

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Procedural Justice as a Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Selected Tertiary Institutions in Rivers State

Sunday Owzorji

Student, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Abstract:

This paper which examined organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in selected tertiary institutions in Rivers State is descriptive, with the objective of determining how organizational justice helps in the improvement of organizational citizenship behavior. The null hypothesis was adopted having collected data from the institutions and the regression analysis was done with the aid of the SPSS. The null hypothesis were rejected hence the P-value was less than r_2 value, showing that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). From our findings, we concluded that the presence of organizational justice enhances organizational citizenship behavior and that corporate culture plays a very significant role in the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior since it determines how citizens perceive the organization. Based on these findings, we recommend that organizations should inculcate the views and opinions of their employees, encourage equitable distribution of resources, and ensure that proper procedures of doing things are adopted in the organization as this will encourage positive performance behavior.

Keywords: Civic virtue, distributive justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, organizational justice, sportsmanship

1. Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been studied since the late 1970s. Over the past three decades, interest in these behaviors has increased substantially. Organizational behavior has been linked to overall organizational effectiveness towards self-development, altruism, work satisfaction, commitment and turnover intentions. Thus, these types of employee behaviors have important consequences in the workplace. Dennis Organ is generally considered the father of OCB. Organ expanded upon Katz's (1964) original work. Organ (1988) defines OCB as individual behavior that is discretionary not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes, the effective functioning of the organization.

Scholars have ascertained the importance of citizenship behavior in the organization (e.g. Gabriel, 2015, Organ 1999) resulting in the avalanche of studies attempting to determine its antecedents in the workplace. An understanding of organizational justice and citizenship work behavior in non-stable/volatile business environment like Nigeria deserves further investigation to add to existing knowledge, owing to globalization, and diversity in cultural issues, several studies has been carried out with respect to organizational justice and citizenship work behavior in Rivers State. We will in this research, test the same dimensional variable as operationalized by Greenberg (1990). These dimensions are: (i) distributive justice, (ii) procedural justice. We will consider this dimensions in the Nigerian context, having in mind the diversity in culture, belief, value, morality, and needs, to ascertain the effects of organizational justice on employee work behavior within the tertiary institutions in our volatile and dynamic Nigerian work environment in Nigeria. To fill the literature gap, this study examines the link between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in selected tertiary institution in Rivers State. The purpose of this paper therefore is to examine the relationship between Distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and the specific objectives are to:

1. To determine the relationship between distributive justice and sportsmanship
2. To determine the relationship between distributive justice and civic virtue.

1.1. Research Questions

The following research questions are put forward

1. What is the relationship between distributive justice and sportsmanship?
2. What is the relationship between distributive justice and civic virtue?

1.2. Research Hypotheses

To provide answers to our research questions we are holding unto the following Hypothesis:

- H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and sportsmanship.
- H_{02} : There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and civic virtue

2. Literature

2.1. Distributive Justice

Distributive justice can be classified into three principles: (a) equity (b) equality, and (c) need. Distributive justice was originally conceptualized based on Adams' equity theory (1965), which posited that resource allocation among employees should be consistent with the ratio of each employee's contribution to an organization. In other words, an individual who has contributed the most to an organization should receive a greater amount of allocation than others. According to the theory, an employee tends to compare his/her job inputs and outcomes with others and perceives injustice if he/she has not been treated fairly by the organization based on referent comparisons. Equality also consists of three sub-principles: (a) equality of results, an equal distribution over the long term, (b) equality of opportunities, an equal chance to receive resources, and (c) equality of treatment, which means that all distributions are equal in a given situation (Tornblom and Jonsson, 1985). According to Tornblom and Johnson (1985), equality is more commonly adopted when the relationship among members or subunits is cooperative and the cohesion and a sense of a common fate of the organization is high among them. Finally, need is the notion that an individual who lacks necessary resources needs to receive more of the share of resources than others (Hums Chelladurai, 1994). The need principle is more commonly used when the goals of the organizations are personal growth of each member and survival of the group Deutsch, (1975).

2.2. Concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

The citizenship is a subject that was raised for the first time in the social sciences for establishing the community spirit and solidarity among the society people (Fathi Vajargah & Chokadeh, 2006). After democratic ruling system as a manner for ruling over people by the people entered in the political systems, the necessity of people's presence in the governing interactions was revealed, thus the political sciences to achieve the suitable scientific paradigms, borrowed the citizenship from social sciences. The third presence of citizenship after presence in social sciences and political sciences is appeared in education system. In fact, after proving the importance and value of citizenship the education systems intended to extend and intensify this important factor. But presence of citizenship in the context of education was so significant that today many of the world countries have considered the "citizenship education (Kazemi & Chokadeh, 2005). Appearance of citizenship concept in 'organization and management science under title of organizational citizens [p behavior indeed is formed as a combination of social, political and educational science, based on the following assumptions: (1) The organizations are the major constituent elements of the community and have major role in the humans lives; (2) The humans and their intellectual capitals are considered as the major elements of organizations; (3) The major part of humans life is spent in the organizations and interaction with them; and (4) The new approaches of organization and management consider the responsible and reliable, brave, knowledge oriented human as the major agent in success of organizations (Jamali et al, 2009).

The citizen is a person who lives in a state-nation and has specified rights and privileges as well as tasks vis-à-vis the government such as obeying the government (Lagasse, 2000, quoted by Banks, 2008). Active and responsible citizenship doesn't mean only beginning to various local, national and international community but means active participation in the social life and collective institutions as well.

2.3. Measures of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organ has presented a classification of organizational citizenship behavior approaches which formed the concept of OGB, but we shall limit ourselves to the two of our interest:

2.3.1. Civic Virtue

Including behaviors such as attending the extraordinary activities when this presence is not required, supporting the presented development and changes made by the organization managers and tendency to studying the book, magazine and increasing general information and paying attention to the hanging poster and notice in the organization for the others' information. This approach of organizational citizenship behavior is corresponding to the faithfully support in Graham (1989) study and protection of organizational benefits in the model of Fareh et al (1997), and organizational loyalty and civic behavior in model of Podsakoff (2000).

2.3.2. Sportsmanship

One of organizational citizenship behaviors that have been considered less than helping behaviors. As Organ (1991), sportsmanship has been defined as tendency to tolerating the unavoidable annoying conditions in work without complaint and expressing the sadness. Organizational loyalty: this category of behaviors including defending the organization against the threats, participation in achieving the reputation for the organization and collaboration with the others to achieve the whole benefits. Organizational loyalty due to promotion of organizational position before external beneficiaries is necessary. Protection and defend against external threats and binding even in undesirable conditions may be deemed as loyalty. Organizational obedience: organizational obedience has a long record in the context of organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational obedience is accepting the necessity and appropriateness of logic rules and organizational regulations that are reflected in the job descriptions and policies of organization Respecting the rules and instructions, believing the work completion at the appointed time and adequate consideration to the job indicates the obedience. The reason for considering this behavior as the organizational citizenship behavior is that even despite of expecting every person to obey all organizational regulations, rules and procedures at any situation, many of employees don't do it simply. Therefore, these

employees who obey all regulations and instructions out of conscience even in the event of lacking supervision are deemed as good citizens.

2.4. The Relationship between Distributive Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The relationship between organizational characteristics and OCBs were somewhat mixed. Neither organizational formalization, inflexibility, advisory/staff support, nor spatial distances were consistently related to citizenship behaviors. However, group cohesiveness was found to be significantly and positive related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue: and perceived organizational support was found to be significantly related to employee altruism. In addition, rewards outside the leader's control were negatively related to altruism, courtesy, and conscientiousness.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

Therefore, this study made use of the quasi-experimental research design. The population for this study consists of all the selected tertiary institution located in Rivers States. One Institution was randomly selected from each Institution that makes up the Rivers State. Thereafter a total of 5002 comprised of study population of study (academic and non- academic staff) of the selected institution.

S/No	Universities	Population	% of Population
1	University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt.	1050	21
2	Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Nkpolu P.H	956	19.1
3	Rivers State Polytechnic, Bori, Rivers State.	892	17.8
4	Rivers State University of Education	873	17.5
5	Federal College of Education Omoku	697	13.9
6	Rivers State College of Health Science and Technology, Port Harcourt	534	10.7
	Total	5002	100

Table 1: Tertiary Institution and Population Size

The sample size was determined at 5% level of significance using Yaro Yamen's formula presented by Baridam, (2001).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

When

n = sample size

N = population size

e = level of significance (5%)

$$\therefore \frac{5002}{1 + 5002(0.25)} = 370$$

Different data sources and collection methods were utilized in this study. Three major data collection strategies employed were: Questionnaires, personal oral interviews, and a review of related literature. The researcher designed a comprehensive questionnaire; the questionnaire was pre – tested on a group of ten (10) workers. This was done to check the suitability of the questionnaire for the study. Sets of the questionnaire were administered personally by the researcher to the employees of the organization where the primary data exist for specialized explanation. To generate a richer response set and to assure better validity and reliability of the measures used, survey participants were asking to respond to a variety of multiple scaled items, ordinal ranking items, semi – structured questions, and open -ended questions.

In the course of administering the questionnaire, series of oral questions were put to some of the respondents of purposes of explanation of issues arising there from and for clarity of opinion of the respondents.

3.2. Test of Validity and Reliability

Several steps are taken to ensure the validity and reliability of this study. According Baridam (2001:80), validity and reliability are very important constructs in the measurement of research variable.

3.2.1. Test of Validity

3.2.1.1. Operational Measures of the Variables

The independent variable in this study is organizational justice. The dimensions of this variable include: distributive justice, procedural justice. Each of these dimensions was operationalized as follows:

Distributive Justice: The measure of this variable was based on the earlier research of price and Mueller (1986). A total of 5 questions were used to measure this variable. The scale was based on the degree to which the respondent agreed with the following statements concerning the distribution of the rewards and organizational favors:

- i. Rewards in this organization are distributed based on merit. That is the people who work hardest or produce the most should get the greatest rewards (equity norm).
- ii. Every member gets the same share of rewards, regardless of effect (the notion of equality).
- iii. Every member receives rewards in proportion to their needs (the need norm).

The dependent variable for this study is Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). The components of this construct include: sportsmanship, civic virtue (interpersonal harmony) these components of citizenship behavior will be measured by means of the questionnaire. The scale used to measure the three components.

3.3. Analysis Technique

To empirically evaluate the relationships between the independent variables (organizational justice) and the dependent variables (organization citizenship behavior), this study, the spearman Rank- order correlation co-efficient (spearman s' rho) statistical technique was employed, using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The analysis considered the influence of employees' perception of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior. The spearman Rank correlation statistical technique is appropriate for our analysis because the variables in this study are measured in ordinal scales.

4. Descriptive Analysis

Number of Questionnaire Distributed/ Number Returned

A total of 370 copies of questionnaire were distributed to the employee (both teaching and non-teaching members of staff) of the selected universities.

S/No	Universities	Number of Distributed	Number Returned	% Rate of Response
1	University of Lagos	72	40	60.
2	University of Ibadan	68	41	65
3	Obafemi Awolowo University	61	38	58
4	University of Ife	58	35	63
5	Federal University of Technology Akure	57	39	72
6	University of Ilorin	54	30	60
	Total	370	223	63.1

Table 1: Response Rate to Distributed Questionnaire

Sources: Survey Data, 2015

Of this number 370, a total of 233 (responding 60.2%) copies of the questionnaire were returned and hence, used for analysis. The numbers returned from each of the university are also indicated in the table above.

4.1. Statistical Testing of Hypotheses

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.870a	.754	.470	.46240	
a. Predictors: (constant), Distributive justice					
ANOVA ^b					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	46.435	1	46.43 5	217.176	.000a
2. Residual	51.956	243	.214		
3. Total	98.391	223			
a. Predictors: (constant), Distributive justice					
b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior					
Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant)	.875	.147	.687	5.953	.000
Distributive Justice	.710	.048		14.737	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior					

Table 2: Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Results of data analysis indicate that the adjusted coefficient of determination (R) is 0.470. This implies that the independent variable (Distributive justice) account for about 47.0 percent of the variation in the dependent variable (organizational citizenship behavior). The results of data analysis also indicate that F-calculated is 217.176 and the corresponding significance value is 0.000 which is less than 0.01. This implies that the model is significant.

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.866 ^a	.750	.387	.49718	

a. predictors: (constant Distributive justice)

ANOVA^b					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	38.817	3	12.939	52.344	.000 ^a
Residual	59.573	241	.247		
Total	98.391	223			

a. Predictors: (Constant) Distributive Justice
b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Coefficients^a					
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant)					
Distributive Justice	.875	.147	.687	5.953	.000
	.710	.048		14.737	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior
b. Dependent variable: Altruism

Table 3: Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Distributive Justice, on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.709 ^a	.503	.372	.50736	

a. Predictors: (Constant) Distributive justice

ANOVA^b					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	37.977	3	12.659	49.177	.000 ^a
Residual	62.037	241	.257		
Total	100.014	244			

a. Predictors: (Constant) Distributive Justice
b. Dependent Variable: Civic virtue

Coefficients^a					
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant)	.977	.178		5.486	.000
Distributive Justice	.111	.040	.146	2.742	.007
	.403	.054	.436	7.462	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Civic virtue

Table 4: Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Distributive Justice on Civic Virtue

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.724 ^a	.524	.518	.43347

a. Predictors: (Constant) Distributive justice

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	49.907	3	16.636	88.536	.000 ^a
Residual	45.283	241	.188		
Total	95.191	223			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice- Dependent Variable: sportsmanship

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant)	-.685	.152		4.501	.000
Distributive Justice	.178	.034	.242	5.180	.000
	.482	.046	.535	10.453	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Sportsmanship

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant)	.992	.181		5.489	.000
Distributive Justice	.120	.041	.158	2.927	.004
Procedural Justice	.368	.055	.398	6.721	.000

a. Dependent Variable: sportsmanship

Table 5: Regression analysis showing the effects of Distributive justice on Sportsmanship

4.2. Hypothesis One

❖ Relationship between Distributive Justice and Sportsmanship

The first hypothesis sought to examine the relationship between distributive justice and sportsmanship within the Nigeria work environment. Hence, it was hypothesized that:

- H₀₁: Justice and Civic Virtue

The Spearman's Rank Order correlation was run to determine the relationship. There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and sportsmanship. As can be seen from the analysis of collected data, there was a strong, positive correlation between distributive justice and civic virtue, which was statistically significant ($r_s = 0.467$, $P < 0.01$). Based on the finding above, it was concluded that distributive justice enhances sportsmanship.

4.3. Hypothesis Two

❖ Relationship between Distributive Justice and Civic Virtue

The second hypothesis sought to examine the relationship between distributive justice and civic virtue within the western Nigeria work environment. Hence, it was hypothesized that:

- H₀₂: There is no Significant Relationship between Distributive Justice and Civic Virtue

The Spearman's Rank Order correlation was run to determine the relationships between Distributive justice and civic virtue as can be seen from the analysis of collected data, there was a strong, positive correlation between distributive justice and civic virtue, which was statistically significant ($r_s = 0.630$, $P < 0.01$). Based on the finding above, it was concluded that distributive justice enhances civic.

5. Discussion, Conclusion & Recommendations

5.1. Discussion of Findings

The hypotheses sought to examine the relationship between distributive justice and the measures of organizational citizenship behavior (sportsmanship, and civic virtue) within the Nigerian work environment and the university system to be specific. Hence, it was hypothesized that there is no relationship between distributive justice and the measures of employee work behavior (sportsmanship, and civic virtue). These hypotheses were tested using the Spearman rank statistical techniques. As can be seen from the analysis of collected data, a positive and significant relationship was revealed between distributive justice and the measures of

organizational citizenship behavior (sportsmanship and civic virtue). This finding may be explained by the fact that when employees perceive fairness in their assessments of the distribution of rewards and inducements received in exchange for their contributions at work (distributive justice), they directly or indirectly reciprocate this gesture by displaying such desirable work behavior as: discretionary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with an organizationally relevant task or problem (*sportsmanship*). Tolerant behaviors one the part of the employee that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization or beyond their usual call of duty, (Civic Virtue) are behavior on the part of an individual that indicates that he/she responsibly participates in, is involved in, or is concerned about the life of the company (civic virtue).

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the discussions above, the following conclusions were made:

Employees perception of organizational justice will promote such desirable work related behavior as wiliness of employee to tolerate less than required minimum ideal situation in carrying out one's duties beyond the minimum requirements (sportsmanship) and put up an attitude that indicate that individual is responsible to the life and governance of the organization (civic virtue). More specifically, From the foregoing, we therefore deduced the following from our findings

- i. The operation of distributive justice significantly enhances organizational citizenship behavior (sportsmanship and civic virtue) within the western Nigeria work environment and the university system to be specific.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the discussion and conclusions above, the following recommendations and suggestions are made:

1. That managers knowing that people are always concerned about how they are treated, managers should ensure that the views of individual worker are considered in the enactment of rules and regulation, they should ensure fairness, equity and quality human face treat during the enactment of process and procedure as this is capable of enhancing their display of citizenship behavior. They should remove laws limiting employee from participating in decision making.

2. Managers should take steps to ensure that there is fairness in the distribution of organizational rewards, liberalism and favors that the employee received in exchange for their contribution at work (distributive justice), as this is capable of enhancing their display of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

6. References

- i. Baridam, D. M. (2001). Research methods in administrative science, 2nd ed, Port Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- ii. Brockner, J., Chen, Y. R., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K., Skarlicki, D. P. (2000). Culture and procedural fairness – when the effects of what you depend on how you do it. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 138 – 159.
- iii. Colquitt, J. A.; Greenberg, J. and Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice” a historical review. In Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J. A. (eds). 2005 Handbook of Organizational Justice, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- iv. Cooper, D. R. and Schindler P. M. (2001). Business research methods, NEW York the McGraw Hill Co., Inc.
- v. Gabriel, J.M.O (2015), Organizational citizenship behaviour & corporate resilience in the Nigerian domestic aviation sector. Unpublished PhD. Thesis submitted in rivers state university of sciences and technology
- vi. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*. 16 : 399-432.
- vii. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., and Black, W. C. (2001). *Multivariate data analysis with readings*, 5th Ed, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentices – Hall McBurney.
- viii. Hui, C., Law K. S. & Chen Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese Case. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 77: 3-21.
- ix. Katz, D. (1964). “Motivation basis of organizational behaviour”. *Behavioural Science*, 9:131 – 145. Harvard University Press.
- x. Lam, S. S. K.; Hui, C.; & Law, K. S. (1999). Employee work behaviour: comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 594-601.
- xi. Lau, R. S. Y. (2008). Integration and extension of leader-member exchange and organizational justice at individual and group-levels of analysis. *The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Management*, 1-168.
- xii. Lee, C., Pillutla, M., & Law, K. S., (2000). Power – distance, fender and organizational justice. *Journal of Management*, 26: 685 – 704.
- xiii. Mackenzie, S. B.; Podsakoff, P. M. & Fetter, R. (1991). Employee work behaviour and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons performance. *Employee Work Behaviour and Human Decision processes*, 50: 123-150.
- xiv. Mackenzie, S. B.; Podsakoff, P. M. & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of employee work behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 5: 70-80.
- xv. Mackenzie, S. B.; Podsakoff, P. M.; & Paine, J. E. (1998). Effects of employee work behaviour and productivity on evaluations of performance at different hierarchical levels in sales organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27: 396-410.
- xvi. Moorman R. H., (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of applied Psychology*, 76: 845 – 855.

- xvii. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (6) 845-855.
- xviii. Moorman, R. H.; Niehoff, B. P. & Organ C. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and employee work behaviour : sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6: 209-225.
- xix. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, M.A: Lexington Books.
- xx. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performances*, 10: 85 – 97.
- xxi. Podsakoff, P. M.; Mackenzie, S. B.; Paine, B. P. & Bacharach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *journals of management*, 26: 513-563.
- xxii. Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, organizational Citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1:107- 142.
- xxiii. Young, L. D. (2010). Is Organizational justice enough to promote citizenship behaviour at work? A Retest in Korea, *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 45 (4) 637-648.