Summary
Organizational Justice and
Organization Citizenship Behavior Relationship:
A Meta-Analysis on Studies in Turkey

Sait Gürbüz
Turkish Military Academy

Özgür Ayhan
Turkish Military Academy

Mahmut Sert
Turkish Military Academy

Different from the task performance organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are the extra role behavior that "shape the organizational, social, and psychological contexts that serve as the catalyst for task activities and processes" (Borman & Motowidlo 1997: 100). Because of the importance of OCB in terms of organizational effectiveness and efficiency, it has been studied since it has been conceptualized by Organ (1988) in various context and culture. Empirical findings indicate that one of the most significant antecedents of OCB is organizational justice (OJ) (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). In the literature, OJ-OCB relationship has been meta-analyzed previously in western context (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al, 2001; Dalal, 2005; Organ & Ryan, 1995). However, no meta-analytical study explored OJ-OCB linkage in a predominantly collectivist cultural setting. To enhance generalizability of the results of the previous meta-analytical studies, more systematic research conducted in different cultural context is needed. Thus, main purpose of present study is to provide a meta-analytic examination of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in a collectivist culture (i.e., Turkey) using principles of psychometric meta-analysis method. We believe that including such a sample from a collectivist culture should lead to more comprehensive and realistic estimates of the OJ-OCB relationship.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is the discretionary employee behaviors that above and beyond prescribed role behaviors (Organ, 1988). OCB which is theoretically based on Barnard (1938) and Katz's (1964) studies, is conceptualized by Organ. Researchers observed that OCB is a key construct for effectiveness and efficiency (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Spitzmuller, Van Dyne, & Ilies, 2008). Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) have also pointed out that OCB is beneficial for both individuals and organizations.

There is no clear consensus about dimensions of OCB. There are approximately 30 dimensions mentioned as OCB in literature (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). According to Organ (1988), OCB has five dimensions which are altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue and sportsmanship, are used and tested in most of the studies (LePine, Erez and Johnson, 2002).

On the other hand, Williams and Anderson (1991) divided OCB based on targets of those behaviors. They operationalized OCB as organizational citizenship- individuals (OVD-I) and organizational citizenship behavior- organization (OCB-O). OCB-I refers to behaviors directly related to advantage of specific person, and OCB-O refers to behavior directly effect on organizational effectiveness and efficiency (Williams & Anderson, 1991). While OCB-I strongly related to altruism and courtesy, OCB-O strongly related to civic virtue and sportsmanship. In this study we differentiate between three facets of OCB: OCB as a general overall (general) construct (OCB-G), OCB directed at the organization as a whole (OCB-O) and OCB targeted specific individuals (OCB-I) using framework suggested by William and Anderson (1991).

Another important variable related to effectiveness and efficiency (Greenberg, 1990) and one of the antecedents of OCB is organizational justice (OJ) (Songür, Basım, & Şeşen, 2008). OJ can be defined as the perception of employees on various activities behaviors of managers and employees on them (Whitman et al., 2012). In the literature there are many definitions and all of them emphasis employees perception of justice. The important issue related to OJ is that what is perceived fair instead of what is really fair (Gürbüz, 2007).

Justice perception depends on the distribution

Address for Correspondence: Özgür Ayhan, Turkish Military Academy, Defense Sciences Institute, Bakanlıklar, 06654 Çankaya Ankara, Türkiye
E-mail: oayhan@kho.edu.tr

of gains, process of distribution and interaction in this process (İçerli, 2010). This expression point the three dimension of OJ which are distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ) (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Konovsky, 2000). Distributive justice refers to not only the distribution of reward but also distribution of workload in the organization fairly (Colquitt et al., 2001). Justice at the process of reward and workload distribution, constitute the PJ (Luo, 2007). Finally, IJ constitute the social aspect of process and refer to the quality of interaction (Luo, 2007).

According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), employees develop their attitude and behavior in accordance with the transaction that encounter in organization. If employee work in a fair environment, it is possible to show extra-role behaviors. Researchers claimed that social exchange theory and equity theory (Adams, 1965) provided a theoretical rationale between the relationship between OCB and OJ (George, 1991; Moorman, 1991; Moorman & Byrne, 2005; Organ, 1988). According to those theories, employee who encounters with injustice, will not give up his or her formal role behavior because of possibility of punishment, but he or she will leave extra role behavior that are under his or her control (Moormon, 1991).

Greenberg (1993) stated that justice is one of the most significant antecedents of extra role behaviors. Research results showed that there are moderate to strong relationships between OCB and OJ (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002; Young, 2010). On the other hand, researcher claimed that PJ has stronger relationship with OCB than DJ and IJ (Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Greenberg, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). In contrary, Yılmaz and Ceylan, (2006) and Farh, Early and Lin (1997) stated that there is stronger relationship between DJ and OCB than other facets of OJ. Rifai (2005) and Schappe (1998) reported that there is no a significant relationship between OCB and OJ.

Based on previous research results and social exchange and equity theory, there will be a significantly positive relationship between OJ and OCB. Hence;

H$_1$: There will be significantly positive relationships between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (H$_{1a}$), organizational citizenship behavior-individual (H$_{1b}$) and organizational citizenship behavior-organization (H$_{1c}$).

H$_2$: There will be significantly positive relationships between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior (H$_{2a}$), organizational citizenship behavior-individual (H$_{2b}$) and organizational citizenship behavior-organization (H$_{2c}$).

H$_3$: There will be significantly positive relationships between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior (H$_{3a}$), organizational citizenship behavior-individual (H$_{3b}$) and organizational citizenship behavior-organization (H$_{3c}$).

H$_4$: There will be significantly positive relationships between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior (H$_{4a}$), organizational citizenship behavior-individual (H$_{4b}$) and organizational citizenship behavior-organization (H$_{4c}$).

Method

Population and Samples

In order to identify relevant organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior studies in Turkey, both computer and manual literature searches were conducted. To ensure that all potential studies were identified, alternative keyword combinations (e.g., örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı, ekstra-rol davranışı, bağlamsal performans, örgütsel adalet, organizational citizenship behavio(u)r, extra-role behavior, contextual performance, organizational justice, fairness and OCB) were used to search the 17 international databases (Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, EBSCHO, Emerald, ERIC, DOAS (Directory of Open Access Journals), IEEE Xplore Digital Library, JSTOR, PsycINFO, Sage Journals Online, Science Direct, Springer Link, ULAKBİM (Ulusal Veri Tabanları), Taylor and Francis Online Journals, Wiley Online Library, Web of Knowledge, Web of Science.) Studies that appeared to include a relationship between OJ and OCB were obtained. Additionally, in order to locate full-text unpublished master's theses and doctoral dissertations, Theses and Dissertations Databases of Turkish Council of Higher Education (YOK TVT) and ProQuest were searched. Finally, searching process yielded a total of 27 studies that appeared to be relevant to the current study.

Coding

Information and data from selected studies were coded in a form developed by researchers. Three coders who are the researcher of this study, worked independently to code the data. Overall agreement level between coders was 95.84%. All disagreements were resolved using a subsequent joint discussion.

We used Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) and Card's (2012) studies as models in developing the coding form which had three sections; the first section involved information about the study and the sample. In second section, information about the instruments was coded. Finally, in third section correlation coefficients and statistical data that can be used to compute a correlation coefficient (e.g., t test or ANOVA values) were coded.

Inclusion Criteria

We determined several decision rules to determine which of studies should be included in the current meta-analysis. First, only studies that examined the relationship between OJ and OCB or relationship between their facets. Second, studies that used Turkish samples were included. Third, studies must have provided enough statistical information (e.g., correlation coefficient) to allow effect sizes to be computed. Finally, only studies that used full or part time employee samples were included.

Procedure

Meta-analytic procedures specified by Hunter and Schmidt (1990) were employed to compute our results using the interactive artifact distribution-based meta-analysis program; the source of artifact distribution was our database. This method allows for the assessment of statistical artifacts like sampling and scale error. The Hunter and Schmidt's method also allows for observation and correction of statistical artifacts. We report both sample size- weighted mean observed correlations and population estimates that have been corrected for unreliability (using ICC2 values) in the predictor and the criterion. Finally, the standard deviations and 80% credibility intervals (CV) around each corrected correlation were reported.

Results

The meta-analytic results of the OJ and OCB relationship are presented in Table 1. The uncorrected sample-size weighted mean correlation between OJ and OCB was .37. After correcting this estimate for unreliability in both OJ and OCB, the mean corrected correlation was .41, indicating a moderate positive relationship between OJ and OCB . Moreover, the 80% credibility interval (.23-.59) was above and did not overlap with zero, indicating that the positive relationship generalizes across studies. The results in Table 1 also indicate that OJ was positively related to OCB-I ($\rho = .26$) and OCB-O ($\rho = .47$). For each of these outcomes the 80% credibility interval excluded zero. Taken together, these results provide support for Hypothesis 1.

We also examined the extent to which different justice dimensions (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional) were related to overall OCB and its sub dimensions. We expected that of the three types justice, related to OCB-G, OCB-I and OCB-O. The mean corrected correlation belong to distributive justice and OCB-G ($\rho = .35$), OCB-I ($\rho = .29$) and OCB-O ($\rho = .32$) indicate moderate relationship. Additionally like distributive justice, procedural justice related to OCB-G ($\rho = .33$), OCB-I ($\rho = .29$) and OCB-O ($\rho = .32$). Results indicate that the

Tablo 1. Meta-Analytic Correlation Matrix for Behavior Facets

	OCB-General	OCB-Individual	OCB-Organizational
Organizational Justice	.37 (.41)[a]	.20 (.26)[b]	.38 (.47)[c]
Distributive Justice	.27 (.35)[d]	.22 (.29)[e]	.25 (.32)[f]
Procedural Justice	.26 (.33)[g]	.24 (.30)[h]	.26 (.32)[ı]
Interactional Justice	.32 (.41)[j]	.26 (.31)[k]	.26 (.32)[l]

Not. **k**; number of samples in which relationship was estimated, **N**; total number of individuals in the k samples, Those outside parentheses are correlations uncorrected correlations (i.e., *mean r*); those in parentheses arecorrected for unreliability (i.e., *mean ρ*)., SS_ρ; standard deviation of corrected correlations, **%80 CrI**; lower and upper limits of 80 % credibility interval, **%95 CI**; lower and upper limits of 95 % confidence interval, **T.V.E.S.A %**; Percentage of total variance in corrected artifacts explained by study artifacts **OCB**; organizational citizenship behavior.

a	k=12	N=4484	SS_ρ=.14	%80 Cr.I = (.23-.59)	%95 CI = (.33-.49)	T.V.E.S.A % = 11.24
b	k=3	N=762	SS_ρ=.06	%80 Cr.I = (.18-.34)	%95 CI = (.14-.37)	T.V.E.S.A % = 61.27
c	k=4	N=809	SS_ρ=.11	%80 Cr.I = (.33-.61)	%95 CI = (.34-.60)	T.V.E.S.A % = 46.60
d	k=16	N=4193	SS_ρ=.13	%80 Cr.I = (.19-.51)	%95 CI = (.28-.42)	T.V.E.S.A % = 23.92
e	k=15	N=4700	SS_ρ=.14	%80 Cr.I = (.11-.46)	%95 CI = (.21-.36)	T.V.E.S.A % = 20.16
f	k=15	N=4700	SS_ρ=.12	%80 Cr.I = (.16-.48)	%95 CI = (.25-.39)	T.V.E.S.A % = 27.57
g	k=13	N=3852	SS_ρ=.10	%80 Cr.I = (.20-.46)	%95 CI = (.26-.40)	T.V.E.S.A % = 30.20
h	k=16	N=4541	SS_ρ=.14	%80 Cr.I = (.22-.37)	%95 CI = (.22-.37)	T.V.E.S.A % = 18.85
ı	k=17	N=4847	SS_ρ=.11	%80 Cr.I = (.26-.39)	%95 CI = (.26-.39)	T.V.E.S.A % = 34.38
j	k=11	N=3286	SS_ρ=.23	%80 Cr.I = (.12-.70)	%95 CI = (.27-.55)	T.V.E.S.A % = 07.40
k	k=15	N=4472	SS_ρ=.17	%80 Cr.I = (.10-.52)	%95 CI = (.22-.40)	T.V.E.S.A % = 12.70
l	k=15	N=4472	SS_ρ=.11	%80 Cr.I = (.18-.46)	%95 CI = (.25-.39)	T.V.E.S.A % = 33.63

interactional justice most strongly linked with OCB-G (ρ = . 41), OCB-I (ρ = . 31) and OCB-O (ρ = . 32). For each of these outcomes the 80% credibility interval excluded zero. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 4.

Discussion

The present meta-analysis estimated the relationship between OJ and OCB at both general construct and facet levels. Based on studies involving 29 independent samples (N = 8674) in Turkey, we found moderately strong between general constructs and dimensions of OCB and OJ. Especially the relationship between general concepts of OJ and OCB-O was relatively stronger. At facet level, the relationship between interaction justice (IJ) and OCB-G was relatively stronger. As employees perceive higher levels of justice, they have a greater tendency to direct those behaviors that are above and beyond their formal job requirements toward the organization as a whole rather than toward individuals in the organization.

In order to advance a clearer and level-free understanding of the OJ and OCB relationship, we also compared our results with those of previous meta-analyses conducted western context (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Meyer et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Riketta, 2002). Our findings are consistent with findings of previous meta-analyses which reported significant positive correlations between OJ and OCB (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Meyer et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Riketta, 2002). In short, the patterns of the relationships appear to be slightly greater in magnitude than western context. One of the possible reasons of this difference can be related with contextual differences. Previous studies analyzed relationship between OCB and OJ were generally experienced in individualistic USA culture. However present study examined this relationship in collectivist Turkish culture (Gürbüz & Bingöl, 2007; Hoftede, 1984). Some of the individual studies which examine the relationships between OCB and cultural values had similar result with this study. OCB display possibilities in collectivist culture are higher than individualistic culture (Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Paine & Organ, 2000; Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, & Cummings, 2000). Individuals who live in collectivist society prefer equality and need distribution rule for them and groups they involve, but individual who lives in individualistic community prefer rule of fairness in distribution of organizational gains (Chen, 1995; Sama & Papamarcos, 2000).

This study extends the understanding of OCB and OJ relationship in different context from West. With this way researchers can see the relationships more accurate. The results of this meta-analysis have some practical implications. The results suggest that OJ and all of its three facets are the significant predictor of OCB. Accordingly, managers could focus on implementing policies and practices fairly and take into consideration all three dimensions of OJ as a whole. They should give honestly information to their employee about distribution decision and behave kindly and sincerely all their interaction with them.

As is the case with all scientific studies, we are mindful of certain limitations. First, sample of this study conducted only in Turkish context. In future, there would be used mixed sample from both Western context and Eastern context. Second, meta-analysis requires the reporting of zero-order results meant that several important OJ - OCB articles could not be included in our study. Finally, not reaching unpublished studies is another limitation for present study.

Overall, this study provides substantial empirical support for OJ and OCB relationship in Turkish context. Future research should build on these findings to obtain a better understanding of the importance of justice and citizenship behavior.