

# Promoting organizational citizenship behaviors: Relative effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived managerial fairness

Alper Ertürk

*Gebze Institute of Technology, Department of Business Administration, Turkey*

Cengiz Yılmaz

*Gebze Institute of Technology, Department of Business Administration, Turkey*

Adnan Ceylan

*Gebze Institute of Technology, Department of Business Administration, Turkey*

## **Abstract**

The study examines the joint and relative effects of procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction upon organizational citizenship behaviors of blue-collar workers in manufacturing industry. The basic postulate of our research is that, employee perceptions of managerial fairness (i.e., distributive justice and procedural justice) will surpass the effects of the traditional attitudinal factors (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as they jointly influence organizational citizenship behaviors. Results of hierarchical regression analysis provide strong support for our central research thesis: among the four major antecedent constructs, employee perceptions of distributive justice are found to exert the strongest effect on organizational citizenship behaviors of the blue collar workers in our sampling context. Based on these results, we suggest that incorporating contingency explanations for workplace, job, and general environmental conditions could contribute substantially to the current state of knowledge about methods of promoting organizational citizenship in the workplace. Managerial and theoretical implications of study findings are discussed.

## 1. Introduction

Management literature (both academic and professional) has begun to dedicate considerable attention to understanding the dynamics of and to develop normative theories of extra-role employee behaviors that are thought to contribute positively to overall organizational performance (e.g., Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983; Organ, 1988; Schnake, 1991; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). One form of such behaviors that seems to have received unprecedented excitement from practicing managers is *organizational citizenship behaviors* (hereafter, OCBs). Defined originally 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” (Organ, 1988: 4), OCBs are generally conceptualized as comprising a large set of prosocial employee contributions that (1) are thought to enhance organizational effectiveness and (2) transcend beyond those recognized by the organizations formal incentive system (Organ and Konovsky, 1989). Specific examples of OCB type employee behaviors include helping co-workers, volunteering for extra-role activities, and participating proactively in all forms of workplace activities that are pro-organization, as well as avoidance from dysfunctional workplace behaviors such as engaging in arguments with co-workers and complaining about workplace conditions (Organ, 1990). Accordingly, Schake (1991) defines OCBs as functional, extra-role, prosocial employee behaviors directed at various targets that constitute the organization (i.e., individuals, groups, functional departments, etc.) and/or the entire organization.

The vital importance of OCBs for organizational productivity has long been recognized by practicing managers (e.g., Katzell and Yankelovich, 1975). Integrating decades of research in this area, Cohen and Vigoda (2000) note that OCBs improve organizational effectiveness through a multitude of ways. According to these authors, a non-exhaustive list of the various ‘benefits’ of OCBs include: (a) improved co-worker and managerial productivity, (b) superior efficiency in resource use and allocation, (c) reduced maintenance expenses, (d) better coordination of organizational activities across individuals, groups, and functional departments, (e) improved organizational attractiveness for high-quality new recruits, (f) increased stability in the organization’s performance, and (g) enhanced organizational capability to adapt effectively to environmental changes.

MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and their colleagues (MacKenzie *et al.*, 1991, 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Hui, 1993) have also suggested several reasons why managers may value OCBs and take them into account when evaluating employee performance. Some of the reasons have to do with

norms of reciprocity and fairness, some have to do with the way managers form their evaluations, and others have to do with the informational distinctiveness and accessibility of OCB information in memory.

Nonetheless, while it is evident that OCBs are crucial determinants of an organization's effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, and overall performance, research about the specific factors that promote OCBs under differing economic and organizational contexts seems to suggest equivocal solutions for practicing managers. More importantly, a majority of the existing works on the determinants of OCBs have been conducted in the United States or Western Europe. It is therefore essential to explore the relative effects of the various potential antecedents of OCBs under different economic and cultural context. The present study contributes to the literature by exploring the relative effects of (1) job satisfaction, (2) organizational commitment, (3) perceived distributive fairness, and (4) perceived procedural fairness on the emergence of OCBs across blue-collar workers in the Turkish manufacturing industry.

## 2. Literature review

Since the introduction of the concept in the early 1980s (e.g., Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983), the notion of OCBs has received substantial research attention in the organizational sciences (e.g., Becker and Vance, 1993; Moorman, 1991 and 1993; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Schappe, 1998; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, 2000; Alotaibi, 2001). More recently, emphasis in OCB research seems to have shifted from attempts to delineate the conceptual domain of the construct and the importance of OCBs for organizational performance toward understanding the specific factors that contribute to the emergence of various different forms of OCBs. Among the most prominent factors identified as determinants of OCBs are job satisfaction (Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Bateman and Organ, 1983) and organizational commitment (Carson and Carson, 1998; Munene, 1995; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Schappe, 1998). In addition, variables such as job involvement, organizational trust, and fairness perceptions, as well as several demographic variables such as age, gender, and organizational tenure, have been suggested as affecting OCBs (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990; Munene, 1995; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).

As Organ and Konovsky (1989) assert, employee perceptions of the degree of fairness in the workplace might be particularly important to the emergence of OCBs, since fair treatment is expected to result in a dramatic shift in the employees' mindsets concerning the nature of their

relationships with their respective organizations and give rise to employee responses compatible with social exchange principles where norms of fairness and reciprocity prevail. Unfair treatment, on the other hand, will promote a solely economic exchange orientation. Thus, research in this area has begun to focus on the specific effects of both (1) perceived fairness in the procedures employed in organizations affecting employees, that is, *procedural fairness* (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman, Niehoff and Organ, 1993; Alotaibi, 2001), and (2) perceived equity in the distribution of rewards, that is, *distributive fairness* (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Alotaibi, 2001), on the emergence of OCBs.

Interestingly, however, studies conducted by Schappe (1998), Konovsky and Pugh (1994), and George (1991) have failed to find a significant effect of fairness perceptions on OCBs. A closer review of OCB research conducted in differing organizational settings would in fact reveal that no single antecedent factor has consistently been found to significantly influence OCBs. Even the widely accepted attitudinal factors such as organizational commitment (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Tansky, 1993; Alotaibi, 2001) and job satisfaction (Schappe, 1998; Alotaibi, 2001) have sometimes been found unrelated to OCBs. More importantly, works attempting to incorporate multiple antecedent factors in their empirical models and investigate the relative effects of each have also yielded mixed results. For example, empirical studies by Organ (1988) and Moorman (1993) suggest that when fairness perceptions and job satisfaction are measured together, fairness perceptions explain a greater portion of the observed variance in OCBs; whereas follow-up works by Organ and Ryan (1995) and Pond III *et al.* (1997) fail to demonstrate that fairness perceptions are capable of explaining a unique variance in OCBs in cases where both organizational commitment and job satisfaction are incorporated in empirical analyses. Also, Farh *et al.* (1997) examined the different forms of citizenship behavior observed in Taiwan and the potential moderating effect that traditionality and modernity had on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior.

It is therefore reasonable to assert that the specific antecedent factors that give rise to OCBs, as well as the relative effect of each antecedent factor, will be dependent upon a variety of situational factors pertaining to the organizational and general environmental context. Concerning the relative effects of fairness perceptions and job attitudes, we posit that employee perceptions of managerial fairness will emerge as more important determinant of OCBs than the traditional attitudinal factors (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as they jointly influence organizational citizenship behaviors.

Note, for instance, that, in a meta-analytic review of 55 studies involving the attitudinal and dispositional predictors of OCBs, Organ and Ryan (1995) find job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions as the sole correlates of OCBs among a large number of potential antecedents. Indeed, a vast majority of prior research posits employee attitudinal dispositions, particularly job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as the *primary driving factors* for the emergence of OCBs (Schappe, 1998; Williams and Anderson, 1991). In addition, in their meta analysis, Podsakoff and his colleagues mentioned the relationships between OCBs and the following antecedent variables: trust in one's leader, perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, 'core' transformational leadership behavior, articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, and intellectual stimulation (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, 2000).

Consider, then, a manager seeking to promote employee OCBs. Should the manager focus on managing employee perceptions of fairness in the organization? Or, should the manager put more effort on maintaining a highly satisfied and committed workforce? These questions warrant further empirical research.

Following previous studies' findings already outlined, our expectation was that organizational commitment, job satisfaction and fairness perceptions would contribute positively to OCBs. Furthermore, we also suggested that employee perceptions of managerial fairness will emerge as more important determinants of OCBs than job satisfaction and organizational commitment as they jointly influence organizational citizenship behaviors. Consequently, the major hypotheses tested in this study were:

- H1: Organizational commitment is positively related to OCBs.
- H2: Job satisfaction is positively related to OCBs.
- H3: Procedural justice is positively related to OCBs.
- H4: Distributive justice is positively related to OCBs.
- H5: As they jointly influence OCBs, procedural justice has greater effect on OCBs than organizational commitment and job satisfaction.
- H6: As they jointly influence OCBs, distributive justice has greater effect on OCBs than organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Procedure and sample

In this study, we explore the relative effects job satisfaction, organizational commitment, procedural fairness, and distributive fairness on the OCBs of blue-collar workers in manufacturing industry.

Questionnaires were used to collect data from blue-collar employees. Employees were asked about their perception of justice, organizational commitment and job satisfaction levels, as well as organizational citizenship behaviors that they showed. Data was recorded on written forms. Some demographic data was also collected, such as age, gender, tenure in the organization and education level. No personal data was collected except demographics.

First, each questionnaire was translated from English into Turkish with the assistance of official translators, and then back-translated into English. After a few minor modifications, we administered the questionnaires to randomly selected 15 blue-collar workers for a pilot survey. During pilot survey testing, the questions were proved to be easily understood by blue-collar workers, who generally gave full responses.

Next, questionnaires were mailed to a sampling frame of 150 blue-collar employees selected randomly from three manufacturing companies operating in İstanbul and Kocaeli. Included within each questionnaire packet was a cover letter and a return envelope addressed directly to the researchers to assure respondent confidentiality and anonymity.

Of the 150 distributed, 107 usable questionnaires returned, yielding an effective response rate of 71%. As to the characteristics of the final sample, 40 respondents are female and 67 respondents are male, the mean respondent age is 31.2 with a standard deviation of 5.73, and the mean respondent organizational tenure is 5.02 with a standard deviation of 3.28.

#### 3.2. Measures

All constructs are measured using seven-point Likert scales with anchors strongly disagree (= 1) and strongly agree (= 7). Measurement items are provided in the appendix.

*Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.* In order to measure the level of OCBs by our respondents, we used selected items from the 'Citizenship Behavior Scale' developed by Smith *et al.* (1983) and used by Schappe (1998) (e.g., "I help others who have heavy work loads", "I willingly give of my time to help others who have work related problems"). The selected five items were subjected to an exploratory

factor analysis and a single factor was extracted using an eigenvalue of 1 as the cut-off point. Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale is 0.68.

*Organizational Commitment.* Based on Mowday *et al.* (1979), organizational commitment is conceptualized as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization,” and is measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (e.g., “I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization”, “I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar”, “I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for”). Cronbach alpha of the fifteen-item scale is calculated as 0.93.

*Job Satisfaction.* We used an 18-item scale adopted from Brayfield and Rothe (1951) to measure job satisfaction (e.g., “My job is like a hobby to me”, “I enjoy my work more than my leisure time”, “I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job”). Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale is 0.92.

*Procedural Justice.* Procedural justice is measured with a 15-item scale adopted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) (e.g., “Job decisions are made by the manager in an unbiased manner”, “To make job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information”, “My general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees”). This scale measures the degree of fairness in the formal and informal procedures applied by the supervisor and the upper management. Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale is 0.95.

*Distributive Justice.* A five-item scale adopted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) is used to measure distributive justice. The questions assess the perceived fairness of work outcomes regarding pay, workload, and task responsibilities (e.g., “I think that my level of pay is fair”, “I consider my work load to be quite fair”). Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale is 0.95.

#### 4. Analyses

We first conducted an exploratory factor analysis (using varimax rotation) of all measurement items. Consistent with our expectations, all items loaded (1) with high-standardized coefficients onto their respective factors and (2) with substantially lower standardized coefficients on other factors. In addition, the coefficient alpha estimates for all the scales are greater than the recommended level of 0.70, except for the OCB scale, which has a reliability of 0.68. We therefore decided that the measures have adequate internal consistency and computed composite scores (i.e., averages of item scores in a scale) of each scale for use in further analyses. The means, standard deviations, reliability estimates and

interrelations of all variables are displayed in Table 1. Factor loadings of items in scales are summarized in the Appendix.

Next, we performed a series of (hierarchical) regression analyses to explore the relative portions of unique variances in OCBs accounted for by each antecedent factor—i.e., procedural justice, distributive justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This procedure provides a unique partitioning of the total variance accounted for in a dependent variable by a set of predictors (Cohen and Cohen, 1983). The first regression model included the two demographic indicators of respondent age and organizational tenure as control variables. Next, each predictor variable was added to the model in a step-by-step procedure in order to assess the unique explanatory power of each. Variables were included in the model in the order of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, procedural justice, and distributive justice. The resulting parameter estimates and the incremental variance explained in OCBs in each model are presented in Table 2.

#### 4. Results

As shown in Table 1, correlations among all variables reveal that organizational commitment, job satisfaction, procedural justice and distributive justice are significantly positively related to OCBs ( $r = 0.345$ ,  $r = 0.343$ ,  $r = 0.447$ ,  $r = 0.548$  respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ). Therefore, our first hypothesis that organizational commitment is positively related to OCBs, our second hypothesis that job satisfaction is positively related to OCBs, our third hypothesis that procedural justice is positively related to OCBs, and our fourth hypothesis that distributive justice is positively related to OCBs were supported.

**Table 1**  
Means, Standart Deviations, Reliability Coefficients and  
Interrelations of All Variables

	Mean	Std. Dev.	OCB	Org. Com.	Job Sat.	Dist. Just.	Proc. Just.	Age
OCB	2.28	0.48	(0.68) <sup>a</sup>					
Org.Com.	3.05	0.61	.345 <sup>***</sup>	(0.93) <sup>a</sup>				
Job Satis.	3.89	0.74	.343 <sup>***</sup>	.844 <sup>***</sup>	(0.92) <sup>a</sup>			
Dist.Just.	2.53	0.69	.548 <sup>***</sup>	.556 <sup>***</sup>	.428 <sup>***</sup>	(0.95) <sup>a</sup>		
Proc.Just.	2.61	0.26	.447 <sup>***</sup>	.816 <sup>***</sup>	.646 <sup>***</sup>	.668 <sup>***</sup>	(0.95) <sup>a</sup>	
Age	31.2	5.73	-.008	.412 <sup>***</sup>	.415 <sup>***</sup>	.032	.215 <sup>*</sup>	-
Tenure	5.02	3.14	.111	.427 <sup>***</sup>	.451 <sup>***</sup>	.009	.286 <sup>**</sup>	.689 <sup>***</sup>

Notes: <sup>a</sup> Cronbach alpha reliabilities for observed variables.

<sup>\*</sup> Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level.



**Table 2**  
Hierarchical Regression Analysis with OCB as Dependant Variable

Step	Variable	Beta	T	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	F
1	Control Variable (Age)	-.160	-1.200			
	Control Variable (Tenure)	.221	1.661	.026	-	1.383
2	Age	-.249	-1.963			
	Tenure	.112	.878	.152	.126	6.167***
	Organizational Commitment	.399	3.918***			
3	Age	-.254	-2.002*			
	Tenure	.092	.714			
	Organizational Commitment	.233	1.370	.165	.013	5.020***
	Job Satisfaction	.209	1.221			
4	Age	-.178	-1.435			
	Tenure	.075	.603			
	Organizational Commitment	.229	1.030	.235	.070	6.228***
	Job Satisfaction	.267	1.610			
	Procedural Justice	.477	3.067**			
5	Age	-.173	-1.511			
	Tenure	.185	1.582			
	Organizational Commitment	.303	1.472			
	Job Satisfaction	.258	1.682	.355	.120	9.168***
	Procedural Justice	.188	1.189			
	Distributive Justice	.483	4.299***			

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

As mentioned above, we performed a series of (hierarchical) regression analysis to test our fifth and sixth hypotheses. As shown in Table 2, the first model investigated involves the two control variables only, that is, employee age and organizational tenure, as predictors of OCBs, and both variables are found to be nonsignificantly related to OCBs. After the inclusion of organizational commitment at the second stage, however, the amount of explained variance in OCBs increases by 12.6% to an overall level of 15.2. Hence, it appears that organizational commitment explains a unique variance in OCBs. However, after the addition of job satisfaction as a predictor variable in the third stage, (1) the standardized regression coefficient linking organizational commitment to OCBs drops to the point of being nonsignificant at the traditional .05 level, (2) job satisfaction is also found to be unrelated to the emergence of OCBs, and (3) the incremental variance explained is negligible ( $\Delta R^2 = 0.013$ ). Thus, while these findings can be attributed to potential effects of a possible multicollinearity (since organizational commitment and job satisfaction are highly correlated), the fact that the regression coefficient linking organizational commitment to OCBs is

largely attenuated after the inclusion of job satisfaction suggests that the two variables explain the same portion of the observed variance in OCBs.

As expected, the inclusion of procedural justice in the fourth stage and distributive justice in the fifth stage yields a significant change in the amount of variance explained in OCBs ( $\Delta R^2 = 0.070$  for procedural justice and  $\Delta R^2 = 0.120$  for distributive justice). Thus, employee perceptions of both forms of justice in managerial practices appear as relatively stronger determinants of OCBs than organizational commitment and job satisfaction in our sampling context. More importantly, a closer look into the results of the final model should reveal that, after the inclusion of distributive justice in the fifth stage, all other antecedent factors (procedural justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment) drop to the point of being nonsignificantly related to OCBs, with distributive justice remaining as the strongest predictor of OCBs that has statistical significance (the standardized regression coefficient for distributive justice is 0.483,  $p < 0.001$ ). Thus, it appears that distributive fairness is the most important driver of OCBs in our sampling context, perhaps mediating the effects of employee perceptions of procedural fairness and attitudinal dispositions. Therefore, these results supported our fifth hypothesis that procedural justice has greater effect on OCBs than organizational commitment and job satisfaction and our sixth hypothesis that distributive justice has greater effect on OCBs than organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

## 5. Discussions and conclusion

The purpose of our research was to explore the joint and relative effects of procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction upon organizational citizenship behaviors of blue-collar workers in manufacturing industry. We examined the relative effects of these major determinants of employee OCBs in such a specific sampling context in order to contribute to the emerging contingency-based theoretical articulations of OCBs.

Our findings reveal that organizational commitment, job satisfaction, procedural justice and distributive justice have positive effects on OCBs. Our findings also reveal that, while organizational commitment and procedural justice are important determinants of OCB type behaviors, distributive justice exerts the strongest effect on the OCBs of blue collar workers in our sampling context, surpassing the effects of others. Thus all of our six hypotheses were supported.

Consistent with our expectations, employees put more emphasis on the fairness of the managerial practices, particularly on the perceived equity of managerial practices in reward distribution, than on the traditional determinants of OCBs such as job satisfaction and

organizational commitment. We find that the effects of employee job attitudes and even perceptions of procedural justice on OCBs are largely attenuated when distributive justice perceptions are controlled for. It is therefore highly possible that job attitudes and perceived fairness of managerial procedures may have indirect effects on employee OCBs through distributive fairness perceptions. That is, favorable job attitudes and procedural fairness judgments might result in enhanced perceptions of distributive justice, thereby fostering OCBs. Indeed, the growing body of research about the role of managerial justice on employee attitudinal and behavioral responses suggest that promoting distributive justice may enable organizations to utilize more fully the capacities of individuals within the system by allowing individuals to realize their aspirations and contributions and motivating and activating behaviors that lead to innovation, cooperation, and contribution (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Moorman, 1991; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993; Greenberg, 1994; Lowe and Vodanovich, 1995; Cobb and Frey, 1996; Konovsky, 2000). Thus it is extremely important that the reward system be perceived as fair by employees.

Research in this area demonstrated the effect and importance of perceived fairness on the emergence of OCBs in different cultures (e.g. Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman, Niehoff and Organ, 1993; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Alotaibi, 2001). Similarly, research conducted in Turkey showed that perceived managerial fairness had strong effect on OCBs and extra-role behaviors (e.g., Wasti, 2001; Özen İşbaşı, 2001; Ertürk, 2003). This study improved the results of the studies conducted in Turkish culture by showing that employee perceptions of managerial fairness (i.e., distributive justice and procedural justice) surpass the effects of the other traditional attitudinal factors (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as they jointly influence organizational citizenship behaviors.

These studies demonstrate that Turkish employees consider managerial fairness as the most important factor among the other managerial and attitudinal factors. For that reason, managers should focus on managing employee perceptions of procedural and distributive fairness in the organization. Fairness should be one of the foremost thoughts of top management to maintain and increase the extra-role behaviors of the employees in Turkey. In order to achieve this, managers should spell out all procedures in writing and clearly communicate them before bringing them into force. Additionally, since individuals might perceive managerial fairness differently based upon their own personal experiences, managers must convince employees that the distribution of rewards and duties is realized fairly.

People tend to be more satisfied with outcomes they perceive to be fair than with those they perceive to be unfair. In addition, people may compare the adequacy of the rewards they receive to their expectations, or referent standards. Thus, if employees feel discontent in what they receive compared to those of a referent other, they are more likely to behave negative. According to the results of this study, distributive justice has greater effect on OCBs than procedural justice. If employees receive fair pay or rewards when they deserve them, they would also evaluate procedures fairly. In other words, the fairness of a procedure can be assessed in terms of the expected value-outcome that employees receive. Employees may not be interested in procedures or rules. They are just interested in the rewards they get receive. Thus, distributive justice plays a more vital role in employees' work-related extra-role behaviors than does procedural justice. So, top management must persuade all employees that the equity and fairness are given the top priority and come first among all issues in the organization. Managers should worry less about the procedures and rules and should concentrate more on providing fair reward allocation and distribution. If employees perceive that they are treated fairly and get fair rewards, they can overlook minor inconveniences and show extra-role behaviors.

Our results highlight the need for developing contingency approaches for explaining the emergence of prosocial employee behaviors in organizations. Empirical investigations of the antecedent factors that give rise to employee behaviors that are pro-co-workers, pro-management, and pro-organization in different cultures contexts, organizational settings, economic infrastructures, and institutional structures are likely to contribute substantially to our understanding of the OCB phenomenon. Research should also focus on the individual and organizational-level consequences of OCBs under differing conditions.

Organizational citizenship behaviors and similar extra-role behaviors have been proven to have important effects on the effectiveness, efficiency and profitability of the companies. Most organizations in all business sectors are trying to stay alive under such unstable and uncertain economic conditions. Therefore, this fact increases the importance of organizational citizenship and extra-role behaviors and makes those factors more and more crucial for the future of organizations.

The presumption that 'usual suspects' such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment are the primary determinants of all forms of employee responses under all possible conditions has long been proven false, and much further research is necessary to develop a comprehensive theory of OCBs and their potential value for organizations. Our study, however, is but one step towards understanding the OCB phenomenon.

Overall, the contributions of this research must be viewed in light of several limitations. The data used in this study were collected during the most influential days of the recent (February 2001) economic crisis in Turkey. Because substantial employee layoffs were realized in the firms in our sample during or shortly after the data collection, the psychological impact, such as strong feelings of job insecurity, might have affected employees' priorities. So, shifted priorities might have inflated the effect of perceived fairness on OCBs under these circumstances. Hence, this might be considered as one of the limitations of this study.

Another limitation is that all the data used in the study were acquired using the same questionnaire. Therefore, data related to OCBs were acquired from the employees as self-report instead of being acquired from the managers. This procedure might have led to common-method bias that might have inflated or deflated the relationships among factors. However, the fact that correlations among the factors vary from 0.34 to 0.84 (Table 1) shows that the strong affect of common-method bias is very unlikely.

Furthermore, due to time and financial constraints we faced, we could not select a random sample of employees within three private manufacturing organizations. Therefore, these results may not be considered as representative of the general manufacturing sector. Yet, despite the small sample size in the current study, our findings may prove useful for guiding future research. Also, broad studies across several private organizations are needed.

## References

- ALOTAIBI, A.G. (2001), "Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Study of Public Personnel in Kuwait", *Public Personnel Management*, 30, 363-77.
- BATEMAN, T. and ORGAN D.W. (1983), "Job Satisfaction and The Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee Citizenship", *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 586-95.
- BECKER, T.E. and VANCE, R.J. (1993), "Construct Validity of Three Types of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Illustration of the Direct Product Model with Refinements", *Journal of Management*, 19, 663-82.
- BRAYFIELD, A.H. and ROTHE, H.F. (1951), "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-11.
- CARSON, K.D., and CARSON, P.P. (1998), "Career Commitment, Competencies and Citizenship", *Journal of Career Assessment*, 6(2), 195-208.
- COBB, A.T., and FREY, F.M. (1996), "The Effects of Leader Fairness and Pay Outcomes on Superior/Subordinate Relations", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 1401-26.
- COHEN, J. and COHEN, P. (1983), "Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences", *Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum*.

- COHEN, A. And VIGODA, E. (2000), “Do Good Citizen Make Good Organizational Citizens? An Empirical Examination of The Relationship Between General Citizenship and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Israel”, *Administration and Society*, 32(5), 596-625.
- ERTÜRK, A. (2003). “Örgütsel Kimlik Algısı: Etkileyen Faktörler ve Sonuçları”, *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*, Gebze Institute of Technology.
- FARH, J.L., PODSAKOFF, P.M. and ORGAN, D.W. (1990), “Accounting For Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Leader Fairness and Task Scope Versus Satisfaction”, *Journal of Management*, 16, 705-21.
- FARH, J. L., EARLEY, P. C., and LIN, S. C. (1997), “Impetus for Action: A Cultural Analysis of Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Chinese Society”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-44.
- FOLGER, R., and KONOVSKY, M.A. (1989), “Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Decisions”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-30.
- GEORGE, J.M. (1991), “State of Trait: Effects of Positive Mood on Pro-Social Behavior at Work”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 299-307.
- GREENBERG, J. (1990), “Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow”, *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- (1993), “Justice and Organizational Citizenship: A Commentary on the State of the Science”, *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal*, 6, 18.
- (1994), “Using Socially Fair Treatment to Promote Acceptance of A Work Site Smoking Ban”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288-97.
- KATZELL, d. and YANKELOVICH, D. (1975), “Work, Productivity and Job Satisfaction”, *The Psychological Corporation*, New York, NY.
- KONOVSKY, M.A., and CROPANZANO, R. (1991), “Perceived Fairness of Employee Drug Testing as a Predictor of Employee Attitudes and Job Performance”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698-707.
- KONOVSKY, M.A., and PUGH, S.D. (1994), “Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-69.
- KONOVSKY, M.A. (2000), “Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations”, *Journal of Management*, 26, 489-511.
- LOWE, R.H., and VODANOVICH, S.J. (1995), “A Field Study of Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10, 99-114.
- MACKENZIE, S. B., PODSAKOFF, P. M., and FETTER, R. (1991), “Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Objective Productivity as Determinants of Managerial Evaluations of Salespersons’ Performance”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 123-50.
- MACKENZIE, S. B., PODSAKOFF, P. M., and FETTER, R. (1993), “The Impact Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior On Evaluations Of Sales Performance”, *Journal of Marketing*, 57: 70-80.
- MCFARLIN, D.B., and SWEENEY, P.D. (1992), “Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcome”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-37.
- MOORMAN, R.H. (1991), “Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-55.

- MOORMAN, R.H. (1993), "The Influence of Cognitive and Affective Based Job Satisfaction on the Relationship Between Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Human Relations*, 46, 759-76.
- MOORMAN, R.H., NIEHOFF, B.P., and ORGAN, D.W. (1993), "Treating Employees Fairly and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Sorting the Effects of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Procedural Justice", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-25.
- MOTOWIDLO, S.J. (1984), "Does Job Satisfaction Lead to Consideration and Personal Sensitivity?", *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 910-15.
- MOWDAY, R.T., PORTER, L.W., and STEERS, R.M. (1979), "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-47.
- (1982), "Employee Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover", New York: Academic Press.
- MUNENE, J.C. (1995), "Not-on-Seat: An Investigation of Some Correlates of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Nigeria", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 44(2), 111-22.
- NIEHOFF, B.P. and MOORMAN, R.H. (1993), "Justice as a Mediator of the Relationships Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-56.
- O'REILLY, C. and CHATMAN, J. (1986), "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Pro-Social Behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-9.
- ORGAN, D.W. (1988), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome", Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- (1990), "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 43-72.
- ORGAN, D.W. and KONOVSKY, M. (1989). "Cognitive versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-64.
- ORGAN, D.W. and LINGL, A. (1995), "Personality, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 339-50.
- ORGAN, D.W. and RYAN, K. (1995), "A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- ÖZEN İŞBAŞI, J. (2001). "Çalışanların Yöneticilerine Duydukları Güvenin ve Örgütsel Adaletle İlişkin Algılamalarının Vatandaşlık Davranışının Oluşumundaki Rolü", *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Ekim, 1(1): 51-73.
- PODSAKOFF, P. M., MACKENZIE, S. B., and HUI, C. (1993), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Managerial Evaluations of Employee Performance: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research", in G. R. Ferris and K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (Vol. 11): 1-40. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- PODSAKOFF, P. M., MACKENZIE, S. B., PAINE, J.B., and BACHRACH, D.G. (2000), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-63.

- POND III, S.B., NACOSTE, R.W., MOHR, M.F., and RODRIGUES, C.M. (1997). "The Measurement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Are We Assuming Too Much?", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(17), 1527-44.
- PUFFER, S.M. (1987), "Prosocial Behavior, Noncompliant Behavior, and Work Performance Among Commission Salespeople", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 615-21.
- SCHAPPE, S.P. (1998), "The Influence of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Fairness Perceptions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied*, 132, 277-91.
- SCHNAKE, M. (1991), "Organizational Citizenship: A Review Proposed Model and Research Agenda", *Human Relations*, 44, 735-59.
- SCHOLL, R.W. (1981), "Differentiating Organizational Commitment from Expectancy as a Motivating Force", *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 589-99.
- SMITH, A., ORGAN, D.W. and NEAR, J.W. (1983), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-63.
- SWEENEY, P.D., and MCFARLIN, D.B. (1993), "Workers' Evaluations of The 'Ends' and 'Means': An Examination of Four Models of Distributive and Procedural Justice", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- TANSKY, J.W. (1993), "Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What is the Relationship?", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 195-207.
- TURNIPSEED, D. (1996), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Examination of The Influence of The Workplace", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 17(2), 42-7.
- WASTI, A. (2001), "Örgütsel Adalet Kavramı ve Tercüme Bir Ölçeğin Türkçe'de Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Analizi", *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Ekim, 1 (1).
- WEINER, Y. (1982). "Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View", *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-28.
- WILLIAMS, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1991). "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and in-role Behaviors", *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-17.



### Appendix A

#### Factor Loadings of Items in Scales

Variable Question	OCB	Procedural Justice	Distributive Justice	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment
OCB 1	,781				
OCB 2	,714				
OCB 3	,775				
OCB4	,742				
OCB5	,583				
PJ 1		,844			
PJ 2		,784			
PJ 3		,629			
PJ 4		,832			
PJ 5		,701			
PJ 6		,881			
PJ 7		,942			
PJ 8		,825			
PJ 9		,518			
PJ 10		,923			
PJ 11		,786			
PJ 12		,679			
PJ 13		,868			
PJ 14		,719			
PJ 15		,813			
DJ 1			,704		
DJ 2			,878		
DJ 3			,754		
DJ 4			,639		
DJ 5			,907		
Explained Variance	%	% 77,000	% 74,875		
	68,900				

**Appendix A (continued)**

Variable Question	OCB	Procedural Justice	Distributive Justice	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment
JS 1				,814	
JS 2				,702	
JS 3				,822	
JS 4				,714	
JS 5				,802	
JS 6				,622	
JS 7				,473	
JS 8				,520	
JS 9				,867	
OC 1					,755
OC 2					,893
OC 3					,678
OC 4					,855
OC 5					,593
OC 6					,578
OC 7					,730
OC 8					,691
OC 9					,488
OC 10					,716
Explained Variance				% 67,753	% 74,875

## Appendix B

### Scale Items Used as Measures

#### *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Smith et al., 1983)*

1. I help others who have heavy work loads.
2. I help others who have been absent.
3. I willingly give of my time to help others who have work related problems.
4. I never take long lunches or breaks.
5. I do not take extra breaks.

#### *Organizational Commitment Scale (Mowday et al., 1979)*

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful.
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization. (R)
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar. (R)
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization. (R)
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely. (R)
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (R)
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.
14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part. (R)

*Job Satisfaction Scale (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951)*

1. My job is like a hobby to me.
2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.
3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.
4. I consider my job rather unpleasant. (R)
5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.
6. I am often bored with my job. (R)
7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
8. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work. (R)
9. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.
10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get. (R)
11. I definitely dislike my work. (R)
12. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.
13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
14. Each day of work seems like it will never end. (R)
15. I like my job better than the average worker does.
16. My job is pretty uninteresting. (R)
17. I find real enjoyment in my work.
18. I am disappointed that I ever took this job. (R)

*Procedural Justice Scale (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993)*

1. Job decisions are made by the general manager in an unbiased manner.
2. My general manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.
3. To make job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information.
4. My general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.
5. All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.
6. Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the general manager.
7. When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with kindness and consideration.
8. When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with respect and dignity.
9. When decisions are made about my job, the general manager is sensitive to my personal needs.

10. When decisions are made about my job, the general manager deals with me in a truthful manner.
11. When decisions are made about my job, the general manager shows concern for my rights as an employee.
12. Concerning decisions made about my job, the general manager discusses the implications of the decisions with me.
13. The general manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.
14. When making decisions about my job, the general manager offers explanations that make sense to me.
15. My general manager explains very clearly any decision made about my job.

*Distributive Justice Scale (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993)*

1. My work schedule is fair.
2. I think that my level of pay is fair.
3. I consider my work load to be quite fair.
4. Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.
5. I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.

### Özet

#### Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının arttırılması: İş tatmininin, örgütsel bağlılığın ve algılanan yönetimsel adaletin göreceli etkileri

Bu çalışma, prosedür adaletinin, dağıtım adaletinin, örgütsel bağlılığın ve iş tatmininin, imâlat endüstrisindeki mavi-yakalı çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki göreceli etkilerini incelemektedir. Araştırmamızın temel önermesi; birlikte düşünüldüklerinde çalışanlar tarafından algılanan yönetimsel adaletin (dağıtım adaleti ve prosedür adaleti) örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkilerinin, geleneksel davranışsal faktörlerin (iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık) etkilerinden daha fazla olduğudur. Yapılan hiyerarşik regresyon analizinin sonuçları, temel araştırma tezimize kuvvetli destek sağlamıştır: Dört ana faktör arasından, çalışanlar tarafından algılanan dağıtım adaletinin, örneklemimizi oluşturan mavi-yakalı çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerinde en fazla etkiye sahip olduğu bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlar, iş ortamı, işin kendisi ve genel çevre koşulları için yapılan önermeler geliştikçe, bunun iş ortamındaki örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları hakkındaki anlayışımızın da gelişeceğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca, çalışmanın uygulamaya ve teoriye yönelik sonuçları da belirtilmiştir.