

The Effects of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice Perception on Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Sait Gürbüz**

Abstract: *This study aims to determine the possible effects of job satisfaction and organizational justice perception on employees' organizational citizenship behavior. For this purpose, an empirical study was conducted with 380 public employees working in a public institution in Erzurum. According to the results of this study, job satisfaction has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational justice perception also influences organizational citizenship behavior, though not as much as job satisfaction. Nevertheless, when job satisfaction and organizational justice were analyzed together, the effect of organizational justice was found to be unrelated to the emergence of organizational citizenship behavior. Accordingly, it was decided that organizational justice perception has a mediating effect on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.*

Key Words: *Job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior.*

Introduction

The effects of the elements of organizational life on the behavior and attitudes of employees have been emphasized by organizational behavior researchers for many years. In recent years, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been considered to be one of the concepts that affect organizations in respect of the outcomes of the behavior and attitudes of employees. Today, the success of organizations in achieving their goals and objectives not only depends on their employees' fulfillment of their tasks and responsibilities specified in their formal job descriptions, but also on their attitudes and behavior that contribute to the organization's image, social stance, efficiency and effectiveness, which are stipulated neither in job descriptions nor in contracts. The importance of OCB stems from its relationship with certain variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational trust, etc.. Due to the facts that these behaviors, which have assumed importance in the literature and thus, have become the

* This study has been written by making use of the writer's Ph.D. dissertation accepted by Istanbul University The Institute of Social Sciences in 2007.

** Ph.D., Turkish General Staff Personnel Department.

subject of numerous studies as OCB in foreign literature in the last two decades, are not laid down in job descriptions and they do not have a direct relationship with reward systems, they are discretionary employee behaviors performed for the benefit of the organization.

The fundamental goal of Human Resources Management is to satisfy employees and to enhance their commitment to the organization in order to stimulate the display of OCB. Organization managers cannot force employees to exhibit such behaviors. Nevertheless, factors that lead to/affect OCB can be identified and the display of OCB by employees can be increased by the creation of a conducive environment via these factors. Among such factors, which have been conceptualized as the antecedents of OCB, job satisfaction and the perception of organizational justice are the primary ones.

The aim of this study is to reveal the possible impact of job satisfaction and the organizational justice perception on OCB which performed by employees. The study basically consists of three major sections. In the first section, a theoretical framework relating to OCB, job satisfaction and the perception of organizational justice is presented. The second section contains features of the sample and data gathering tool within the scope of the method of survey. The last section provides findings and results of the survey as well as suggestions.

Theoretical Framework

OCB, which was first introduced to business management literature in 1983, has become one of the most intensively studied topics in recent times (Bateman and Organ, 1983). The interest in OCB originates from its relationship with the variables of job satisfaction and the perception of organizational justice, which are deemed to have a direct and/or indirect effect on individual and organizational performance.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The definition, theoretical foundation, dimensions, antecedents and organizational outcomes of OCB comprise the subjects that are studied in depth in OCB literature. Dennis Organ (1988: 5) defines OCB as an individual behavior and effort beyond the standards and job definitions specified for him/her and extra-role behavior. The concept of discretion refers to the fact that such behaviors are those not required by the individual's role in the organization or his/her formal job description (İşbaşı, 2000: 4). According to Greenberg and Baron (1997: 372), OCB (organizational citizenship behavior) refers

to actions performed by employees that surpass the minimum role requirements expected by organizations. In view of these definitions, OCB can be expressed as individual behavior that is discretionary, noncompulsory, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and job descriptions and that ensures the efficient functioning of an organization. Here, the term 'non-compulsory' denotes that such behavior is optional and is not subject to any punishment when not performed.

Intense study of OCB especially in the last two decades stems from its importance for organizations. MacKenzie et al. (1998: 87-88) state that there are three main reasons for the intense study of OCB in recent years. The first reason is that performance resulting from OCB is taken into consideration while deciding promotion and wages during performance appraisals. Managers do not force employees to exhibit OCB, or resort to sanctions in order to make them display such behavior. Likewise, employees are not in expectation of any systematic reward as a consequence of their OCB. However, Organ (1997: 87) affirms that managers directly or indirectly consider OCB in Human Resources Management (HRM) practices and reward employee performance of OCB. The studies conducted in the context of the relationship of OCB with the functions of HRM are other indicators that support Organ's assertion (Chompookum and Derr, 2004: 406). The second reason is the contribution of OCB to the achievement and effectiveness of the organization. Considering the overall OCB in the long term, OCB behavior enhances organizational effectiveness and performance (Netemeyer and Boles, 1997: 89). Organ asserts that these behaviors are often internally motivated, arising from and sustained by an individual's intrinsic need for a sense of achievement, competence, belonging or affiliation (Organ, 1988: 27). Another factor that renders OCB important is the close relationship of OCB with job satisfaction, organizational justice, anti-citizenship behaviors and intention to quit.

Theoretical Foundations of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In business management literature, the reasons for and outcomes of most of the concepts are explained by referring to certain fundamental theories. Even though OCB was introduced to HRM and organizational behavioral science as late as the 1980s, various theories exist that constitute the foundation of this concept and facilitate its comprehension. Social Exchange Theory (SET) comes first among these theories.

Social Exchange Theory was developed by Blau in 1964 (Blau, 1964: 91). Social Exchange Theory constitutes the foundation of the OCB-based studies. Blau states that there are two types of social relationship in exchange process: social exchange relationship and economic exchange relationship. In the social exchange relationship, interpersonal relations are not based on certain obligations (Foa and Foa, 1980: 93). When a party transmits a resource to the other party, the other party is expected to respond in the same way. However, the timing and nature of the said response are based on the principle of voluntariness. Such discretionary behaviors (such as OCBs) are not compulsory. According to the SET, gains to be obtained by the parties as a result of exchange are not subject to bargaining. These resources are left up to the discretion of individuals. Besides, such resources are not expressed in monetary terms. Therefore, the basic and most crucial distinction that distinguishes social exchange from economic exchange is that social exchange entails unspecified obligations. The results generated by this exchange are the indicators of mutual trust and friendship (Organ et al., 2005: 54). Economic transaction rests on a formal contract that stipulates the exact quantities to be exchanged. The differences of exchange are clearly laid down. In this relationship, parties do not exhibit voluntary and collaborative behaviors unless stipulated. Organ (1990) states that when joining an organization, employees accept SET and they are enthusiastic to display organizational citizenship behavior. In this context, employees will continue to display OCBs as expected by the organization until they are compelled to exhibit economic exchange behavior (Organ, 1990: 44). Therefore, the display of OCB in respect of SET is a behavior, which is displayed against fair behavior and satisfactory working conditions. Otherwise, employees might exhibit retaliatory behaviors such as absenteeism and intention to quit (Organ, 1988: 27).

In view of fundamental theories used in explaining OCB and its theoretical development as well as the related studies, the causes why employees display OCB can be summarized as follows;

- ✓ When employees are satisfied with the existing practices and processes in the working environment and perceive justice and equality from their superiors, they develop a favorable attitude towards the organization and its managers and thus will display OCBs.
- ✓ An individual, who works under psychological contract, establishes a favorable relationship with the organization and exhibits OCB for the benefit of the organization. OCB may be in the form of organizational commitment, obedience to superi-

ors and collaboration. Therefore, if an employee has a highest level of participation and if he/she favorably perceives the psychological contract, he/she is expected to display OCB at a high level.

- ✓ If an employee believes that he/she will receive social approval and make himself/herself accepted as a result of his/her OCB, he/she may display OCB behavior.
- ✓ When an employee believes that he/she will get something in return for his/her favorable and voluntary behavior in the future and that OCB, which he/she has displayed throughout his/her career will bring him/her various rewards and promotion, he/she may display OCB.
- ✓ An employee may display OCB without expectations of reciprocity, willing to help coworkers because of his/her culture, value judgments and beliefs.

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ, who introduced the concept of OCB, found that various individual and organizational variables predicted two forms of OCB, namely generalized compliance and altruism (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 588). In his book published in 1988 (Organ, 1988: 25), Organ has theorized that OCB has five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, civic virtue and sportsmanship. Later, Organ defined three dimensions of OCB: helping, courtesy and conscientiousness (Organ, 1997). In the literature, it is observed that researchers, who conduct studies on OCB, mostly prefer the five dimensions suggested by Organ as the scale.

Altruism represents voluntary actions by an individual to help others with work-related problems (Podsakoff - MacKenzie, 1994: 351). It refers to assisting co-workers with their work tasks. Altruistic OCB involves helping coworkers who are inefficient at fulfilling their tasks; assuming the task of coworkers who are late to work because of health problems; assisting new coworkers in the process of their orientation; helping those with a heavy workload; helping peers with their work-related problems; providing coworkers with materials they need or, which they cannot acquire by themselves (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 513-563).

Conscientiousness, another variant suggested by Organ, is voluntary behavior, which surpasses the *minimum role* requirements of employees (Farh et al., 2004: 242). Conscientiousness refers to the willingness to perform beyond the minimal requirement in areas of

coming to work despite unfavorable weather conditions, not extending coffee-breaks very much, working overtime voluntarily, attending meetings not required by the job but that help its overall image, obeying the rules of an organization and department, saving organizational resources such as water, electricity and fuel (Podsakoff et al., 1993: 7).

Courtesy behaviors are "gestures that help someone else prevent a problem with communication and interaction such as warning, counseling and reminding (Organ, 1988: 47). The common characteristics of courtesy behaviors are that they are displayed in order to warn organization members before problems occur. Considering the effects of his/her actions or decisions on coworkers; providing other coworkers with information about important issues; respecting the rights and privileges of others within the organization and displaying reminding and counseling behaviors on general issues are OCB behaviors that fall within the scope of courtesy (Organ, 1988: 47; Podsakoff et al., 2000: 513).

Sportsmanship as a form of OCB relates to things people choose not to do such as avoiding any sort of unfavorable behavior that would lead to conflicts and tension or not complaining about trivial matters (Organ, 1990: 96). Sportsmanship refers to behaviors such as respecting coworkers, overestimating problems unnecessarily; trying to make the best of the situation, even if there are problems; assuming a constructive attitude towards organization-related problems; defending the image and activities of an organization outside the organization (Organ, 1988: 11).

Civic virtue is defined as active and responsible participation in the political life of the organization (Podsakoff - Mac Kenzie, 1994: 351). Civic virtue OCB can be listed as regularly attending and participating in meetings regarding the organization; supporting decisions made in line with the objectives of an organization; keeping pace with developments in the organization; playing an active role in other employees' adoption of organizational changes; making the utmost use of bulletin and notice boards in the organization; sharing his/her positive thoughts about the organization with coworkers; participating in self-development courses though not required to do so (Organ, 1988: 11).

Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Most of the studies relating to OCB focus on the factors that manifest OCB or, that motivate individuals to display such behavior. It can

be asserted that the existence of these antecedents-determinants increases the possibility of the display of OCB by employees, whereas their absence leads to a decrease in OCB. The first study on the antecedents of OCB was conducted by Smith et al. (1983). According to the study, the most powerful antecedent of OCB is job satisfaction. In the meta-analytical review of 55 studies, Organ and Ryan (1995: 775) found that the main antecedents of OCB are job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and leader support. Besides, empirical research conducted by Podsakoff et al. (2000: 513) focused on four major categories of antecedents: individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. George and Jones (1997: 153) suggest three levels of context including: individual (e.g., skill level, role definition); group (norms, goals) and organization (structure, policies and rewards).

In general, in an organization where OCB performance is high, the social functioning of the organization is smoother and conflicts among employees lessen. Thus, the effectiveness of the organization improves and its organizational performance develops in a favorable manner. Chen, Hui and Sego (1998: 923) asserted that in an organization, the existence of OCB leads to low labor turnover. Committed employees stay with the organization for longer terms; they perform high quality work and make significant contributions to the organization's achievement. Therefore, the spread of OCBs throughout an organization creates a better working environment that results in the commitment of employees, efficiency and low turnover (Cohen - Vigoda, 2000: 597-599). Cohen and Vigoda list the contributions of OCB to organizational achievement as follows;

- ✓ OCB enhances employee and organizational effectiveness.
- ✓ OCB prevents the exit of a highly skilled and/or high-potential employee from the organization.
- ✓ OCB ensures continuity of organizational performance.
- ✓ OCB ensures better coordination across groups, teams and individuals.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice first came onto the agenda with Equity Theory, which was put forward by Adams in 1960: It is basically related with the equity/justice perceived by employees in an organizational environment. In general, organizational justice can be defined as the employee's perception of justice concerning various practices

and activities of the organization (Greenberg, 1996: 24). According to Taylor, organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness of the distribution of justice and distribution of outcomes by decision-makers (Masterson et al., 2000). Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) define organizational justice as perceptions of the fairness of workplace outcomes or processes. Organizational justice appears in various processes of the work environment. Among these processes are organizational activities and programs, pay, reward or promotion opportunities, and interpersonal interaction.

Despite differences in approaches, in the literature, organizational justice consists of three sub-dimensions in general: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

Distributive Justice

The studies conducted on distributive justice in organizations have focused on employees' perceptions of fairness of organizational outcomes. Distributive justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness of outcome distributions (wage, reward, promotion, etc.) (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998: 25). Cohen defines distributive justice as "the allocation of resources among individuals, whose proportional shares are determined as to the specific functional rules and provisions under certain standards (Cohen, 1987:20). The subject of distributive justice is interpersonal acquisitions such as tasks, goods, wages, promotions, opportunities, rewards and punishment. Distributive justice, which refers to individuals' perceptions of fairness of the distribution of outcomes, gives an idea about whether the individual's acquisitions are fair, appropriate and ethical (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

Individuals may perceive their outcomes (income, incentives, promotion, social rights, etc.) as fair or unfair. They compare their outcomes with those of others. As a result of their comparison they may believe that they are treated unfairly. This belief influences their attitude; the 'feeling' part of their work. Then, their behavior, the 'doing' part of their work, may change towards the direction of their attitude. What is essential in distributive justice is that individuals should believe that they receive an equal share of the distributed resources. While initial studies on distributive justice were mostly conducted in the field of sociology and psychology, subsequent studies focused on the effects of employees' negative perceptions of distributive justice on their performance and attitude towards their job (Cohen, 1987: 24). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) found that employees' perceptions of unfairness have a negative impact on their job perfor-

mance and quality of the job. Besides, their OCB is replaced by nervous behavior.

Procedural Justice

Organizational justice researchers have conceptualized justice perceived from procedures and policies used in decision-making in the work environment as procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990: 399-432). In other words, such perceptions are related to the fairness of methods, policies and procedures employed in decision-making rather than the fairness of outcomes. While Folger and Cropanzano (1991:131) define procedural justice as justice perception of methods and procedures used in determining outcomes, according to Greenberg (1990: 402), these are perceptions relating to methods and policies. On the other hand, Konovsky (2000: 492) stated that procedural justice refers to how decisions for the distribution of outcomes are made: It is also related to subjective and objective situations.

As procedural justice refers to the employees' perception of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources, this type of justice is closely related with the procedures pursued by supervisors and leaders. Accordingly, a study has clearly revealed that procedural justice is in a stronger relationship with trust in management compared to distributive justice (Yilmaz, 2004: 20). Valuing employees' opinions and suggestions during various organizational processes and decisions is an important aspect of leader's justice. Hence, leaders not only get help from their subordinates, but also they show that they value their opinions and their voice is heard (Tyler, 1987: 333-344). Therefore, procedural justice is rather related to the perception of leadership justice. Studies reveal that if subordinates' opinions and suggestions are not sought and considered, employees perceive decision-making process as unfair (Van Dyne et al, 1998).

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice refers to the perception of the quality of treatment an employee receives when policies and procedures are implemented in the workplace (Bies - Moag, 1986: 43-55). Employees show much concern for the treatment they receive from authority figure and the adequacy with which formal decision making procedures are explained. Interactional justice describes the interaction between recipients that are affected by decisions and the allocators of distribution. Bies (2001: 93) defines interactional justice as the quali-

ty of interpersonal treatment employees experience when procedures are enacted. According to Barling and Michelle (1993: 649), interactional justice is the perception of justice relating to the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion. Employees expect supervisors to extend equal treatment to all members. They seek fair interaction with the organization. Supervisors or allocators, who treat some employees with respect, but the other rudely, are not perceived as fair. Therefore, justice is built as a result of supervisors' treatment towards their subordinates with respect and dignity (Folger - Bies, 1989: 79-90).

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Along with job satisfaction and organizational commitment, organizational justice is one of the leading antecedents of OCB (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). The relationship between organizational justice and OCB is basically described by the social exchange relationship between an employee and organization. When an employee's perception of justice with regard to organizational procedures and processes is favorable, then he/she believes that the organization values and respects him/her. This initial attitude and behavior, which an employee develops, might result in the employee's psychological attachment to the organization and his/her positive, voluntary and collaborative behavior, i.e. the display of OCB.

Folger (1977) described the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior on the basis of Cognitive Attribution Theory. In Folger's view, unfairness perceived as a result of an employee's comparison of his/her outcomes with outcomes of coworkers or groups, whom he/she takes as a reference, leads to various reactions (Folger, 1977: 163). Apart from verbal reactions, employees' reactions to interactional justice cues may be emotional and behavioral too. In their studies, which they conducted on the basis of Folger's (1977) finding in question, Organ (1988), Smith et al. (1983), Barr and Pawar (1995) and Moorman (1991) found that one of the explicit reactions of employees against perceived organizational injustice was the withdrawal of one's organizational citizenship activities/not performing OCB. Organ (1988) and Moorman (1991) explained in terms of Adams' Equity Theory why employees avoid performing OCB when they perceive organizational injustice. In their view, when employees do not fulfill their tasks stipulated in their job description, not only they will face

various forms of sanction, but also they will not be able to benefit from formal rewards. Instead, they prefer not to display OCB, which is easier and less risky.

The studies investigating the relationship of perceived organizational justice with OCB have different findings. While Moorman et al., (1998: 354) found that perceived organizational support serves as an intermediary between OCB and procedural justice, Tansky (1993: 204) revealed that altruism was the only dimension of fairness to relate to OCB. Another survey conducted by Farh et al. (1990) indicated that among dimensions of OCB, organizational justice has the most significant relationship with the dimension of altruism. Moorman (1991) stated that fairness had a more influential role in determining the dimension of altruism. Konovsky and Pugh (1994) asserted that perceived organizational justice that increases trust in organization has a favorable impact on OCB. Farh et al. (1997); George (1991); Konovsky and Pugh (1994); Niehoff and Moorman (1993) found that distributive justice has a stronger relationship with OCB compared to procedural justice. Schappe (1992) maintains that procedural justice is not an antecedent of OCB. Scarlicki and Latham (1996) found that though organizational justice influences employees' OCB at organizational level, it has no effect on their OCB at individual level.

Job Satisfaction

The Importance and Definition of Job Satisfaction

Today, an organization that seeks to survive, to sustain its competitive advantage and to achieve its goals and objectives under the new economic approach, which continuously changes, develops, should have competent and high-performing human resources. In this context, one of the factors that directly or indirectly influences employees' achievement and performance is job satisfaction. Studies indicate that improving the quality of service and establishing a more efficient and effective working environment in order to eliminate the reasons that lead to job dissatisfaction, thus enhancing job satisfaction (Işıkhan, 1996).

In general, job satisfaction is in regard to one's positive or negative feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of his/her work. In this context, a positive attitude towards work will result in job satisfaction, whereas negative feelings about work will lead to job dissatisfaction (Erdoğan, 1999: 231). There are other definitions in the literature relating to job satisfaction. Vroom (1964: 99) defines job satisfaction as "the reaction of the workers against the role they play in

their work". In view of these definitions, it can be concluded that job satisfaction has three important characteristics (Luthans, 1989: 170-172);

1. Job satisfaction is a situational response to a work situation. For that reason, it is not visible. It can only be expressed or, it can be determined via various attitude measurements.
2. In general, job satisfaction is the determination of to what extent needs and expectations are fulfilled. In Locke's view (1976), the importance attached to a variable by an individual is directly correlated to how much he/she values it. Therefore, when an individual gets less than he/she wants, dissatisfaction will arise.
3. Job satisfaction represents interrelated attitudes such as job itself, wage, promotion opportunities, managerial approach, coworkers, etc.

Explanatory Theories on Job Satisfaction

It will be helpful to investigate job satisfaction in terms of Social Exchange Theory, which was explained earlier. Employees expect to be recognized for their time and effort serving the organization. In other words, they want to exchange their effort and other contributions with rewards or other positive outcomes to be provided by the organization. Therefore, their degree of fulfillment of expectations and needs determines their level of job satisfaction. In human resource management literature, while describing job satisfaction, various approaches such as Job Characteristics Theory, Discrepancy Theory, Steady State Theory and Job Facet Theory are included. The writer will briefly touch on Job Characteristics Theory and Job Facet Theory in order to avoid expansion of the scope of the study.

Job Characteristics Theory, which describes the relationship between job characteristics and on individual response to work, was developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980). In the Job Characteristics Model, the reasons for job satisfaction are accepted as targeted characteristics. According to the theory, when employees view their job as meaningful, they like their job. As a result, they become motivated to perform to the best of their ability. According to Hackman and Oldham (1980: 90-92), at the most basic level, five core job characteristics lead to a number of personal and work outcomes that are beneficial to the individual:

1. Skill Variety: A job that involves doing the same type of work can be boring. Increasing the range of tasks and not by selecting

tasks which match the skills of the employee, not only eliminates boredom but also helps employees to acquire new skills.

2. Task Identity: It is the extent to which a job involves doing a complete and identifiable piece of work with a visible outcome.
3. Task Significance: It is the extent to which an identifiable piece of work (job) is important to others within or outside the organization. An employee's knowledge of other people's dependence on the work he or she is doing is an important factor in his or her job satisfaction.
4. Autonomy: Allowing employees to exercise choice and discretion to achieve organizational objectives has a motivating effect on them.
5. Feedback: Providing employees with frequent and constructive feedback relating to their work make them more satisfied with their work.

In recent years, HRM departments have given particular importance to work design in order to ensure employee job satisfaction. The existence of these five job characteristics will increase employees' job satisfaction and level of achievement motivation. The reason is that these characteristics related to the job will not only make work more meaningful for employees, but also increase their self-confidence in line with their increased responsibility. Besides employees will be able to be informed of the outcome of their job (Eren, 2003: 606).

Job Facet Theory was developed by Lawler on the basis of Equity Theory and Discrepancy Theory (Thierry, 1998: 253-254). This theory separates the individual's job into various sub-dimensions (job facets) and focuses on determining to what extent an employee is satisfied with each job facet. In other words, the employee's general job satisfaction consists of the summary of his/her satisfaction from each sub-dimension that comprises his/her work. Among these sub-dimensions are achievement, progress, authority, wages, coworkers, creativity and autonomy. Another important point, which Job Facet Theory underlines, is that employee's satisfaction will vary for each facet consisting his/her work and that this satisfaction will comprise his/her general job satisfaction. The theory was criticized due to the possibility that the importance given by an employee to each facet might vary (Thierry, 1998: 253-254). Looking from the viewpoint of supervisor-employee, the supervisor should identify job facets, which the employee values most. Then he/she should give priority to these facets in order to ensure the employee's satisfaction with these facets.

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

While initial studies conducted on the factors affecting the job concluded that job satisfaction/frustration stemmed from the job itself, recent studies indicated that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is closely associated with the employee's personal characteristics and general nature of the job (Erdoğan, 1999: 233). Therefore, factors can be divided into two groups: individual factors and job-related factors (Özgen et al., 2002: 237). Personality, gender, age, marital status, level of education and work experience are among individual variables that affect job satisfaction (King et al., 1982: 120). Studies indicated that there is a significant relationship between these variables and job satisfaction.

Organizational factors affecting job satisfaction can be listed as the general nature of job, level of job difficulty, wages, promotions, rewards, fringe benefits, personal interrelations and communication, working conditions and job security. Achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, role clarity, involvement, autonomy and well-coordination are other factors that are associated with job satisfaction (Seymour et al., 1985: 270).

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Various approaches (Social Exchange Theory, Equity Theory and Psychological Contract) are referred to when describing the interaction between job satisfaction and OCB. The "norm of reciprocity" constitutes the essence of most of these theories. The norm of reciprocity is the social expectation that people tend to respond to each other in kind - returning benefits for benefits, and responding with either indifference or hostility to harm. An employee that is satisfied with his/her job will engage in OCB as a way of thanking those that have helped him or her. In other words, he/she will be in a positive mood due to his/her job satisfaction. Accordingly, he/she will display positive behavior towards his/her supervisors and coworkers. Therefore, an employee with a positive attitude towards his/her job will probably display OCB such as helping his/her coworkers, contributing to the organization's image and saving organizational resources (Dyne et al., 1994: 766). Organ stated that when employees are satisfied with their job, their response to the organization, they respond by displaying organizational commitment and OCB (Organ, 1998). Studies indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between OCB and job satisfaction. (Organ, 1988, Organ - Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1993; Mackenzie et al., 1993; Smith et al. 1983; Dyne et al., 1994;

Organ - Lingl, 1995). In their study of a sample of university employees, the first study on the antecedents of OCB, Bateman and Organ (1993) detected a substantive relationship between job satisfaction and OCB (job itself $r: .19$; coworkers $r: .18$; promotion $r: .40$; wage $r: .25$; 'supervision $r: .36$). Besides, LePine et al. (2002) found that there was an $r: .24$ correlation between general job satisfaction and OCB. In their study on the relationship of OCB's dimensions of compliance and altruism with the scope of the job, job satisfaction and leader fairness, Farh et al. (1990) found that job satisfaction affects OCB. Scholl et al. detected that pay equity ($r: .19$) and wage satisfaction $r: .41$) had a positive relationship with OCB (McKenna et al., 1987). Contrary to the above mentioned studies, there are also studies, which indicated that there was not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. While Schappe (1998) maintained in his study that there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and OCB, Farh et al. (1990) found that job satisfaction could not predict OCB's dimensions of altruism and compliance.

In the study conducted by Ertürk et al. (2004), the relationship of OCB with job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational justice was analyzed. The findings of the study indicated that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational justice had a positive relationship with OCB, distributive justice had a much more significant effect on OCB than job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Ertürk et al. (2004) revealed that there was an $r: .343$ correlation between overall job satisfaction and OCB.

Study Hypothesis

In line with the findings and evaluation of the empirical study given above, the three hypotheses developed to be examined in this research are given below:

H₁: Employee job satisfaction has a positive effect on OCB.

H₂: Employees' perceptions of organizational justice have a positive effect on OCB.

H₃: The effect of job satisfaction on OCB is stronger than organizational justice.

Method

Sample and Data Collection

The survey was conducted with middle and first-level supervisors and ordinary civil servants employed in one of Turkey's leading institutions responsible for national security in Erzurum Province. The name of the institution was kept anonymous with a view to avoiding possible unfavorable impacts of survey findings on the image of the institution. There were several reasons for choosing the scope of the survey as middle and first-level supervisors and ordinary civil servants. First of all, the majority of the labor force of the institution subject to the survey is composed of the relevant group. Moreover, this group is responsible for the implementation of the institution's instructions, decisions and objectives. The survey universe consists of public employees in the Erzurum region. Accordingly, universe size was determined as approximately 3,000 employees. At first, it was decided considering universe value (n), a sample size of 341 would be enough with 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error (Altunışık et al., 2002: 599). Nevertheless, assuming that some of the respondents may not complete the questionnaire properly, it was believed that a sample size of 380 would be more appropriate in respect of reliability of the survey.

Sampling was made by groups in order to ensure equal and objective representation of personnel subject to the survey. In other words, the survey was administered through a stratified random sample of personnel working in the Erzurum branch of the institution. Percentage and numbers of personnel consisting the universe that used in the sampling as to their status were as follows: The stratum weight of first-level supervisors within the sample size %28 (115), middle-level supervisors %40 (142), ordinary civil servants %32 (123).

380 paper questionnaires were personally delivered to subjects by the researcher. Some of the questionnaire forms were returned unfilled due to the absence of some personnel because of various reasons (leave of absence, assignment, etc.). Out of 380 questionnaire forms, 350 were handed back to the researcher. The rate of return was about 92%. After 40 questionnaires were excluded from the main analysis because of incomplete and improper answers, data obtained from a total of 310 questionnaire forms were analyzed. Out of the questionnaire forms analyzed, 25.8% (80 respondents) were completed by middle-level supervisors, while 44.2% (137 respondents) by first-level supervisors and 30% (93 respondents) by ordinary civil servants. As a result, it can be said that the number of questionnaires eligible for analysis was close to target group quotas.

The demographic characteristics of respondents are given in Chart 1. As can be seen in the Chart, 44% (138 respondents) of respondents were above age 44. Therefore, the majority of respondents were middle-aged and older. Only 25.8% (80 respondents) had elementary school education, which indicated that the respondents' levels of education were quite high in general. Nearly 30% of respondents were ordinary civil servants, while the remaining nearly 70% were in supervisory positions.

Chart 1. Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Age	21 and Below	2	,6
	22-27	67	21,6
	28-33	103	33,2
	34-39	96	31,0
	40 and Above	42	13,5
Level of Education	High School and Below	80	25,8
	Associate's Degree	51	16,5
	Bachelor's Degree	121	39,0
	Post Graduate Degree	29	9,4
	Doctor's Degree	29	9,4
Status	Middle-Level Supervisor	80	25,8
	First-Level Supervisor	137	44,2
	Ordinary Civil Servant	93	30,0

Measures

In the present study, a questionnaire was used as the data-gathering tool. The questionnaire was developed in order to measure job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice and OCB of first-level and middle-level supervisors. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section contained expressions relating to control variables, which were determined as demographic variables. The other section aimed to measure attitudes and behavior. The 5-point Likert scale was used as the behavior measurement tool. The most favorable expression in respect of the aim of the survey scored the highest point, while the least favorable expression was given the lowest point. Negatively worded questions were reverse coded in order to avoid repressive answers.

The questions in the questionnaire aiming at measuring employees' behavior towards their job (job satisfaction) were constructed in such a way so as to measure the sub-dimensions of job itself, wage, promotion, coworkers and rewards. For this purpose, the scales developed by Spector (1997); Brayfield and Rothe (1951) for measuring general and subdivisions of job satisfaction were utilized in line with the aim of the survey. The second main dimension aimed to measure respondents' perceived organizational justice. The scale of organizational justice consisted of three sub-dimensions: procedural justice; interaction justice and distributive justice. For this purpose, the most widely used scales with high reliability and validity, which were developed by Price and Mueller (1986); Niehoff and Moorman (1993), were used. General structures of these scales were kept unchanged except minor adjustments made due to the characteristics of both the institutions and its employees. In the third main dimension, respondents' OCB was attempted to be measured. The OCB scale consisted of five dimensions – altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, civic virtue and sportsmanship. The OCB scale was constructed by making use of the scale employed by leading OCB researchers like Organ and Konovsky (1989), Williams and Anderson (1991); Moorman and Blakely (1995); Schappe (1998).

Findings and Discussion

Validity and Reliability of Survey Findings

The method of factor analysis was used to test the validity of scale construction. First of all, the appropriateness of data for factor analysis was tested. The values of test conducted via KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity for this purpose are given

in Chart 2. KMO value refers to a degree of common variance in variables. The KMO measures sampling adequacy, which should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. The value of KMO sampling adequacy (0,870) and the significance level of Bartlett Test (0,000) showed that the preferred sample size and correlation matrix was appropriate. In other words, the population distribution of the sample was normal. Following the pilot survey, the job satisfaction scale, the organizational justice scale and OCB scale were individually subjected to factor analysis to identify whether they expressed sub-dimensions or not.

Chart 2. KMO and Bartlett Test Values

KMO Sampling Adequacy Value		,870
Bartlett Test	Approximate Chi-Square	18679,337
	Significance Value	,000

After necessary analyses were conducted following the pilot survey, it was decided to exclude some expressions from the scale. Factor loadings of items obtained in the final scale were above 0,60. Only the number of items of these dimensions and total variance explained in respect of the scope of survey are shown in Chart 3.

Chart 3. The Number of Items and Variance Values Explained

Scales	The number of items in pilot survey	The number of items in final scale	Total variance explained
Job Satisfaction	38	30	% 64,185
Organizational Justice	20	17	% 68,186
OCB	35	22	% 66,469

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used in order to measure the reliability of the scale. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient assumes importance in respect of predicting the internal consistency of items contained in the scale and thus determining whether the scale is homogenous or not. Chart 4 provides reliability coefficients for the overall scale and its sub-dimensions. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the OCB scale was calculated as 0,8711. The reliability coefficients of sub-dimensions consisting OCB scale were relatively lower than those of the job satisfaction and organizational justice scales. Nevertheless, due to the fact that a reliability level of 70% is deemed acceptable in respect of Social Sciences, it can be easily said that the

OCB scale did not pose a reliability risk. The general reliability coefficient of the final scale, on which various research-related statistical calculations were performed, was obtained as Cronbach $\alpha=.96$. It can be maintained that in this aspect, the internal consistency or reliability of measurement tool was high. Hence, the survey was highly reliable.

Chart 4. Reliability Coefficients

Sub-Dimensions	The Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient (Cronbach alpha)
Job Satisfaction Scale	30	,93
Organizational Justice Scale	17	,93
OCB Scale	22	,87
Overall Scale	69	,95

Findings Relating to the Means of Variables

The average and standard deviation values given in Chart 5 provide a general idea about the consistency in the averages and levels of job satisfaction and perceived organizational justice and OCB of employees working in the survey subject institution.

Chart 5 shows that the dimension of satisfaction with wage, one of the components of the individual's job satisfaction, had the lowest average value (1.92). Satisfaction with wage was followed by satisfaction with rewards (2.12) and satisfaction with promotion (2.23). The low level of average values of the dimension in question, which refers to organization's attitudes in HRM practices such as promotion, performance appraisal (efficiency report) and rewarding, indicated that respondents considered the organization's policies relating to the above-mentioned practices unfair and inefficient. With an average value of 2.67, the dimension of general job satisfaction had a low (negative) average. Hence, it can be deduced that employees' attitudes towards their job were negative in general. However such a low value might stem from the negative value of sub-dimensions relating to wage, reward and promotion systems. In view of the fact that job satisfaction affects chiefly OCB and organizational commitment along with many important organizational phenomena, keeping employee job satisfaction high and finding out of ways of restoring their satisfaction with their job assume great importance.

Chart 5. Table of Mean and Standard Deviation Values

DIMENSIONS OF SURVEY	Mean (\bar{x})	Standard Deviation (SS)
Dimension of General Job Satisfaction	2.67	.66
Satisfaction With Job Itself	3.20	.93
Satisfaction With Wage	1.92	.75
Satisfaction With Promotion	2.23	.92
Satisfaction With Rewards	2.12	.95
Perceived Support From Coworkers and Supervisors	3.29	.82
General Organizational Justice	2.93	.88
Procedural Justice	3.21	.94
Interaction Justice	3.07	1.11
Distributive Justice	2.52	.86
General OCB Dimension	4.06	.45
Altruism	4.21	.63
Conscientiousness	4.28	.57
Sportsmanship	4.05	.64
Courtesy	4.33	.50
Civic Virtue	3.67	.65

The mean of organizational justice was 2.93, i.e. below 3. The analysis of subdivisions of organizational justice revealed that the values of procedural justice and interaction justice were positive. The 2.52 average value of distributive justice was negative, revealing a problematic dimension. In other words, employees think that organizational outcomes such as promotion, wage and rewards are not distributed fairly. Similarly low values obtained in the context of job satisfaction support this deduction.

Results of Correlation Analyses

With respect to the correlation among variables, the results of the analysis of correlation between job satisfaction, organizational justice and OCB, the basic hypothesis of the survey, are given in Chart 7. As can be seen, there was a positive significant relationship ($r: 0.411$) between job satisfaction and OCB. This survey found a moderate positive relationship $r: 0.360$ between organizational justice and OCB ($p=0.00 < 0.01$). Besides, a strong positive relationship ($r: 0.775$) was observed between job satisfaction and organizational justice. The em-

ployee OCB had a positive relationship with job satisfaction and perceived organizational justice. The results of the correlation analysis indicated that job satisfaction had a stronger positive relationship with OCB than organizational justice (Chart 6).

Despite their explanatory feature concerning relations, it should also be kept in mind that correlation analyses fail to give a precise idea about which dimension affects the other. Moreover, correlation analyses do not identify the effects of more than one variable on one variable. Nevertheless, in view of inter-variable relations and when these relationships are reviewed following the identification of the problematic dimensions in the section involving the average values of dimensions, these relationships become highly meaningful. Regression analyses should be conducted on the main (general) dimensions included in the survey in order to identify their interaction, i.e. their effect upon one another.

Chart 6. The Correlation Between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Justice and OCB

Variables	1	2
1. Job Satisfaction	1.000	
2. Organizational Justice	0.775*	1.000
3. OCB	0.411*	0.360*

* significant at the level of 0.01

Results of Regression Analyses

Firstly regression analyses of job satisfaction and organizational justice were conducted individually. Then, these two variables were subjected to multiple-regression analysis to identify whether, and to what extent they jointly affect OCB. Chart 7 shows that job satisfaction explained 0.169 of OCB. In other words, this value obtained from the regression analysis shows the determinant power of job satisfaction on OCB and shows the existence of a cause-effect relation. Meanwhile, β value reveals that OCB was affected by job satisfaction at the rate of 0.281. In view of this result, the first hypothesis of the survey, "*H₁: Employees' job satisfaction has a positive effect on their OCB*" was confirmed.

Chart 7. Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction-OCB

R	R ²	Std. Beta	β	t	P
---	----------------	-----------	---------	---	---

0.411	0.169	0.411	0.281	7.909	0.000
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Dependent: OCB; Predictor: Job Satisfaction

Regression analysis, which displayed the probable effect of organizational justice on OCB, is given in Chart 8. The analysis results revealed that organizational justice could explain merely 0.129 of OCM. Despite its low level compared to the determining coefficient of job satisfaction, the explaining power in question was still significant ($p=0.00 < 0.01$). Organizational justice affected OCB at the rate of $\beta:0.185$. Thus, "*H₂: Employees' perceptions of organizational justice have a positive effect on their OCB*" was accepted.

Chart 8. Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice-OCB

R	R ²	Std. Beta	β	t	P
0.360	0.129	0.360	0.185	6.765	0.000

Dependent: OCB; Predictor: Organizational Justice

It can be observed that when job satisfaction and organizational justice were individually subjected to regression analysis, they affected and explained OCB to a certain extent. However, when organizational justice and job satisfaction are jointly subjected to regression analysis, in other words, if the effects of two predictor variables influential in OCB are analyzed together (multi-regression), the result might be different.

Chart 9. Multi-Regression Analysis Indicating the Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice on OCB

Variables		R	R ²	Std. Beta	β	t	P
Dependent	Predictor						
OCB	Job Satisfaction	0.416	0.173	0.331	0.226	4.028	0.000
	Org. Justice			0.103	5,321E-02	1.259	0.209

The R-square value given in Chart 9 indicates that organizational justice and job satisfaction jointly accounted for nearly 17% of OCB. In other words, the combined determining power of these two dimensions on OCB was 0.173. In this context, it will be possible to say that the individual's display of OCB is extremely affected by factors other than these two factors (such as organizational commitment, identification with organization, demographic factors, etc.) and that other dimensions should be taken into account while investigating the reasons for OCB display among military personnel. The multi-regression analysis of general job satisfaction and organization di-

mension found that the dimension of organizational justice had no direct and significant effect on OCB ($p=0.209>0.01$). Thus, the final hypothesis, "*H₃: The explaining and determining power of job satisfaction on OCB is higher than organizational justice*" was confirmed.

It was observed during the joint analysis of the effect of the dimension of job satisfaction and the variable of organizational justice on OCB that the effect of organizational justice on OCB remained insignificant beside the effect of job satisfaction. This result shows that public employees' display of OCB can be explained rather by the variables affecting the dimension of job satisfaction. In the multi-regression analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfaction affected OCB at the level of $\beta:0.226$. In view of the relevant value, it can be said that individuals display OCB to the extent they are satisfied with their job. Considering the effect of numerous individual, demographic or cultural factors on OCB other than the above-mentioned factors, the result achieved is normal. Nevertheless, as can be seen in Chart 10, the organizational justice variable, which did not have a direct effect on OCB, had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta: 0.568$; $r: 0.754$; $R^2: 0.568$). In view of the fact that job satisfaction affected OCB by being affected by organizational justice, job satisfaction *serves as a mediator* between organizational justice and OCB. The reason is that as Chart 10 shows, the dimension of organizational justice had a significant positive effect on employee job satisfaction ($\beta=0.568$). Job satisfaction had a significant effect on OCB ($\beta=0.281$ -Chart 7). Then, within the framework of *Organizational Justice* \rightarrow *Job Satisfaction* \rightarrow *OCB* relationship, job satisfaction can be said to have mediating effect of organizational justice on OCB. Considering the moderate significant correlation between organizational justice variable and OCB ($r: 0.360$), this assessment can be considered acceptable.

Chart 10. Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice - Job Satisfaction

R	R ²	Std. Beta	β	T	P
0.754	0.568	0.754	0.568	20.127	0.000

Dependent: Job Satisfaction; Predictor: Organizational Justice

Conclusion and Suggestions

This survey, which was conducted on the personnel of a leading public institution in Turkey, aimed to explore how and to what extent

the said personnel's OCB attitudes and behaviors were affected by their job satisfaction and perceptions of organizational justice.

Job satisfaction refers to employees' attitudes toward their job. The survey found that employees' job satisfaction had a significant relationship with their display of OCB. Though not as significant as job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice also affected OCB. However, when job satisfaction was subjected to the analysis jointly with organizational justice, it was observed that the effect of organizational justice remained insignificant, whereas the effectiveness of job satisfaction increased. In view of the relationship of organizational justice with job satisfaction and its effectiveness, job satisfaction can be said to have mediating effect of organizational justice on OCB. In this context, it is possible to enhance the employee OCB by making changes that will improve the individual's perceptions of job satisfaction and organizational justice. In other words, in cases where a problem is perceived in employees' OCB level in respect of the organization, in other words, when it is observed that employees tend not to display behaviors that are beneficial both for themselves and the organization when exhibited though not stipulated in their job description or defined in a formal reward system, the organization's efforts towards increasing their job satisfaction will improve their OCB performance as well.

An organization's HRM policies in effect such as promotion, wage, performance appraisal and reward system are the elements that comprise an individual's job satisfaction. If an organization expects employees to display OCB, it should preferentially satisfy its employees within the framework of human resources practices. Looking at average values of dimensions in general, attitude scores for subdimensions below 3 were as follows: the dimension of general job satisfaction (2.67); satisfaction with wage (1.92); satisfaction with promotion (2.23); satisfaction with rewards (2.12); the dimension of general organizational justice (2.93); distributive justice (2.52). The basic principle of HRM is to utilize the human element in the most efficient and effective way and to equip human resources with qualities that will be advantageous to the organization. Especially low levels of average attitude values relating to wage, promotion and reward systems create the need for the adoption of new practices that would enhance employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Employees' levels of job satisfaction, perceptions of organizational justice and OCB can be raised through focusing on the low level-dimensions and groups given above within the framework of the reciprocity relationship. In this context, it is believed that in view of the

findings relating to average values, specific strategies should be preferentially adopted to increase employee job satisfaction and thus OCB. These strategies should primarily aim to improve HRM practices involving wage, promotion and reward systems via relational frameworks and to adopt fairer and more adequate processes and methods that will be approved by employees.

This survey was conducted on the personnel of Erzurum branch of one of Turkey's leading public institutions. The survey had to be limited to the Erzurum region due to the time and financial obstacles to reaching the branches of the said institutions in other regions. In the survey, attitude scores relating to dependent (OCB) and predictor (job satisfaction, organizational justice) variables were obtained from the same source, i.e. the individual himself/herself. Thus, common method variance could be produced. In other words, for instance, in the event that subjects did not give objective and realistic answers, intervariable relations could be lower or higher than their actual level. In this context, as the application of the OCB scale to the employees personally might cause common method variance, this may be considered as another constraint of the survey.

The subjects of this survey were employees working in a public institution. However, the institution in question has a specific organizational structure and culture. Considering its fundamental values and duties as well, this institution has an organizational structure different to other organizations. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that survey results might not apply to employees of different organizations and sectors.

In the survey, the relationship of employee OCB with job satisfaction and organizational justice was analyzed. As explained in the theoretical section, OCB is also related with factors other than these two variables. In this context, the writer believes that the examination of the relationship of OCB with other factors such as organizational commitment, leader-member relationship or trust in leader and organization in subsequent studies would be helpful. Dependent (OCB) and predictor (job satisfaction, organizational justice) variables analyzed in the survey consist of various subdimensions. The relationship scrutinized in this survey did not cover the sub-dimensions of the aforesaid variables in order not to expand the scope of the study. Future studies may focus on the effects of the subdimensions comprising the variables upon one another. The survey findings relating to dimension averages revealed that some of the dimensions (wage, promotion, reward, distributive justice) produced negative results. The reasons for dissatisfaction with these dimensions and the design-

ing of systems and processes that will have a positive effect on the individuals' attitude has emerged as a new research subject.

References

- Altunışık, R. - Coşkun, R. - Bayraktaroğlu S. - Yıldırım, E. (2002), *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri*, Geliştirilmiş 2. Baskı, Sakarya Kitabevi, Sakarya.
- Barling, J. - Michelle, P. (1993), "Interactional, Formal, and Distributive Justice in the Workplace: An Exploratory Study", *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 127, No 6, p. 649-656.
- Barr, S. H. - Pawar, B. S. (1995), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Domain Specifications for Three Middle Range Theories", *Academy of Management Journal*, Best Papers Proceedings, p. 302-306.
- Barringer, M. W. - Sturman, M. C. (1998), "The Effect of Variable Work Arrangements on the Organizational Commitment of Contingent Workers", *CAHRS Working Papers*, s. 1-32, <http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/CAHRS/PDFs/WorkingPapers/WP98-2.pdf>, (04 Temmuz 2006).
- Bateman, T. S. - Organ, D. W. (1983), "Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: the Relationship Between Affect and Employee Citizenship", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, No 4, p. 587-595.
- Bies, R. J. (2001), "Interactional Justice: The Sacred and the Profane", J. Greenberg - R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in Organizational Justice* içinde, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, p. 89-118.
- Bies, R. J. - Moag, J. S. (1986), "Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria for Fairness", B. H. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* içinde, Greenwich, CT, JAI Press, p. 43-55.
- Bies, R. J., Shapiro D. L - Cummings, L. L. (1988), "Causal Accounts and Managing Organizational Conflict: Is it Enough to Say It's Not My Fault?", *Communications Research*, Vol. 15, p. 381-399.
- Blau, P. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York, Jossey-Bass.
- Brayfield, A. H. - Rothe, H. F. (1951), "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, p. 307-311.
- Chen, X. P., Hui, C. - Sego, D. J. (1998), "The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Turnover: Conceptualization and Preliminary Tests of Key Hypotheses", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, No. 6, p. 922-931.
- Chompookum, D. - Derr, C. B. (2004), "The Effects of Internal Career Orientations on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Thailand", *Career Development International*, Vol. 9, No. 4, p. 406-423.
- Cohen, A. - 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*, Vol. 32, No. 5, p. 596-625.

- Cohen, R. L. (1987), "Distributive Justice: Theory and Research", *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 1, p. 19-40.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001), "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, p. 386-400.
- Cropanzano, R. - Folger, R. (1991), "Procedural Justice and Worker Motivation" In R. Steers and L. Porter (Ed.), *Motivation and Work Behavior*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 131-143.
- 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*, s. 317-372, New York, Wiley'den aktaran Hyung-Ryong Lee, "An Empirical Study of Organizational Justice as a Mediator of the Relationships Among Leader Member Exchange and Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intentions in the Lodging Industry", Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Doktora Tezi, 2000, 19.
- Eisenberger, R. - Huntington, R. - Hutchison S. - Sowa, D. (1986), "Perceived Organizational Support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, p. 500-507.
- Erdoğan, İ. (1999), *İşletme Yönetiminde Örgütsel Davranış*, İşletme Fakültesi Yayını, No. 5, İstanbul.
- Eren, E. (2003), *Yönetim ve Organizasyon: Çağdaş ve Küresel Yaklaşımlar*, Beta Yayınları, 6. Baskı, İstanbul.
- Farh, J. - Zhong, C. B. - Organ, D.W. (2004), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China", *Organization Science*, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 241-253.
- Farh, J., Organ, D.W. - Podsakoff, P. (1990), "Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Leader Fairness and Task Scope Versus Satisfaction", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16, No. 4, p. 705-721.
- Foa, U. G. - Foa, E. B. (1980), "Resource Theory: Interpersonal Behavior as Exchange", K. S. Gergen - M. S. Greenberg - R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research* içinde, s. 77-94, New York, Plenum Press,
- Folger, R. (1977), "Distributive and Procedural Justice: Combined Impact of Voice and Improvement on Experienced in Equity", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 35, p. 108-119.
- Folger, R. - Konovsky, M. A. (1989), "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions" *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 1, p. 115-130.
- Folger, R. - Bies, R. J. (1989), "Managerial Responsibilities and Procedural Justice", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 79-90.
- Folger, R. - Cropanzano, R. (1998), *Organizational Justice and Human Resources Management*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, London.

- George J. M. - Jones, G. R. (1997), "Organizational Spontaneity in Context", *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, No. 2, q. 153-170.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960), "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, p. 161-178.
- Greenberg, J. (1990), "Employee Theft as a Reaction a to Underpayment Inequity: The Hidden Cost of Pay Cut", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75, No. 5, p. 561-568.
- Greenber, J. (1996), *The Quest for Justice on the Job: Essays and Experiments*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
- Greenberg, J. - Baron, R. A. (1997), *Behavior in Organizations*, 7th Ed., New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Hackman, J. R., - Oldham, G. R. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Reading, MA, Addison Wesley Publishing.
- Igbaria, M. - Wormley, W. M. (1992), "Organizational Experiences and Career Success of MIS Professionals and Managers: An Examination of Race Differences", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 4, p. 507-528.
- Işıkhan, V. (1996), "Sosyal Hizmet Örgütlerinin İşlevsellik Ölçütü: İş Doyumu", *MPM, Verimlilik Dergisi*, Sayı 1, s. 117-130.
- İşbaşı, J. Ö. (2000), "Çalışanın Yöneticilere Duydukları Güvenin Örgütsel Adaletle İlişkin Algılamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışının Oluşumundaki Rolü: Bir Turizm Örgütünde Uygulama", Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Antalya.
- King, M., Murray A. - Atkinson, T. (1982), "Background, Personality, Job Characteristics, and Satisfaction with Work in a National Sample", *Human Relation*, Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 120-134.
- Konovsky, M. A. (2000), "Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations." *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, p. 489-511.
- Konovsky, M. A. - Pugh, D. (1994), "Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, p. 656-669.
- LePine, J. A. - Erez, A. - Johnson, D. E. (2002), "The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, No 1, p. 52-65.
- Lind, E. A. - Kanfer R., - Earley, P. C. (1990), "Voice, Control, and Procedural Justice: Instrumental and Noninstrumental Concerns in Fairness Judgments", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 59, p. 952-959.
- Locke, E. A. (1976), *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction; Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand-McNally, Chicago.
- Luthans, F. (1989), *Organizational Behavior*, Mc Graw Hill International Edition,

- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P.M. - Ahearne, M. (1998), "Some Possible Antecedents and Consequences of in Role and Extra-Role Salespersons Performance", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62, No. 3, p. 87-98.
- Mackenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. - Fetter, R. (1993), "The Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Evaluations of Sales Performance", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57, p. 70-80.
- Masterson, S. S. vd. (2000), "Integrating Justice and Social Exchange: The Differing Effects of Fair Procedures and Treatment on Work Relationships", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, p. 738-748.
- Moideenkutty, U. (2005), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Developmental Experiences: Do Role Definitions Moderate the Relationship", *The Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 88-108.
- Moorman, R. H. (1993), "The Influence of Cognitive and Affective Based Job Satisfaction Measures on the Relationship Between Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior" *Human Relations*, Vol. 46, No. 6, p. 759-776.
- Moorman, R. H. - Blakely, P. L. - Niehoff, B. P. (1998), "Does Perceived Organizational Support Mediate the Relationship between Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior?," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 3, p. 351-357.
- Netemeyer, R. G. - Boles, J. S. (1997), "An Investigation into the Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in a Personal Selling Context," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 61, No. 3, p. 85-98.
- Niehoff, B. P. - Moorman, R. H. (1993), "Justice as a Mediator of The Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36, p. 527-556.
- Organ, D. W. - Lingl, A. (1995), "Personality, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 35, No. 3, p. 339-350.
- Organ, D. W. (1990), "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 12, p. 43-72.
- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington, MA, Lexington Books,
- Organ, D. W. (1997), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-Up Time", *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, p. 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. - Podsakoff, P. - MacKenzie, S. (2005), *Organizational Citizenship: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications,
- Organ, D. W. - Ryan, K. A. (1995), "Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, No. 4, p. 775-82.
- Özgen, H. - Öztürk, A. - Yalçın, A. (2002), *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*, Nobel Kitabevi, Adana.

- Podsakoff, P. M. - MacKenzie S. B. (1994), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Sales Unit Effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31, No. 3, p. 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M. - MacKenzie, S. B. - Paine, J.B. - Bachrach, D. G. (2000), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, p. 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M. - MacKenzie, S. B. - Hui, C. (1993), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors as Determinants of Managerial Evaluations of Employee Performance: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research", in G. R. Ferris - K. M. Rowley (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 11, p. 1-40, Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.
- Price L. - Mueller, C. W. (1986), *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*, Marshfield, MA, Pittman,
- Schappe, S. P. (1998), "The Influence of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Fairness Perceptions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 13, No. 2, p. 277-290.
- Scholl, R. W. E. - Cooper, A. - McKenna, J. A. (1987), "Referent Selection in Determining Equity Perceptions: Differential Effects on Behavioral and Attitudinal Outcomes", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 40, p. 113-124.
- Seymour, Adler - Skow, B. - Richard - Salvemini, Nat J. (1985), "Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction: When Cause Becomes Consequence", *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 35, p. 266-278.
- Skarlicki, D. P. - Latham, G. P. (1996), "Increasing Citizenship Behavior within a Labor Union: A test of Organizational Justice Theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, p. 653-663.
- Smith, C. A. - Organ D. W. - Near, J. P. (1983), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, No. 44, p. 653-663.
- Spector, P. E. (1997), *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications,
- Tansky, J. W. (1993), "Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What Is The Relationship?", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 6, p. 195-207.
- Thierry, H. (1998), "Motivation and Satisfaction", Drenth, P. J. D. - Thierry, H. - DeWolff, C. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology*, içinde, Sussex, Psychology Press Ltd.
- Tyler, T. (1987), "Conditions Leading to Value-Expressive Effects in Judgments of Procedural Justice: A Test of Four Models", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52, p. 333-344.
- Tyler, T. - Blader, S. (2000), *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*, Psychology Pres, Philadelphia.

- Tyler, T. - Lind, E. A. (1992), "A Relational Model of Authority in Groups", Zanna, M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* içinde, San Diego, CA, Academic Press, Vol. 25, p. 115-191.
- Vroom, H. V. (1964), *The Determination of Job Satisfaction Work and Motivation*. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.,
- William, B. - Werther - Davis, Keith (1993), *Human Resources and Personnel Management*, 4. bs., New York, Mc Graw Hill, p. 151-152.
- Williams, L. J. - Anderson, S. (1991), "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, p. 601-617.
- Yılmaz, G. (2004), "İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamalarına İlişkin Örgütsel Adalet Algısının Çalışanların Tutum ve Davranışlarına Etkileri", İstanbul Üniversitesi, İnsan Kaynakları Bilim Dalı, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi.
- Van den Bos, K. - Wilke, H. A. M. - Lind, E. A. (1998), "When Do We Need Procedural Fairness? the Role of Trust in Authority", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 75, No. 6, p. 1449-1458.
- Van Dyne, L. - Graham, J. W., - Dienesch, R. M. (1994), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 4, p. 765-802.