

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Taking Job Satisfaction as the Mediator

Nan Yin

Lecturer, Department of Business School, Nanjing Xiaozhuang University, China

Abstract:

Organizational justice has long been the focus of research in the field of organizational behavior. In general, organizational justice is the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments, performance evaluation, decision-making process and the interaction with the supervisor. Many studies show that organizational justice has a significant impact on employee attitudes and behaviors. To be clear, the main objective of this study is to explore whether the organizational justice the employee perceived will affect employee's job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.

This study takes the real workplace environment as the target, with the actual staff as the sample, using the small and medium-sized computer and computer parts sales companies in Nanjing, China as the subject. In this study, 48 companies were randomly selected through field visits, the test object being the staff engaged in sales business in 48 computer and computer parts sales companies.

The results show that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, and that job satisfaction has partial mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

Keywords: Organizational justice, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior

1. Introduction

Many studies have pointed out that organizational citizenship behavior contributes to the improvement of organizational performance (Organ, 1988; Robbins, 2001). For example, organizational citizenship behavior, proposed in the research results of Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1994), can account for seventeen percent of the variance in organizational performance. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as the employee's voluntary efforts and strong organizational behavior in working beyond the contract, and in the context of the absence of organizational rewards (Organ, 1988). In fact, the success of any organization's operations depends not only on the role of the employees, but also on the employees' self-motivated, non-rewarding behavior beyond the role. Based on the premise that organizational citizenship behavior helps to improve organizational performance, the main purpose of this study is to explore the factors that contribute to the promotion of employees' active organizational citizenship behavior and its internal effective mechanism.

What are the factors (or contexts) that contribute to employees' organizational citizenship behavior? Different scholars have put forward different views and research results. Basically, in terms of the discussion antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior, this study focuses on the two variables, which are organizational justice and job satisfaction. Specifically, organizational justice is the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments, performance evaluation, decision-making process and the justice in interaction with the supervisor. On the other hand, job satisfaction has long been a concern of many management scholars. For instance, Seashore & Taber (1975) found out that job satisfaction can affect individual job performance, job withdrawal, productivity and turnover rate, and even affect the quality of social life. In other words, the degree of job satisfaction of employees has an impact on individuals, organizations, and even the community. Based on this, this study attempts to explore the influence of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior and the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship, hoping to provide the practical suggestion for human resource manager on the organization's promotion of employees' active organizational citizenship behavior with the results of this study. In conclusion, this study has the following two objectives: (1) To explore whether there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior; and (2) To explore whether job satisfaction plays an intermediary role in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

2. Literature Reviews and Analysis

2.1. Organizational Justice

The concept of equity is an important concept of value in interpersonal society. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng (2001) take equity as a social concept. Research on Organizational Justice, tracing to its origin, takes the equity

theory of Adams (1965) as its source (Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995). According to Adams (1965), individuals are not only concerned with how much their work (input) gets paid (output), but also the comparative social state, which indicates the comparison between the ratio of their pay and reward to that of others. Once the ratio is equal, the individual feels satisfied because he feels the equity; on the contrary, he will feel deprived or dissatisfied because he feels unfair. Adams (1965) further proposed that When employees feel the existence of injustice, he will take action (to reduce the input or ask for more output) to reduce the state of unfairness. Indeed, in the organization, the perception of equity is an important determinant of employee attitudes and behavior at work. Related research shows that the organizational justice perceived by employees will affect the attitude and behavior of them. Further, organizational justice will bring positive effect to the organization (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002).

Greenberg (1990), the scholar, define organizational justice as: Organizational members' perception of justice in the workplace. As to this conception, organizational justice is the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments, performance evaluation, decision-making process and the justice in interaction with the supervisor. As to the contents of organizational justice, Aquino (1995) divided organizational justice into three dimensions: Distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

2.1.1. Distributive Justice

Distributive justice refers to the extent to which the individual feels that the organization is in equity in the distribution of resources (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). For instance, the employee may compare his wages with that of others and people on other positions to make a personal subjective judgment of whether fair or not. Such personal subjective judgment of justice of distribution results (justice perception) focuses on the fairness of the distribution of organizational members' rewards, while according to the results of the distribution, the members of the organization will be able to assess the justice perception of management decisions (Bierhoff, Cohen & Geenberg, 1986). Additionally, from the perspective of social exchange, Homans (1961) proposed distributive justice rule, in which the distributive justice is defined as the fair distribution of remuneration and cost among people.

2.1.2. Procedural Justice

The concept of procedural justice was first proposed by Thibaut & Walker (1975). Procedural justice refers to the evaluation of whether the decision-making process is fair or not, when the individual is in the process of decision making or resource allocation (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The research of them pointed out that once the program is based on the principle that the results are in accordance with the principle of fairness (procedural fairness), even if the employee is not satisfied with the results of the distribution, the staff will have a positive reaction to the overall results.

2.1.3. Interactional Justice

Interactional justice refers to the evaluation and perception of the individual sensed in interpersonal treatment or justice in interpersonal relationships (Bies & Moag, 1986). The emphasis of interactional justice is that the supervisor treats the interpersonal interaction between them and their employees. According to the concept of procedural justice, the concept of interactional justice is extended by Bies & Moag. They believe that employees are also affected by two important factors in the judgment of procedural justice: (1) Decision maker's attitude toward employees; and (2) Whether the process of decision making is properly explained by the decision maker. As a result, they further argue that the quality of interpersonal treatment (interactional justice) in the process of the organization's operation affects the perception of organizational justice.

Similarly, Moorman (1991) proposed that the so-called interactional justice is the way the organization decision-making process is carried out. It includes the interaction between managers and employees, for instance, whether the manager responsible for the implementation of the organization process is in attitudes of tender, sincerity and respect for the rights and interests of employees. In short, regardless of the outcome of the treatment, the individual's quality of being treated by others (the manager) is a major determinant of the individual's assessment of organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990). According to the supervisor's attitude towards interpersonal interaction with employees, it was pointed out by the research of Tyler & Bies (1989) that there are five criteria for dealing with the perceived justice in the organization: 1. Appropriate consideration of employee opinion; 2. Removal of personal bias of the manager; 3. Consistency rules for decision making applications; 4. The response in time to the staff's opinion to the decision; 5. Explanation of the basis of decision by the manager.

As mentioned above, the focus of distributive justice lies in the fairness of individual remuneration, the emphasis of procedural justice is the fairness in the process of individual compensation decision making while the stress of interactional justice is on the attitude of respect for employees (Hosmer & Kiewitz, 2005). As a whole, though focuses of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are on different dimensions, they all play an important role in the attitude and behavior of organizational members. Therefore, organizational justice in the study will include the above three aspects.

2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior refers to the employees' behavior to show benefit to the organization, and this behavior is not the duties of official role as the foundation, and is not subject to restrictions stipulated contracts (Organ, 1990). Specifically, the organizational citizenship behavior refers to the spontaneous social behavior of employees, which is not within the scope of the organization's formal responsibility, so it is impossible to force employees to use the formal

reward and punishment system (Organ, 1988). It was believed by Organ (1988) that the design of any organizational system cannot be perfect, and that it is difficult for organizations to achieve organizational goals if they only rely on the behavior of the members of the organization in role. Therefore, it must rely on the members of the organization to take the initiative to implement some of the role-external behavior, in order to promote the achievement of organizational goals. For employees, organizational citizenship behavior is not within the scope of formal reward structure of the organization (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ, 1988). Thus, employees have the right to make their own judgments on the performance of this behavior. In other words, when employees are engaged in such activities, they do not care whether they can get the reward (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994); similarly, when employees do not engage in such behavior, they do not worry about that the organization will punish them.

Different scholars have put forward different views on dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) divided organizational citizenship behavior into 5 dimensions, which are: (1) Altruism, indicating that members of the organization will be able to automatically assist other members to complete the task; (2) Conscientiousness, indicating that members of the organization do beyond the role of the standard transaction; (3) Courtesy, indicating that members will consider whether or not to cause others to worry; (4) Sportsmanship, indicating that members will be willing to tolerate some inconvenience, do not complain about the work of some injustice; and (5) Civil virtue, indicating that members will pay attention to organizational threats and opportunities, and seek the best interests of the organization. Generally speaking, many scholars of organizational citizenship behavior research are based on these five aspects, which are also accepted in this study as the measure of organizational citizenship behavior.

2.3. The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

According to equity theory (Adams, 1965) and social exchange theory (Homans, 1961), When the employee feels that the organization is fair to him (her), he (she) will have a sense of duty and feel obligation to think of taking action to return to such fair treatment of the organization, which is namely spontaneous organizational citizenship behavior. For instance, when justice is in the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments, performance evaluation, decision-making process and the justice in interaction with the supervisor, employees will feel that the company is really looking after and caring about their rights, and will further conduct the act of giving back to the organization. In short, through this exchange process, the exchange of the two sides will establish a mutually beneficial relationship.

To sum up, when employees feel the fair treatment of the organization, they will have a sense of return obligations, and will demonstrate the beneficial behavior of the organization to fulfill such obligations to the organization. In other words, when employees are satisfied with the treatment of the organization (such as the perceived support or fair treatment of the organization), they will enhance the loyalty or emotional identity to the company, and will take in return for maintaining the interests of the organization. Such spontaneous organizational citizenship behavior is the concrete manifestation of the employee's return to the organization (Organ, 1988).

In addition, many empirical studies have found a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Williams et al., 2002; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Moorman, 1991). Therefore, this study presents the first hypothesis:

- H1: There is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

2.4. Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction

In the employee's work attitude, it is generally accepted that job satisfaction is one of the most important work attitudes to affect the organization. It is because job satisfaction will directly affect the employee's other work attitude and behavior. The concept of job satisfaction was first proposed by Hoppock (1935), claiming that Job satisfaction refers to the satisfaction of the employees' psychology and physiology to the working environment and the work itself, which is namely the subjective cognition of the working situation.

This study aims to explore whether job satisfaction has mediating effect between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, which shall be in accordance with four elements of mediating effect proposed by Baron & Kenny (1986). (1) Whether there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior; (2) Whether there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction; (3) Whether there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior; and (4) Whether the effect of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior will disappear or decrease when the job satisfaction variable is placed. In the aspect of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, this study has explored and established the research Hypothesis 1 in the previous section. On the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, according to studies of Seashore & Taber (1975) and Locke (1973), two factors, which are the environment (job related events), and the behavior of the individual (employee, colleague or supervisor), will have an impact on the job satisfaction of individual in the organization. At the same time, in the aspect of concept, organizational justice is the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments, performance evaluation, decision-making process and the justice in interaction with the supervisor. This kind of cognition includes two factors that affect the individual work satisfaction, which are the work environment (including the event) as well as the staff individual subjective appraisal and the feeling.

On the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior, as stated above, when justice is in the subjective evaluation and perception of employees towards allocation of resources, rewards and punishments,

performance evaluation, decision-making process and the justice in interaction with the supervisor, the individual job satisfaction will be improved. Employees feel a sense of obligation to the organization when they feel that they are fairly treated and have a positive attitude toward the organization. Based on the principle of reciprocity, individuals are actively involved in work and behavior, especially in non-explicit organizational citizenship behavior, in order to return to the organization (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). In other words, employee job satisfaction can contribute to the employee's obligation to return to the company, and then show organizational citizenship behavior (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Based on the above inference, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

- H2: Job satisfaction has mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Object

This study takes the real workplace environment as the target, with the actual staff as the sample, using the small and medium-sized computer and computer parts sales companies in Nanjing, China as the subject. According to the 2015 Nanjing statistical yearbook, a total of 276 computer and computer parts sales companies are in Nanjing. In this study, 48 companies were randomly selected through field visits, the test object being the staff engaged in sales business in 48 computer and computer parts sales companies. In this study, a total of 650 questionnaires were distributed, and 392 questionnaires (60%) were collected. The total 359 effective questionnaires were collected (55%).

3.2. Variable Measurement

In this study, the questionnaire was used as a research tool, the questionnaire was compiled by experts and scholars, and the six-point scale by Likert was taken into measurement, which indicates that 1 to 6 points have been given respectively from very disagree to very much agree. The questionnaire includes four parts: Organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction and demographic variables. It is hereby stated as follows:

3.2.1. Organizational Justice

The organizational justice scale designed by Aquino (1995) was used as the measurement. This scale has 11 questions in it, which include: 4 questions in distributive justice, 3 in procedural justice and 4 in interactional justice. The Cronbach's alpha value of this scale in this study was 0.80.

3.2.2. Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction scale designed by Tsui, Egan and O'Reilly (1992) was used as the measurement. This scale has 6 question entries in it, which include nature of work, colleagues, supervisors, salary, promotion and work status in which satisfaction is perceived. The Cronbach's alpha value of this scale in this study was 0.84.

3.2.3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The organizational citizenship behavior scale designed by Podsakoff, etc. (1990) was used as the measurement to assess the extent to which respondents show organizational citizenship behavior. It includes 5 dimensions which are altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civil virtue. 24 questions were originally covered in the scale, while taking the influence of the number of items on the willingness to fill into consideration, this study takes independent sample ($n=50$) test in advance, and 3 questions have been selected for the highest load factor (λ) for each dimension, which contribute to 15 questions in total. The Cronbach's alpha value of this scale in this study was 0.85.

As a whole, the Cronbach's alpha values of the scales in this study are all higher than 0.7, which indicates that the internal consistency of each measurement variable is high. In other words, the reliability of the scales is acceptable.

3.2.4. Controlled Variable

Previous studies have shown that certain demographic variables are related to organizational citizenship behavior, which include: Gender (Allen, 2006; Lovel, 1999), age (Kuehn & Ai-Busaidi, 2002), education (Gregerson, 1993; Ng & Feldman, 2009), annual income (Ueda & Ohzono, 2013), and work years (Morrison, 1994). Thus, in this study, the demographic variables above were included in the controlled variables.

3.3. Statistical Analysis

This study takes SPSS12.0 and AMOS statistical software packages as data analysis tools to conduct the descriptive statistical analysis, reliability and validity analysis, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis.

4. Research Results

4.1. Sample Descriptive Statistics

In this study, the paper questionnaire was used to collect data. In the 359 valid samples, there were 209 men (58.2%). In the age distribution, 112 people (31.2%) are younger than 30 years old; 157 (43.7%) within 31-40 years old; 69 (19.2%) within 41-50 years old; 21 (5.9%) are older than 50. In education level distribution, college education takes the main, which covers 177 people (49.3%); graduate or above comes to secondary, which covers 68 (19.0%); high

school/vocational covers 60 (17.1%); junior college covers 54 (15.0%). In position distribution, non-competent staff takes the main, which covers 304 people (84.7%). In annual income, those less than 80,000 yuan cover 220 people (61.3%); 121 (33.7%) are within 80,000-100,000 yuan; 11 (3.1%) are within 100,000-120,000 yuan; 7 (1.9%) are more than 120,000 yuan. In the aspect of working years, 177 people (49.3%) are less than 5 years, which takes the main; the second is 5-10 years, which covers 75 people (20.9%); 68 (18.9%) are more than 15 years; 39 (10.9%) are 10-15 years.

4.2. Correlation, Reliability and Validity Analysis

As presented in Table 1, the correlation of the measured variables was consistent with the hypothesis of this study. In reliability, the Cronbach's alpha values of the scales in this study are all higher than 0.7, which indicates that the internal consistency of each measurement variable is high. In validity, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed with AMOS software in this study. The results showed that the loading (λ) values of all items were above 0.5, which indicates that the convergent validity of the variables is good (Hair et al., 2006). Additionally, in the aspect of discriminant validity, as proposed in Table 1, The average variance (AVE) of the three study variables sqrt values are greater than the correlation coefficient between the variables, which indicates that the discriminant validity of the variables is good (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Therefore, on the whole, the reliability and validity of the variables are within acceptable limits.

Variable	M	Sd	1	2	3	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability (Cr)
Organizational justice	4.28	0.95	(.75)			.80	.79
Job satisfaction	4.39	0.78	.733**	(.80)		.85	.85
Organizational citizenship behavior	4.55	0.68	.573**	.656**	(.77)	.84	.86

Table 1: Correlation, Reliability and Validity Analysis
Note: The Diagonal Value Was the Square Root of AVE

4.3. Regression Analysis

This study uses regression analysis to test the two hypotheses of this study. In the aspect of controlled variables, as far as that this study focuses on the part of organizational justice to organizational citizenship behavior, the regression analysis was only related to the control variables that were significantly correlated with organizational citizenship behavior based on consideration of form content reduction.

4.3.1. Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice to Organizational Citizenship Behavior

As presented in Table 2, the Explained variance of organizational justice to organizational citizenship behavior is 28.5% ($\beta=.573$, $p<.001$), which indicates that organizational justice is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior, and that the two are in positive correlation. Namely, it indicates that when employees feel that the higher the level of organizational justice, the higher their willingness to show organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, H1 (organizational justice has a positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior) is supported.

Dependent Variable variable	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	
	Model 1	Model 2
Controlled variable		
education	.149**	.063
Annual income	-.184**	-.093
Independent variable		
Organizational justice		.573***
R ²	.070	.355
ΔR^2		.285
F	4.436***	27.579***

Table 2: Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice to Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Note: * $P<.05$ ** $P<.01$ *** $P<.001$; **B Are Standardized Coefficients

4.3.2. Verification of the Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction

The results of the regression analysis have shown that the first, second, and third conditions in mediating effect by Baron & Kenny (1986) are all satisfied. According to the argument of Baron&Kenny (1986), when the intermediary variables (i.e. job satisfaction) is placed into the regression model, that the relationship between the independent variables (i.e., organizational justice) and dependent variables (i.e., organizational citizenship behavior) is weakened or disappeared means that it satisfied the fourth conditions the establishment of mediating effect.

As presented in Table 3, when job satisfaction is placed into the regression model 3, it is found that β value of organizational justice to organizational citizenship behavior is decreased from 0.57($p<.001$) to 0.19($p<.01$). The above results show that job satisfaction has partial mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and

organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, H2 (job satisfaction has mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior) is partially supported.

Dependent Variable variable	Organizational Citizenship Behavior		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Controlled variable			
Education	.149*	.063	.091
Annual income	-.184**	-.093	-.134**
Independent variable			
Organizational justice		.573***	.194**
Job satisfaction			.519***
R ²	.070	.355	.471
ΔR ²		.285	.116
F	4.436***	27.579***	38.889***

Table 3: Regression Analysis of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Note: *P<.05 **P<.01 ***P<.001; **B Are Standardized Coefficients

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1. Discussion

This study has the following two objectives: (1) To explore whether there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior; and (2) to explore whether job satisfaction plays an intermediary role in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. The results show that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, and that job satisfaction has partial mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior.

H1 of the study is that organizational justice has a positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior. As presented in Form 4.2, employees' perception of organizational justice will positively influence their organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the higher the perceived organizational justice, the more willing the employees are to show the organizational citizenship behavior.

In addition, it is shown that job satisfaction has partial mediating effect on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, which is consistent with the research of Moorman (1991) in relative research results. Besides, according to the conditions in mediating effect by Baron & Kenny (1986), the results also show that: (1) When the sense of organizational justice is higher, the employee's job satisfaction is higher; and (2) The higher the employee's job satisfaction, the higher the willingness to show organizational citizenship behavior.

5.2. Managerial Implications

In today's operation environment that focuses on flexibility, speed and teamwork, the stressed of business management should be paid on how to make employees willing to do their best for the organization's goals. Further, most of the scholars argue that the success of an organization, in addition to setting a clear standard of role responsibilities, relies more on arousing the employees to organizational citizenship behavior initiative to pay some formal duties (Barnard, 1938; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Organ, 1988). Just as pointed out by Borman & Motowidlo (1993), employee organizational citizenship behavior positively affects the performance of an organization or team. In short, the more employees who have a high level of organizational citizenship behavior, the higher the overall performance of an organization.

In particular, the organizational citizenship behavior has been paid more attention to by academic and practical managers is because the organizational citizenship behavior has the characteristics of altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civil virtue. These traits can effectively reduce the internal conflicts of the team or organization (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997). For instance, with a majority of employees of altruistic and helping others in an organization, its employees will not be spared, but will be happy to help new colleagues to solve the problem related to the work. With such behavior, new colleagues can quickly integrate into the company, which can reduce uncertainty and unease about the new environment, and reduce the flow of new colleagues. On the other hand, when the majority of employees have the spirit of diligence and professionalism and courteous attitude, it can effectively reduce the internal conflicts of the team or organization, and employees will continue to take the initiative to help organizations or put forward suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the organization because of the belief in the interests of the organization.

A good social exchange relationship urges the members of the organization to return from the heart and the emotional attachment to the organization (Cropanzano, Rupp & Byrne, 2003; Lambert, 2000). Therefore, the conditions that any organization expects employees to take the initiative to contribute, and actively demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior must be that employees have a sense of gratitude, responsibility and trust in the organization. Specifically, employees who have a sense of gratitude, responsibility and trust in the organization may have strong emotional commitment and willingness to contribute to the organization. From the results of this study, Management and human resource management units should ensure the mechanism of organizational justice within the organization in

order to create a working relationship and atmosphere with positive social exchange. Such working relationship and atmosphere can on one hand incubate psychological gratitude and sense of duty of employees and on the other hand improve the job satisfaction of employees to motivate employees' organizational citizenship behavior.

Additionally, from the perspective of employee satisfaction, organizations cannot just rely solely on wages, employee rights, dividends and other fair distribution to enhance employee job satisfaction. What is of the similar significance is that the organization shall taking different management mechanisms to make the employees feel the efforts of the organization in maintenance of procedural and interactional justice in daily working experience. Furthermore, most employees in modern organizations are chasing for satisfaction of individual growth and success through working (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Therefore, in addition to realizing the procedural justice in organization performance evaluation and distributive justice in remuneration (Fasolo, 1995), which takes that in the design of the promotion system, employees shall find their own efforts and the expected results are linked (Eisenberger et al, 1990) as an example, it is also possible to provide staff training opportunities to help them learn and grow, so as to improve their job satisfaction.

Finally, it has been found out in this study, which is similar to the studies of private or public sectors by other scholars, that in addition to that employees' perceptions of organizational justice will directly affect their willingness to show organizational citizenship behavior, it will indirectly affect the organizational citizenship behavior through employee satisfaction. In short, when employees have a high degree of job satisfaction, they have higher willingness to actively demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior for the benefit and success of the organization. Therefore, the organization in the implementation of the internal management measures shall on one hand let the employees feel the treatment of organizational justice and on the other hand, more importantly, pay attention to the management measures to improve employee satisfaction. To sum up, in the context of benign working conditions, a high quality of helping others and altruistic organization atmosphere is believed to be able to attract better talent and retain excellent employees; and When the organization has a group of excellent employees, the organization will eventually be able to bring positive performance.

5.3. Research Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

In the process of data collection, analysis and research, this study tried to ensure the completion; however, it inevitably encountered some research dilemma. The followings are research limitations and future research recommendations of this study: (1) In consideration of human, material and time constraints, questionnaires were just issued to the small and medium-sized computer and computer parts sales companies in Nanjing, China. A further and more comprehensive study is to be carried out to approve whether it can be on behalf of the practical situation in China as a whole. (2) The object of this study is limited to staff in computer sales industry. Though The findings are broadly consistent with those found by other scholars in different organizations, it must be alert to make is a general rule of the results to other industries. (3) This study uses cross-sectional data as the basis for empirical research, which can only be based on the point of time in study. Thus, the results of this study limit the inference basis of causality. It is suggested that future studies can be carried out to investigate the causal relationship between variables in a long-time longitudinal study. (4) This study used a questionnaire survey as a single source of data collection, which will unavoidably produce the common source bias. Although a test in this study was conducted for common source bias, it can only be determined that it has not caused serious problems in this study. It is recommended that future research should be conducted with the help of environmental factors for multiple resources in data collection. For instance, the evaluation of the organizational citizenship behavior of the participants by the supervisor or colleagues to replace the respondents' self-assessment can be taken, which can completely eliminate the doubt of common source bias.

6. References

- i. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2
- ii. Allen, T. D. (2006). "Rewarding Good Citizens: The Relationship Between Citizenship Behavior, Gender, and Organizational Rewards". *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(1), 120-143. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00006.x
- iii. Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships Among Pay Inequity, Perceptions of Procedural Justice, and Organizational Citizenship. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 8(1), 21-33. doi: 10.1007/BF02621253
- iv. Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 491-509. doi: 10.1002/job.211
- v. Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- vi. Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173. doi: 10.2307/255908
- vii. Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- viii. Bierhoff, H. W., Cohen, R. L., & Greenberg, J. Eds. (1986). *Justice in social relations*. New York: Plenum. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4684-5059-0
- ix. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 1, 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- x. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 71-98.
- xi. Chang, E. (2002), Distributive justice and organizational commitment revisited: Moderation by layoff in the case of Korean employees, *Human Resource Management*, 41(2), 261. doi: 10.1002/hrm.10035
- xii. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. L. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425
- xiii. Cropanzano, R., D. E. Rupp, & Z. S. Byrne (2003). The Relationship of Emotional Exhaustion to Work Attitudes, Job Performance, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1, 160-169. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.160
- xiv. De Cremer, D. (2005). Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20 (1), 4-13. doi: 10.1108/02683940510571603
- xv. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
- xvi. Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.75.1.51
- xvii. 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. doi: 10.2307/2393733
- xviii. Fasolo, P. M.(1995). Procedural justice and perceived organizational support: Hypothesized effects on job performance. In R. Cropanzano & M. Kacmar(Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice and support: Managing the social climate in the work place*, 185-195.
- xix. Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3, 141-183.
- xx. Fornell, C. R., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3151312
- xxi. Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270. doi: 10.1007/BF01385031
- xxii. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 6(2), 399-432. doi: 10.1177/014920639001600208
- xxiii. Gregerson, H.B. (1993). "Multiple commitments at work and extra-role behavior during three stages of organizational tenure", *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1), pp.31-47. doi : 10.1016/0148-2963(93)90041-M
- xxiv. Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Co.
- xxv. Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- xxvi. Hoppock, R. (Eds.) (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Row.
- xxvii. Hosmer L. R., & Kiewitz, C. (2005). Organizational justice: A behavioral science concept with critical implications for business ethics and stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15(1), 61-91. doi : 10.5840/beq20051513
- xxviii. Kalleberg, A. L., (1977). *Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction*, *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143. doi: 10.2307/2117735
- xxix. Katz, D. (1964). "The motivational basis of organizational behavior." *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-133. doi: 10.1002/bs.3830090206
- xxx. Katz, D. and Kahn, R. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- xxxi. Kirkman, B. I., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual Power Distance Orientation and Follower Reactions to Transformational Leaders: A Cross-Level, Cross-Cultural Examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744-764. doi : 10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669971
- xxxii. Konovsky, M. A. & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669. doi: 10.2307/256704
- xxxiii. Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building Commitment, Attachment, and Trust in Strategic Decision-Making Team: The Role of Procedural Justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 60-84. doi: 10.2307/256728
- xxxiv. Kuehn, K.W. & Ai-Busaidi, y. (2002). "Citizenship behavior in a non-Western context: An examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self-reported OCB". *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 12(2), 107-125. doi : 10.1108/eb047446
- xxxv. Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C. & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Comparing Perspectives of Supervisors Subordinates Across Four International Samples, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 594-601. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.594
- xxxvi. Lambert, S. (2000). Added Benefits: The Link between Work-Life Benefits and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 801-815. doi: 10.2307/1556411
- xxxvii. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity? In K. J. Gergen, M. S.
- xxxviii. Lind, E. A., & Van den Bos, K. (2002). When Fairness Works: Toward a General Theory of Uncertainty Management. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 24, 181-223. doi: 10.1016/S0191-3085(02)24006-X
- xxxix. Locke, E. A. (1973). *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*. In M.d.Dunnette (Ed.) . *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally. 1297-1343.

- xi. Lovel, S.E., Anton, J., Mason, C., & Davidson, A. (1999). "Does gender affect the link between organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation", *Sex Roles*, 41, 469-479.
- xlii. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- xliii. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637. doi: 10.2307/256489
- xliiii. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organization justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-885. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.6.845
- xliv. Morrison, E. W. (1994). "Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective". *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543-1567. doi: 10.2307/256798
- xlv. Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). "How broadly does education contribute to job performance?", *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 89-134. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01130.x
- xlvi. Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993), Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior, *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556. doi: 10.2307/256591
- xlvii. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- xlviii. Organ, D. W. & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157
- xlix. Organ D. W., & Ryan, Katherine. (1995). A meta-analytic of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x
 - I. Podsakoff, P.M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351-363. doi: 10.2307/3152222
 - ii. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7
 - iii. Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133-151. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
 - liii. Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Illinois: Homewood Company.
 - liv. Robbins, S. P. (1992), *Organizational Behavior: concepts, controversies, and Applications*, 6th ed., Prentice Hall, N. J.
 - lv. Samuel Aryee, Pawan S. Budhwar, Zhen Xiong 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. doi: 10.1002/job.138
 - lvi. Schermerhorn, Jr., J. R. Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1994). *Managing Organizational Behavior*, 5th Ed., New York: John Wiley & Sons.
 - lvii. Seashore, S. E., & Taber, T. D. (1975). Job satisfaction and their correlations. *American Behavior and Scientists*. 18, 346.
 - lviii. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
 - lix. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organization citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.68.4.653
 - lx. Tett, R. P. & J. P. Meyer. (1993). Job Satisfaction, Organization Commitment, Turnover Intention, and Turnover: Path Analyses Based on Meta-Analytic Findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2), 259-291. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x
 - lxi. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. 1975. *Procedure justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
 - lxii. Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly. (1992) Being Different: Relational Demography and Organizational Attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579. doi: 10.2307/2393472
 - lxiii. Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1989). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedure justice. In J. Carroll (Ed.), *Advances in applied social psychology: Business settings* : 77-98, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 - lxiv. Ueda, Y., & Ohzono, Y. (2013). "Effects of Workers' Careers and Family Situations on OCB-Related Work Values". *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(10), 86-96.
 - lxv. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802. doi: 10.2307/256600
 - lxvi. Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
 - lxvii. Williams, S., Pitre, R. & Zainuba, M. (2002), Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(1), 33-44. doi: 10.1080/0022454020960