

The Effect of Employees' Perceptions of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Application in Turkish Public Hospital

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Dikmetaş Yardan¹, Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap Durukan Köse²
and Assist. Prof. Dr. Tuncay Köse³**

Abstract

Today, the most important element for the efficient and effective functioning of organizations is human resource. Organizations need employees whom performance goes beyond formal duties as a vital source of organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, employees exhibit higher levels of performance and act more than their job descriptions when they believe they are treated fairly at workplace. Based on this, two important organizational concepts will be recognized which are called as organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice. In this study, the effect of employees' who are working in a hospital, perceptions of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior were investigated. The work group of the study is formed by 162 employees (58.27 %) working as allied health personnel consists of nurse, midwife, laboratory technician and medical secretary. At the end of study, distributive justice has a positive effect on the conscientious and courtesy; interactional justice has a positive effect on the conscientious and civic virtue. Organizational justice perception factor explains 3.1% of the OCB. According to these results, increasing employees' justice perceptions in a positive way, OCB can be slightly improved.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Turkey

¹ Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun School of Health Science, Department of Health Care Institutions Management, Samsun, Turkey. elifdikmetas@hotmail.com

² Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla School of Health Science, Department of Health Management, Muğla, Turkey. sdurukankose@mu.edu.tr

³ Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla School of Health Science, Department of Health Management, Muğla, Turkey. tuncaykose@mu.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Greenberg and Baron (2000: 372) defined the organizational justice as the action of an employee who performs more than the obligations of formal organizations. Organizational justice describes the individual's perception of fairness in organizations, his behavioral reaction to such perceptions and to show how these perceptions affect organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), commitment and job satisfaction (Noruzyet *al.*, 2011). Unfair treatment or injustice not only decreases job performance but also decreases quality of work and degree of cooperation among workers (Fatimah, Amiraa & Halim, 2011). There are three dimensions of organizational justice which are named as distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Ruolian & Vivien, 2002). Distributive justice is described as the fairness of distribution of resources (e.g., performance ratings, pay, promotions) or about results orientations (Alvi & Abbasi, 2012). Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness and the transparency in the decision making procedures followed in resource allocation or disputes resolution (Khan & Habib, 2011, Tepper & Taylor, 2003). Interactional justice reflects employees' feelings of how fair they are treated by their supervisors (Blakely, Andrews & Moorman, 2005).

Research shows perceived organizational justice is one of the factors that cause employees doing their jobs over his duties (Colquitt et al., 2001). OCB can be defined as a behavior that goes beyond the formal requirements of the job and is beneficial to the organization (Organ & Ryan, 1995, Al-Hyasat, Al Shra'ah & Abu Rumman, 2013). Organ (1998) provides a classification for dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Conscientious, Courtesy, Altruism, Sportsmanship, Civic virtue (Goudarzvandchegini, Gilaninia & Abdesonboli, 2011). Altruism is defined as the contributions to effectiveness that take the form of assistance the specific persons, such as colleagues, associates, clients, or the boss (Organ, 1997). In other words, it involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work related problems (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). Conscientious includes faithful adherence to rules about work procedures and conduct (VanYperen, Van den Berg & Willering, 1999); Sportsmanship is the willingness to tolerate circumstances without complaining, while courtesy is the discretionary behavior aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring (Neuman & Kickul, 1998) and finally, civic virtue is individual behavior that indicates an employee participates in and is reasonably concerned about the life of the organization (Lievens & Anseel, 2004).

Organ suggested that fairness perception plays an important role in promoting OCB (Moorman, Blakely & Neihoff, 1998). If Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is believed a job contribution, then a worker's reaction to underpayment, viewed as an injustice, perceived as an inequity, will demonstrate decreased exhibition of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Batool, 2012). In other words, the negative emotions of organizational members toward procedural justice and distributive justice will give rise to absenteeism, low performance, deviance, low loyalty and citizenship behaviors (Abu Elanain, 2010). Researchers have reported a strong relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and OCB in a variety of studies (Konovsky, 2000, Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998).

This study will engage all these three dimensions of organizational justice to explore their impact on organizational citizenship and evaluate this relation according to socio-demographic characteristics in a hospital of Turkey.

2. The Research Method

2. 1. Hypothesis Development

On the basis of above facts this study has proposed following hypotheses. According to conceptual model of research, main hypothesis is that there is a positive relationship among employee's perceptions of organizational justice with organizational citizenship behavior and employee's perceptions of organizational justice have positive and significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior.

In addition, sub-hypotheses are:

- H1. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and sportsmanship
- H2. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and civic virtue
- H3. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and altruism
- H4. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and conscientious
- H5. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and courtesy
- H6. There is a relationship between distributive justice perceptions and total citizenship behaviors
- H7. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and sportsmanship

- H8. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and civic virtue
- H9. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and altruism
- H10. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and conscientious
- H11. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and courtesy
- H12. There is a relationship between procedural justice perceptions and total citizenship behaviors
- H13. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and sportsmanship
- H14. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and civic virtue
- H15. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and altruism
- H16. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and conscientious
- H17. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and courtesy
- H18. There is a relationship between interactional justice perceptions and total citizenship behaviors
- H19. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and sportsmanship
- H20. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and civic virtue
- H21. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and altruism
- H22. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and conscientious
- H23. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and courtesy
- H24. There is a relationship between total organizational justice perceptions and total citizenship behaviors
- H25. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on altruism
- H26. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on conscientious
- H27. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on courtesy
- H28. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on sportsmanship
- H29. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on civic virtue

H30. Employee's perceptions of organizational justice have significant impact on OCB

2. 2. The Scope of the Research and Scales Used

The work group of the study is formed by the employees working as an allied health personnel consists of nurse, midwife, laboratory technician and medical secretary in a hospital. A sample was not chosen in the study, the whole of the employees were tried to be reached however the number of reachable employees were obtained as 162 (58.27 %). The questionnaire was applied during November-December 2012.

In this study a questionnaire consisted of three parts was used as a data collecting tool.

Personal Information Form: It consists of 9 close-ended questions to identify properties related to their socio-demographic that can have effects on organizational citizenship and organizational justice of employees.

Organizational Citizenship Evaluation Scale: The scale is consisted of five parts (totally 29 items) and five point likert type. In this scale, the minimum value (1) means "Strongly Disagree" and the maximum value (5) means "Strongly Agree". The subdimension of scale are altruism (C1), conscientious (C2), courtesy (C3), sportsmanship (C4), civic virtue (C5) and also there is not any reversed expression in evaluation (Bozkurt, 2010). The 4 of these 29 items are about the altruism, 5 for conscientious, 3 for courtesy, 3 for sportsmanship, 4 for civic virtue. It developed by Organ in 1988 and adapted by Bozkurt (2010). The questionnaire form was taken from the thesis of Bozkurt and Turkish validity and reliability study were done by Bozkurt.

Organizational Justice Evaluation Scale: It is consisted of three parts with five (totally 19 items) and five point likert type. In this scale, the minimum value (1) means "Strongly Disagree" and the maximum value (5) means "Strongly Agree". The subdimension of scale are distributive (J1), procedural (J2) and interactional (J3) justice and also there is not any reversed expression in evaluation. It was developed by Moorman as to understand how individuals evaluate organizational justice.

The 6 items of the scale are developed for measuring the procedural justice, 9 for interactional justice and 5 for distributive justice. The questionnaire form was taken from the thesis of Sarı (2011). The validity and reliability of questionnaire was provided by Sarı.

The reliability of it was revised again by us and the total value of organizational justice was found (α) 0.949 and the total value of organizational citizenship was found (α) 0.779. As the Cronbach Alpha value of used scale was over 0.70, we can say that scales have internal consistency, that means they are reliable.

2. 3. The Analysis of Data

The analysis of data were done by using SPSS version 20.0. The first of the analysis which was done in context of this study is descriptive statistical analysis. In descriptive analysis, frequency distribution and proportions were used. In order to identify if there is difference between demographic variables in context of study dimensions, Kruskal-Wallis Variance Analysis and Mann-Whitney U Test was used; after that Dunn's Z Test was used to find out where the difference came from.

The second of the analysis which was done in context of this study is explanatory analyses. Correlation techniques and multiple regression analyses were used to identify the relationships between the variables examined. Level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.10$. The self reported data from participants was seen as a limitation of the study.

3. Results of the Research

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Demographic characteristics of the respondents is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Control Variables (n:162)	f	%	Control Variables (n:162)	f	%
Gender			MaritalStatus		
Male	9	5.60	Single	39	24.10
Female	153	94.40	Married	123	75.90
TOTAL	162	100.00	TOTAL	162	100.00
Age			Education		
30 andlessthan	15	9.26	Primary School	0	0.00
31-35	47	29.01	High School	33	20.40
36-40	34	20.99	Associate Diploma	59	36.40
41-45	38	23.46	Bachelor 's Degree	68	42.00
46 andover	28	17.28	Highereducation	2	1.20
TOTAL	162	100.00	TOTAL	162	100.00
Profession			Squad Status		
Nurse	84	51.90	Permanentstaff (Law No. 657)	55	5.70
Laboratorytechnician	18	11.10	Contractedstaff	1	0.60
Midwife	52	32.10	Companystaff	6	3.70
Medicalsecretary	8	4.90	TOTAL	162	100.00
TOTAL	162	100.00			
Yearsworked at theinstitution(Workingexperience)			Salary (TurkishLiras-TL)		
Lessthan 1-5	52	32.10	2000 andlessthan	60	37.04
6-10	44	27.16	2001-2300	71	43.83
11-15	41	25.31	2301 andover	1	19.14
16 andover	25	15.43	TOTAL	62	00.00
TOTAL	162	100.00			
Manner of work					
Shift	114	70.40			
Daytime	48	29.60			
TOTAL	162	100.00			

The 94.40 % of respondents are female. Fifty percent of the respondents are at the age of 31-40, 23.46 percent are 41-45. So, the majority of the respondents are midlife workers. The 75.90 percent of respondents are married and 24.10 percent are single. The rate of the respondents who have bachelor's degree is 42.00 percent and 36.40 have two years associate degree. The 32.10 percent of the employees have a seniority of less than 1-5 years, 52.47 percent have 6-15 years and 15.43 percent have 16 and over years seniority at the hospital. The 43.83 percent of the respondents gain between 2001-2300 Turkish Liras monthly and 70.40 percent are working in shifts.

Also, Table 2 shows the basic statistics of each dimension from respondent's point of view. In basic statistics, arithmetic mean and median as measure of central tendency and as distributing measurement standard deviation were used.

Table 2. Basic Statistics of Dimensions

Variables	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Altruism (C1)	3.93	4.00	0.69
Conscientious (C2)	4.16	4.20	0.65
Courtesy (C3)	4.20	4.33	0.76
Sportsmanship (C4)	2.62	2.33	0.67
Civic Virtue (C5)	3.58	3.50	0.65
Distributive Justice (J1)	3.29	3.40	0.99
Procedural Justice (J2)	3.57	3.83	0.95
Interactional Justice (J3)	3.59	3.83	0.98
Total Organizational Citizenship Behavior (CT)	3.75	3.79	0.46
Total Organizational Justice Perceptions (JT)	3.51	3.80	0.90

3.2. Correlation Analysis

In this section, the direction and the strength of the relationship among the variables are determined by Spearman correlation coefficient. For this purpose, we calculated the correlation coefficients of sub measures of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. After conducting the analysis, various types of relations in different levels found out between the perceptions of employees towards organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Correlations of the scales are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Correlations between the Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Justice

		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	J1	J2	J3	CTotal	JTotal
Spearman's rho	C1 Cor.Coefficient	1.000	.356**	.410**	.172*	.453**	.116	.124	.127	.798**	.130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.029	.000	.140	.116	.108	.000	.100
	C2 Cor.Coefficient	.356**	1.000	.503**	-.068	.138	.046	.253**	.259**	.610**	.237**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.387	.079	.559	.001	.001	.000	.002
	C3 Cor.Coefficient	.410**	.503**	1.000	-.029	.227**	-.076	.094	.080	.614**	.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.713	.004	.335	.234	.313	.000	.551
	C4 Cor.Coefficient	.172*	-.068	-.029	1.000	.083	-.220**	-.199*	-.220**	.299**	-.235**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.029	.387	.713	.	.293	.005	.011	.005	.000	.003
	C5 Cor.Coefficient	.453**	.138	.227**	.083	1.000	.260**	.204**	.264**	.626**	.276**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.079	.004	.293	.	.001	.009	.001	.000	.000
	J1 Cor.Coefficient	.116	.046	-.076	-.220**	.260**	1.000	.656**	.682**	.089	.818**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.140	.559	.335	.005	.001	.	.000	.000	.260	.000
	J2 Cor.Coefficient	.124	.253**	.094	-.199*	.204**	.656**	1.000	.797**	.159*	.890**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.116	.001	.234	.011	.009	.000	.	.000	.043	.000
J3 Cor.Coefficient	.127	.259**	.080	-.220**	.264**	.682**	.797**	1.000	.173*	.952**	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.108	.001	.313	.005	.001	.000	.000	.	.028	.000	
CT Cor.Coefficient	.798**	.610**	.614**	.299**	.626**	.089	.159*	.173*	1.000	.166*	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.260	.043	.028	.	.035	
JT Cor.Coefficient	.130	.237**	.047	-.235**	.276**	.818**	.890**	.952**	.166*	1.000	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.100	.002	.551	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.035	.	

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

There is a negative relationship between the distributive justice perceptions (J1) and organizational citizenship behaviors in the meaning of sportsmanship (C4) ($r: -0.220$; $p < 0.01$). There is a positive relationship between the distributive justice perceptions (J1) and civic virtue (C5) ($r: 0.260$; $p < 0.01$). We didn't find any relationships between the distributive justice perceptions of employees and altruism, conscientious, courtesy and total citizenship behaviors. Based on the results, with considering the Spearman's correlation coefficient between two variables and also the meaningful of test in 0.01 level, the H2 hypothesis was accepted while the H1, H3, H4, H5 and H6 hypotheses were rejected.

There is a positive relationship between the procedural justice perceptions (J2) and organizational citizenship behaviors in the meaning of conscientious (C2) ($r: 0.253$; $p < 0.01$), civic virtue (C5) ($r: 0.204$; $p < 0.01$) and total citizenship behaviors (CT) ($r: 0.159$; $p < 0.05$).

There is a negative relationship between the procedural justice perceptions (J2) and sportsmanship (C4) ($r: -0.199; p < 0.05$). We didn't determine any relationships between altruism and courtesy behaviors and the procedural perceptions. Based on the results, with considering the Spearman's correlation coefficient between two variables and also the meaningful of test in 0.01 and 0.05 levels, the H8, H10 and H12 hypotheses were accepted; the H7, H9, and H11 hypotheses were rejected.

There is a positive relationship between the interactional justice perceptions (J3) and organizational citizenship behaviors in the meaning of conscientious (C2) ($r: 0.259; p < 0.01$), civic virtue (C5) ($r: 0.264; p < 0.01$) and total citizenship behaviors (CT) ($r: 0.173; p < 0.05$). There is a negative relationship between the interactional justice perceptions (J3) and sportsmanship (C4) ($r: -0.220; p < 0.01$). We didn't determine any relationships between altruism and courtesy behaviors and the interactional perceptions. Based on the results, with considering the Spearman's correlation coefficient between two variables and also the meaningful of test in 0.01 and 0.05 levels, the H14, H16 and H18 hypotheses were accepted while the H13, H15, and H17 hypotheses were rejected.

There is a positive relationship between the total organizational justice perceptions (JT) and organizational citizenship behaviors in the meaning of conscientious (C2) ($r: 0.237; p < 0.01$), civic virtue (C5) ($r: 0.276; p < 0.01$) and total citizenship behaviors (CT) ($r: 0.166; p < 0.01$). There is a negative relationship between the total organizational justice perceptions (JT) and sportsmanship (C4) ($r: -0.235; p < 0.05$). We didn't determine any relationships between altruism and courtesy behaviors and the interactional perceptions. Based on the results, with considering the Spearman's correlation coefficient between two variables and also the meaningful of test in 0.01 and 0.05 levels, the H20, H22 and H24 hypotheses were accepted; the H19, H21, and H23 hypotheses were rejected.

3.3. Comparison between the Organizational justice and Organizational Citizenship behaviors and Participants' Demographic Characteristics.

In order to identify if there is difference between demographic variables in context of study dimensions, Kruskal-Wallis Variance Analysis and Mann-Whitney U Test was used. All demographic variables were included in the analysis.

As shown in Table 4, organizational justice perceptions and OCB are different from each other as of the profession, squad status, income and the manner of work. Pairwise comparisons were made with Dunn's Z test for the different variables.

However, no difference was found for gender, marital status, age, education and seniority after the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests. The significant results are given in Table 4.

As a result of the pairwise comparison, nurses give more importance to courtesy than midwives ($p= 0.009$), and medical secretaries ($p= 0.002$); and laboratory technicians give more importance to it than medical secretaries and ($p= 0.027$). Also, in terms of squadstatus, permanent employees give more importance to the behavior of courtesy than company staff ($p=0.014$).

Employees with a monthly income of 2000 TL and below perceive that there are less interactional justice ($p= 0.012$) and total organizational justice ($p= 0.029$) than those with income between 2001-2300 TL.

Finally, employees work during the daytime perceive that there are more distribution, interaction and organizational justice than the employees work in the form of shift.

Table 4: The Views of the Respondents on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Justice Sub-Dimensions According to Demographic Variables

	C1		C2		C3		C4		C5		J1		J2		J3		CT		JT	
PROFESSION	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Nurse	4.04	0.62	4.18	0.57	4.38	0.57	2.56	0.60	3.59	0.58	3.30	1.05	3.62	0.95	3.61	0.96	3.80	0.36	3.54	0.91
Laboratory technician	4.00	0.54	4.39	0.54	4.30	0.85	2.46	0.82	3.54	0.81	3.39	0.75	3.73	1.12	3.86	1.20	3.81	0.51	3.71	0.99
Midwife	3.82	0.69	4.11	0.69	3.97	0.84	2.71	0.72	3.61	0.61	3.20	0.96	3.47	0.92	3.55	0.93	3.70	0.48	3.44	0.85
Medical secretary	3.38	1.30	3.88	1.20	3.42	0.99	3.04	0.60	3.34	1.16	3.60	1.10	3.27	0.74	2.99	0.83	3.45	0.92	3.23	0.79
	X ² =3.329 , p=0.344		X ² =3.359 , p=0.340		X ² =18.767*, , p=0.000		X ² =6.077 , p=0.108		X ² =0.379 , p=0.944		X ² =1.063 , p=0.786		X ² =3.476 , p=0.324		X ² =5.692 , p=0.128		X ² =1.396 , p=0.707		X ² =3.188 , p=0.364	
SQUAD STATUS	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Permanent staff	3.95	0.66	4.17	0.61	4.23	0.72	2.60	0.67	3.58	0.62	3.27	0.98	3.59	0.96	3.62	0.98	3.76	0.43	3.52	0.90
Contracted staff	3.00		4.40		4.33		2.33		4.50		5.00		3.83		4.33		3.79		4.35	
Companystaff	3.50	1.29	3.87	1.42	3.28	1.12	3.22	0.58	3.42	1.24	3.50	1.28	3.00	0.59	2.70	0.75	3.50	1.03	2.99	0.76
	X ² =2.461 , p=0.292		X ² =0.134 , p=0.935		X ² =8.469*, , p=0.014		X ² =5.575 , p=0.062		X ² =2.448 , p=0.294		X ² =2.941 , p=0.230		X ² =3.255 , p=0.196		X ² =5.855 , p=0.054		X ² =0.017 , p=0.992		X ² =3.865 , p=0.145	
INCOME (TL)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
2000 and less than	3.91	0.85	4.13	0.73	4.16	0.86	2.68	0.70	3.55	0.75	3.11	1.03	3.44	0.93	3.37	1.01	3.74	0.58	3.33	0.89
2001-2300	4.00	0.59	4.19	0.65	4.19	0.75	2.64	0.72	3.63	0.59	3.46	0.85	3.76	0.90	3.86	0.88	3.79	0.41	3.73	0.79
2301 and over	3.81	0.54	4.16	0.49	4.28	0.54	2.45	0.44	3.52	0.58	3.27	1.16	3.39	1.05	3.39	1.03	3.70	0.27	3.36	1.03
	X ² =2.632 , p=0.268		X ² =0.321 , p=0.852		X ² =0.041 , p=0.980		X ² =2.490 , p=0.288		X ² =1.320 , p=0.517		X ² =4.182 , p=0.124		X ² =5.356 , p=0.069		X ² =9.730*, , p=0.008		X ² =4.951 , p=0.084		X ² =7.948*, , p=0.019	
MANNER OF WORK	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Shift	3.93	0.73	4.16	0.66	4.20	0.80	2.63	0.61	3.58	0.64	3.13	1.00	3.48	0.95	3.48	0.94	3.76	0.49	3.40	0.87
Daytime	3.93	0.60	4.18	0.63	4.17	0.64	2.58	0.80	3.57	0.66	3.68	0.87	3.78	0.93	3.84	1.04	3.75	0.39	3.78	0.90
	U=2711.5, , p=0.928		U=2677.0, , p=0.827		U=2439.0, , p=0.268		U=2358.0, , p=0.158		U=2734.5, , p=0.996		U=1847.0*, , p=0.001		U=2205.0, , p=0.051		U=2123.0*, , p=0.024		U=2557.5, , p=0.512		U=1995.5*, , p=0.007	

SD, standard deviation.

*p<0.05

3.4. Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perception and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The regression output for the effects of organizational justice perceptions of employees on the organizational citizenship behavior is given in Tables. The hypotheses 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 were tested by this analysis.

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Altruism

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Constant)	3.631	0.221			16.407
0.000					
Distributive justice	-4.971	0.081		0.000	-0.001
1.000					
Procedural justice	-0.026	0.112		-0.036	-0.231
0.817					
Interactional justice	0.109	0.107		0.155	1.023
0.308					
R = 0.127	R ² = 0.016				
F = 0.860	p = 0.463				

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Altruism)

Results of analysis show R² value of 0.016 and overall relationship was not significant (F=0.860, $p > 0.05$). According to these data, the hypothesis 25 was rejected. In other words, organizational justice perceptions have no effect on the behavior of the altruism.

Table 6: Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Conscientious

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Constant)	3.712	0.199		18.690	0.000
Distributive justice	-0.227	0.073	-0.344	-3.115	0.002
Procedural justice	0.103	0.101	0.150	1.021	0.309
Interactional justice	0.232	0.096	0.349	2.414	0.017
R = 0.311	R ² = 0.110				
F = 6.491	p = 0.000				

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Conscientious)

Results of analysis show R^2 value of 0.110 and overall relationship was significant ($F = 6.491$, $p < 0.05$). According to these data, the hypothesis 26 was accepted. Results indicate that these three actions contributed 11% of the variance for the conscientious. As seen in Table 6, the Beta values for the distributive, procedural and interactional justice were -0.344, 0.150 and 0.349 respectively. Based on these beta values, distributive justice perception was the strongest impact on the conscientious. However it should be noted that distributive and interactional justice were significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$), while procedural justice was not significant. The results of these analyses indicate a significant relationship among organizational justice perceptions and conscientious. The variable of the interactional justice affects directly on the conscientious and the variable of the distributive justice affects inversely on the conscientious.

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Courtesy

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Constant)	3.995	0.238		18.690	
Distributive justice	-0.205	0.087	-0.268	-2.347	
Procedural justice	0.053	0.121	0.066	0.436	
Interactional justice	0.191	0.115	0.248	1.662	
$R = 0.218$ $R^2 = 0.047$ $F = 2.624$ $p = 0.053$					

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Courtesy)

Results of analysis show R^2 value of 0.047 and overall relationship was not significant ($F = 2.624$, $p > 0.05$). According to these data, the hypothesis 27 was rejected. But, based on these beta values, distributive justice perception was significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$). The results of these analyses indicate a significant relationship among distributive justice and courtesy. But, the variable of the distributive justice affects inversely on the courtesy.

Table 8: Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Sportsmanship

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Constant)	2.889	0.214			13.481
0.000					
Distributive justice	-0.089	0.078		-0.131	-1.129
0.261					
Procedural justice	-0.055	0.109		0.078	-0.508
0.612					
Interactional justice	0.060	0.104		0.088	0.583
0.561					
R = 0.133	R ² = 0.018				
F = 0.954	p = 0.416				

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Sportsmanship)

Results of analysis show R² value of 0.018 and overall relationship was not significant (F = 0.954, $p > 0.05$). According to these data, the hypothesis 28 was rejected. In other words, organizational justice perceptions have no effect on the behavior of the sportsmanship.

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Civic Virtue

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Constant)	2.950	0.200			14.754
0.000					
Distributive justice	0.024	0.073		0.036	0.322
0.748					
Procedural justice	-0.102	0.101		-0.150	-1.007
0.316					
Interactional justice	0.255	0.097		0.386	2.638
0.009					
R = 0.295	R ² = 0.087				
F = 5.024	p = 0.002				

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Civic Virtue)

Results of analysis show R² value of 0.087 and overall relationship was significant (F = 5.024, $p < 0.05$).

According to these data, the hypothesis 29 was accepted. As seen in Table 9, the Beta values for the distributive, procedural and interactional justice were 0.036, -0.150 and 0.386 respectively. Based on these beta values, interactional justice perception was the strongest impact on the civic virtue. However it should be noted that interactional justice was significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$), while distributive and procedural justice were not

Table 10: Regression Analysis between Organizational Justice Perceptions and OCB

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t
(Constant)	65.252	2.742		23.795
Organizational justice	0.086	0.038	0.177	2.274
$R = 0.177$ $R^2 = 0.031$ $F = 5.173$ $p = 0.024$				

$p < 0.05$, (criterion: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour)

With regard to the results of Table 10, R^2 value of 0.031 and relationship was significant ($F = 5.173$, $p < 0.05$). According to these data, the hypothesis 30 was accepted. It is specified that quantity of the standardized β related to the organizational justice is equal to 0.177. This number shows that, in return for one unit of change in the standard deviation, the component of the organizational justice is added as 0.177 to the standard deviation of the variable of the organizational citizenship behavior. Considering the rate of related to the variable of the organizational justice and its significance ($t = 2.274$ and $p = 0.024$), it is specified that the variable of the organizational justice influences directly on the variable of the organizational citizenship behavior.

Also, with regard to model in the below table, the regression equation is as follows:

Constant quantity + Slope (Organizational justice) = organizational citizenship behavior = $65.252 + 0.086$

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study searched for the survey of the effect of employees' perceptions of organizational justice on OCB. The results of correlation and regression analysis supported and clarified that relationship. Regarding the special role of hospitals and sensitivity of the interactions between employees and patients, organizational justice perceptions and OCB becomes more important.

In this study, the correlation test to examine the relationship among each dimensions of organizational justice and OCB showed that from the dimensions of organizational justice had positively relation with civic virtue and negatively relation with sportsmanship. The dimensions of organizational justice, procedural and interpersonal justice, were positively correlated with conscientious. In addition to these relations, regression analysis revealed that distributive justice has a positive effect on the conscientious and courtesy; interactional justice has a positive effect on the conscientious and civic virtue. The results of the research, organizational justice perceptions factor explains 3.1% of the OCB. According to these results, increasing employees' justice perceptions in a positive way, OCB can be slightly improved.

Moorman et al. (1998) concluded that procedural justice is an antecedent to perceived organizational support which in turn fully mediates its relationship to OCB. Asgari, Nojabaei and Arjmand (2011) reached the conclusion that there exists a significant relationship between the procedural justice with the OCB of the employees and the distributive justice and interactional justice haven't a significant relationship with the OCB. Farahbod et al. (2012) found that only the interactive justice is positively related to OCB. According to the Batool's results (2012), procedural and distributive justice equally add in the direction of justifying variance in OCB. Other findings showed that overall organizational justice has a positive and significant relation with OCB that are in accordance with those from previous studies (Noruzy et al., 2011, Chegini, 2009, Damirchi, Talatapeh & Darban, 2013, Goudarzi and Chegini, Gilaninia & Abdesonboli, 2011). In other words, organizational justice makes employees to feel as members of the organization, and they become more responsive at the workplace that finally may lead to exhibit higher levels of OCBs.

Hospitals may want to increase employees' justice perception because it plays a role in motivating employees to engage in OCB. Justice perceptions are influenced not only by individual differences but also by organizational structures and procedures. The employees believing in the fair distribution of wages, bonus or promotional offers that are received, resources and rights show OCBs such as contribute to the organizational development, appropriate the organization and take care of the job and patients. Also, the employees who believe that they personally are treated fairly by their supervisors are significantly more likely to exhibit citizenship behaviors.

Hospital managers who desire to create an organizational atmosphere that elicits citizenship activity must strive to improve the perceived fairness of their interactions with subordinates. Many managers face conditions that may constrain their ability to reward employees equitably. Monetary and other legal restrictions are often outside managerial control like in the public hospitals. However, the sensitivity with which a manager treats his or her subordinates and the ability to demonstrate fair intentions is relatively controllable. In order to improve organizational justice and so OCB, some required efforts is proposed, including: increased employee participate in some decision-making and institutional affairs, holding periodic meetings to create understanding between managers and employees and giving importance to courtesy.

The research was conducted at hospital in Turkey, using nurses, midwives, laboratory technicians and medical secretaries as respondents. This provides a limitation in generalizing the findings of this study.

5. References

- Abu Elanain H. M. (2010). Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational justice and workout comes in a non-Western Context of the UA, *Journal of Management Development*, 29(1), 5-27.
- Alvi, A. K. & Abbasi, A. S. (2012). Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement in banking sector of Pakistan, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 12 (5): 643-649.
- Al-Hyasat, K. M. K, Al Shra'ah, A. E. M. & Abu Rumman, M.A (2013). The impact of the organizational justice on the development of the organizational citizenship behavior in Jordanian Press Organizations, *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.5, No.2, pp. 213-222.
- Asgari, M. H., Nojabaei, S. S. & Arjmand, F. (2011). The relationship between the organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of the employees, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol. 10, No 2, pp. 141-148.

- Batool, S. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: diagnosis of prognostic strength of performance monitoring and organizational justice, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 3, No 12, pp. 284- 296.
- Blakely, G. L., Andrew, M. C. & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Winter, pp. 259-273.
- Bozkurt, S. (2010). Investigation of the relationship between human resources practices, organizational citizenship behavior and financial performance: a research in the banking sector, İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Human Resources Management Science, doctoral thesis, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Chegini, M. G. (2009). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 173-176.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H. & Yee Ng, K. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, No 3, pp. 425-445.
- Damirchi, Q. V., Talatapeh, M. B. & Darban, M.Z. (2013). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Moghan's Agro-Industry Company, *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, Volume 2, No. 3, March, pp. 68-70.
- Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M. & Halim, F. W. (2011). The relationships between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction, *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.*19 (S): 115 – 121.
- Farahbod, F., Azadehdel, M., Rezae-I Dizgah, M. & Nezhadi-Jirdehi, M. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: The role of organizational justice and leader-member exchange, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, January, Vol. 3, No 9, pp. 893-903.
- Goudarzvandchegini, M., Gilaninia, S. & Abdesonboli, R. (2011). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior case study: Rasht Public Hospitals, *International Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 2, No. 4; November, pp. 42-49.
- Greenberg, J., & R. A. Baron. (2000). *Behavior in organizations*, 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Khan, S. & Habib, U. (2011). Procedural justice and organizational performance, *Abasyn Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 4, No 7, pp. 36-51.
- Konovsky M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations, *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 489-511.
- Lievens, F. & Anseel, F. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis and invariance of an organizational citizenship behaviour measure across samples in a Dutch-speaking context, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 299–306.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. 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, pp. 351-357.

- Neuman, G. A. & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: achievement orientation and personality, *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Winter, pp. 263-279.
- Noruzy, A., Shatery, K., Rezazadeh, A. & Hatami-Shirkouhi, L. (2011). Investigation the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship: the mediating role of perceived organizational support, *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, Vol. 4, No 7, pp. 842-847.
- Organ D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 775-802.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time, *Human Performance*, 10(2), pp. 85-97.
- 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, 513–563.
- Ruolian, F. & Vivien, K. G. L. (2002). Collectivism, machiavellianism, perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: an empirical study of Chinese employees, *The Second International Conference on Electronic Business*, Taipei. Taiwan, December 10-13 2002.
- Tepper, B. J. & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 46, No 1, pp. 97-105.
- VanYperen, N. W., Van den Berg, A. E. & Willering, M. C. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behaviour: a multilevel analysis, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, pp. 377–392.