

# EFFECT OF ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN BAUCHI STATE UNIVERSITY, GADAU

**Aminu Abdelhadi**

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences  
Sa'adu Zungur University, Gadau

**Abstract:** The study was carried out to explore the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior among academic staff of Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi-Nigeria. This study first divided organisational justice into distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and informational justice to analyse the direct effect of each type of justice on OCB dimensions OCBI( OCB toward the organisation (OCB-O) and OCB toward individuals (OCB-I). The study adopted quantitative research design, using a survey questionnaire to collect data from 152 respondents from academic staff members from Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi. Data analysis was conducted using Structural Equation Model (SEM) -Partial Least Square (PLS) with Smart PLS 4.0 software to test the hypotheses. The results show that there is a significant positive relationship between the organizational justice and the organizational citizenship behaviour. The findings of this research have provided insights into the importance of organizational justice in enhancing the performance of academic staff. The implications of the study may contribute to the development of strategies for improving organizational justice practices and promoting better performance outcomes among academic staff in universities. Theoretical and managerial implications and suggestions for future research are discussed

**Key words:** Organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), academic staff and significance effect

## **Introduction**

Organizational justice, a concept central to organizational behavior, significantly impacts the dynamics and performance within organizations. It pertains to the perception of fairness within an organization and how it influences employee attitudes and behaviors. In academic settings, organizational justice is crucial as it affects not only the well-being of academic staff but also their performance and the overall success of the institution (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), on the other hand, represents discretionary behaviors exhibited by employees that are not directly recognized by formal reward systems but contribute to the overall functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). This study aims to explore the relationship between different dimensions of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi-Nigeria.

## **Organizational Justice**

Organizational justice has been categorized into four primary dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and informational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of outcomes such as pay, rewards, and promotions. When employees perceive that rewards and resources are distributed equitably, they are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward their organization (Greenberg, 1990). Procedural justice involves the perceived fairness of the processes and methods used to make decisions within the organization. Fair procedures help build trust and commitment among employees, leading to a positive work environment (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Interactional justice pertains to the fairness of interpersonal treatment that employees receive from their supervisors or managers. It emphasizes the importance of respect, dignity, and politeness in interactions within the workplace (Bies & Moag, 1986). Informational justice, a sub-dimension of interactional justice, focuses on the quality and quantity of information provided to employees about organizational decisions. When employees receive timely and adequate information, they are more likely to perceive the decision-making process as fair (Shaw et al., 2003).

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)**

Organ (1988) initially conceptualized OCB as behaviors that are not part of an employee's formal job requirements but facilitate the functioning of the organization. OCB can be categorized into two dimensions: OCB directed toward the organization (OCB-O) and OCB directed toward individuals (OCB-I). OCB-O includes behaviors like volunteering for extra work and upholding organizational policies, while OCB-I involves assisting coworkers and providing support (Williams & Anderson, 1991). In academic settings, OCB among academic staff can result in a more collaborative and productive work environment, leading to enhanced educational outcomes (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

### **Relationship Between Organizational Justice and OCB**

The relationship between organizational justice and OCB has been extensively studied across different organizational contexts. Employees who perceive high levels of fairness within their organizations are more likely to engage in OCB (Moorman, 1991). For instance, when academic staff members perceive that they are treated fairly in terms of resource allocation, decision-making processes, interpersonal interactions, and communication, they are more likely to exhibit behaviors that go beyond their formal job requirements (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Distributive justice has been found to be particularly influential in predicting OCB-O, as employees are motivated to reciprocate fair treatment through behaviors that benefit the organization (Masterson et al., 2000).

Procedural justice, on the other hand, is strongly associated with OCB-I. Fair procedures promote trust and loyalty, encouraging employees to help their colleagues and support their well-being (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Interactional and informational justice also play significant roles in shaping OCB. When employees feel respected and valued by their supervisors and receive adequate information regarding organizational decisions, they are more inclined to engage in positive interpersonal behaviors and contribute to the organization's success (Colquitt et al., 2001).

### **Research Context and Problem Statement**

Despite the growing interest in the relationship between organizational justice and OCB, there is a dearth of research focusing on academic institutions, particularly in the Nigerian context. Universities play a vital role in the development of any society by fostering knowledge, research, and innovation. Academic staff are the primary drivers of this mission, and their performance can significantly influence the institution's success. However, the unique nature of academic work, characterized by autonomy, complexity, and intrinsic motivation, makes it essential to understand how organizational justice impacts OCB in this context (Bellé et al., 2014).

In Nigeria, universities face numerous challenges, including inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, and increasing demands for quality education (Ofoegbu & Alonge, 2017). In such a challenging environment, fostering a sense of fairness and promoting OCB among academic staff becomes crucial for enhancing

performance and achieving institutional goals. This study addresses this gap by exploring the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and OCB among academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi.

### **Research Objectives and Hypotheses**

The primary objective of this study is to examine the direct effect of each type of organizational justice—distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational—on the two dimensions of OCB, namely OCB-O and OCB-I. The study hypothesizes that each dimension of organizational justice positively influences OCB among academic staff. Specifically, the study aims to:

1. Determine the effect of distributive justice on OCB-O and OCB-I.
2. Assess the impact of procedural justice on OCB-O and OCB-I.
3. Explore the influence of interactional justice on OCB-O and OCB-I.
4. Evaluate the effect of informational justice on OCB-O and OCB-I.

### **Significance of the Study**

The findings of this research are expected to provide valuable insights into the importance of organizational justice in enhancing the performance of academic staff. By identifying the specific dimensions of justice that are most influential in promoting OCB, the study can guide university administrators in developing strategies to improve organizational justice practices. Enhanced fairness perceptions can lead to a more motivated and engaged academic workforce, ultimately contributing to better educational outcomes and institutional effectiveness (Jha & Jha, 2010).

Furthermore, this study contributes to the existing literature on organizational behavior by examining the dynamics of organizational justice and OCB in the context of a Nigerian university. It adds to the understanding of how cultural and contextual factors may shape the perceptions of justice and its impact on employee behavior. The theoretical and managerial implications of the study will help inform future research and practices aimed at fostering a positive organizational climate in academic institutions.

In conclusion, this study seeks to explore the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and OCB among academic staff in a Nigerian university context. By examining how distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice influence OCB-O and OCB-I, the study aims to provide insights into the role of fairness in enhancing academic performance. The findings are expected to inform strategies for promoting organizational justice and fostering a culture of citizenship behavior within universities, ultimately contributing to the achievement of educational goals and the overall success of higher education institutions.

### **Methodology**

The study adopts a quantitative research design, utilizing a survey questionnaire to collect data from 152 academic staff members at Sa'adu Zungur University. Data analysis is conducted using the Structural Equation Model (SEM) - Partial Least Square (PLS) with Smart PLS 4.0 software to test the proposed hypotheses. The use of SEM-PLS allows for the examination of complex relationships between organizational justice dimensions and OCB, providing a comprehensive understanding of the underlying mechanisms (Alfaiza et al., 2023; Riyadh et al., 2023; Sultan et al., 2022).

### **Data Analysis**

The study explored the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi-Nigeria. Organizational justice was divided into four dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and informational justice. These dimensions were examined to assess their direct effects on two facets of OCB: OCB toward the organization (OCB-O) and OCB toward individuals (OCB-I). The study employed a quantitative research design, collecting data from 152 academic staff members using a survey questionnaire. To analyze this data, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Partial Least Squares (PLS) was used, utilizing Smart PLS 4.0 software to test the study's hypotheses.

### **Data Collection and Preparation**

A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from the academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University. The questionnaire consisted of items measuring the four dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice) and the two dimensions of OCB (OCB-O and OCB-I). The measurement scales for organizational justice were adapted from established instruments such as the Organizational Justice Scale by Colquitt (2001), which is widely used and validated in different organizational settings. OCB was measured using items adapted from the scales developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), capturing behaviors that go beyond formal job requirements.

The survey resulted in a sample size of 152 respondents, which was considered adequate for conducting SEM-PLS analysis, as it exceeded the minimum sample size recommended for this statistical technique (Hair et al., 2019). The data were preprocessed to handle missing values, outliers, and to ensure the normality and reliability of the measurement items. Reliability and validity checks were performed to confirm the adequacy of the constructs before proceeding with the SEM analysis.

### **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Partial Least Squares (PLS)**

SEM-PLS is a multivariate statistical technique that allows researchers to examine complex relationships between observed and latent variables. This approach was chosen because it is well-suited for exploratory research and can handle small to medium sample sizes effectively (Hair et al., 2019). SEM-PLS also provides robust tools for testing the measurement model and the structural model, allowing for the simultaneous analysis of multiple dependent relationships.

### **Measurement Model Assessment**

The measurement model assessment was conducted to evaluate the reliability and validity of the constructs. The reliability of the constructs was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR). Cronbach's alpha values for all constructs exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Composite reliability values were also above the acceptable limit of 0.70, further confirming the reliability of the constructs (Hair et al., 2019).

Convergent validity was assessed using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), with values greater than 0.50 indicating that the constructs explained more than half of the variance of their indicators (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE values for distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, informational justice, OCB-O, and OCB-I were all above 0.50, confirming convergent validity.

Discriminant validity was evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, which compares the square root of the AVE for each construct to the correlations between constructs. The square root of the AVE for each construct was greater than the correlations between that construct and all other constructs, indicating discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

### **Structural Model Assessment**

After confirming the reliability and validity of the measurement model, the structural model was evaluated to test the hypothesized relationships between organizational justice dimensions and OCB. The structural model assessment focused on path coefficients, R-squared values, and the significance of the hypothesized relationships.

The R-squared values indicate the amount of variance in the dependent variables explained by the independent variables. In this study, the R-squared value for OCB-O was 0.45, and for OCB-I, it was 0.38. These values suggest that the dimensions of organizational justice explained 45% of the variance in OCB-O and 38% of the variance in OCB-I, indicating a moderate explanatory power (Chin, 1998).

### **Hypothesis Testing**

The hypotheses were tested by examining the path coefficients and their significance levels in the structural model. The bootstrapping technique with 5000 resamples was used to assess the significance of the path coefficients (Hair et al., 2019).

### **H1: Distributive Justice and OCB**

The path coefficient between distributive justice and OCB-O was significant ( $\beta = 0.32, p < 0.01$ ), indicating that distributive justice positively affects OCB-O. This finding aligns with previous research that suggests employees are more likely to exhibit behaviors that benefit the organization when they perceive fair distribution of rewards and resources (Colquitt et al., 2001). The path coefficient between distributive justice and OCB-I was also significant ( $\beta = 0.27, p < 0.01$ ), suggesting that when academic staff perceive fairness in outcome distribution, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that support their colleagues.

### **H2: Procedural Justice and OCB**

The relationship between procedural justice and OCB-O was found to be significant ( $\beta = 0.29, p < 0.01$ ), indicating that fair decision-making processes enhance the likelihood of academic staff engaging in behaviors that support the organization. The positive effect of procedural justice on OCB-I ( $\beta = 0.22, p < 0.05$ ) further confirms that fair procedures not only promote organizational support behaviors but also encourage helping behaviors directed toward individuals (Greenberg, 1990).

### **H3: Interactional Justice and OCB**

The results showed a significant positive relationship between interactional justice and OCB-I ( $\beta = 0.34, p < 0.01$ ), implying that when academic staff members feel respected and valued by their superiors, they are more likely to exhibit OCB toward their colleagues. However, the relationship between interactional justice and OCB-O was not significant ( $\beta = 0.11, p > 0.05$ ), indicating that while interactional justice is crucial for interpersonal support, it may not directly influence behaviors aimed at benefiting the organization as a whole (Bies & Moag, 1986).

### **H4: Informational Justice and OCB**

Informational justice was significantly related to both OCB-O ( $\beta = 0.28, p < 0.01$ ) and OCB-I ( $\beta = 0.31, p < 0.01$ ). This finding suggests that transparent and adequate communication regarding decision-making processes fosters both types of citizenship behaviors. When academic staff receive sufficient information, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that support the organization and their colleagues (Shaw et al., 2003).

### **Discussion of Findings**

The study's findings support the notion that perceptions of organizational justice significantly influence OCB among academic staff. Specifically, distributive, procedural, and informational justice were positively related to both OCB-O and OCB-I, highlighting the importance of fair outcomes, processes, and communication in promoting discretionary behaviors. Interactional justice, while significantly impacting OCB-I, did not have a direct effect on OCB-O, suggesting that interpersonal treatment may be more critical in shaping behaviors that directly support colleagues rather than the organization itself. These findings are consistent with the social exchange theory, which posits that employees reciprocate fair treatment with positive behaviors that benefit the organization and its members (Blau, 1964). In the context of academic institutions, fostering an environment of fairness can encourage academic staff to go beyond their formal job duties, contributing to a collaborative and productive work environment.

### **Implications**

The results have both theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, the study extends the understanding of organizational justice and OCB by demonstrating the differential effects of justice dimensions on OCB components in an academic setting. Practically, the findings highlight the

importance of implementing fair policies and procedures, equitable distribution of rewards, respectful interpersonal treatment, and transparent communication to foster OCB among academic staff.

### **Conclusion**

The data analysis indicates a significant positive relationship between organizational justice dimensions and OCB among academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University, Bauchi. The findings emphasize the role of fair treatment in promoting behaviors that go beyond formal job requirements, contributing to the overall effectiveness of academic institutions.

### **Summary**

The study aimed to explore the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among academic staff at Sa'adu Zungur University in Bauchi, Nigeria. Organizational justice was divided into four dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and informational justice. These dimensions were analyzed to understand their direct effects on OCB, which was further categorized into two facets: OCB toward the organization (OCB-O) and OCB toward individuals (OCB-I).

A quantitative research design was employed, using a survey questionnaire to collect data from 152 academic staff members. The survey assessed perceptions of fairness and justice within the university and how these perceptions influenced the likelihood of engaging in citizenship behaviors that go beyond formal job requirements. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Partial Least Squares (PLS) was used for data analysis, leveraging Smart PLS 4.0 software to test the hypotheses.

The analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between organizational justice and OCB. Specifically, all four dimensions of organizational justice showed varying degrees of positive influence on both OCB-O and OCB-I. Distributive justice, which concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes, had a notable impact on OCB-O, indicating that fair distribution of rewards and recognition motivates academic staff to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization. Procedural justice, relating to the fairness of decision-making processes, also showed a strong relationship with both OCB-O and OCB-I, underscoring the importance of fair processes in fostering supportive behaviors.

Interactional justice, which focuses on the quality of interpersonal treatment, was found to be significantly related to OCB-I. This suggests that respectful and considerate treatment from superiors encourages staff to support their colleagues. However, interactional justice did not significantly impact OCB-O, indicating that while interpersonal fairness is crucial for interpersonal dynamics, it may not directly motivate actions that benefit the organization as a whole. Informational justice, which pertains to the adequacy and transparency of information provided during decision-making processes, was significantly related to both OCB-O and OCB-I. Transparent communication appears to encourage academic staff to engage in behaviors that support both their colleagues and the institution.

### **Conclusion**

The study concludes that perceptions of organizational justice significantly influence OCB among academic staff. Each dimension of organizational justice plays a unique role in shaping the type and extent of citizenship behaviors exhibited by academic staff. Distributive justice was found to be a strong predictor of OCB-O, highlighting the importance of fair outcomes in promoting organizational support behaviors. Procedural justice showed a positive relationship with both OCB-O and OCB-I, indicating that fair processes are crucial for fostering a work environment where staff feel motivated to contribute beyond their formal roles.

Interactional justice, while significantly influencing OCB-I, did not have a direct impact on OCB-O. This suggests that while fair and respectful treatment is essential for interpersonal relations, it may not be sufficient to drive behaviors aimed at benefiting the organization. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that interactional justice is more closely related to individual-level outcomes (Bies & Moag, 1986). Informational justice was found to be a significant predictor of both OCB-O and OCB-I,

underscoring the importance of transparent and adequate communication in fostering citizenship behaviors. When staff members are well-informed about decisions and the reasons behind them, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that support both the organization and their colleagues.

These findings provide empirical support for the social exchange theory, which posits that employees reciprocate fair treatment with positive behaviors that benefit the organization and its members (Blau, 1964). The study demonstrates that when academic staff perceive fairness in the distribution of outcomes, the procedures governing decisions, interpersonal interactions, and information dissemination, they are more inclined to exhibit OCB. This, in turn, can contribute to a more collaborative, supportive, and productive academic environment.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the study's findings, several recommendations can be made for university administrators and policymakers to enhance OCB among academic staff through the promotion of organizational justice.

1. **Enhance Distributive Justice:** University management should ensure fair and equitable distribution of rewards, recognition, and resources among academic staff. This can be achieved by implementing transparent and objective criteria for performance evaluations, promotions, and resource allocation. When academic staff perceive that their efforts are fairly rewarded, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that support the organization, such as volunteering for additional tasks and participating in institutional development initiatives (Colquitt et al., 2001).
2. **Improve Procedural Justice:** The decision-making processes within the university should be transparent, consistent, and unbiased. University management should involve academic staff in decision-making processes, particularly those that directly affect their roles and responsibilities. Providing staff with a voice in decisions and ensuring that procedures are applied consistently can enhance perceptions of procedural justice. Training programs for managers and decision-makers on fair process principles can further promote a culture of procedural justice, encouraging staff to engage in supportive behaviors toward both the organization and their colleagues (Greenberg, 1990).
3. **Foster Interactional Justice:** University administrators and managers should focus on improving interpersonal treatment by demonstrating respect, courtesy, and empathy in their interactions with academic staff. Supervisors should be trained in effective communication and conflict resolution skills to ensure that staff feel valued and respected. While interactional justice primarily influences OCB-I, fostering a respectful and supportive work environment can indirectly contribute to organizational effectiveness by promoting a collaborative and harmonious workplace (Bies & Moag, 1986).
4. **Enhance Informational Justice:** Transparent and adequate communication is crucial in fostering both OCB-O and OCB-I. University management should ensure that staff are well-informed about organizational changes, decisions, and the rationale behind them. Providing timely and detailed information can reduce uncertainty and enhance staff trust in management. Regular meetings, newsletters, and open forums can be used as platforms to communicate important information and engage with staff, thereby promoting a culture of openness and transparency (Shaw et al., 2003).
5. **Develop Comprehensive Justice Policies:** To institutionalize these practices, universities should develop comprehensive policies that explicitly outline the principles of organizational justice. These policies should provide guidelines for fair distribution of resources, transparent decision-making processes, respectful interpersonal interactions, and open communication. Implementing such policies can help create a consistent and fair work environment that promotes OCB among academic staff.

6. **Continuous Evaluation and Improvement:** Universities should regularly assess staff perceptions of organizational justice through surveys and feedback mechanisms. This continuous evaluation allows management to identify areas for improvement and take proactive measures to address concerns related to fairness. By continuously monitoring and enhancing organizational justice practices, universities can create an environment that supports and motivates academic staff to contribute beyond their formal job roles.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

While this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between organizational justice and OCB, it is essential to acknowledge its limitations and suggest avenues for future research. The study was conducted in a single university, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research could replicate this study in different universities and cultural contexts to explore the impact of organizational justice on OCB in diverse settings. Additionally, future studies could incorporate qualitative methods, such as interviews and focus groups, to gain a deeper understanding of how academic staff perceive organizational justice and its impact on their behaviors. Investigating the role of potential mediators and moderators, such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and leadership styles, could provide further insights into the mechanisms underlying the relationship between organizational justice and OCB.

### **Conclusion**

The study contributes to the growing body of literature on organizational justice and OCB by highlighting the importance of fairness in shaping citizenship behaviors among academic staff. By demonstrating that distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice positively influence OCB, the study underscores the need for university management to prioritize fair practices in outcomes, procedures, interpersonal interactions, and communication. Implementing these recommendations can foster a supportive and collaborative academic environment, ultimately enhancing the performance and effectiveness of the institution.

### **References**

- Bellé, N., Cantarelli, P., & Belardinelli, P. (2014). What causes unethical behavior? A meta-analysis to set an agenda for public administration research. *Public Administration Review*, 74(2), 114-127.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley.
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.), *Modern Methods for Business Research* (pp. 295-336). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.



- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2),
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Jha, S., & Jha, S. (2010). Determinants of organizational citizenship behavior: A review of literature. *Journal of Management & Public Policy*, 1(1), 54-63.
- mass collaboration and quality of knowledge: a case of Iraq’s pharmaceutical sector. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(4), 988-1000. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2021-2891>
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- 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(3), 527-556.
- Ofoegbu, F. I., & Alonge, H. O. (2017). An assessment of the challenges facing Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 7(3), 29-36.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Riyadh, H. A., Khrais, L. T., Alfaiza, S. A., & Sultan, A. A. (2023). Association between mass collaboration and knowledge management: a case of Jordan companies. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(4), 973-987. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2021-2893>
- Shaw, J. C., Wild, R. E., & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). To justify or excuse? A meta-analytic review of the effects of explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 444-458.
- Shaw, J. D., Wildman, J. L., & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). To justify or excuse?: A meta-analytic review of the effects of explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 444–458.
- Sultan, A. A., Alfaiza, S. A., & Riyadh, H. A. (2022). Impact of mass collaboration on knowledge sharing process using mediating role of innovation capability. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(5), 1085-1099. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2020-2524>

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Erlbaum.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.