

Organizational Justice and Citizenship Behaviors: Employee Perspectives

Prakash Shrestha¹, Dilip Parajuli², Makshindra Thapa³

¹Nepal Commerce Campus, Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6973-9343>

²Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

³Patan Multiple Campus, Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

ABSTRACT: *This study aims to assess the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) via the lens of employee perspectives. This study uses a quantitative research approach and employs a set of questionnaires as a data collection tool. Its sampling frame contains 300 participants with various job responsibilities and positions who work in Kathmandu Valley's 15 manufacturing sectors spread over three industrial estates. A judgmental and convenient sample technique was utilized to get responses from these participants. Only 197 (65.67 percent) of the 300 questionnaires distributed were completed and used for data analysis. The findings show a positive association between organizational justice aspects and OCBs among employees in Nepalese manufacturing industries. Hence, organizations that want to promote distributive, procedural, and interactional justice might expect to see a favorable influence on employees' OCBs, leading to a more positive workplace atmosphere and improved overall performance. Management and supervisors in the workplace should recognize the relevance of organizational justice and apply it regularly to enhance and increase their extra-role behaviors.*

KEYWORDS - Employee, Organizational citizenship behavior, Organizational justice, Perspectives

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive market, the primary goal of a business organization is to produce and utilize the benefits resulting from reliance on internal resources, particularly human resources. The same holds for manufacturing industries. Today's industries spend a lot of money yearly on publicity, human resource development programs, and improving productivity and service excellence. Achieving these objectives and organizational goals depends on employee performance and the extent of working together with colleagues, managers, and customers, which is called organizational citizenship behaviors. It appears that an industry that eliminates its employees' organizational citizenship behaviors may face a steady decrease in share and market value, which can impact employee performance and threaten organizational survival. As a result, many scholars have focused their attention on several invisible behaviors, such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), due to their beneficial function in organizational operations throughout the last few decades (Tefera & Hunsaker, 2020; Farahbod et al., 2012).

OCBs cover discretionary and useful extra-role behaviors of an organization's members, which considerably contribute to a variety of desired work outcomes and the effective operation of an organization (Rahman & Karim, 2022; Yaakobi & Weisberg, 2020; Thompson et al., 2020). Such behaviors contribute to the organization's effective operation despite not being required or contractually compensated (Skarlicki & Latham, 1997; Bhupatkar, 2003). Examples of OCBs that aid in coping with various organizational uncertainties include assisting newcomers to the organization, not abusing co-workers' rights, not taking extra breaks, attending elective company meetings, and enduring minor impositions that occur when working with others (Shrestha, 2019; Kidwell et al., 1997). Volunteering to help others with job-related issues is an important component of OCB. Some OCB acts include aiding a colleague or supervisor with relocation, working extra hours, and sharing your peers' work. These techniques are also beneficial to the organization's culture.

Evidence shows that organizational justice is critical in developing OCB among employees (Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022; Winarsih & Riyanto, 2020; Rahman & Karim, 2022; Demirel et al., 2018). Understanding and resolving employees' perceptions of justice allows firms to build a more engaged and proactive staff, ultimately contributing to overall organizational success. Therefore, this study aims to assess the relationship between organizational justice and OCBs via the lens of employee perspectives in the context of the manufacturing industries of Nepal.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept and Aspects of Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fair treatment in terms of personal and organizational outcomes (Moorman, 1991). It is an employee's view of how fairly an organization has treated them (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2006; Campbell et al., 1996). It is the extent to which fair rules and processes exist and are followed in an organization, as well as the extent to which individuals regard their leaders to be fair and truthful, with logic or rationale for their actions (Choi, 2008; Shrestha, 2013).

According to Cropanzano et al. (2001), organizational justice involves a virtue that allows for mutual consideration while also involving interactions with others and consequences that affect others' physical, psychological, and social well-being. It comprises social norms and emergent rules for making decisions and delivering outcomes to employees such as tasks, goods, services, incentives, punishments, salary, organizational positions, advantages, or responsibilities (Wiili-Peltola et al., 2007; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Employees will be inclined to accept organizational rules and choices if they follow fair procedures. It is not only necessary to be handled with dignity and respect, but also to be informed about these procedures (Greenberg, 1990). The manner in which organizational action is taken and carried out is equally important as the actual consequences (Tyler & Bies, 1990).

Prior studies on organizational justice (Robbins & Judge, 2016; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000; Leventhal, 1980) have frequently separated the concept into at least three aspects: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.

Employee concerns about the fairness of managerial decisions on the distribution of outcomes such as pay and promotions are referred to as distributive justice. This justice is concerned with the fairness of decision-making procedures. It is an individual's judgment of whether the gains they have made are allocated fairly. Employees make judgments about justice distribution by comparing their results to prior ones or to those of others (Tyler, 1994). Thus, distributive justice ultimately addresses the degree of perceived fairness in the distribution and allocation of outcomes when a company refers to employee input (Mariam, 2011). Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the decision-making procedures. The term justice relates to the fairness of decision-making (Yang et al., 2013). This fairness concerns the procedures, mechanisms, and processes used to determine outcomes (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Employees are particularly concerned with the fairness of not just their individual outcomes, but also the fairness of decision-making and implementation processes in outcome distribution. Procedural justice has been seen as the most appropriate framework for expressing how employees form judgments about the fairness of organizational processes. Interactional justice refers to the human component of organizational activities, i.e. how management (or those in charge of rewards and resources) treats the beneficiary of justice (Masterson et al., 2000). It is related to the strength of interpersonal interactions inside businesses (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). People identify attitudes as markers of justice inside an organization; therefore how decision-makers treat those affected by decisions is critical in interactional justice. It refers to how authorities treat their subordinates and how these subordinates react to these impressions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Employees are sensitive to communications regarding procedure implementation and decision explanations (Aydin & Karaman-Kepeneci, 2008). Therefore, managers must examine this aspect in order to improve feelings of interactional justice in an organization.

Concept and Aspects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCBs are work-related actions that go beyond the requirements of formal job descriptions (Organ, 1988). Employees who exhibit such actions are referred to be good warriors, acting selflessly on behalf of their organizations (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Citizenship actions improve the organization's performance and efficiency in achieving its goals. It is thus viewed as the result of devoted and identified employees (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Employee attitudes like as contentment, dedication, and perceived fairness are strong predictors of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995), with direct implications for peers and indirect consequences for organizational performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Much emphasis was placed on two main aspects of OCB: (1) altruism, which refers to kinds of OCB that help individual people, such as immediate team members, and (2) compliance, which refers to more impersonal contributions to the company as a whole (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Blancero et al., 1996). Some studies (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1997) offered a five-aspect model of OCB: 1) conscientiousness, 2) altruism, 3) civic virtue, 4) sportsmanship, and 5) courtesy. Van Dyne et al. (1994) incorporated all positive community-relevant conduct, such as obedience, loyalty, and various forms of engagement, under the civic citizenship idea.

Link between Organizational Justice and OCB and Hypotheses Development

Studies show that employees perceive a culture of distributive justice, and they are more inclined to reciprocate their OCB (Moorman & Blakely, 2006). Such justice in organizations has been described as a key component influencing employees' actions and reactions within businesses (Masterson et al., 2000). When an employee's trust is breached by perceived injustice in connections with organizations, the open-ended social exchange nature of the relationship transitions to an explicit, particularly economic exchange nature with

services delivered (Kyendibaiza 2009). Prior studies (e.g., Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Smith et al., 1983) show that altruism, conscientiousness, and civility are examples of OCBs, which can be influenced by the perceived fairness of an event (e.g., punishment). Organ (1990) suggested that OCBs are primarily motivated by views of fairness. He proposed that people in companies begin with a social exchange connection, which lasts until unfairness is demonstrated. The relationship is currently viewed as economic rather than social. Prior research reported that procedural justice influences contentment with a system, whereas distributive justice influences satisfaction with outcomes (Fryxell & Gordon, 1989; Lind & Tyler 1988). Ball et al. (1994) and Moorman (1991) believe that OCBs have a greater association with procedural fairness than distributive justice. Farh et al. (1997) reported that OCBs are linked to procedural justice. Masterson et al. (2000) concluded that interactional justice (both interpersonal and informational) would be a better predictor of OCBs. In light of these explanations, a favorable association between perceived organizational fairness and OCB is expected. The following hypotheses have been proposed in this study:

H1: There is a significant and positive association between distributive justice and employee OCBs.

H2: There is a significant and positive association between procedural justice and employee OCBs.

H3: There is a significant and positive association between interactional justice and employee OCBs.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a quantitative research approach and employs a set of questionnaires as a data collection tool. Its sampling frame contains 300 participants with various job responsibilities and positions who work in Kathmandu Valley's 15 manufacturing sectors spread over three industrial estates (Balaju, Patan, and Bhaktapur). A judgmental and convenient sample technique was utilized to get responses from these participants. Only 197 (65.67 percent) of the 300 questionnaires distributed were completed and used for data analysis. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Gender	N	%	Age	N	%
Female	69	35	18 - 24 years	29	14.7
Male	128	65	25 -35 years	84	42.6
Other	0	0	36 - 45 years	84	42.6
Job Position	N	%	Nature of Industry	N	%
Technician	15	7.61	Foods, Biscuits and Confectionary	22	11.2
Operator	21	10.7	Noodles	31	15.7
Supervisor	17	8.63	Dairy	16	8.12
Engineer	6	3.05	Beverage	24	12.2
Head of Production	12	6.09	Plastic	10	5.08
Helper	22	11.2	Printing and Packaging	22	11.2
Security Guard	27	13.7	Engineering and Workshops	23	11.7
Accountant	12	6.09	Colour and Chemicals	8	4.06
Line Manager	12	6.09	Metals, Handicrafts and Ceramics	10	5.08
Factory Staff	15	7.61	Clothing and Textiles	7	3.55
Office Staff	23	11.7	Mineral Water	14	7.11
Store Keeper	15	7.61	Poultry Farm and Pallets	10	5.08

Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin's (1996) measures of distributive justice (5 items), Colquitt's (2001) procedural justice (3 items), and interactional justice (6 items) were used to assess organizational justice. Besides, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for them are 0.91, 0.87, and 0.92, respectively. To assess OCBs, Bettencourt and Brown's (1997) 8-item scale was employed, with minimal modifications for the Nepalese environment. Its Cronbach's alpha coefficient is 0.87. All of these items were evaluated using a five-point Likert scale. Furthermore, the Pearson correlation model was employed to test the hypotheses.

IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Descriptive statistics and Pearson Correlation Results

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlation results.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations and Pearson Correlation Results

Variables	Mean	SD	DJ	PJ	IJ	OCBs
Distributive Justice (DJ)	3.62	0.11	1			
Procedural Justice (PJ)	3.48	0.52	0.39*	1		
Interactional Justice (IJ)	3.79	0.71	0.43*	0.37*	1	
OCBs	4.09	0.63	0.61**	0.67**	0.71**	1

*Note: Correlation is significant at *p<0.05, **p<0.01 (2-tailed).*

The results indicate that respondents consider the distribution of rewards and resources in their organization to be slightly above average. This shows that respondents have a relatively positive impression of distributive fairness. Similarly, the results also suggest that respondents regard the procedural dimensions of fairness in their organization to be slightly lower than distributive justice but still above the midpoint of the scale. This implies a generally good but somewhat lower view of fairness in procedures when compared to distributive justice. The results also indicate that respondents believe interpersonal relationships inside their business are fair and courteous. This implies that respondents believe they are treated with dignity and respect by their supervisors and colleagues. The results also suggest that respondents are highly engaged with OCBs. This indicates that individuals are willing to go above and beyond their formal job tasks to assist their organization and co-workers.

The results also demonstrate that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are all significantly associated with OCBs. Hence, the results support all three hypotheses. This strong positive association suggests that higher perceptions of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are associated with higher levels of OCBs.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study emphasizes the necessity of workplace justice. The study expected that OCB would have a favorable association with all three types of justice. The findings show a positive association between organizational justice aspects and OCBs among employees (Rahman & Karim, 2022; Winarsih & Riyanto, 2020). Organizational justice is concerned with concerns of fairness in organizations that are significant to management and employees (Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022). Employees frequently do equality evaluations with other employees to see whether employees receive enough pay for their contributions to the firm (Gan & Yusof, 2018; Rauf & Hansiya, 2014; Chien, 2013). Justice is one of the most essential factors influencing employee behavior, including OCBs. Several empirical studies have found that organizational justice has a favourable effect on OCBs (Cohen-Charash et al., 2001). The findings of this study support (Varihanna & Nizam, 2020). They suggest that the impression of organizational justice can foster the establishment of work behavior in employees.

The results indicate that employees who see fairness in distribution, procedures, and interactions are more likely to engage in behaviour's that go beyond their formal job duties, which can benefit the firm. To improve OCBs, management should concentrate on improving all three types of justice. Ensuring fair resource and reward distribution (DJ), clear and fair processes (PJ), and courteous and fair interpersonal treatment (IJ) can all contribute to a more cooperative and engaged workforce. Therefore, organizations that want to promote distributive, procedural, and interactional justice might expect to see a favourable influence on employees' OCBs, leading to a more positive workplace atmosphere and improved overall performance. Management and supervisors in the workplace should recognize the relevance of organizational justice and apply it regularly to enhance and increase their extra-role behaviour's.

VI. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

All participants were employees from specific manufacturing industries, which may be connected with certain distinguishing qualities. As a result, the findings may not apply to other samples from various industries. A larger sample from various industries would make it easier to generalize the results.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Aydin, I., & Karaman-Kepeneci, Y. (2008). Principals' opinions of organisational justice in elementary schools in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(4), 497-513. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810882027>.
- [2]. Ball, G.A., Trevino, L.K., & Sims, H.P., Jr. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 299-322.
- [3]. Bettencourt, L. A., & Brown, S. W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction, and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73, 39-61.
- [4]. Bhupatkar, A.A. (2003). *Employees' Perceptions of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors*. Kansas: Emporia State University.
- [5]. Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. (1986). International Justice: communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 43-55.
- [6]. Blancero, D., Johnson, S.A., & Lakshman, C. (1996). Psychological contracts and fairness: The effect of violations on customer service behavior. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 1, 49-63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00129603>
- [7]. Brief, A.P., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.

- [8]. Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., & Oswald, F. L. (1996). The substantive nature of job performance variability. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 258–299). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [9]. Chien, C.Y. (2013). Verifying the effects of organizational justice and work values upon organizational performance: Using organizational citizenship behavior as the dual mediator. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7, 2195–2205. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM2013.6961>.
- [10]. Choi, J. (2008). Event justice perceptions and employees' reactions: Perceptions of social entity justice as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 513-528.
- [11]. Cohen-Charash, Y, & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A metaanalysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
- [12]. Colquitt, J. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- [13]. Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z., Bobocel, D.R., & Rupp, D. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-209
- [14]. Demirel, Y., Elhusadi, I., & Alhasadi, A. (2018). The Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Factors. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 7(3), 27-39.
- [15]. Farahbod, F., Azadehdel, M., Dizgah, M.R., & Jirdehi, M.N. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: The role of organizational justice and leader–member exchange. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 893-903.
- [16]. Farh, J. L., Earley, P.C., & Lin, S.C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444.
- [17]. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- [18]. Fryxell, G.E., & Gordon, M.E. (1989). Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of satisfaction with union and management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 851-866.
- [19]. Gan, J. L., & Yusof, H.M. (2018). *Does organizational justice influence organizational citizenship behavior among engineers?* In Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Paris, France, 26–27 July 2018, 2227–2234.
- [20]. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- [21]. Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J.A. (2006) (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational justice*, 113-152. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [22]. Hermanto, Y.B., & Srimulyani, V.A. (2022). The effects of organizational justice on employee performance using dimension of organizational citizenship behavior as mediation. *Sustainability*, 14, 13322. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013322>.
- [23]. Kidwell, R. E. Jr., Mossholder, K. W., & Bennett, N. (1997). Cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis using work groups and individuals. *Journal of Management*, 23, 775-793.
- [24]. Kyendibaiza, F.N. (2009). *The effect of Operant Competences, Role Clarity, Psychological Contract, Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. Uganda: Makerere University.
- [25]. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. S. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- [26]. Lind, E.A., & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.
- [27]. Mariam, N. (2011). *Organizational justice, employee trust, employee commitment and service quality in Uganda revenue authority*. Uganda: Makerere University.
- [28]. Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M., & Taylor, M.S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, pp. 738-48.
- [29]. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- [30]. Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (2006). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.
- [31]. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personal Psychology*, 48, 775-802.

- [32]. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- [33]. Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262-270.
- [34]. Rahman, Md. H.A., & Karim, D.N. (2022). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of work engagement. *Heliyon*, 8, e09450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09450>.
- [35]. Rauf, A., & Hansiya, F. (2014). Perception of organizational justice as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical study at schools in Sri Lanka. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6, 124–130.
- [36]. Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2016). *Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education Limited.
- [37]. Shrestha, P. (2013). *Perceived organizational justice and job performance*. Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
- [38]. Shrestha, P. (2019). Employee commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in Nepal. *American International Journal of Business Management*, 2(12), 86-90.
- [39]. Skarlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- [40]. Skarlicki, D.P., & Latham, G.P. (1997). Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behavior within a labor union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 617-633.
- [41]. Smith, C. A, Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- [42]. Tang, T. L., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *Advanced Management Journal*, 61, 25-31.
- [43]. Tefera, C.A., & Hunsaker, W.D. (2020). Intangible assets and organizational citizenship behavior: a conceptual model. *Heliyon*, 6(7), e04497.
- [44]. Thompson, P.S., Bergeron, D.M., & Bolino, M.C. (2020). No obligation? How gender influences the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior. *American Psychological Association*, 105, 1338-1350.
- [45]. Tyler, T. R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 850-863.
- [46]. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- [47]. van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E.C.M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 137-147.
- [48]. Varihanna, H.H., & Nizam, A. (2020). Effects of organizational trust and justice on job satisfaction and their consequences on organizational citizenship behavior. *East African Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 3, 389–395. <https://doi.org/10.36349/EASJEBM.2020.v03i04.016>.
- [49]. Wiili-Peltola, E., Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., & Virtanen, M. (2007). Organisational justice and employee perceptions on hospital management. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 21(3), 320-332. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260710751771>.
- [50]. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.
- [51]. Winarsih, S., & Riyanto, S. (2020). The effect of organizational culture, organizational justice, and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *International Journal of Management and Humanities*, 5(1), 12-19.
- [52]. Yaakobi, E., & Weisberg, J. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior predicts quality, creativity, and efficiency performance: the roles of occupational and collective efficacies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00758>.
- [53]. Yang, J., Treadway, D. C., & Stepina, L. P. (2013). Justice and politics: mechanisms for the underlying relationships of role demands to employees' satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(8), 1624-1635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12115>.

***Corresponding Author: MakshindraThapa**
Patan Multiple Campus, Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
email:makshindra.thapa@pmc.tu.edu.np