people relations and connections make the community developed and healthy.

Citizenship behavior means efforts of organization members. Though it is not directly related to job tasks, it develops and improves organization goals. In this study, it is tried to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. On the other hand, we tried to identify the type of relationship between those 2 variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The type of this research is analytical-descriptive which underlines correlation. The type of this research goal is applied. Statistical society includes all the staff of Rasht governmental organizations (Iran-Guilan). Regarding Cronboch formula, sample contents were determined 300 people.

Method of collecting data was Natmir questionnaire and the questions were made by researcher himself.

Questionnaire justifiability was confirmed by management field professors and its stability, regarding Cronboch Alfa coefficient, was determined 85%. Thus, both justifiability and stability of questionnaire were confirmed.

Research History: 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[8]. Organizational justice is a complicated field which has complex expressions and differences. Anyway, organizational justice infers to individuals fair and ethical behaviors in organizations[5]. Organizational justice is very important, since it is related to organizational basic processes such as: commitment, membership, job satisfaction and operations[3,4].
Early researches of organizations were on the basis of equity and judgeship theory[1,2,6]. After expansion of organizational judgment researches, center of focus was changed from judging the results (justice was final

result) to social judgment[8,10,12]. Some researchers show that social judgment is as important as judging the results and there is a relationship between social justice and management operation and also between staff behaviors[11].

Citizenship behavior: Organizational citizenship behavior structure seeks to identify loyalty dimensions which comprise different instances. In this dimension, organization members behave specifically that is higher than the medium task level.

According to, citizenship behaviors in organization are divided in 3 groups:

- Organizational obedience
- Organizational loyalty
- Organizational cooperation

Graham also believes that these behaviors are directly affected by rights which are given to individuals by organizations. In this case, individuals behave on the basis of those three groups if they see they have organizational citizenship rights. So, organizational citizenship behavior is affected by different factors and can affect organizational justice focuses.

Distributive justice, policy justice, communicative justice, inter individual justice and informational justice are all related to organizational citizenship behavior of the aspect of consequences.

Research hypotheses:

- There is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between policy justice and organizational citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior

RESULTS AND DISSCUSION

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_0: There is not any relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 1: Correlation between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior

	Organizational citizenship behavior	Organizational justice
Organizational justice		
P. co	1.000	0.851*
Sig.(2-t.)		0.000
N	300.000	300.000
Organizational citizenship behavior		
p. co	0.851*	1.000
sig. (2-t.)	0.000	
N	300.000	300.000

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-t.)

Table 2: Correlation between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior

	Organizational citizenship behavior	Distributive justice
Organizational citizenship behavior		
P. co	1.000	0.696*
Sig.(2-t.)		0.000
N	300.000	300.000
Distributive justice		
p. co	0.696*	1.000
sig. (2-t.)	0.000	
N	300.000	300.000

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-t.)

Table 3: Correlation between policy justice and organizational citizenship behavior

	Organizational citizenship behavior	Policy justice
Organizational citizenship behavior		
P. co	1.000	0.847*
Sig.(2-t.)		0.000
N	300.000	300.000
Policy justice		
p. co	0.847*	1.000
sig. (2-t.)	0.000	
N	300.000	300.000

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.o1 level (2-t.)

Table 4: Correlation between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior

	Organizational citizenship behavior	Inter individual justice
Organizational citizenship behavior		
p. co	1.000	0.465*
sig. (2-t.)		0.000
N	300.000	300.000
Inter individual justice		
p. co	0.465*	1.000
sig. (2-t.)	0.000	
N	300.000	300.000

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-t.)

H_1: There is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Regarding the above Table 1, it is shown that the level of correlation coefficient between these two variables is 85.1%. Since the degree of meaningful level in this test is lower than 5%. So, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_0: There is not any relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_1: There is a relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 2 shows that correlation coefficient level between these two variables equals to 69.6%. Since the degree of meaningful level is lower that 5.7% in correlation coefficient test, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between policy justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_0: There is not any relationship between policy justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_1: There is a relationship between policy justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 3 shows that correlation coefficient level between these two variables is 84.7%. Since the degree of meaningful level was determined lower that 5% in correlation coefficient test, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 4: There is a relationship between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_0: There is not any relationship between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_1: There is a relationship between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Regarding Table 4, it can be said that correlation coefficient between inter individual justice and organizational citizenship behavior equals to 46.5%. The meaningful level in correlation coefficient test is lower than 5%, so hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 5: There is a relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 5: Correlation between informational justice and Organizational citizenship behavior

	Organizational citizenship behavior	Informational justice
Organizational citizenship behavior		
p. co	1.000	0.677*
sig. (2-t.)		0.000
N	300.000	300.000
Informational justice		
p. co	0.677*	1.000
sig. (2-t.)	0.000	
N	300.000	300.000

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-t.)

H_0: There is not any relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H_1: There is a relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 5 shows that correlation coefficient level between these two variables equals to 67.7%. Since the degree of meaningful level was determined lower than 5% in correlation coefficient test, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

CONCLUSION

As it can be shown from the hypotheses test results, there is a meaningful relationship between organizational justice dimensions. So, it is necessary to distribute and allocate resources and rewards justly in order to establish an organizational citizenship behavior in a way that staff can believe in justice observation. So it is better to make policies justly and to communicate with individuals carefully.

Observance of politeness, position and respect cause staff feel good. Thus, the more the level of inter individual justice, the more the organizational citizenship behavior.

Finally, informational justice mechanisms should be planned in a way that policies and relations are made justly.

REFERENCES

.
1. Adams, J.S., 1965. Inequity in Social Exchange. In: Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), Vol. 2, Academic Press, New York, pp: 267-99.
2. Bradberry, T. and B.C. Tatum, 2002. Seeking justice in organizations: The time is now. Proceeding of the 2nd Symposium Biannual International Conference on Personal Meaning on Freedom, Responsibility, Justice, July 18-21, Vancouver, BC.
3. Colquitt, J.A., R..A. Noe and C.L. Jackson, 2002. Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. Personnel Psychol., 55: 83-109. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00104.x
4. Colquitt, J.A., D.E. Conlon, M.J. Wesson, C.O. Porter and K.Y. Ng, 2001. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. J. Applied Psychol., 86: 424-445. PMID: 11419803
5. Cropanzano, R., 1993. Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management. 1st Edn., Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, ISBN: 10: 0805810552, pp: 312.
6. Foldger, R. and M.A. Konovsky, 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. Acad. Manage. J., 32: 115-130. http://www.jstor.org/stable/256422
7. Gholipour, A. and A. Poor Ezzat, 2008. Injustice consequences in organization. Bardasht E Dovvom Publications, Imam Sadegh University research Center Website.
8. Gladwell, M., 2005. Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking. 1st Edn., Little Brown, Boston, MA., ISBN: 10: 0316172324, pp: 288.
9. Greenberg, J., 1990. Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. J. Applied Psychol., 75: 561-568. http://www.michaelwmorris.com/R671/documents/Session_07/Greenberg90.pdf
10. Greenberg, J., 1990. Looking fair Vs being fair: Managing impressions of organizational justice. Res. Org. Behav., 12: 111-157.
11. Leventhal, G.S., J. Karuza and E.R. Fry, 1980. Beyond Fairness: A Theory of Allocation Preferences. In: Justice and Social Interaction, Mikula, G. (Ed.). Springer-Verlag, New York, USA., pp: 167-218.
12. Thibaut, J.W. and L. Walker, 1975. Procedural Justice: A Psychology Analysis. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, ISBN: 10: 0470858699, pp: 160.