RESEARCH ARTICLE

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN EMPLOYEES OF A TURKISH UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

[1]Esra Saatci, [2]Efe Efeoglu, [1]ZelihaAkman Usguloglu, [1]Elif Can Halici and [3],*Emrah Ersoy

[1]Department of Family Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey
[2]Department of International Commerce and Finance, Faculty of Business Administration, Adana Science and Technology University, Turkey
[3]Center of Goitre Research and Treatment, Clinic of Family Medicine, Rize, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Background and objective: The aim of this study is to define the level of organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational justice and related factors in employees of Cukurova University Hospital. **Methodology:** Our sample consisted of 159 employees. Data was collected with a sociodemographic questionnaire, Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale, and Perception of Organizational Justice Scale. **Results:** All subdomain scores of organizational citizenship behavior were at the lowest quartile. Three out of four subordinates scores of perception of organizational justice were in moderate-high group. Only informational justice score was in low-moderate group. The significant related factors for all subdomains of organizational citizenship behavior were number of children, occupation, and tenure. Age was significantly related to all subordinates except civic virtue. Gender was significantly related to courtesy and sportsmanship. Perception of organizational justice was significantly related to age, number of patients per day, and the department where the participant works. Organizational citizenship behavior was significantly correlated with perception of organizational justice. **Conclusion:** As the level of organizational citizenship behavior were found to be low and the level of perception of organizational justice were found to be moderate-high in employees of Cukurova University Hospital, interventions are required to improve the level of organizational citizenship behavior and informational justice.

Citation: *Esra Saatci, Efe Efeoglu, ZelihaAkman Usguloglu, Elif Can Halici and Emrah Ersoy*, **2018.** "Organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational justice in employees of a Turkish university hospital", *International Journal of Current Research*, 10, (08), 72337-72342.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of organizational citizenship had been used by Organ (Organ, 1988) and others (Podsakoff *et al.,* 2000; DiPaola and Hoy, 2005) in 1983. Organ (1988) defined the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as "the voluntary individual action that is not defined clearly in the formal reward and punishment system of the organization but supporting the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization as a whole". Gautam (2004) and others (Asgari *et al.,* 2008) indicate the OCB may be described as the voluntary, contextual or extra role performance. Despite the new definition, "individual behavior that supports the social and psychological context of task performance" (Organ, 1997), most academicians still measure OCB construct via such

*Corresponding author: **Emrah Ersoy,**
Center of Goitre Research and Treatment, Clinic of Family Medicine, Rize, Turkey.

typology of behavioral components as altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (Organ *et al.,* 2006). Engagement with OCB by employees are depending some preconditions (Williams *et al.,* 2002). In 2002 Aryee *et al.,* (2002) stated that one of such precondition is workers' perception of justice. In 2008 Asgari *et al.,* (2008) also concluded that when employees perceive justice practices they behave positively. In 2005 Elovainio *et al.,* (2005) have defined organizational justice as fairness and honest treatment to employees in the organization. Hubbel and Assad (2005) (2005) said that it is about the process of these outcome are fair or not. Cremers (2005) described that organizational justice is the important controlling aspect in all activities of any organizations. The concept of organizational justice is been related with other important organizational variables such as organizational citizenship, loyalty, motivation, organizational climate, job satisfaction, absenteeism, productivity and release (Forret and Love, 2008). Colquitt *et al.,* (2001) have found that organizational justice perceptions (OJP) strongly affect the

attitude of workers. They stated that attitudes such as employee job satisfaction, turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and workplace behavior such as absenteeism and OCB are found to be correlated with perception of justice in the work place. Perception of justice in the workers may generate a state of mind with a positive attitude. This condition may in turn lead the workers to get engage in performing OCB (2000). According to Moorman (1993), organizational justice is about the organizational behaviors. The evaluation of the employees by their chiefs and their perceptions toward its fairness determine their organizational behaviors. Morman's theory points out the fair attitudes of managers are more important than the just evaluations about the general procedures. The procedural justice, who is about the formal procedures related to the organization, focuses on the organization generally, on the other hand, interpersonal justice enables the workers see themselves as valuable and important individuals. The tripartite conceptualization of organizational justice consists of distributive, procedural, and interactional dimensions. Distributive justice represents the perceived fairness regarding the allocation of organizational resources; procedural justice implies the perceived fairness of the means and procedures used to determine those allocations; and interactional justice means the perceived fairness concerning the quality of interpersonal treatment, typically received from one's supervisor, in an organization when procedures are enacted (Colquitt *et al.,* 2005). On the other hand, some describe an additional fourth dimension; informational justice (Colquitt and Chertkoff, 2002; Nowakovski and Conlon, 2005). The aim of this study was to find the level of OCB and OJP in employees of Cukurova University Hospital in the city of Adana, Turkey.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample

Our sample consisted of 159 employees of Cukurova University Hospital. Data was collected and analyzed September 2015 to February 2016. The respondents were working in various departments of Internal, Surgical and Basic Medical Sciences. The age range was 20 to 57 years. The minimum duration of working in the faculty was one year whereas the maximum was 37 years.

Questionnaires

Data was collected using sociodemographic questionnaire, organizational citizenship behavior scale, and organizational justice scale. The questionnaires were completed face-to-face. Sociodemographic questionnaire included details such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, profession, duration of work in the profession, duration of work in this institution, name of the department, type of work (day or night), mean number of patients seen per day.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

The organizational citizenship scale was developed by Podsakoff (2) and Morrison (20) for measuring the OCB. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version was performed by Basim (21) (2008). This scale consists of 20 items and five subdimensions: altruism (five items), conscientiousness (four items), courtesy (three items), sportsmanship (four items), and civic virtue (four items). Participants rate the items on a 5-

point Likert- type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*).

Organizational Justice Perceptions

Perception of organizational justice was measured using the Justice Scale that was developed by Moorman. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version was performed by Gurbuz and Mert (22) (2009). The scale consists of 24 items and four components; distributive (eight items), procedural (seven items), interactional (four items), and informational dimensions (five items). Participants rated the items on a 5-point Likert- type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Statistical analysis

Data was coded and installed using Excel program and analyzed using SPSS statistical pocket program. Mann-Whitney, Kruskal Wallis and Spearman two-tail tests were used. The level of significance was set as $p \leq 0,05$.

RESULTS

Sociodemographic data

The age range was 20-57 years, 42,4% (n=64) were in 20-30 age group, 63,7% (n=100) was female, 56,6% (n=90) was married, 54,5% (n=85) had no children. Of respondents, 29,3% (n=44) was specialists or assistant professors or associate professors or full professors, 52,2% (n=82) were working in this profession for four years maximum, 66,0% (n=105) were working in this institution for four years maximum. For 38,1% (n=59) of respondents, Cukurova University Hospital was the second workplace. Many of the respondents were working in the Internal Medical Sciences (n=101, 66,4%) and 96,1% (n=148) had no managerial post, 45,3% (n=72) was working during daytime, 68,1% (n=94) had no night shifts, 34% (n=50) had one to 20 patients per day. Almost half of the respondents (48, 4%, n=74) were public workers whereas 32, 7% (n=50) was temporary workers (Table 1).

The Level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The scores of subdomains of Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the employees of Cukurova University Medical Faculty are shown in Table 2. All subdomain scores of organizational citizenship behavior were at the lowest quartile.

The Level of Organizational Justice Perception: The scores of subdomains of Organizational Justice Perception for the employees of Cukurova University Hospital are shown in Table 3. Three out of four subordinates scores of perception of organizational justice were in moderate-high group. Only informational justice score was in low-moderate group.

Sociodemographic Characteristics and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The sociodemographic details of the respondents and their relationship with subdomains of Organizational Citizenship Behavior are shown in Table 4. The significant related factors for all subdomains of organizational citizenship behavior were number of children, occupation, and tenure. Age was significantly related to all subordinates except civic virtue. Gender was significantly related to courtesy and sportsmanship.

Table 1. Sociodemographic details of the respondents (n=159)

		n	%
Gender (n=157)	Female	100	63,7
	Male	57	36,3
Age (n=151) (years)	20-30	64	42,4
	31-40	60	39,7
	41-50	17	11,3
	51 and +	10	6,6
Marital status (n=159)	Married	90	56,6
	Single	69	43,4
Number of children (n=156)	None	85	54,5
	One	39	25,0
	Two and more	32	20,5
Duration of work in this profession (n=157) (years)	0-4	82	52,2
	5-9	33	21,0
	10-14	13	8,3
	15-19	15	9,6
	20 and more	14	8,9
Duration of work in this institution (n=159) (years)	0-4	105	66,0
	5-9	16	10,1
	10-14	13	8,2
	15-19	11	6,9
	20 and more	14	8,8
Number of workplace since graduation (n=155)	First	41	26,5
	Second	59	38,1
	Third	37	23,9
	Fourth and more	18	11,5
Post/Occupation (n=150)	Resident	37	24,7
	Specialist/academic	44	29,3
	Support/cleaning staff	25	16,7
	Nurse/midwife	25	16,7
	Secretary/receptionist	12	8,0
	Technician	7	4,6
Department (n=152)	Internal medical sciences	101	66,4
	Surgical medical sciences	45	29,6
	Basic medical sciences	6	4,0
Managerial post (n=154)	Yes	6	3,9
	No	148	96,1
Work type (n=159)	Daytime	72	45,3
	Daytime + On call	62	39,0
	Shifts	25	15,7
Number of night shifts per month (n=138)	None	94	68,1
	Less than 5	2	1,4
	5-8	19	13,8
	9 and more	23	16,7
Number of patients per day (n=148)	None	13	8,8
	1-20	50	34
	21-50	49	33,8
	51-99	26	17,6
	100 and more	10	5,8
Tenure (n=152)	Public worker (code: 657)	74	48,7
	University staff (code: 2547)	28	18,4
	Temporary staff	50	32,9

Table 2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale Subdomain Scores of Respondents

Altruism (n=158)	n	%
5-10	141	89,2
11-15	14	8,9
16-20	0	0
21-25	3	1,9
Courtesy (n=158)		
3-5	66	41,8
6-8	77	48,7
9-11	13	8,2
12-15	2	1,3
Consciousness (n=155)		
4-9	119	76,8
10-15	34	21,9
16-20	2	1,3
Sportsmanship (n=156)		
4-9	96	61,5
10-15	53	34,0
16-20	7	4,5
Civic virtue (n=159)		
5-10	129	81,1
11-15	27	17,0
16-20	3	1,9
21-25	0	0

Table 3. Organizational Justice Perception Subdomain Scores of Respondents

Distributive (n=151)	N	%
8-15	10	6,6
16-20	42	27,8
21-24	0	0
25-32	54	35,8
33-40	45	29,8
Procedural (n=143)		
7-13	14	9,8
14-20	48	33,5
21-27	54	37,8
28-35	27	18,9
Interactional (n=150)		
4-9	60	40,0
10-15	70	46,7
16-20	20	13,3
Informational (n=149)		
5-10	39	26,2
11-15	57	38,3
16-20	36	24,2
21-25	17	11,3

Table 4. Sociodemographic details and relationship with subdomains of organizational citizenship behavior (p values)

Sociodemographic details	Altruism	Courtesy	Consciousness	Sportsmanship	Civic virtue
Gender	NS	0,019	NS	0,005	NS
Age	0,0001	0,013	0,005	0,002	NS
Number of children	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Status (public or university staff)	0,007	0,014	0,001	0,001	0,001
Working day or night time	0,003	NS	0,001	0,003	0,0001
Department	NS	NS	NS	0,014	0,045
Number of workplace since graduation	NS	NS	0,021	NS	NS
Occupation	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001

NS: no significant

Table 5. Relationship between sociodemographic details and subdomains of perception of organizational justice (p values)

	Distributive	Procedural	Interactional	Informational
Age	0,001	0,024	NS	NS
Number of patients per day	0,008	0,003	NS	0,028
Department	NS	NS	0,018	NS
Number of workplace since graduation	NS	0,042	0,034	0,001

Ns: Not Significant

Table 6. Correlation between subdomains of organizational citizenship behavior (p values)

	Altruism	Courtesy	Consciousness	Sportsmanship	Civic virtue
Altruism	NA	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	NS
Courtesy	0,0001	NA	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001
Consciousness	0,0001	0,0001	NA	0,0001	0,0001
Sportsmanship	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	NA	0,0001
Civic virtue	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	NA

NA: not applicable NS: not significant

Table 7: Correlation between subdomains of organizational justice perception (p values)

	Distributive	Procedural	Interactional	Informational
Distributive	NA	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001
Procedural	0,0001	NA	0,0001	0,0001
Interactional	0,0001	0,0001	NA	0,0001
Informational	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	NA

NA: not applicable

The sociodemographic details of the respondents and their relationship with subdomains of Organizational Justice Perception are shown in Table 5. Perception of organizational justice was significantly related to age, number of patients per day, and the department where the participant works. The correlation between subdomains of Organizational Citizenship Behavior is shown in Table 6. The correlation between subdomains of Organizational Justice Perception is shown in Table 7.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Justice

The correlation between subdomains of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and subdomains of Organizational Justice Perception is shown in Table 8. Organizational citizenship behavior was significantly correlated with perception of organizational justice.

DISCUSSION

This study tested the relationships between organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational justice among a sample of employees in Cukurova University Hospital, Adana city, Turkey. Toour knowledge, there are very few studies in OCB and organizational justice perception in the health sector in our country. Results of this study revealed that medical faculty workers' level of organizational citizenship behavior was low whereas level of perceptions of organizational justice were at moderate-high level. Unlike the study by Nielsen *et al.* (2009) we found that age was significantly related to OCB and organizational justice perception. There was a significant relationship between gender and OCB. This finding agreed with Rubin's (2009) research results. Occupation, time spend in this occupation and in this institution, daily workload seemed to be important factors in OCB and organizational justice perception levels of workers. Inconsistent with our findings, Podsakoff (2000) stated that demographic variables (e.g., organizational tenure and employee gender) have not been found to be related to OCB. Being aware of the factors that may influence employees' perception of justice is very crucial for every organization. Further, studying on organizational citizenship behavior among health institutions is very important as employees have essential roles. Considering the findings of this study it is possible to recommend the health institutions to increase the level of justice to improve their engagement in organizational citizenship behavior.

Chen *et al.* (1998) conceptualized levels of OCB performance as a behavioral predictor of employee turnover and empirically examined the strength of this relationship. Our findings are inconsistent with Chen's. We found that the highest level of OCB and organizational justice perception was in the workers who were working in this hospital for four years maximum. Sahin and Taskaya (2010) found that procedural and distributional justice levels were lower than the levels of other subdomains of justice in health professionals. They also found that organizational justice perception was significantly related to educational status, duration of work in this institution, number of night shifts per month, having managerial tasks and the number of patients seen per day. Our findings are consistent with this study. The study of Moorman (1991) showed that the workers perceiving fair practices of managers provide more OCB. According to Ortiz (2006), the consciousness of OCB depends primarily on the organizational justice perception. Konovsky and Pugh (1994) conclude that the trust toward managers strengthen the relationship between procedural justice and OCB. The interactional justice perception is an important tool to forecast the practices of citizenship behaviors (2005). Our finding suggests that organizational justice perception has a meaningful correlation with OCB and this agrees with Cropanzano's study (2007). Williams and others (2002) determined positive and significant relationship between formal procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice and OCB intent of workers in various sectors including manufacturing, finance, ICT, banking in a city at the southwest of USA. In another survey, Blakely and others (2005) asserted that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice perception and OCB among full time personnel in different organizations. Chiaburu and Lim (2008) found out that there is a positive relationship between procedural justice and OCB among employees in a firm in USA. Chegini (2009) determined high correlation between

OCB and organizational justice dimensions among 300 Rasht public sector employees in Iran. Young (2010) has also outcomes showing the positive relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors among 454 private sector workers in Korea. Among the studies in Turkey, Arslantas (36) found a significant effect of perceived justice on OCB among white-collar workers of a communication and foreign trade firm in 2005. Erkutlu (2008) determined a positive and significant relationship between interactional, procedural and distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior among academicians in 10 public universities in Turkey. The positive emotions of individuals toward procedural justice bring about higher performance and increase in OCB (Abu Elanain, 2010). When the employees perceive the managerial and organizational procedures such as wage distribution and decision making fairly, they perform more effort to improve their organization and obey the rules about working hours voluntarily (Colquitt and Chertkoff, 2002). Blakely *et al.* (2005), in a research done in different organizations, found that when employees have a positive perception of their superior's fair behavior, the possibility of OCB increases.

Limitations: This current study has some limitations. The first limitation is that not all workers could be reached and our results cannot be generalized. Second, OCB and justice perceptions of the employees are sensitive to time. Third, the interest of workers in OCB might have caused a bias in accepting to participate in the study.

Conclusion

As the level of organizational citizenship behavior were found to be low and the level of perception of organizational justice were found to be moderate-high in employees of Cukurova University Hospital, interventions are required to improve the level of organizational citizenship behavior and informational justice.

Compliance with Ethical Standards: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Abu Elanain, H. M. 2010. Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes in a non-western context of the UAE. *Journal of Management Development,* 29(1), 5-27.

Abu Elanain, H. M. 2010. Work locus of control and interactional justice as mediators of the relationship between openness to experience and organizational citizenship behavior. Cross Cultural Management: *An International Journal,* 17(2), 170-192.

Arslantas, C. C. 2005. An empiric study to define the effect of perceived justice on organizational citizenship behavior. Akademik Fener, 2(4), 205-218 (in Turkish).

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S. and Z. X. Chen. 2002. Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 23(3), 267-285.

Asgari, A., Silong, A. D., Ahmad, A. and A. S. Bahaman. 2008. The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, organizational justice, leader-member exchange, perceived organizational support. *European Journal of Scientific Research,* 23 (2), 227-242.

Basim, H. N., Sesen, H. 2006. An adaptation and comparison of organizational citizenship behavior scale. Ankara Universitesi SBF Dergisi, 61(4), 83-101 (in Turkish).

Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C. and R. H. Moorman. 2005. The moderating effects of sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology,* 20(2), 259-273.

Chegini, M. G. 2009. The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration,* 1 (2), 171-174.

Chen, X. P., Hui, C. and D. J. Sego (1998. The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83 (6): 922-931.

Chiaburu, D. S. and A. S. Lim. 2008. Manager trustworthiness or interactional justice? Predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 83, 453-467.

Colquitt, J. A. and J. M. Chertkoff. 2002. Explaining injustice: The interactive effect of explanation and outcome on fairness perceptions and task motivation. *Journal of Management,* 28(5), 591-610.

Colquitt, J. A., D. E. Conlod, M. J. Wesson., C. Porter & K. N. G. Yee. 2001. Justice at the Millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(3), 425-445.

Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J. & Scott, B. A. 2005. Organizational justice: Where do we stand? *In J. Green- berg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.),* Handbook of organizational justice (pp. 113-154). Mahwah: NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cremers, K. J. M. and V. B. Nair. 2005. Governance mechanisms and equity prices. *The Journal of Finance,* 60 (6), 2859-2894.

Cropanzano, R. D., Bowen, E. and S. W. Gilliland. 2007), The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 21 (4), 34-48.

DiPaola, M. F. and W. K. Hoy. 2005. School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership,* 15 (4), 387–406.

Elovainio, M., Van den Bos, K., Linna, A., Kivimaki, M., Ala-Mursula, L., Pentti, J. and J. Vahtera. 2005), Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public-sector employees. *Social Science and Medicine,* 61 (12), 2501- 2512.

Erkutlu, H. 2008. The regulatory role of organizational culture on the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice concepts. Abstract book of 16th National Administration and Organization Congress. Istanbul Culture University, 16-18 May, 224-230 (in Turkish).

Forret, M. and M. S. Love. 2008. Employee justice perceptions and coworker relationships. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 29 (3), 248-260.

Gautam, T., Van Dick, R. and U. Wagner. 2004. Organizational identification and organizational commitment: Distinct aspects of two related concepts. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* 7 (3), 301-315.

Giap, B. N., Hackermeier, I., Jiao, X. and S. P. Wagdarikar. 2005. Organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational justice in student jobs. Workplace Behavior in Student Jobs, 1-14.

Gurbuz, S. and I. S. Mert. 2009. Validity and reliability of organizational justice scale. An empiric study in public. Amme Idaresi Dergisi, 42 (3), 117-139 (in Turkish).

Hubbel, A. P. and R. M. Chory-Assad. 2005. Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies,* 56 (1), 47-70.

Konovsky, M. A. and S. D. Pugh. 1994. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal,* 37, 656-669.

Moorman, H. M., Niehoff, B. P. and D. W. Organ. 1993. Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Right Journal,* 6 (3), 209-225.

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.

Morrison, E. 1994. Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal,* 37 (6), 1543-1567.

Nielsen, T. M., Hrivnak, G. A. and M. Shaw. 2009. Organizational citizenship behavior and performance: A meta-analysis of group-level research. *Small Group Research,* 40 (5): 555–77.

Nowakovski, J. M. and Conlon, D. E. 2005. Organizational justice: Looking back, looking forward. *International Journal of Conflict Management,* 16 (1): 4-29.

Organ, D. W. 1988. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. Human Performance, 10 (2), 85-97.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and S. B. MacKenzie. 2006. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. SAGE Publications.

Patino-Ortiz M, Galvez EM, Tejeida-Padilla R, & J. Pationo-Ortez. 2006. Organizational development, complexity and dynamics of systems. Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences - 2006, Sonoma, CA, USA.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and D. G. Bachrach, 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management,* 26 (3): 513-563.

Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C., Bommer, W. H. and T. T. Baldwin. 2009. Do leaders reap what they sow? Leader and employee outcomes of leader cynicism about organizational change. *Leadership Quarterly,* 20, 680-688.

Şahin, B. and S. Taşkaya. 2010. Assessment of the factors affecting perception of organizational justice of health employees by the structural equation model. *Hacettepe Saglik Idaresi Dergisi,* 13 (2), 85-114 (in Turkish).

Williams, S., Pitre, R. & M. Zainuba. 2000. Does mood influence organizational citizenship behaviour intentions? An experimental manipulation of affective state. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management,* 8 (2), 49-59.

Williams, S., Pitre, R. and M. Zainuba. 2002. Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 142 (1), 33-44.

Young, L. D. 2010. Is organizational justice enough to promote citizenship behavior at work? A retest in Korea. *European Journal of Scientific Research,* 45 (4), 637-648.

****