Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What Is the Relationship?

Judith W. Tansky[1]

This study investigates the relationship between perceptions of overall fairness, organizational citizenship behavior, employee attitudes, and the quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship based on the justice and organizational citizenship literature. Results show that employees do form perceptions of overall fairness and that these perceptions influence job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Relationships are found between altruism and perceptions of overall fairness, job satisfaction and categories of organizational citizenship behavior, and the quality of the supervisory-subordinate relationship and perception of overall fairness and organizational citizenship behavior. Practical implications and issues for future research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational justice has been recognized as an important issue in the effective functioning of organizations (Greenberg, 1990; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Greenberg and Tyler (1987) suggested that people are concerned about matters of justice and that justice does influence job attitudes, and in fact, may explain a wide variety of organizational behaviors as well (Greenberg, 1990). Unfortunately, research in organizational justice has focused more on job attitudes (Greenberg, 1990), limiting our knowledge concerning justice effects on important organizational behaviors. Recently, Organ (1988) claimed that one important behavior across people and over time that makes an organization more effective is organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, one issue of interest for the organizational justice literature and in the effective functioning of organizations may be the relationship between justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

[1]College of Business, Department of Management, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807.

The organizational justice literature is the result of attempts to explain the role of fairness in the workplace (Greenberg, 1987). The distinction is made between distributive justice, which focuses on the fairness of the outcomes received from decision procedures, and procedural justice, which focuses on the fairness of the procedures themselves (Greenberg, 1990). Research has also provided evidence that people consider the quality of their treatment by others as a determinant of fairness (this is usually called "interactional justice," see Barrett-Howard & Tyler, 1986; Bies, 1986; Tyler, 1988). Thus, Greenberg (1990) concluded that procedural justice is influenced by the structural characteristics of the decision and the quality of the interpersonal treatment associated with the decision making (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991, p. 699).

The justice literature has primarily focused on the distinction between procedural and distributive justice (e.g., Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Greenberg, 1986; Tyler & Caine, 1981). The research on procedural justice has focused on specific issues within organizations. These issues include such areas as drug testing (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991), grievance systems (Gordon & Fryxell, 1989), layoffs (Brockner & Greenberg, 1990), pay raises (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), and performance appraisal (Greenberg, 1986). The justice research has not focused on employees' overall perceptions of the fairness of the organization.

Greenberg (1988) suggested that organizations may strive to establish a "culture of fairness" since such organizations may reap benefits that might include attracting and maintaining the best job candidates (pp. 67-68). The implication is that the best job candidates will make the organization more effective because of their attitudes and behaviors. Little research focuses on whether perceptions of overall fairness or perceptions of a "culture of fairness" influence employee attitudes and/or behaviors.

A "culture of fairness" may mean that employees believe they will be rewarded well for their performance. Perceptions of overall fairness may also mean that employees believe that, overall, the rules that are used to make decisions are fair or that they will be treated with respect. In turn, these perceptions may lead to more global organizational evaluations, such as that the management in this organization is honest and ethical.

Organ (1988) argued that "perceived fairness is a particularly salient attribute of the exchange relationship between individuals or between an individual and a larger entity, such as the organization" (pp. 67-68). Employees not only enter into an economic exchange with their employers, but they also enter into a social exchange. Although both exchanges involve fairness, the fairness of the social exchange is based on a "global, intuitive assessment" (Organ, 1990, p. 63). "Fairness in social exchange requires only a sense that the relationship is based on 'good faith' recognition of each other's contributions" (Organ, 1990, p. 63). Thus, employees' perceptions of overall fairness may include both a specific assessment of the fairness of the economic exchange, and a global assessment of the social exchange.

Social exchange theory (Adams, 1965; Blau, 1964) predicts that, given certain conditions, people seek to reciprocate those who benefit them (Bateman & Organ, 1983, p. 588). One behavior that employees may exhibit to reciprocate those who

benefit them is organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988, p. 4). The individual makes a personal choice to display OCB since it is not required by the individual's job description.

Moorman (1991) argued that research should examine the relationship between perceptions of fairness and organizational citizenship behavior. If employees perceive a culture of fairness that leads to global organizational evaluations such as "managers in this organization are honest and ethical," then they may reciprocate by displaying OCB, a nontraditional type of performance (Moorman, 1991). Organ (1988) argued that employees may feel they have more control over OCB than they do over regular job performance and thus may be more apt to modify OCB. Thus, employees may evaluate the social exchange relationship in terms of overall fairness and reciprocate with OCB. This type of exchange was suggested by Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991). As a result of their study on drug-testing fairness, they concluded that their findings suggested an underlying mechanism of social exchange.

Based upon the justice and social exchange literature, the purpose of this article is to examine the relationship between perceptions of overall fairness and organizational citizenship behavior. This study also looked at the relationships that may exist between perceptions of overall fairness, OCB, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment since these attitudes have been shown to be related (see Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Moorman, 1991). The quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship, perceptions of overall fairness, and OCB were also examined. Predictors are important if we are concerned with influencing perceptions of overall fairness or OCB.

HYPOTHESES

Organ (1988) has identified five categories of OCB or discretionary behaviors: Altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Based upon the work of Organ (1988), the five categories will be defined as follows: (1) Altruism includes all discretionary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with an organizationally relevant task or problem. (2) Conscientiousness captures the various instances in which organization members carry out certain role behaviors well beyond the minimum required levels. (3) Sportsmanship represents some actions that people refrain from doing. (4) Courtesy represents helping someone prevent a problem from occurring, or taking steps in advance to mitigate the problem. (5) Based on the work of Graham (1986), civic virtue is the responsible participation in the political life of the organization.

One way to respond to perceived unfairness lies in a calculated, discriminating withholding of discretionary gestures of the sort suggested by OCB (Organ, 1988). The opposite argument might also be made. One way to react to perceptions of overall fairness may be to display citizenship behaviors, especially if employees consider conditions of social exchange (Moorman, 1991). Studies have found positive

relationships between perceptions of fairness and various forms of OCB. Konovsky and Folger (1991) found a relationship between procedural justice and altruism, while Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990) found fairness related to a two-factor model of OCB. Two other studies found extrarole behavior significantly correlated with job equity and pay equity (Dittrich & Carroll, 1979; Scholl, Cooper, & McKenna, 1987). Recently, a study (Moorman, 1991) found a causal relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and OCB, but interactional justice was the only dimension of fairness to significantly relate to OCB. Thus, I propose that:

Hypothesis 1. Perceptions of overall fairness will be positively related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Research in the area of justice has shown that perceptions of justice are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Moorman, 1991). If employees form opinions about fairness of outcomes or procedures related to a specific organizational phenomena (e.g., pay) and these perceptions are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, then one might also hypothesize that when employees form perceptions of overall fairness they may be related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Organ (1990) recommended testing the hypothesis that OCB is an expression of satisfaction. Several studies have looked at the relationships between OCB and satisfaction and found significant correlations between the two. For example, Bateman and Organ (1983) found a correlation of .41 between supervisory OCB ratings and OCB. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) found a correlation of .33 between job satisfaction and altruism and .29 between job satisfaction and compliance (the forerunner of conscientiousness).

Hypothesis 2. Perceptions of overall fairness will be positively related to job satisfaction and to organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 3. Job satisfaction will be positively related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Organizational commitment may predict OCB (Organ, 1990) if organizational commitment is defined as an attitude or a set of behavioral intentions. Organizational commitment can imply an acceptance of organizational values, an intent to remain in the organization, or a willingness to exert effort on the behalf of the organization (Steers, Mowday, & Porter, 1982). Research by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), based on defining organizational commitment as the strength of the attachment to the organization, found a relationship between OCB and extrarole behavior.

Hypothesis 4. Organizational commitment will be positively related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Other researchers (see Moorman, 1991; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) have raised the issue of the importance of the relationship with the

supervisor on OCB. Research (see Tyler & Bies, 1989) has shown that the inter-personal context of procedural justice is very important. Moorman found that interactional justice was the only dimension of fairness to be significantly related to OCB (1991, p. 852), and defended these findings with the following argument. Subordinates who were rated high by supervisors on OCB might be members of the supervisor's in-group, as described in the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Scandura & Graen, 1984). The in-group perceives the quality of their relationship with their supervisor as more positive. These subordinates might also be more apt to rate their managers more highly, which Moorman (1991) argued would explain high interactional justice. Thus, perceptions of the quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship might be related to OCB behaviors and also to perceptions of overall fairness.

Hypothesis 5. The quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship will be positively related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Hypothesis 6. The quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship will be positively related to perceptions of overall fairness.

METHOD

The data for this study were collected as part of a larger study. Because of the nature of the larger study, the data was both longitudinal and cross sectional. Participants in the study were non-union employees working in various locations for a division of a subsidiary of a Fortune 100 company. Packets were mailed to 64 supervisor/managers who were randomly selected from computer files. These managers were also asked to respond to a questionnaire about OCB for two to seven of their subordinates. They were also asked to give a questionnaire to each subordinate for whom they completed an OCB questionnaire. It was possible that the same employee would be participating as both a manager and a subordinate.

Thirty-nine supervisor/managers returned the OCB questionnaires, for a response rate of 61%. The supervisor/managers filled out survey information on 191 employees. Of the 191 people asked to participate by their managers, 101 responded, for a 53% response rate. Due to the design of the study, only 75 of the 101 had responded to the items required for this study. The average age of employees was 37.3 years, the average length of time with the organization was 10.5 years, and the average tenure in the present job was 4.8 years. The average number of years of education was 15 years. Of the participants, 73.3% were male, 41% held supervisory or management positions, and 77% were exempt employees.

In August of 1990 the questionnaires were sent to the supervisor/managers and the employees. At that time sixteen of the employees responded to the entire questionnaire. Fifty-nine of the employees responded to all of the items except for the job satisfaction and organizational commitment items. They were asked to give

their names and addresses so that they could be sent a second questionnaire. The second questionnaire was mailed in January of 1991. Fifty-five employees responded to the second questionnaire. Four of the original fifty-nine employees had terminated in the five month span.

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, the measures were self-reported and were five-point Likert scales. For multiitem scales, component scores were standardized when reliability analyses revealed that it was necessary to correct for different component variances.

Perceptions of overall fairness were measured with a three-item scale designed for this study based on the justice literature, particularly the work of Folger and Konovsky (1989), Bies (1986), and Greenberg (1986). The items included: "management in my organization treats me honestly and ethically," "overall my organization is fair," and the "programs and policies in my organization are fair." Scales ranged from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree").

The five categories of OCB (altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue) were measured with scales based upon the work of Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989), which is a modified version of the measure used and validated by Podsakoff et al. (1990). They reported reliabilities ranging from .70 for civic virtue to .85 for altruism.

OCB was measured by the employee's immediate supervisor. According to Organ (1988) this is both advantageous and problematic. Positively, it avoids the same-source, common method problem. It is also argued (Organ, 1988) that if bosses do not directly observe the behaviors, they probably receive feedback on them from other employees. Negatively, supervisors may generalize behaviors they know to those they do not, they may not distinguish well between OCB and in-role performance, and one may risk compromising the concept of OCB (Organ, 1988).

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were measured with established scales. The 20-item short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) was used to assess job satisfaction. The 15-item scale devised by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) was used to assess organizational commitment. The attitudinal definition of organizational commitment is "the relative strength of an individual's identification with an involvement in a particular organization which is characterized by belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and a desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Steers et al., 1982, p. 27). Cronbach's alphas for organizational commitment have ranged from .82 to .93 with a median of .90 (Price & Mueller, 1986).

Employee perceptions of the quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship were measured by the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) scale (see Graen & Cashman, 1975). There are seven statements with four-point scales which differ for each question. The items were recoded so that a high score indicated a positive

relationship. Various Cronbach alphas have been reported for this scale. For example, in a two-part study, Scandura and Graen (1984) reported alphas of .86 and .84, respectively.

The following demographic variables were used as control variables in this study: Years of education, sex (0 = male, 1 = female), supervisory level (0 = no supervisory position, 1 = supervisory position), and exempt/nonexempt status (0 = exempt, 1 = nonexempt).

RESULTS

T-tests were performed to see if there were significant differences in job satisfaction and organizational commitment for employees responding to one questionnaire versus employees responding to two questionnaires in five months. Since there were no significant differences, the sample was treated the same for purposes of analysis. Means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and internal reliabilities are reported in Table I. Overall, the correlations among variables were low. Correlations for the five categories of OCB ranged from .36 to .57.

A factor analysis was performed for perceptions of overall fairness. The three items for perceptions of overall fairness loaded on one factor with an eigenvalue of 1.46. Partial support was found for Hypothesis 1 when examining the correlations (see Table I). Perceptions of overall fairness were positively and significantly related to altruism and conscientiousness. Table II shows the results of regressing altruism and conscientiousness on perceptions of overall fairness. Only the results of regressing altruism on perceptions of overall fairness were significant.

Table I shows support for Hypothesis 2. Perceptions of overall fairness and job satisfaction are positively and significantly related, as are perceptions of overall fairness and organizational commitment. Regression analysis showed that perceptions of overall fairness explained 20% of the variance in job satisfaction ($F = 16.11, p < 0.001$), and explained 18% of the variance in organizational commitment ($F = 13.2, p < 0.001$).

Partial support was found for Hypothesis 3 (see Table I). Job satisfaction was positively and significantly related to altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. These four relationships were also supported when each OCB dimension was regressed on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction accounted for 9% of the variance in altruism ($F = 5.77, p < 0.05$); 6% of the variance in sportsmanship ($F = 4.29, p < 0.05$); 14% of the variance in courtesy ($F = 10.52, p < 0.01$); and 13% of the variance in civic virtue ($F = 9.64, p < 0.01$).

Each of these five categories of OCB were regressed on job satisfaction, controlling for perceptions of overall fairness. After controlling for perceptions of overall fairness, job satisfaction accounted for an additional 11% of the variance in courtesy (change in $F = 7.92, p < 0.01$, total $F = 5.19, p < 0.01$). Only job satisfaction has a significant T value. The same relationship was found for civic virtue. After controlling for perceptions of overall fairness, job satisfaction accounted for an additional 10% of the variance in civic virtue (change in

Table I. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations[a]

Variable	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Perceptions of overall fairness	3.59	0.68	(0.73)											
2 Altruism	3.99	0.64	0.26*	(0.76)										
3 Conscientiousness	4.06	0.65	0.21*	0.57***	(0.74)									
4 Sportsmanship	3.78	0.67	0.19	0.43***	0.37**	(0.73)								
5 Courtesy	4.01	0.64	0.13	0.57***	0.48***	0.50***	(0.82)							
6 Civic virtue	3.95	0.60	0.14	0.49***	0.58***	0.41***	0.36**	(0.76)						
7 Job satisfaction	3.73	0.52	0.45***	0.27*	0.15	0.25*	0.37**	0.35**	(0.88)					
8 Organizational commitment	3.66	0.48	0.42***	0.06	-0.03	-0.08	0.08	0.07	0.57***	(0.85)				
9 Supervisory/subordinate relationship	3.11	0.57	0.52***	0.37***	0.34**	0.30**	0.22*	0.33**	0.45***	0.30**	(0.85)			
10 Years of education	15.01	1.81	0.04	-0.30**	-0.17	-0.11	-0.07	0.08	-0.09	-0.16	-0.07			
11 Sex	0.27	0.45	-0.11	0.05	0.01	0.05	-0.25*	-0.11	0.02	-0.08	-0.08	-0.26*		
12 Supervisory level	0.41	0.50	-0.01	-0.11	0.01	-0.13	-0.09	0.18	-0.02	0.06	-0.10	0.28**	-0.26*	
13 Age	37.25	12.28	-0.04	-0.24*	-0.14	-0.22*	-0.20*	-0.03	0.01	0.24*	-0.02	-0.07	-0.04	0.27**

[a] N varies 64 to 75. Reliabilities are shown in parentheses. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$.

Table II. Results of Regressing Altruism and Conscientiousness on
Perceptions of Overall Fairness

Dependent variable	Altruism		
	b	SE	β
Perceptions of overall fairness	0.28	0.12	0.29*
r^2		0.08*	

Dependent variable	Conscientiousness		
	b	SE	β
Perceptions of overall fairness	0.22	0.12	0.22
r^2		0.05	

*$p < 0.05$.

$F = 6.91, p < 0.05$, total $F = 4.79, p < 0.05$). Again, only job satisfaction had a significant T value.

Hypothesis 4 was not supported (see Table I). There were no significant, positive relationships between organizational commitment and any of the five categories of OCB.

Hypothesis 5 was supported. The quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship was positively and significantly related to altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (see Table I). Each category of OCB was regressed on the quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship controlling for years of education, sex, supervisory position, and age. After controlling for the demographic variables, quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship accounted for an additional 13% of altruism (change in $F = 11.57, p < 0.01$, total $F = 5.06, p < 0.001$); 14% of conscientiousness (change in $F = 11.02, p < 0.01$, total $F = 3.06, p < 0.05$); 9% of sportsmanship (change in $F = 6.63, p < 0.05$, total $F = 2.42, p < 0.05$); 9% of courtesy (change in $F = 7.49, p < 0.01$, total $F = 3.67, p < 0.01$); and 13% of civic virtue (change in $F = 10.00, p < 0.01$, total $F = 2.49, p < 0.05$).

Support was found for Hypothesis 6, the supervisory/subordinate relationship was positively and significantly related to perceptions of overall fairness (see Table I). After controlling for years of education, sex, supervisory level, and age, the supervisory/subordinate relationship accounted for an additional 28.9% of the variance in perceptions of overall fairness (change in $F = 27.5$, $p < 0.001$).

Each of the five categories of OCB was regressed on perceptions of overall fairness, controlling for years of education, sex, supervisory level, and age, and the supervisory/subordinate relationship. Perceptions of overall fairness did not account for a significant percentage of the variance of any of the five categories.

DISCUSSION

These findings support previous research findings (Farh *et al.*, 1990; Konovsky & Folger, 1991) that perceptions of fairness are related to altruism more than the other four categories of OCB. Since altruism represents discretionary behaviors that help a specific other person and the OCB ratings were done by the supervisor, one might argue that supervisors are most aware of altruistic behaviors since they affect the supervisor's work. Future work looking at other evaluators for OCB (e.g., co-workers, self-reports) might discover different findings. For example, co-workers might be more aware of individuals who help someone prevent a problem from occurring (courtesy) or of individuals who refrain from certain actions (sportsmanship).

Future work might also examine global perceptions of the three justices (distributive, procedural, and interactional) rather than perceptions of overall fairness. People may not only form a global perception of overall fairness, but also global perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Moorman (1991) found that perceptions of interactional justice accounted for a significant relationship with altruism. Employees may perceive that their supervisor is most responsible for how they treat employees over the long term. Distributive and procedural aspects may be attributed to the organizational management as a whole. Thus, employees may reciprocate their supervisors' fair treatment with OCB behaviors that directly benefit their supervisor (altruism).

Some support was found for a relationship between conscientiousness and perceptions of overall fairness. Supervisors may have a difficult time distinguishing between this OCB and performance. Many supervisors may see instances where organization members carry out certain role behaviors well beyond the minimum required levels as excellent job performance rather than OCB. Again, ratings by other evaluators may result in different findings.

Perceptions of overall fairness were strongly associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Since the study was longitudinal, this provides evidence of a cause/effect relationship between a "culture of fairness" and these two employee attitudes. Thus, if any organization is concerned with employee attitudes, it should also be concerned not only with specific perceptions of fairness (e.g., performance appraisal, pay) but also with overall, or global, perceptions. Support is offered for Organ's (1990) argument that employees make an assessment of both their economic and social exchange with the organization and that perceived fairness is a salient attribute of the exchange relationship.

Organ (1988) has argued that the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB that has been found in the literature "merely reflects the degree to which job satisfaction measures include job fairness" (Moorman, 1991, p. 851). Although Moorman (1991) found support for this argument, only partial support was found for this study. Job satisfaction was related to every category of OCB except conscientiousness. This may be related to performance, in the sense that employees may carry out certain role behaviors beyond the minimum required levels because they are concerned with pay raises, promotions, or other rewards that might be gained because of this discretionary behavior. When perceptions of overall fairness

were controlled, regression analysis showed that only two of the OCBs did not have significant variance accounted for by job satisfaction. These two types of OCBs, altruism and sportsmanship, may be related to job satisfaction because the measures include job fairness. Job satisfaction may be more directly related to both courtesy and civic virtue. If employees are satisfied with their coworkers, job itself, etc., then they may be more apt to prevent problems that may disrupt the organization. Also, employees who feel good about their job may be more interested in participating in the organization. Future research should use the revised OCB scales of Podsakoff *et al.* (1990) to explore this issue, and OCB ratings by the employee may be more appropriate for examining this type of relationship.

No evidence was found to support the argument that organizational commitment may influence OCB. Organ (1990) may have provided the explanation for this situation when he argued that "other variables might actually predict OCB better than organizational commitment, since the connections from attitudes to intentions to behavior are far from perfect" (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, p. 51). As previously stated, OCB ratings by the employee may be more appropriate for examining this type of relationship, because employees may see themselves exhibiting behaviors that the supervisor does not observe. For future research, one might ask co-workers to evaluate OCB.

Strong support was found for the relationship between quality of the supervisory/subordinate relationship and perceptions of overall fairness. People do consider the quality of their treatment by others as a determinant of fairness (Greenberg, 1990). This is an argument for developing scales that measure perceptions of overall fairness of outcomes, overall fairness of procedures, and overall fairness of interpersonal treatment.

Support was found for the predicted relationships between quality of supervisory/subordinate relationship and the five categories of OCB. One explanation for this finding focuses on the fact that the supervisor evaluated OCB behavior. Supervisors who have a good relationship with their subordinates may also rate them higher on OCB, or treat high-OCB subordinates more favorably than other employees. A social exchange argument might also explain the findings. Employees who believe they have a good relationship with their supervisor are getting benefits that are not specifically outlined in their economic exchange with the organization. In order to reciprocate, they display discretionary OCBs that benefit the organization, the supervisor, or another party in the organization.

These findings have a number of practical implications. Among them are that supervisors can influence both perceptions of a "culture of fairness" and OCBs. Research is needed to examine what a supervisor can do to influence employees' perceptions of a quality relationship between the two. Management in the organization might focus on developing a "culture of fairness" since perceptions then may result in desired employee attitudes.

Management might also want to focus on increasing the job satisfaction of employees if management is interested in OCB. This study provides evidence that there may be a direct relationship between some categories of OCB and job satisfaction. Organ (1990) argued that job satisfaction would be unrelated to OCB when the fairness component was partialled out. This was not true of all categories

of OCB. Thus, perceptions of fairness may be important for some categories of OCB and job satisfaction may be important for other categories.

Several limitations should be considered when reading this study. First, this sample came from one company, so there may be concerns over generalizability. Second, different results might be found in other organizations that were more or less fair, or where more or less OCB occurred. Factors unique to this organization may influence the results in ways that would be quite different for other organizations. Third, the size of this sample was quite small, which may lead to incorrect interpretations of the data. More longitudinal studies across organizations are needed.

CONCLUSIONS

This study contributes to both the justice literature and the literature on OCB. Evidence is provided to show that employees do form perceptions of overall fairness and that those perceptions influence employee attitudes, specifically, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Evidence is also provided that fairness is related to some types of OCB and that job satisfaction may be related to other types of OCB. Strong relationships were found between the quality of supervisory/ subordinate relationships and perceptions of overall fairness and OCB. There is also evidence to suggest that demographic variables should be examined as predictors of different categories of OCB.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2), 267-299. New York: Academic Press.

Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research, 1,* 177-198.

Barrett-Howard, E., & Tyler, T. (1986). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 296-304.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 587-595.

Bies, R. J. (1986, August). Identifying principles of interactional justice: The case of corporate recruiting. In Bies, R. J. (Chair.), *Moving Beyond Equity Theory: New Directions in Research on Justice in Organizations.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York: Wiley, 1964.

Brockner, J., & Greenberg, J. (1990). The impact of layoffs on survivors: An organizational justice perspective. In Carroll, J. S. (Ed.) *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings,* 45-75. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dittrich, J. E., & Carroll, M. R. (1979). Organizational equity perceptions, employee job satisfaction, and departmental absence and turnover rates. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24,* 29-40.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16,* 705-721.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975) *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32,* 115-130.

Gordon, M. E., & Fryxell, G. E. (1989). Voluntariness of association as a moderator of the importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 3,* 325-334.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In Hunt, J. G., & Larson, L. L. (Eds.) *Leadership Frontiers,* 143-165. Kent, OH: Kent State Press.

Graham, J. W. (1986, August). *Organizational citizenship informed by political theory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 340-342.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 9-22.

Greenberg, J. (1988). Cultivating an image of justice: Looking fair on the job. *Academy of Management Executive, 2,* 155-157.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16,* 399-432.

Greenberg, J., & Tyler, T. R. (1987). Why procedural justice in organizations? *Social Justice Research, 1,* 127-142.

Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 698-707.

Konovsky, M. A., & Folger, R. (1991). *The effects of procedural and distributive justice on organizational citizenship behavior.* Unpublished manuscript, A. B. Freeman School of Business, Tulane University.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice.* New York: Plenum.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 845-855.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M.. & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 492-499.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In Staw, B. M., & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 12), 43-72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1989). *A second generation measure of organizational citizenship behavior.* Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1,* 107-142.

Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of Organizational Measurement.* Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.

Scandura G. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating affects of initial leader/member exchange status on the effects of leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69,* 428,436.

Scholl, R. W., Cooper, E. A., & McKenna, J. F. (1987). Relationships in determining equity perceptions: Differential effects, behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 300-316.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653-663.

Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Porter, L. (1982). *Employee Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover.* New York: Academic Press.

Tyler, T. R. (1988). What is procedural Justice? *Law and Society Review, 22,* 301-335.

Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1989). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In Carroll, J. S. (Ed.) *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings,* 77-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler, T. R., & Caine, A. (1981). The role of distributive and procedural fairness in the endorsement of formal leaders. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41,* 643-655.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.* Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.