

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR TEACHERS IN INDONESIA

Syafa'at Ariful Huda

STKIP Kusumanegara

Syafaathuda@yahoo.com

Fiki Alghadri

STKIP Kusumanegara

Alghar6450@gmail.com

Purwani Puji Utami

STKIP Kusumanegara

Purwani_puji@stkipkusumanegara.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Purpose: In this study, we investigated the effects of organizational justice and trust directed at the organization as a whole on OCB. Also investigated were the influence between organizational justice and OCB, and the influence between trust and OCB. **Design/Methodology/Approach:** From a sample of 273 teachers from 305 Private Junior High Schools in Tangerang District, we tested the hypothesized model using structural equation models. **Findings:** The main findings are as follows: Findings show that organizational justice and trust have a positive effect on teacher's OCB and OCB is also positively related to trust. **Originality/value:** The results of the study show that teachers could be engaged in organizational citizenship behavior when they perceive fairness of the equality, needs, rights of opinion, transparency, neutrality and acknowledging the same position of the organizational process.

Keywords: Organizational justice, trust, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The primary duties of a teacher are stated in Article 1 Section 1 of Law of Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2005 about Teacher and Lecturer which are to educate, guide, direct, train, assess, and evaluate learners in childhood educational program of formal education line, elementary education, and secondary education (UUD 1945, 2005). Teacher's absence without clear reasons is the form of action without OCB behavior. The absent teachers have yet to perform their formal obligations and, since they have yet to perform their obligation, it means they have yet to implement OCB. In line with the prior, most principals in Tangerang Regency revealed there are behaviors which hamper school development such as unwilling to help fellow teachers in need, unwilling to prioritize school interest, and sometimes getting involved in an unhealthy competition with other teachers. According to the explanation, it can be concluded that teachers performing OCB bring more benefits than those who only perform their main duties. Unfortunately, not all teachers are willing to perform OCB. It often occurs in various educational institutions that teachers only perform their duties as a teacher without performing OCB behavior. It is proven that many teachers do not want to stay in school for long time, so after performing their duties, they directly go home. Simply put, if teachers cannot

meet their main duties and functions, they surely cannot implement OCB behavior.

Organizational justice must always be applied in learning activities at schools by all stakeholders since it influences OCB (Sjahrudin & Sudiro, 2013). The next factor is trust. However, in fact, many teachers, in doing their duties, fail to fulfill their positive expectation, meaning that the trust in private schools remains low. To support life needs, organizational members need trust. Therefore, trust can boost proper OCB (Access, Usikalu, Ogunleye, & Effiong, 2015) and develop working behaviors outside duties and beyond their obligation limit (OCB). Furthermore, trust is a very essential matter and needs to be considered by each teacher. Job satisfaction also influences the emergence of OCB (Rama & Barusman, 2014). Teachers who work hard based on feeling of trust to their job are ready to work seriously, perform their duties, and even gladly work beyond their obligation (OCB). They can help other teachers needing their help and defend school interest to achieve national education purposes.

Referring to above information that OCB is essential, this research tests how far variables can influence the development of OCB in teachers. The units of analysis in this research are teachers at Private Junior High School (JHS) in Tangerang Regency, Banten. The result of this research is expected to assist school stakeholders to develop OCB in teachers since the development of OCB leads to the success of a school.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ defines OCB as positive behaviors that arise in individuals without expecting rewards or praise and the behaviors can directly improve the organization effectively (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). The OCB variable is growing as many studies focus on this concept, including the development of the original concept by Organ.

Experts commonly mention four basic characteristics of OCB, namely: (1) discretionary, optional, or voluntary (Hashim, 2016); (2) not a measure in the formal reward system (Becton, Giles, Schraeder, & Giles, 2008); (3) beyond the call of duty (Jain, Giga, Cooper, & Cooper, 2013; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983); and (4) increasing organizational effectiveness (Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Yen, 2004).

Luthans (2011) says the following about OCB, “That is discretionary, not directly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Luthans, 2011). The opinion is in line with the statement proposed (Miner, 2005) that organizational citizenship behaviors are individual behaviors that are discretionary and thus not explicitly recognized by any formal reward system yet they promote the effective functioning of an organization; they are not part of the employment contract and failure to perform them is not considered to be punishable.

OCB is behavior beyond the call of duty not the main behavior from members of the organization but is still needed for organizational survival and effectiveness. In line with that, Ardadi says that OCB is the behavior of employees that exceeds the required role, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system but affects the performance and effectiveness of the organization (Widyananda, Emilisa, Pratana, Ekonomi, & Trisakti, 2014).

There are indicators to prove the existence of work to improve organizational effectiveness, including the willingness to work hard as stated (Schermerhorn, John. Hunt, James. Osborn, Richard. and Bien, 2010) that Organizational Citizenship Behaviors are the extras people do in their work". OCB is the term used to identify the employee behavior (Darsana, 2013). Thus, OCB refers to additional work people do in their job outside of their job description it represents much hard work they do.

Experts argue that OCB can take various forms "They include behaviors such as volunteering for assignments, going out of one's way to welcome new employees, helping others who need assistance, staying late to finish a task, or voicing one's opinion on critical organizational issues." (Wagner III & Hollenbeck, 2010)

Jex and Thomas explain in detail the behavior representing the concept of OCB as described by Organ as follows (Jex, Steve M & Britt, 2008):

1. Altruism represents what we typically think of as "helping behaviors" in the workplace. This form of OCB is some-times referred to as prosocial behavior. An example of altruism would be an employee's voluntarily assisting a coworker who is having difficulty operating his/her computer.
2. Courtesy represents behaviors that reflect basic consideration for others. An example of behavior within this category would be periodically "touching base" with one's coworkers to find out how things are going or letting others know where one can be reached.
3. Sportsmanship is different from other forms of OCB because it is typically exhibited by not engaging in certain forms of behaviors, such as complaining about problems or minor inconveniences.
4. Conscientiousness involves being a good citizen in the workplace and doing things such as arriving on time for meetings.
5. Civic virtue is somewhat different from the others because the target is the organization or, in some cases, the work group rather than another individual. An example of this form of OCB would be attending a charitable function sponsored by the organization (Jex, Steve, and Britt, 2008).

From the afore-mentioned explanation, OCB is a person's actions carried out based on volunteerism and outside of the main role, and it is done for the good of the organization with indicators (1) altruism, (2) courtesy, (3) sportsmanship, (4) conscientiousness, and (5) civic virtue.

Organizational Justice

Justice is a never-ending issue in the context of organizational life. One form of justice is receiving serious attention is organizational justice. Organizational justice is an important concept that has been recently introduced into organizational studies (Griffin, Ricky W and Moorhead, 2014). In addition, organizational justice has a positive (Ismail, 2014; Moorman, 1991) and a significant influence on OCB (Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2013).

Experts have been paying much attention to this form of justice. Organizational justice is how employees feel about the treatment they get from

the organization (Iqbal, Aziz, & Tasawar, 2012). If employees believe they are treated unfairly, then trust, job satisfaction, and OCB decrease (Wech, 2002). In unfair circumstances, employees also experience inconvenience in work and then they may try to find other jobs. Generally, researchers focus on three aspects of organizational justice: results, processes, and interpersonal interactions (Sjahrudin, 2013). Organizational justice is one's perception of justice in the organization (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, & Porter, 2001), which includes perceptions of how decisions are made related to the distribution of results and perceptions of justice over the output itself. There are three aspects of organizational justice, namely (1) distributive justice (the results they get from the organization), procedural justice (policies or processes in achieving something that has been regulated by the organization) (Greenberg & Folger, 1983), and interactional justice (how to maintain and implement decision making in organizations) (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Sjahrudin, 2013). According to Moorman, in (Deconinck, 2010; Elovainio, Bos, Linna, & Kivima, 2005), organizational justice is the extent to which employees are treated fairly in the workplace (Muchinsky, 2000) defines organizational justice as a fair treatment of someone in the organization. (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2005) define organizational justice as the extent to which individuals feel to be treated fairly in the workplace. (Beugr, 2011; Gordon, 1993) define organizational justice as the treatment of organizations or leaders toward employees, both in the form of regulations for procedural justice or in the realization of the distribution of remuneration according to employee perceptions. That is, organizational justice reflects the attitude of the leaders according to the perceptions of subordinates, i.e. to be fair and objective in making decisions, especially regarding employee selection and promotion, assignments and division of tasks, performance appraisals, and salary increases, positions, and reward services. In summary, organizational justice is a person's judgment about the extent to which he/she is treated fairly by the organization.

Fair in that sense, according to Weller as quoted by Ivancevic, Konopaske and Matteson, means feeling good, appropriate, true, and honest. If someone sees the difference between the rewards received for their efforts compared to others, it will motivate them to work more (or less) (Weller, 1995). With such conditions, organizational justice is the glue that encourages someone to cooperate effectively (Brief, Motowidlo, & Motowidlo, 2016; Cropanzano et al., 2007). Other experts see organizational justice as a procedure used in obtaining results or the level of employee perceptions related to justice given by the organization in terms of results (Lambert, Eric and Hogan, 2008; Sweeney, 1992). This means that organizational justice has a vital role in the dynamics of organizational life. Dittret, in (Gordon, 1993), identifies seven dimensions of organizational justice, namely pay rules, pay administration, work place, pay level, rule administration, distribution of jobs, and latitude.

However, (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) mention three forms of organizational justice. The first is procedural justice, related to "the perceived fairness of the procedures that are used in a decision-making process" or justice by actual decision made by organization. The second is distributive justice or justice felt on the methods used to arrive at decisions (Deutsch, 1975). The third is interactional justice, related to the broader concept of procedural justice. This means that

interactional justice is justice felt on the accepted interpersonal treatment (Hussain, Ahmad, Ahmed, & Saleem, 2012; Kwong, 2002). The three dimensions of organizational justice can be explained in more detail as follows.

(Muchinsky, 2000) confirms that distributive justice refers to justice on the allocation of results, which can be in the form of salary allocations, workloads, promotions, and penalties. Furthermore, Muchinsky explains three perspectives in assessing distributive justice. The first is equity or the balance between contributions and results obtained by individuals, as for example bonuses are given in accordance with contributions given by the individual, in which the higher the productivity of the individual work, the higher the bonus is obtained. The second is equality or equal opportunities for everyone to get results or decisions, such as at the end of the year all employees receive the same bonus amount. The last is need, which refers to proper planning between individual needs and results, such as bonus distribution is based on individual financial needs. It can be concluded that distributive justice is planning on outcomes (salary or reward).

The next is procedural justice, a process involving work motivation that focuses on perceptions of procedures used to make decisions related to the distribution of work (George & Jones, 2012; Hubbell & Chory-assad, 2007). Procedural justice is also related to understanding and feeling of being treated fairly in the process of distributing rewards (Wagner III & Hollenbeck, 2010). Therefore, procedural justice tests the fairness of the process itself carried out through decisions made with clear standards, processes used consistent with work requirements, and rights of workers to complain about decisions made. Procedural justice focuses on the process used to make decisions; the decision-making process can be in the form of making regulations and punishment (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004). Two types of perspectives exist in procedural justice, voice and no-voice. When employees have a voice in making decisions, it is said to be procedurally fair. However, if employees are not given a voice in making decisions, it is categorized as unfair (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004). According to Lynd and Tyler in (Dunnet, J and Flint, 2006), four values shape procedural justice. They are (1) voice, referring the opportunity for employees to express their aspirations, (2) trust, referring employee trust in decision makers, (3) neutrality, referring to perception of employees on honesty and unbiased position of decision makers, and (4) standing, referring to treatment obtained by employees from authorities who make decisions.

The third is interactional justice. According to (Dunnet, J and Flint, 2006), the core of interactional justice is fair treatment obtained by individuals from other people and the main theme is the treatment obtained from superiors. Fair treatment refers to courtesy, honesty, dignity, and respect. Injustice is felt when employees are treated disrespectfully, for example a boss calls employees as stupid when they are making mistakes.

From the description above, it can be summarized that organizational justice is a person's perception toward an organization or leader who treat the person and others fairly based on indicators (1) equality, (2) needs, (3) right to speak, (4) transparency, (5) neutrality, and (6) position.

Trust

Trust becomes one of the variables in this study because some studies have indicated a direct effect of organizational trust on OCB (Podsakoff & McAllister, 2014). Trust has a significant influence on OCB (Sjahrudin, 2013; Wat & Shaffer, 2004; Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).

As a concept, Mayer *et al.* in (Mollering, 2006), trust is a desire of a party to accept pleasant actions from another party based on an expectation that the other party would take certain actions very important for the trustee, regardless of the ability to supervise or control the other party. Meanwhile, trust is a historical dependency process based on relevant but limited experience samples (Luthans *et al.*, 2007). It takes time to shape trust it is formed time by time and then accumulates (Robbins, 2003). (Robbins and Judge, 2013) trust as a positive expectation that other parties will not say words, do actions, or make decisions to disappoint other parties. (McShane & Von Glinow, 2008) define trust as a person's positive expectations of others in a situation involving risk. Trust also means giving up fate to someone or another group (Currall, 2002; McShane & Von Glinow, 2008). (Colquitt, Jason A. LePine, Jeffery & Wesson, 2015) define trust as a desire to depend on an authority based on positive expectations of actions and attention by authorities. Although using diverse narratives or words, in essence, trust reflects positive desires or expectations one has toward other parties.

Trust is interpreted somewhat differently in the perspective of human resources (HR). (Stone, 2005) said that trust is a measure of how much employees want to share information, cooperate with each other, and not take advantage of each other. In more detail, trust is confidence and support from the leaders to achieve organizational goals and the belief that the organization will treat employees well (Ismail, 2014). This definition provides a relatively different nuance by emphasizing the element of sharing information in collaboration and taking non-profit attitudes. However, this definition also has content in line with previous definitions, i.e. the attitude of not taking advantage of each other. Thus, it remains the same, positive desires for others.

(Robbins and Judge, 2013) mention five key dimensions in the concept of trust, which can be used as indicators to measure trust. They are (1) integrity, referring to honesty and truth; (2) competence, related to the knowledge and technical and interpersonal skills of individuals; (3) consistency, related to the ability to predict and assess individuals accurately in handling situations; (4) loyalty, representing the desire to protect and save others; and (5) openness.

Openness, according to (DeVito, 2013), refers to three aspects in interpersonal communication, which include: (1) willingness to self-disclosure as long as the disclosure is adequate; (2) willingness to act honestly to other people; and (3) being able to think and feel clearly. This means that trust can be measured and be built through integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty, and openness.

From the description, it can be synthesized that trust is someone's desire for the organization and for other parties based on positive expectations for action and attention, with indicators of (1) integrity, (2) competence, (3) consistency, (4) loyalty, and (5) openness.

Research Hypothesis

The theory and concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in organizational field have been researched for over 30 years. However, most of the researches focus on how to improve OCB in employees. There are basic differences between teacher and employee, including educational and learning processes where intensive interaction occurs and will psychologically influence life. Teachers not only transfer knowledge, but they also educate learners to behave from not good to good, from less good to good, and good to better. It is more complex and broader than employees who, after completing their works, do not think about anything else. According to previous studies, this research proposes the following hypotheses:

1. Organizational justice influences organizational citizenship behavior
2. Trust influences organizational citizenship behavior

METHOD

Research Data and Sample Collection

The data used in this research is collected through questionnaires made based on concept study of each variable. Each questionnaire consists of 4 variables: OCB consists of 30 questions, organizational justice consists of 35 questions, trust consists of 35 questions, and job satisfaction consists of 30 questions. Testing the questionnaires with validity and reliability results 0.05 r_{table} significant level in which the question's criteria is valid when $r_{calculation} > \text{dari } r_{table}$ and is reliable when $r_{calculation}$ approaches 1. Therefore, valid questions for each variable are 27 questions for OCB, 30 questions for organizational justice, 30 questions for trust, and 28 questions for job satisfaction. Valid and reliable questionnaires are used to collect data and they are distributed to 273 respondents. The 273 respondents are obtained by calculating slovin formula with the population of 864 respondents.

As for sampling technique for 273 respondents, the writer uses proportional random sampling technique which is a technique with non-systematic, but random collection (based on desire) by considering the proportion of population in each school. The steps conducted to collect the samples are: to determine manageable population namely all 864 teachers in Tangerang Regency, to create number and sampling frameworks for 864 teachers by adding number 1 to 864, and to randomly select 273 teachers as research samples from the existing 864 teachers.

Findings and Discussion

Measurement Model

Validity is a correct nature based on available evidence or thinking logic. Validity is important since it is the information of a fact to measure existing concept in a research procedure of measurement. In social science research process, measurements based on characteristics are conducted indirectly. Researcher uses CFA to analyze the result of research. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is conducted to test model, in which the created measurement model is based on the formulation of theory. It has two focuses: whether the conceptualized indicators are consistent and correct and what indicators dominantly form the researched construct. Therefore, evaluation through the

validity of five constructs can be conducted whose consideration refers to the result of fit-model index from SEM; (RMSEA = 0.0587, X^2/df = 2.014, GFI = 0.911, CFI = 0.991, NFI = 0.983, NNFI = 0.988) in table 1. All models are suitable with acceptable index. The values of CR and VE in the variables of organizational justice are CR = 0.990 VE = 0.774m trusts are CR = 0.985 VE = 0.700, job satisfaction are CR = 0.987 VE = 0.774, and OCB are CR = 0.980 VE = 0.658. All variables meet requirements in which the values of CR (Construct Reliability) must be over 0.7 and VE (Variance Extracted) must be over 0.5.

Result of analysis from lisrel calculation reveals conformity of model and significance of causality of each variable. The relationship of variable and theoretical variable measurements is commonly same or supports the previous study result. Structural model analysis results that organizational justice brings positive influence to teacher's OCB (γ_{14} = .29, t = 4.88) and supports hypothesis 1. It seems trust has weak relationship but significantly influences teacher's OCB (γ_{24} = .21, t = 4.23) and supports hypothesis 2

CONCLUSION

First, the writer reviews and synthesizes the theory and concept from all variables, creates indicator, and makes research model to verify research model and answer hypotheses using two methods: literary review and empirical analysis. The result of research shows that organizational justice has significant influence to organizational citizenship behavior (hypothesis 1). Therefore, it is known that in the process to improve OCB, organizational justice in implementing policies in school institution is a variable with significant influence and this result is consistent with previous researches (for example, (Ismail, 2014; Jafari & Bidarian, 2012; Luthans, 2011). Trust is proven to boost OCB (hypothesis 2) which is consistent with previous research findings (for example, (Colquitt et al., 2001).

In brief, the result of this research shows that citizenship behavior may be influenced by several variables including organizational justice, trust. This research aims to verify suggested model based on theoretical study and concepts from scientific journals and handbooks using empirical analysis. Researcher records several suggested implications from the conducted research, including improving the quality of procedural justice, method, and approach in implementing decisions. Decisions made by schools have to consider teachers' expectations and needs and to improve consistency, loyalty, and transparency in educational management either facility, finance, educator, or educational workers in the levels of school, regency education department, provincial education department, and central education department.

Moreover, the result of this research can be simply presented that proper organizational justice for teachers to work generates the feelings of convenience, happiness, and even satisfaction. If they are fulfilled, it can be said that the teachers have obtained job satisfaction. It will certainly encourage teachers to have positive assessment to their jobs. Trust is an encouragement arising from within a person. If a teacher has trust to executives or organizations they will work more diligently and more zealously. The zeal here is used to solve problems, complete duties, and other matters related to the duties performed by a teacher. A teacher with trust will show their persistence to obtain something from

their workplace, which can be said to obtain job satisfaction, and to love their jobs with personal responsibility, high expectation to works, and desire to their duties on time. In other words, proper job satisfaction will boost teacher's trust. Trust is basically an encouragement for teacher to trust their co-workers and work conditions triggered by external stimulus or arising from within an individual through psychological and thinking process of the individual. OCB is influenced by distributive, procedural, and interactional justices or behaviors to help and to be responsible to organization. Basically, those are all things which support the performance of work. The synergy of organizational justice, trust implemented in school by teacher and organization will bring positive impact to OCB which eventually leads to effective and efficient performance of work and school management activities. Therefore, school quality development will be a necessity.

REFERENCES

- Access, O., Usikalu, O., Ogunleye, A. J., & Effiong, J. (2015). Organizational Trust , Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among Teachers in Ekiti State , Nigeria . By. *British Open Journal of Psychology*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Becton, J. B., Giles, W. F., Schraeder, M., & Giles, W. F. (2008). Evaluating and rewarding OCBs Potential consequences of formally reward systems. *Psychological Journal*, 30(5), 494–514. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450810888277>
- Beugr, C. D. (2011). Understanding organizational justice and its impact on managing employees : an African perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(October 2014), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190210131311>
- Brief, A. P., Motowidlo, S. J., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2016). Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710–725. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258391>
- Colquitt, Jason A. LePine, Jeffery & Wesson, W. (2015). *Organizational Behavior, Improving Performance and Commitment* (Fourth Edi). New York: McGraw-Hill Education. Retrieved from www.mhhe.com
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., & Porter, C. O. L. H. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *Academy Of Management Perspectives*, 7(1), 34–49.
- Currall, S. C. (2002). A Multilevel Approach to Trust in Joint Ventures. *JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS STUDIES*, 33(3), 479–495.
- Darsana, M. (2013). The Influence Of Personality And Organizational Culture On Employee Performance Through Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The International Journal Of Management*, 2(4), 35–42.
- DeConinck, J. ., & Stilwell, C. . (2004). Incorporating Organizational Justice, Role States, Pay Satisfaction and Supervisor Satisfaction in A Model of Turn Over Intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(3), 225–231.
- Deconinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice , perceived organizational support , and perceived supervisor support on marketing

- employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(12), 1349–1355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.01.003>
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, Equality, and Need: What Determines Which Value Will Be Used as the Basis of Distributive Justice? *Journal Of Social Issue*, 31(3), 137–149.
- DeVito, J. A. (2013). *The interpersonal communication book*. (Bowers Karon, Ed.) (13th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Dunnet, J and Flint, D. (2006). Part-time Workers and Organizational Justice. *The Business Review Cambridge*, (1), 39–43.
- Elovainio, M., Bos, K. Van Den, Linna, A., & Kivima, M. (2005). Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public sector employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(12), 2501–2512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.046>
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. (Sally Yagan, Ed.) (SIXTH EDIT). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Gordon, J. R. (1993). *A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior* (Forth Edit). Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
- Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural Justice, Participation, and the Fair Process Effect in Groups and Organizations. In *Organizational Behavior* (Eleventh, pp. 234–245). New Jersey: Nelson Education, Ltd.
- Griffin, Ricky W and Moorhead, G. (2014). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*. (Tamara Grega, Ed.) (Eleventh E). Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd. Retrieved from www.cengagebrain.com
- Hashim, N. H. (2016). PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCES AND TOURISM RESEARCH CONFERENCE 20-22 APRIL 2016 EDITORS: In *The Impact of Leader-Member Exchange on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Readiness Among Local Government Employees in Southern Region of Malaysia* (First, pp. 121–133). Malaysia: Terengganu, Malaysia. Retrieved from <https://fssg.unisza.edu.my/>
- Hubbell, A. P., & Chory-assad, R. M. (2007). Motivating factors: perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies*, 56(1), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0008957042000332241>
- Hussain, M. F., Ahmad, R., Ahmed, R., & Saleem, M. (2012). A study of organizational citizenship behaviour: A case of Pakistan using model assessment approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(11), 6378–6389. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1787>
- Iqbal, H. K., Aziz, U., & Tasawar, A. (2012). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(9), 1348–1354. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.09.750>
- Ismail, H. (2014). Organizational Justice and Citizenship Behavior, the Mediating Role of Trust. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(1), 86–96. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v5i1.6757>
- Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2005). *Organizational*

Behavior and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Jafari, P., & Bidarian, S. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1815–1820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.905>
- Jain, A. K., Giga, S. I., Cooper, C. L., & Cooper, C. L. (2013). Perceived organizational support as a moderator in the relationship between organisational stressors and organizational citizenship behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 21(3), 313–334. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-Mar-2012-0574>
- Jex, Steve M & Britt, T. W. (2008). *Organizational Psychology A Scientist-Practitioner Approach* (Second Edi). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kwong, J. Y. Y. (2002). A Moderator of the Interaction Effect of Procedural Justice and Outcome Favorability: Importance of the Relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87(2), 278–299. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2966>
- Lambert, Eric and Hogan, N. (2008). The Importance of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Shaping Turnover Intent A Test of a Causal Model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96–118.
- Lee, U. H., Kim, H. K., & Kim, Y. H. (2013). Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Outcomes, 5(1), 54–65.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior An Evidence-Based Approach*. (Jane Beck, Ed.) (Twelfth Ed). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., Norman, S. M., Norman, S. M., Child, I. G., ... Gilliland, S. W. (2007). PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCES AND TOURISM RESEARCH CONFERENCE 20-22 APRIL 2016 EDITORS: *Journal of Business Research*, 30(5), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450810888277>
- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2008). *Organizational Behavior, Emerging Realities for the Workplace Revolution*. (J. Biernat, Ed.) (4th Editio). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin,.
- Miner, J. B. (2005). *Organizational Behavior I. Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Mollering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Moorman, R. . (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). *Psychology applied to Work*. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, its Nature, Antecedants, and Consequences*. California: Sage Publication.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & McAllister, L. (2014). Organizational Justice and Citizenship Behavior, the Mediating Role of Trust. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(1), 23–37.
- Rama, A., & Barusman, P. (2014). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior with Organization Commitment as the Moderator. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(9), 118–126.

- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Essentials Of Organizational Behavior*. (D. Shafer, Ed.) (Sevent Ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins and Judge. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. (S. Yagan, Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Schermerhorn, John. Hunt, James. Osborn, Richard. and Bien, M. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. (L. Johnson, Ed.) (11th editi). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Retrieved from www.wiley.com/go/returnlabel.
- Sjahruddin, H. (2013). I NTERDISCIPLINARY J OURNAL O F C ONTEMPORARY R ESEARCH I N B USINESS Organizational Justice , Organizational Commitment and Trust in Manager as predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, (2000), 133–141.
- Sjahruddin, H., & Sudiro, A. (2013). Personality Effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): Trust in Manager and Organizational Commitment Mediator of Organizational Justice in Makassar City Hospitals (Indonesia). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(9), 95–105.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the Workplace : The Roles of Distributive , Procedural , and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434–443.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663.
- Stone, R. J. (2005). *Human Resources Management*. Milton: Sons Australia.
- Sweeney, P. D. (1992). DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AS PREDICTORS OF SATISFACTION WITH PERSONAL AND. *Journal of Business Research*, 35(3).
- UU 1945. (2005). UU RI No 14 Tahun 2005 (pp. 1–54). Jakarta.
- Wagner III, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2010). *Organizational Behavior, Securing Competitive Advantage*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS : THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS. *JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM RESEARCH Organ*, 24(3), 301–319.
- Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2004). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors and empowerment. *Personnel Review*, 34(4), 406–422. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480510599752>
- Wech, B. A. (2002). Trust Context. *BUSINESS & SOCIETY*, 4(3), 353–360.
- Weller, L. D. J. (1995). The Equity Factor A Vital Part of The Quality Equation. In *Organizational Behavior* (pp. 345–356). New York: Sage Publication.
- Widyananda, A., Emilisa, N., Pratana, R., Ekonomi, F., & Trisakti, U. (2014). PENGARUH PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION TERHADAP JOB SATISFACTION DAN ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 5(1).
- Yen, R. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Effectiveness : Examining Relationships in Taiwanese Banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(8), 1617–1637.
- Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice , trust , job

satisfaction , and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers : Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(Iceepsy), 1472–1481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.387>