

**PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF  
MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN NIGERIA**

**Dr Dumo Nkesi Opara**  
**Department of Office and Information Management**  
**Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni Port Harcourt**

*Email: dumopara@gmail.com*

**ABSTRACT**

*This study examined procedural justice and organization citizenship behaviour of manufacturing companies in Nigeria. The study adopted the correlational survey research design. The population of the study consisted of 135 registered manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria. A sample size of 389 respondents (employees) was used for the study. The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamene's formula. A structured questionnaire was used to obtain data from the respondents. The data collected were presented and analyzed using percentage and frequency analysis, mean and standard deviation, while the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient and partial correlation analysis were used to test the formulated hypotheses. The SPSS version 22.0 was used to aid the analysis. The findings revealed that there is positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and organization citizenship behaviour. Based on the findings, it was concluded that procedural justice has a significant positive relationship with organization citizenship behaviour. Based on the conclusion, it was recommended that management team of manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria should ensure that there is distributive in their organization as it would motivate workers to exhibit good behavior at work.*

**Keywords: Procedural Justice, Organization, Citizenship Behaviour**

**INTRODUCTION**

Organizational citizenship behaviour is crucial to the growth of an organization since it represents a discretionary behaviour of employee that goes beyond his or her job description. Organ in Gamage (2014) stated that high levels of organizational citizenship behaviour leads to high levels of organizational efficiency, effectiveness and adaptability. Podsakoff et al (2009) added that organizational citizenship behaviour leads to high job performance, increased productivity and efficiency, reduced costs, enhanced customer satisfaction and profitability. Podsakoff, et al (2009) further stated that an employee who exerts high level of organizational citizenship behaviour shows his or her true willingness to move the organization forward. Lee and Allen (2002) argued that the more organizational citizenship behaviour is displayed by employees in the workplace, the more effective the organization becomes.

It is important for employees to display organizational citizenship behaviour as a way of promoting their organization. Examples of organizational citizenship behaviours which an employee needs to display towards co-workers include suggesting ways to improve colleague's work, loading paper into the printer or even giving a lift to a colleague; while those behaviours directed towards the organization as a whole include making suggestions to improve workplace facilities, doing unpaid overtime, defending the organization against external threats and promoting the public image of the organization (Pickford & Joy, 2016). Other examples of organizational citizenship behaviours include readiness to compromise difficulties at the workplace, act in accordance with the organization's rules and regulations guiding principles and practices, and exhibiting vigorous involvement in the organization (Katz & Kahn, in Mohamed & Anisa, 2012). These extra-role behaviours are desirable but difficult for employees to cultivate within typical organizational structures (Pickford & Joy, 2016).

Procedural justice refers to employee's perception regarding the processes and procedures used in the distribution of outcomes (Alsaalem & Alhaiani, 2007). It reflects the process leading to results (Cagliyan et al, 2017). Steiner and Bertolino in Cagliyan et al (2017) defined distributive justice as the fairness perceptions of procedures and processes that are used to make result-based decisions. Miles (2012) described distributive justice as employee's perception of fairness in the procedures used by management in deciding the allocation of organizational resources. Similarly, Folger and Konovsky in Ali and Jan (2012) conceptualized procedural justice as the degree to which the methods and guidelines for implementing reward allocations are perceived to be fair by those affected by allocation decisions.

Procedural justice is all about the perceived fairness of the means that leads to determine the outcomes (Folger & Konovsky in Jawad et al, 2012). It emphasizes consistency, impartiality and rationality in the process of determining and distributing outcomes (Folger & Konovsky in Okocha & Anyanwu, 2016). Thibaut and Walker in Rahman et al (2016) defined procedural justice as the extent to which employees perceive the fairness of procedure that is applied to reach at outcome decisions. It is basically the perceptions regarding the ways or methods in which decisions are made in the organization (Rahman, et al, 2016). Tepper and Taylor in Rahman et al (2016) posited that procedure justice is the fairness of the means through which managers make decisions related to resources allocation. It is the degree of fairness in the methods and procedures used by managers to evaluate the contribution of an employee and distribute outcomes.

The behaviour of some workers in manufacturing organizations in Nigeria has become so worrisome to managers in these organizations. A close observation shows that many workers in manufacturing companies do not exhibit good behaviours such as organizational citizenship behaviours, organizational commitment and regular work attendance. There is a high level of absenteeism among workers while those who regularly report to work often resume late at their duty post, resulting in low productivity. Ajala (2015) observed that many Nigerian workers have cultivated the habit of coming to work late and when they arrive at work, they often show lukewarm attitude to work, resulting in low productivity. Many observers of Nigerian workers have always come up with a common impression that generally Nigerian workers are reluctant to act, feel unconcerned, and deceitful in their approach to work. These workers are said to lack the zeal to work, spirit of sportsmanship, courtesy, commitment, and dedication to work. Although there is no empirical evidence that justify this claim as empirical studies that examined the relationship between procedural justice and workers citizenship behaviour in manufacturing organizations in south-south Nigeria are absent or scanty. This has created a gap in knowledge which this study intends to fill.

### **Concept of Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice is an important predictor of workers' behaviour in an organizational setting. According to Misuko (2012), procedural justice or injustice influences employees' attitudes and behaviour in the workplace. He explained that if an employee perceives the processes and procedures used in allocating rewards to be fair, he or she is likely to exhibit good work behaviour such as regular work attendance, job commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviours. On the other hand, the employee will display negative work behaviours (such as increased absenteeism, lateness to work, lack of job commitment, etc.) if he or she perceives bias and impartiality in the processes leading to the allocation of rewards.

It is certain that when the procedure is fair, the outcome will also be fair. For employees, it is much easier to accept the outcomes if the procedure leading to the outcomes is fair and just (Deutsch, 2006). Cropanzano et al in Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) stated that if the process is perceived to be fair and just, employees' show greater loyalty and more willingness to behave in an organization's best interest. However, the question that often arises is what makes the procedures to be fair? First,

if consistency is adopted in the processes and procedures; secondly, if equal treatment is used to address similar cases; thirdly, if there is no impartiality or bias in the processes or procedures used in making decisions; and fourthly, if employees have faith in the decision making authorities (Rahman et al, 2016). Meanwhile, Leventhal in Ajala (2015) identified the core attributes that make procedures fair and just in an organization. According to him, procedural justice is fair and just when there is consistency in the way all employees are treated, lack of bias (i.e. no worker or group of workers is singled out for discrimination or ill-treatment), accuracy (that is, decisions are based on accurate information, representation of all concerned (i.e. appropriate stakeholders have a input in a decision), correction (that is, there should be an appeal process or other mechanisms for correcting mistakes), and ethics (that is, norms of professional conduct are not violated). Leventhal in Ajala (2015) stated that procedural justice can be established if attributes are present in organizations.

### **Consistency in Procedures**

Consistency in procedures simply means that management should use the same procedures in deciding the allocation of organizational resources to all employees. Procedural justice requires high degree of consistency in treating workers at the same (Jawad et al, 2012). It emphasizes consistency in the process of determining and distributing outcomes (Okocha & Anyanwu, 2016). Rahman et al (2016) stated that if there is consistency in the procedures used in allocating organizational resources, employees will put in more efforts to ensure that the organization achieves its goals. Tepper and Taylor in Rahman et al (2016) posited that consistency in procedures used by managers in resources allocation would make employees to exhibit good behaviour at work.

Rahman et al (2016) pointed out that consistency in procedures for making decisions and fair policies give employees the feeling of respect and this would motivate them to exhibit good behavior at work. Fuchs and Edwards (2012) noted that when there is inconsistency in the procedures used in allocating organizational resources, employees will be dissatisfied with their job and this dissatisfaction will reflect on their work behaviour. Elovaino et al (2002) stated that consistency in the process and procedures for allocating organizational resources will bring about cognitive, affective and behavioural reactions in the workplace and enhances psychological well-being of employees with a feeling of satisfaction and morale booster. Ajala (2015) posited that a fair and consistent processes lead to intellectual and emotional recognition which in turn create trust and commitment among workers.

### **Lack of Bias**

Lack of bias simply means that all workers in the organization is treated fairly in the workplace. It means that there is absence of favouritism and nepotism in the organization. Bias is a statement or action in favour of or against a worker and this comes in form of unfair treatment, prejudicial or closed-minded. A manager may develop bias for or against a worker simply because he does not like the person, his family member or where worker comes from. Whenever such a manager is making decisions regarding the procedures for allocating organizational resources, he tends to use flawed reasoning. Bias kills the morale and love which an employee has for an organization. It makes an employee to exhibit negative attitude to work. It can also lead to absenteeism, poor commitment to work and low productivity (Ajala, 2015).

Lack of bias would promote procedural justice in the workplace. Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) stated that when there is absence of bias in an organization, the employees will feel an atmosphere of procedural justice and exhibit good behavior at work. If an employee perceives bias in the procedures used in allocating rewards, he or she is likely to exhibit a negative behaviour at workplace such as regular work attendance, job commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviours (Akanbi & Ofoegbu, 2013). Misuko (2012) confirmed this when he stated that an employee will display negative work behaviours if he or she perceives bias and impartiality in the processes leading

to the allocation of rewards. Skarlicki and Folger in Skarlicki et al (2008) stated that when employees feel unfairly treated, they can engage in organizational retaliation – defined as the tendency to 'make the wrongdoer pay.

### **Ethics**

Ethics is a philosophical term originating from Greek word "ethos" meaning custom or character (Mihelic, et al, 2010). It is the science of right and wrong, the science of moral principles, the science of moral judgment and conduct (Kocaba & Karakose, 2009). Minkes et al in Mihelic et al (2010) stated that ethics is concerned with describing and prescribing moral requirements and behaviours, which suggests that there are acceptable and unacceptable ways of behaving that serve as a function of philosophical principles. Sims in Mihelic et al (2010) defined ethical behaviour as that behaviour which is morally accepted as "good" and "right" as opposed to "bad" or "wrong" in a given situation. Komives in Kocaba and Karakose (2009) pointed out five principles in making ethical decisions which include: respecting autonomy, doing no harm, being just, benefiting others and being faithful.

Within the context of organizational leadership, ethics refer to the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement and decision making (Trevino & Brown in Amsale et al, 2016), while moral standard connotes a set of standards or principles derived from how a leader behaves following a particular philosophy and it can be derived from a standard that a leader believes should be universal (Freeman & Stewart, 2006). Ethical and moral behaviours include the exhibition of fairness, equity, multicultural competence, modeling ethical behaviours and altruism in discharging duties. They are both legally and morally acceptable to the larger community (Trevino, in Mihelic, et al, 2010). Such behaviours are essential for good leadership.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Organizational citizenship behaviour is defined by Appelbaum et al (2004) as a set of voluntary which are not part of the official duties of an employee but are executed by him or her to improve the functions of the organization. The behaviours are not included among the behaviours which an employee needs to perform to meet his or her own role or job description. Organ in Gamage (2014) defined organizational citizenship behaviour as an individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization.

Organizational citizenship behaviour was redefined by Organ in Chinomona and Dhurup (2015) as the willingness of an employee to go beyond his or her prescribed role to perform some extra-role to ensure proper functioning of the organization. These extra-role behaviours are performed to support the maintenance and facilitate socio-psychological context that improve task performance in the organization. The definition of organizational citizenship behaviour given by Organ draws our attention to three critical aspects that are key points to this construct. First, it draws our attention to the fact that OCBs are discretionary behaviours which are not included in the job description of an employee, but are performed by the employee based on personal decision. Secondly, we were made to understand that OCBs go beyond the task assigned to the employee; and thirdly, OCBs brings about proper functioning of the organization i.e. organizational effectiveness. Lambert (2006) agreed with the attributes of OCB outlined by Organ when he stated that OCB goes beyond the basic requirement of an employee's job to the extent that such behaviours are discretionary and benefit the organization.

### **Sportsmanship**

Sportsmanship is a behaviour whereby an employee demonstrates tolerance of less than ideals circumstances without complaining (Konovsky & Organ, in Ariani, 2013). Feather and Rauter (2004)

defined sportsmanship as the willingness of an employee to tolerate less than ideal organizational circumstances without making any complaint or blowing out problems out of proportion. It is the ability of an employee to maintain peace even when policies and changes within the organization do not favour him or her. Sportsmanship helps managers to save time and energy by reducing the amount of employees' complaints which they have to address or resolve. Farh et al in Ariani (2013) posited that employees who display the spirit of sportsmanship are always willing to tolerate difficulties in the workplace that are likely to improve the organization without making unnecessary criticisms and complaints.

### **Courtesy**

Courtesy refers to the efforts made by an employee to prevent a problem with other co-workers and avoid abusing the rights of others (Konovsky & Organ, in Ariani, 2013). Organ in Mohamed and Anisa (2012) posited that courtesy indicates that the employees value their co-workers and treat them with respect, admiration and esteem. Ozdem (2012) stated that courtesy comprises of positive behaviours of employees who continuously interact with each other because of their duties and get affected by the decisions and duties of each other. These behaviours are based on the principle of informing others previously on the act or decision that might affect them (Ozdem, 2012). Examples of courtesy behaviour include informing others on the work schedule when necessary, informing and reminding others previously on the decisions that might affect them, asking for the opinions of other workers who get affected by his or her decisions (Ozdem, 2012).

### **Civic Virtue**

Civic virtue refers to the participation and accountability in organizational life and the desire of an employee to promote the good image of the organization (Organ, in Azizi et al, 2014). Konovsky and Organ in Ariani (2013) defined civic virtue as a constructive behaviour whereby an employee demonstrates the willingness to participate responsibly in the life of the organization. Law in Ariani (2013) stated that civic virtue connotes a deep concern and interest which an employee shows towards his or her organization. It is a strong interest, feeling and commitment which an employee displays towards the organization as a whole. Organ in Mohamed and Anisa (2012) stated that civic virtue implies that employees sensibly take part in the political life of the organization. It is an attitude representative whereby an employee gives vigorous attention towards the lifespan of their organization (Organ in Danish et al, 2015). Ozdem (2012) stated that civic virtue entails a responsible and structural participation in the political process of the organization.

Civic virtue behaviour reflects an employee's recognition as member of an organization just the way a citizen is recognized as a member of a country and accepts the responsibilities to that effect. It entails a deep concern and involvement in the activities of the organization (Chen et al, 2009). Civic virtue is the conducive intervention within the political life of the organization (Ozdem, 2012). Examples of civic virtue behaviours include contributing to the reputation of the organization, observing the opportunities and threats to the organization, improving and renewing oneself than the others, following the developments in the fields, and following the changes in the organization closely (Ozdem, 2012).

### **Workers Commitment**

Worker's commitment in an organizational setting has been defined in various ways. For instance, Porter et al in Cagliyan et al (2017) defined worker's commitment as the degree of intensity with which an employee identifies with his or her organization and engage in it. It could as be defined as employees' belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, their willingness to work towards accomplishing the organization's goals, and their strong desire to continue as member of the organization (Porter et al in Hassan, 2002). Meyer and Herscovitch in Rahman et al (2016)

defined commitment as the binding forces that push an employee to a particular course of action with the purpose of achieving set goals.

Worker's commitment is the likelihood of an employee to remain with his or her organization and become attached to the values and goals of the organization (Rusbuit in Rathore & Sen 2017). Meyer and Allen in Gamage (2014) conceptualized worker's commitment as a psychological state that influences his or her desire to remain member of the organization. It is the relative degree with which an employee identifies himself/herself with the organization, participates and gets involved in the organization (Javanmard et al, in Khaleh & Naji, 2016). Mowday et al in Guha and Chimote (2012) defined worker's commitment as an employee's belief in the organization's goals and values, demonstrate the desire to remain as a member of the organization and remain loyal to the organization. It is the readiness of an employee to apply elevated levels of hard work on behalf of the organization, accept its goals, values, ethics, principles and standards, and show aspiration to stay with the organization (Porter, in Mohamed & Anisa, 2012).

### **Social Exchange Theory**

The social exchange theory originated in the late 1950s and evolved through the early 1960s (Priyankara et al, 2018). The major contributors to the development of the social exchange theory are George Homans, John Thibaut, Harold Kelley and Peter Blau. The theory was developed from the socio-psychological and economic perspectives (Emerson, 1976; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Social exchange is described as voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others (Blau, in Chinomona & Dhurup, 2015). The fundamental premise of the social exchange theory is that it involves an exchange between two parties whereby one party does something and the other party reciprocates. The reciprocated benefits can be in form of economic rewards or social benefits (Yoon & Suh, in Chinomona & Dhurup, 2015).

The social exchange theory is based on the underlying principle that reciprocated benefits bring about social bonds among the exchange parties (Kacmar et al, 2012). This is due to the fact that social exchange creates the feelings of personal obligation, gratitude and trust among the exchange parties, which in turn build a foundation of social solidarity (Yoon & Suh, 2003). The underlying assumption of the social exchange theory is that people create and maintain social relationships on the basis of their expectations that such relationships will benefit the parties. The exchange of benefits (whether intrinsic or extrinsic benefits) independently of normative obligations provide the impetus for social interaction. When one party to the exchange relationship does something for the other party (like providing benefits for the other party), there is bound to be an expectation of some form of valued, future return that is both non-specific and not tied to an explicit market value (Morgeson et al, in Chinomona & Dhurup, 2015).

The social exchange theory explains human exchange relations both at the micro and macro levels (Emerson, in Priyankara et al, 2018). The theory states that economic and social exchanges are the two forms of exchange relations that take place in an organizational setting. According to Blau in Priyankara et al (2018), economic exchange is explicit and contractually bound with defined terms and associated with monetary rewards in an employment relationship; while social exchange is usually unspecified obligations which are connected with non-monetary rewards in an employment relationship, and it often involves indirect chains of exchange.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The correlation survey research design was adopted in this study. The population of this study consisted of all the manufacturing companies registered with the Manufacturers Association of

Nigeria (MAN) in the south-south zone of Nigeria. Presently, there are 135 manufacturing companies registered with the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) in the south-south geopolitical zone (Manufacturers Association of Nigeria, South-South Zonal Office, 2020). The 135 registered manufacturing companies were spread across the six states that make up the south-south zone namely; Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Delta, Edo, Bayelsa and Rivers State

The sample for this study was made up of employees (senior staff and junior staff) of the selected manufacturing companies in the south-south zone. A sample size of 389 employees was used in this study. The sample size was determined mathematically using the Taro Yamene’s formula:

The simple random sampling technique was used to select the sample size for the study. The simple random sampling technique is a probability sampling method that gives every element in a population an equal chance of being selected among the sample to be used for a study (Nwankwo, 2013). By adopting the simple random sampling, it means that each of the 14,510 employees (study population) have equal chance of being selected among the 389 respondents (sample) to be used for the study. Data were collected through questionnaire. The data collected in this study were analyzed statistically using percentage and frequency analysis, mean, standard deviation, Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) and Partial correlation analysis.

## RESULTS

### Hypothesis 1

Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

### Result of correlation analysis between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour

|                     |                                      |                         | Procedural Justice | Organizational Citizenship Behaviour |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Spearman Rank (rho) | Procedural Justice                   | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000              | .386**                               |
|                     |                                      | Sig. (2 tailed)         | .                  | .002                                 |
|                     |                                      | N                       | 282                | 282                                  |
|                     | Organizational Citizenship Behaviour | Correlation Coefficient | .386**             | 1.000                                |
|                     |                                      | Sig. (2 tailed)         | .002               | .                                    |
|                     |                                      | N                       | 282                | 282                                  |

\*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 levels (2 tailed)

\*Correlation is significant at 0.05 levels (2 tailed)

*Source: SPSS-generated Output*

Table above shows the result of correlation analysis carried out between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The result indicates that procedural justice has weak positive correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour (rho = .386\*\*) and the symbol \*\* signifies that this correlation is significant at 0.01 level. Based on this result, the null hypothesis (Ho<sub>1</sub>) is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. This means that we then accept that there is weak, positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

### Discussion of Findings

It was reported in this study that a weak, positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. This finding was obtained from the result of the bivariate analysis carried out on the two variables. The result showed that procedural justice has weak positive correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour and this correlation is significant at 0.01 level. Based on this result, the null hypothesis (Ho<sub>1</sub>) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. This means that we then accepted that there is weak, positive and

significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. This finding is contrary to the research conducted by Elovaino et al (2002) which reported a moderate relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The study equally revealed that procedural justice has a strong, positive and significant relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour in manufacturing companies. Based on these findings, it was concluded that procedural justice has positive and significant influence on organization citizenship behaviour in manufacturing companies in the south-south Nigeria.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

1. Managers in manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria should treat all workers fairly and equitably as it would motivate employees to increase their level of commitment to the organization.
2. Managers in manufacturing companies in south-south Nigeria should reward employees based on their contributions toward organizational goals as this would promote distributive justice in their organization.
3. Top level managers in manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria should provide equal pay, benefits and allowances to workers at the same grade level as this would promote
4. Managers in manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria should apply the same procedures and processes in treating all workers at the same grade level as this would not only promote procedural justice in their organization but would also encourage workers to go beyond their prescribed role to perform some extra-role to ensure proper functioning of the organization.
5. Top managers in manufacturing companies in South-South Nigeria should apply professional ethics in dealing with all workers in their organization as any form of bias will ruin the efforts of the organization to get the best out of its workers.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ajala, E. M. (2015). The influence of organizational justice on employees' commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria: Implications for industrial social work. *African Journal of Social Work*, 5(1), 93-130.
- Akanbi, P.A. & Ofoegbu, O.E. (2013). Impact of perceived organizational justice on organizational commitment of a food and beverage firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 207-218.
- Amsale, F., Bekele, M. & Tafesse, M. (2016). The ethical behaviors of educational leaders in Ethiopian public universities: The case of the Western Cluster Universities. *European Scientific Journal*, 12 (13), 359-379.
- Appelbau, S., Bartolomucci, N., Beaumier, E., Boulanger, J., Corrigan, R., Dore, I. & Serronni, C. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A case study of culture, leadership and trust. *Management Decision*, 42 (1), 13-40.
- Ariani, D.W. (2013). The relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4 (2), 46-56.

- Azizi, B., Alipour, O., Mehni, M.A.K & Shojaee, K. (2014). Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in sport teachers in Department of Education from Sanandaj. *Advances in Applied Science Research*, 5(4), 95-99.
- Cagliyan, V., Attar, M. & Derra, M. (2017). The relationship between organizational justice perception and organizational commitment: A study on Dogus Otomoyive Authorized Dealers in Kenya. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 22 (2), 599-612.
- Chen, H.R., Liu, Y., Cheng, B. & Chiu, H. (2009). A study of human resource management on organization commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour: A comparative case for cross-strait employees of a Taiwanese Paper Company. *Journal of the Chinese Institute of Industrial Engineers*, 26(2), 289-302.
- Chinomona, E. & Dhurup, M. (2015). The role of organizational commitment in the organizational citizenship behaviour and employee intention to stay relationship: The case of Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Humanities and social Sciences*, 5 (7), 47-58.
- Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M. & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: Evidence of a new psychological predictor of health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(1), 105-108.
- Freeman, R. E. & Stewart, L. (2006). *Developing ethical leadership*. London: Bridge Paperso.
- Fuchs, S. & Edwards, M.R. (2012). Predicting pro-change behaviour: The role of perceived organizational justice and organizational identification. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22 (1), 39-59.
- Gamage, A.S. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviour among employees in SMES in Japan: An analysis of the link with HRM practices. *Kindai Management Review*, 2, 129-140.
- Hassan, A. (2002). Organizational justice as a determinant of organizational commitment and intention to leave. *Asian Academic & Management Journal*, 7(2): 55-66.
- Jawad, M., Raja,S. Abraiz, A. & Tabassum, T.M. (2012). Role of Organizational Justice in Organizational Commitment with Moderating Effect of Employee Work Attitudes. *Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 39-45.
- Khaleh, L.A.B.C. & Najji, S. (2016). The Relationship between Organizational Commitment Components and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Nursing Staff. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 5 (5), 173-179.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N. J (2007). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98.
- Mihelic, K.K., Lipicnik, B. & Tekavcic, M. (2010). Ethical leadership. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems*, 14 (5), 31-42.

- Misuko, N. (2012). Employees perception on positive and negative factors influencing procedural justice in making promotion decision. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3 (13), 67 -80.
- Mohamed, M.S. & Anisa, H. (2012). Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Jamal Institute of Management, Jamal Mohamed College, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India.
- Ozdem, G. (2012). The Relationship between the organizational citizenship behaviors and the organizational and professional commitments of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 6(2), 47-64.
- Pickford, H.C. & Joy, G. (2016). *Organizational citizenship behaviours: Definitions and dimensions*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Priyankara, H.P.R., Luo, F., Saeed, A., Nubuor, S.A. & Jayasuriya, M.P.F. (2018). How does leader's support for environment promote organizational citizenship behaviour for environment? A multi-theory perspective. *Sustainability Article*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mdpi.com>.
- Rahman, A. Shahzad, N., Mustafa, K., Khan, M.F. & Qurashi, F. (2016). Effects of organizational justice on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6 (3), 188-196.
- Rathore, M. & Sen, C. (2017). Organizational justice and organizational commitment: A study on it sector. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(4), 117-124.