“Impact of organizational justice and employee engagement on organizational citizenship behavior: A case of private sector universities in Peshawar”

Saqib Shahzad¹, Dr. Waseef Jamal²

Abstract

The preset study was an attempt to find out the effect of organizational justice and employees engagement on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational justice was further measured by distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Organizational citizenship behavior was measured by five sub variables. There were altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship. The data was collected from the faculty members of private sector universities operating in Peshawar. The results of the study showed that organizational justice had significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Employee engagement also was found to have significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. The three facets for organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) were also found to have significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

Key Words: Organizational justice, employee engagement, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, organizational citizenship behavior.

1. Introduction:

In the context of organization behaviors are considered as one of the important factor to be successful in organization. Every behavior is strongly influenced by motivation. Motivated employees are expected to show good behaviors in the workplace. But it is evident that from the perspective of employee behavior in the setting of organization, an employee showing good behavior in the work is rewarded for that behavior, the literature has called it in role behavior. But the other side of the picture says that there are some behaviors which employees show but they are not rewarded. At the same time the organizations also do not have any formal reward system for such behaviors to be rewarded. Here the question arises that what motivates an employee to exhibit such behaviors that are not rewarded??

Referring to the in-role behavior, it states that the activities and strategies undertaken by an employee in accomplishing the task assigned. For such behaviors related to the accomplishment of tasks, that employee is rewarded in terms of salary, so em-

¹ PhD Student, Institute of Management Sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan

² Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan

ployee has to show such positive behavior that results in achieving their assigned tasks. The in-role behavior for a teacher would be preparation of course plans, provision of relevant material, preparation of papers, grading students etc. Moorman and Blakely (1995), a good citizen is that employee who extends help and support to organization, even when organization does not verbally stipulate such support.

When an employee opts for engaging in discretionary behavior that employee in reality goes for the role beyond job requirement. Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) 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. The word discretionary here means that such behavior is not the formal part of an employee's job description and purely optional in its nature. OCB itself is entirely voluntary, constructive, not formally assigned, non-compensated but desired by the organization (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000).

One of the noteworthy factor among many different factors for OCB is the organizational Justice. Employees when receive justice from the management of organization they feel extremely satisfied and committed. This gesture of justice motivates the employees of an organization to go beyond their call of duty.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Citizenship behavior

Bateman and Organ (1983) were the first who use the term "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (OCB) over the two and half decades earlier but its link could be found in the Bernard's, (1938) Concept of Willingness to Cooperate. This was later refined and explained by Katz (1966). Katz described a compact description of in role behavior and extra role behavior with sound difference between them (Podsakoff et al. 2000). Various constructs have been developed to conceptualize the term of OCB since Organs (1988). Construct like pro social behavior (George 1990) extra role behavior (van Dyne et al. 1995); civic organizational behavior (Graham, 1991) contextual performance behavior (Motowidlo, 1993) as stated by podsakoff et al. (2000). Therefore there are some differences among these constructs but the logic behind these constructs are same which have been examined and put forward in different implications and labels. The study of five classification of OCB, have been extensively used by many researchers across the world in diverse perspective and found it a valid tool for measuring OCB. Organ (1988) further tries to define the OCB and highlights five precise types of discretionary behavior and describe how each assists to improve the efficiency of the organizations.

- Altruism (e.g., helping new colleagues and freely giving time to others) is naturally concentrating toward other individuals but add to group efficiency by increasing the performance of individuals.
- Conscientiousness (e.g., efficient use of time and going beyond minimum expectations) increase the efficiency of individual and the group.
- Sportsmanship (e.g., avoids complaining and whining) improves the quantity of time spent on productive activities in the organization.
- Courtesy (e.g., advance notices, reminders, and communicating appropriate information) facilitate avoid problems and facilitates productive use of time.
- Civic Virtue (e.g., serving to communities and voluntarily attending functions) endorse the interests of the organization.

2.2 Organizational Justice

Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice

Distributive justice deals with decisions taken or the content of fairness, whilst procedural justice is associated to the ways used to take those decisions for instance how decisions are made or the process of fairness. Distributive justice is considered to predict satisfaction with the outcome (i.e., pay satisfaction), while procedural justice influences the assessment of the organization and its authorities (i.e., trust in supervision) (Sweeney and McFarlin 1993; Cropanzano & Folger 1991). Fairness and justice is the work condition identified in the Maslach et al. (2001) engagement model. The concept of fairness, or justice, has become an increasingly visible construct in the social sciences. Initially, researchers focused on the justice of decision outcomes, termed distributive justice (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Homans, 1961; Leventhal, 1976). Distributive justice is fostered where outcomes are consistent with implicit norms for allocation, such as equity or equality. More recent work has focused on the justice of the processes that lead to decision outcomes, termed procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Procedural justice is fostered through voice during a decision-making process or influence over the outcome (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) or by adherence to fair process criteria, such as consistency, lack of bias, correctability, representation, accuracy, and ethicality (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal et al., 1980). Saks (2006) stated that employees who have higher perceptions of procedural justice are more likely to respond with higher organization engagement. Hence, employees having higher perception of justice in their organization are expected to feel gratified to be fair in performing their roles through greater levels of engagement. The clarity of the two-factor model of organi-

zational justice was clouded with the introduction of interactional justice, defined as the interpersonal treatment people receive as procedures are enacted (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is fostered when decision makers treat people with respect and sensitivity and explain the rationale for decisions thoroughly. Although some researchers have treated interactional justice as a third type of justice (e.g., Aquino, 1995; Barling & Phillips, 1993; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tata & Bowes-Sperry, 1996), others have considered it a subset of procedural justice (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Tyler & Bies, 1990). Still others have used separate measures of procedural and interactional justice but have combined them because of high intercorrelations (e.g., Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; Skarlicki & Latham, 1997). Thus, it is currently unclear whether organizational justice is best depicted by two or three factors.

H1: Organizational Justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior

H1a: Distributive Justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

H1b: Procedural Justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

H1c: interactional Justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

3. Employee Engagement

Employee engagement considered as direct predictor of financial Performance and success of any organization (Baumruk 2004; Harter et al. 2002; Richman 2006). On the other side, it is also fact that currently employee engagement is towards decreasing trend as organizations and workers both tend to be more materialistic (Bates 2004; Richman 2006). There is vast engagement gap can be seen at work places (Bates 2004; Johnson 2004). Employee engagement may leads to organizational citizenship behavior as it focuses on employee involvement and commitment which certainly lies outside the given parameters of any organization. Rukhum (2010) found a positive relationship between employee engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). The dimensions of OCB are in fact characteristic of employee engagement, but the most strongly co-related OCB dimension with employee engagement is “taking initiatives individually” which refers going an extra-mile (Dicke, 2010). Nevertheless, literature illustrates several criticisms on this relationship as well. According to (Saks, 2006) OCB deviates from employee engagement with a point of view that OCB involves voluntary behaviors that are beyond the job requirements whereas employee engagement is a

formal role of an employee to perform. It is in fact not an element of employees’ job description going for extra role behavior. Dicke (2010) that going an extra mile is a general description of employee engagement which represents a voluntary behavior and defined Saks’s statement that it is “one’s formal role performance”.

H2: Employee Engagement has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis

S.No	Variable Name	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
1	Altruism (Alt)	.920	5
2	Civic Virtue (CV)	.893	4
3	Conscientiousness (Con)	.784	5
4	Courtesy (Cor)	.876	5
5	Sportsmanship (Spo)	.793	3
6	Distributive Justice	.769	4
7	Procedural Justice	.978	7
8	Interactional justice	.753	5
9	Employees Engagement	.715	6

4. Results

The above table of reliably show that the respective items asked each variable for measurement. There were 5 items for measuring the variable Altruism with Cronbach's alpha value .920 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable for measuring the variable altruism. There were 4 items for measuring the variable Civic Virtue with Cronbach's alpha value .893 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable for measuring the variable civic virtue. There were 5 items for measuring the variable conscientiousness with Cronbach's alpha value .784 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable for measuring the variable conscientiousness.

There were 5 items for measuring the variable Courtesy with Cronbach's alpha value .876 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable for measuring the variable courtesy. Sportsmanship variable was measured by 3 items with cornbach alpha value of .793 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable. There were 5 items for measuring the variable Courtesy with Cronbach's alpha value .876 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable for measuring the variable courtesy. Sportsmanship variable was measured by 3 item with Cornbach's alpha value of .793 representing that the questions asked were highly reliable

Table 2: Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.536 ^a	0.426	0.402	0.68466	0.426	143.105	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice, Employee Engagement

The above table of model summary show that $R=.536$ represents that there is 53.6% correlation between Organizational Justice, employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. The value of R square is 0.426 representing that 42.6% variance in the Organizational Citizenship behavior has been explained by organizational justice and Employee Engagement. The value of F statistics is 143.105 with p-value =.000 representing that the model is highly statistically significant

Table 3: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.313	0.16		8.232	.000
	OJ	0.573	0.047	0.636	12.252	.000
	EE	0.438	0.148	0.389	6.758	.000

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

The above table of coefficients show that $\beta=0.573$ for Organizational Justice showing that one unit increase in Organizational Justice causes .573% change in the organizational citizenship behavior. The value of $\beta=0.438$ for employee engagement showing that one unit increase in employee engagement causes .438% change in the organizational citizenship behavior. For Organizational Justice the value of t at 5% significance level is 12.252 with $p=.000$ representing that organizational justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. For employee engagement the value of t at 5% significance level is 6.758 with $p=.000$ representing that employee engagement has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 4: Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.348 ^a	0.385	0.369	0.57646	0.385	37.57	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive_Justice, Procedural_Justice, Interactional_Justice

The above table of model summary show that $R=.348$ represents that there is 34.8% correlation between Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The value of R square is 0.385 representing that 38.5% variance in the Organizational Citizenship behavior has been explained by distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice and Employee Engagement. The value of F statistics is 37.57 with p-value =.000 representing that the model is highly statistically significant

Table 5: Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.313	0.16		8.232	.000
	DJ	0.349	0.032	0.324	5.481	.020
	PJ	0.469	0.207	0.451	4.683	.003
	IJ	0.538	0.164	0.498	8.683	.035

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

The above table of coefficients show that $\beta=0.349$ for Distributive Justice showing that one unit increase in distributive justice causes .349% change in the organizational citizenship behavior. The value of $\beta=0.469$ for procedural justice showing that one unit increase in procedural justice causes .469% change in the organizational citizenship behavior. The value of $\beta=0.538$ for procedural justice showing that one unit increase in procedural justice causes .538% change in the organizational citizenship behavior. For Distributive Justice the value of t at 5% significance level is 5.481 with $p=.02$ representing that distributive justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. For Procedural Justice the value of t at 5% significance level is 4.683 with $p=.003$ representing that procedural justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. For interactional justice the value of t at 5% significance level is 8.683 with $p=.035$ representing that interactional justice has significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

5. Conclusion

The aim of the study was to find out the effect of organizational justice and employee engagement on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational justice was further explained or supported by three facets i.e distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Results of the study showed that both organizational justice and employee engagement had significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior of teaching staff at private sector universities in Peshawar. Since there were three facets for measuring organizational justice i.e distributive, procedural and interactional justice. They also had significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior of teaching staff of private sector universities in Peshawar.

6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

There are a few limitations that were faced while conducting the study. The study was only conducted in Peshawar, it could have been better that the study be conducted in whole Pukhtoonkhwa province. The sample size is also a limitation it can be increased in suitable circumstances by collecting data from more private sector universities in the province. The study was cross sectional in nature. In future the researchers should put more effort to get results with increased sample size by collecting data from more private sector universities. The researchers should try to expand the span of research on the same topic to other cities of the Pakistan as well, for the purpose to get more insight into the citizenship behavior of faculty members in private sector universities.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology*, 127, 649-656
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology*, 127, 649-656
- Bates, S. (2004). Getting engaged. *HR Magazine*, 49 (2).
- Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success. *Workspan*, Vol. 47, pp. 48-52.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 199-218.
- Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. (1991). Procedural justice and worker motivation. In R. M. Steers & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (5th ed., pp. 131-143). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-149.
- Dicke, C. (2010). Employee engagement: I want it, what is it?
- Harter, J., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. in *experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 91-131). New York: Academic Press. interaction (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Johnson, G. (2004). Otherwise engaged. *Training*, 41 (10), 4.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances*.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social*.
- Greenberg, M., & Willis, R. (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Maslach, C., Schaufelli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- Moorman, R.H. & Blakely, G..L. (1995). Individualism and collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it? *Workspan*, Vol 49, pp36-39.
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-619.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.

- Sweeney, P., & McFarlin, D. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "end" and the means": An examination of four models of distributive justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- Tata, J., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (1996). Emphasis on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice: Differential perceptions of men and women. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 1327-1330.
- Thibaut, & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Turnipseed, D.L., & Murkison, E. (2000). A bi-cultural comparison of organizational citizenship behavior: Does the OCB phenomenon transcend national culture. *Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8, 200-222.