

A Study on the Relationship Between Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Justice with Job Satisfaction among the Employees

¹Soleyman Iranzadeh and ²Farzam Chakherlouy

¹Department of Management, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

²Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Abstract: Organizational justice and citizenship behavior is of the main and very important objectives in job satisfaction and performance of staff in any organization. Therefore, the main objective of this survey is to calculate the role of organizational justice and citizenship behavior variables in order to predict the job satisfaction among the employees of Mohaghegh Ardebili University. The statistical society in this study has been considered all the bureau employees and the members of faculties in the educational year 2008-2009 (N=380). The sample of this study includes 190 of men and women employees who have been selected according to random sampling method of proportional category. The instruments to gather the information, were consisted of questionnaire compiled by the researcher, organizational justice questionnaire, citizenship behavior questionnaire and job satisfaction questionnaire. The results suggested that there was a meaningful positive relation between organizational justice and citizenship behavior, with job satisfaction of the employees; and also both the variables have the potential to predict the job satisfaction, but this capability was seen more in organizational justice. Among the other findings of this study, we can mention that there was no meaningful difference between male and female employees considering their citizenship behavior. But a meaningful difference was found between them considering organizational justice and job satisfaction. ($P < 0.01$)

Key words: Organizational justice • Citizenship behavior • JOB satisfaction • Employees

INTRODUCTION

Since organizational justice and citizenship behavior are among the most effective factors in job satisfaction and consequently the job performance of staff in any organization. Hence, organizations devise numerous managerial programs and methods in order to create motive and promote efficiency among their personnel, since reaching this objective is closely related to progress and moving towards the aims of that organization. Considering these points is very effective in the way employees and staff behaves and performs their capabilities.

Organizational studies have so far revealed that factors such as job satisfaction, organizational justice and citizenship behavior; have close relations with other factors like trend for absenteeism, turnover, resignation, arguments, mental pressures and physical and mental diseases.

Citizenship behavior and organizational justice are among the basic and important objectives of the performance among the staff of any organization and is

considered as one of the main foundations of job satisfaction and consequently efficiency of organizational processes [1, 2].

Organizational Justice: Justice perceptions have long been considered as explanatory variables in organizational research [3-5]. Organizational justice describes the individuals' (or groups') perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organization and their behavioral reaction to such perceptions [6]. In the extant literature, justice has been conceptualized based on three dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes, procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine those outcomes [7, 8] and interactional justice refers to the fairness of interpersonal treatment [9]. Therefore the distributive justice is concerned with "ends" and the procedural justice with "means" [10]. The expectancy theory of motivation states that motivation is influenced by the belief that effort will lead to higher performance (expectancy) and belief that higher

performance will lead to better rewards (instrumentality) that are valued (valence) by the employees [11]. Since distributive justice is about the fairness of the outcomes, it has a strong link with instrumentality. Thus, we can see that distributive justice perceptions of employees will have an influence on their motivation. The employees will have certain beliefs and attitudes about the way that the organization will make and implement decisions. In situations where the beliefs of how decisions should be made and how they are actually made are different, the employees may experience cognitive dissonance and as a result the employees will feel uncomfortable that may lead to job dissatisfaction.

Many studies have analyzed the relationship between these two forms of organizational justice and their effects on various work-related variables including turnover intention, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction [10, 7, 12-15]. For example, Alexander and Ruderman [1] used six organizational outcome variables including job satisfaction, turnover intentions, tension/stress, trust in management, conflict/ harmony and evaluation of supervisor. Procedural justice had a greater influence on five of the variables compared to distributive justice. Of the six variables, only turnover intentions had a stronger link with distributive justice than with procedural justice.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction is an issue of interest both for the staff in organizations and for the researchers. In fact, job satisfaction is a variable that has initiated the most studies on organizational behaviors both in theoretical and practical researches, including job designing to supervision. Therefore it is considered as a central variable in these studies [16, 17].

Job satisfaction has numerous organizational and behavioral consequences among which we could mention withdrawal behavior, absenteeism, turnover, burnout, physical and mental health, aggression and theft at work and life satisfaction [18, 17].

Numerous studies have been conducted to explain the importance of the allocation phenomenon (i.e. the distribution of positive and negative reinforcements) in organizations. For example, Lawler [19] noted that the distribution of organizational rewards such as pay, promotion, status, performance evaluations and job tenure can have powerful effects on job satisfaction, quality of work life and organizational effectiveness.

Folger and Konovsky [7] found that perceptions of distributive justice are significantly correlated with pay raise satisfaction as well as with job satisfaction. Others scientists and researchers found the positive

relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction [20- 24]. Cedwyn and Awameleh [21] studied organizational justice and job satisfaction in UAE. They found the positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction at $P < 0.001$ and Multiple regression revealed significant impact of Distributive and International at $p < 0.001$, conversely, procedural justice failed to show any significant relationship with job satisfaction. Irving *et al* [22] found that the relation between procedural justice and job satisfaction was stronger for those who were low in negative affectivity than for those who were high in negative affectivity. Finding of Shokrkon and Neami [23] and Imani [24] studies showed that organizational justice and job satisfaction have positive correlation. And all components of organizational justice have positive correlation with job satisfaction. Witt and Nye [20] in his study found significant positive correlation ($r=0.23$ to $r=0.59$) between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Citizenship behavior is a collection of behaviors and performances presented by an employee in order to help the colleagues or the organization [25] and includes the five following areas :

Altruism: Helpful behaviors shown by a member of the organization in order to help the staff in their chores and organizational cases [26].

Fidelity: Behaviors which leads the individual into responsibilities further than the expected level. For instance, the employee doesn't spend too much time for lunch or doesn't leave his job except for the urgent cases [27].

Politeness and Kindness: Polite behaviors which prevent problems in the work environment. For instance, the employee consults with others before doing something, so that he or she prevents troubles for his or her colleagues [28].

Chivalry: Fair attitudes which prevent complaints in the work place [29].

Citizenship Virtues: Behaviors which resemble the individual's participation in organization-related activities, for example the employee does chores other than his or her own responsibilities in order to promote the organization's image [29].

The Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors on the Organization's Success and Performance:

A key principle in the preliminary definition of Organ of organizational citizenship behavior is that when this behavior exists among people for a long time, the organization's performance will be promoted [29, 30]. This hypothesis remained unchanged for many years, since its acceptance was more based on its conceptual acceptance, not on direct experimental evidences. Conceptually, there are some reasons about the effectiveness of citizenship behavior on organizational performance, as follows :

- Increasing productivity for managers and colleagues: Employees, who contribute other colleagues, learn a chain through which they might promote efficiency or productivity. If employees go after organizational virtues, managers might receive appraisal suggestions and reports on promotion of a working unit. Polite and responsible employees, who refrain from making troubles for their colleagues, help their managers not to fall into managerial crisis patterns [31].
- Releasing resources for constructive objectives: if employees help each other when problems emerge, the manager does not have to deal with these problems and so will have more time to deal with more useful things like planning. Employees who show more responsibility, need less supervision and so let the manger give them more responsibility, consequently less time is wasted for the manager [32].

As experienced employees help new ones to be educated and oriented, more resources are saved in the organization. If employees show sportsmanship, the manager will not have to waste his time to treat with minor complaints.

- Increase of necessity for allocating scarce resources for continuation of pure performances: a natural consequence of helpful behavior is to promote coherence and the team's spirit and enthusiasm and therefore, the manager will not have to consume time and energy to keep the performance of the team. Employees who are polite towards others, decrease the oppositions inside the group and consequently reduce the time necessary to deal with these oppositions [32].

- Helping the participation activities both inside the group and across the group showed that, citizenship virtues by voluntary intention and also active participation in working meetings; help to conform the attempts among group members and potentially increases efficiency of the group. Showing trust by the principle of contacting with other members of the same team, or the members of other teams inside an organization; decreases the possibility of problems, since they need time and effort to be solved [33].
- Increasing ability of organization to be attractive and to absorb the best people: helpful behaviors might increase spirit, group coherence and the feeling of possession belonging to a group, all of which can promote the performance and help the organization in being more attractive and absorbing better employees. Showing sportsmanship, readiness and refraining from complaining for minor issues; can all prepare a pattern for others through which fidelity and commitment to the organization will be expanded and might make the employees remain more [34].
- Strengthening organization's performance stability: Filling the absence of absent staff or helping out those with heavy responsibilities; can promote performance of the working unit (decreases mutability). Responsible employees trend more in keeping a high-level constant output, so they decrease mutability in the performance of a working unit [35].
- Strengthening the ability of the organization to be adapted according the environmental changes: The employees who are in close contact with the market, voluntarily provide some information about the changes in the environment and give suggestions to confront the changes, which will eventually help the organization to be adapted. The employees, who actively take part in the meetings, might help the information department in the organization. Therefore, they could increase the responsibility of individuals to adapt with environment changes. However, although the primary possibility that organizational citizenship behaviors have a role in the effectiveness of working teams, this has drawn little attention in research. Interest in citizenship behaviors and the relevant structures, come from the belief that these behaviors increase organizational performances [35].

The Importance of Research Topic: As social science experts consider citizenship behavior and organizational justice as the main foundations of organizational processes; the research in this field is of great importance. Considering the fact that there has been no research under this title and most of the studies have been conducted sparsely and with limited variables; researching in this field seems necessary and has considerable importance. By conducting this research and considering the above variables in employees, we could help well in removing the barriers of job satisfaction for the clerks and by finding the present shortages; we could help the organization managers to create an environment in which the employees can perform carefree in order to reach the objectives of the organization.

Considering the importance of the above issue, the main question I our study is that “what is the relationship between the citizenship behavior and organizational justice and the job satisfaction? How much role do predictor variables (citizenship behavior and organizational justice) have in job satisfaction?”

The Broad Objectives of the Study:

- Defining the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction of employees.
- Defining the relationship between distribution, procedural and cooperative factors of organizational behavior; and job satisfaction of employees.
- Defining the relationship between citizenship behavior and job satisfaction of employees.
- Comparison of three variables as citizenship behavior, organizational justice and job satisfaction among male and female employees.
- Defining the share of variables like organizational justice and citizenship behavior in predicting job satisfaction of employees.

Study Questions: Which of the two variables could predict job satisfaction of employees: citizenship behaviors or organizational justice?

Hypotheses of Study:

- There is a positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.
- There is a positive relationship between the distributive factor of organizational justice and job satisfaction.

- There is a positive relationship between the procedural factor of organizational justice and job satisfaction.
- There is a positive relationship between the cooperative factor of organizational justice and job satisfaction.
- There is a positive relationship between citizenship behavior and job satisfaction.
- Citizenship behavior is different between the two different genders.
- Organizational justice is seen different between the two genders.
- Job satisfaction is different between the two genders.

Design and Study Method

Type of Study Method: This study is based on the objective and is of applied researches. It is substantially and methodically of integration type of studies. In this research, citizenship behavior and organizational justice have been considered as predictor variables, while job satisfaction has been taken as a criterion variable.

Information Gathering Method: In this research, library method has been used to provide theoretic basics and history of conducted researches; and field method has been taken to gather information for hypothesis tests.

Validity and Reliability of Study Questions:

Questionnaire			reliability
Organizational justice			91/0
Citizenship behavior			73/0
Job satisfaction			89/0
Areas of citizenship	Reliability ratio	Validity ratio	
citizenship	-----	Incorporation with	
Responsibility	Kombach alpha	Division	validation questions
Responsibility	60/0	70/0	42/0
Politeness			
and kindness	72/0	69/0	41/0
Altruism	57/0	56/0	44/0
Chivalry	80/0	65/0	40/0
Affability	60/0	63/0	49/0
General citizenship			
behavior (1)	90/0	91/0	59/0

Sample Volume and Sampling Method: The sample of this study includes 202 of male and female employees of the university, who have been selected according to random sampling proportional method among the study society. It needs to be mentioned that 12 of the selected employees, were omitted from the final analysis for different reasons including the lack of precision in

answers and lack of accession to them in order to gather information. And finally the data from 190 people were entered in SPSS program in order for the variables to be studied and analyzed.

Analysis of Data and Hypothesis Test: To analyze the data using Pearson incorporation ratio, incorporation between the variables is studied in order to evaluate the hypotheses 1 to 5. Also, in order to analyze the hypotheses 6, 7 and 8, the independent test t was used.

In order to predict the job satisfaction using organizational justice and citizenship behavior variables, multi-variable regression analysis with input method has been used.

Descriptive Findings: As we can see in the Table 1, among the 190 employee taking part in the present study, 126 persons (% 66.3) have no trend to make absent at work and only 13 persons (% 6.8) have much or very much trend to make absent.

Table 2 shows that among 190 employees participating in the present study, 16 persons (% 8.4) feel no discrimination, but most of the employees, that is, 106 persons (% 55.8) feel much or very much discrimination.

Table 3 shows that among the total people participated in the present study, only 12 persons (% 6.3) have resigned so far and the rest have not done so.

Table 4 shows that among the employees taking part in the present study, only 22 persons (% 11.6) have ever been dismissed from work.

And this table shows that 64 employees (% 33.7) have ever disputed or struggled with someone at work, but others do not have such problem.

As it is seen in the Table 6, among the 190 employees taking part in the present study, 107 persons (% 56.3) suffer from working stress; and 83 persons (% 43.7) have no such problem.

Table 7 shows the average and the variance of organizational justice and its factors. As we see in the table, the average and variance of scores of organizational justice among the bureau employees is 70.19 (18.22) and it is 72.18 (12.06) among the members of faculty. The total average of organizational justice is 70.98 (16.04).

Table 8 shows the average and variance of organizational justice and its factors. As we see in the table, the average and the variance of scores for organizational justice among female employees is 72.40 (15.44) and this figure is 63.46 (17.32) among male employees. And the total average of organizational justice is 70.98 (16.04).

Table 9 shows the average and the variance of the citizenship behavior. As we see in the table, the average and the variance of scores for citizenship behavior of bureau employees is 131.82 (10.48) and this figure is 130.38 (9.83) among the members of the faculty. And the total citizenship score is 131.24 (10.22).

The Table 10 shows the average and the variance. As we see in the table, the average and the variance of scores for citizenship behavior among male employees, is 131.82 (10.48) while this figure is 130.38 (9.83) among the female employees. And the total average of citizenship behavior is 131.24 (10.22).

Table 11 shows the average and the variance for the job satisfaction. As it can be seen in the table, average and the variance of job satisfaction among the bureau employees are 64.16 (15.45) and this value is 71.11 (8.62) among the members of faculty; and also the average of total job satisfaction is 66.94 (13.56).

Table 12 shows the average and the variance of job satisfaction. As we understand from the table, the average and variance of scores of job satisfaction among men is 65.59 (13.47) while it is 74.16 (811.86) among women. The total job satisfaction is 66.94 (13.56).

Table 1: Affluence distribution and percentage of employees responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Affluence	Percentage
How much do you trend to make absent at work?	None	126	3/66
	Little	28	7/14
	To some extent	23	1/12
	Much	9	7/4
	Very much	4	½

Table 2: Affluent distribution and the percentage of employees in responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Affluence	Percentage
How much discrimination do you think exists at work?	None	16	4/8
	Little	23	1/12
	To some extent	45	7/23
	Much	77	5/40
	Very much	29	3/15

Table 3: Affluent distribution and percentage of employees in responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Offluence	Percentage
Have you resigned so far?	Yes	12	3/6
	No	178	7/93

Table 4: Affluent distribution and percentage of employees in responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Affluence	Percentage
Have you ever been dismissed from work?	Yes	22	6/11
	No	168	4/88

Table 5: Affluent distribution and percentage of employees in responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Affluence	Percentage
Do you have struggle with anyone at your work place?	Yes	64	7/33
	No	126	3/66

Table 6: Affluent distribution and percentage of employees in responding to the following locution:

Locution	Response	Affluence	Percentage
Do you suffer from working stress?	Yes	107	3/56
	No	83	7/43

Table 7: Average and variance of organizational justice and its factors among bureau employees and members of faculty

	Employee		Member of faculty		Total	
	Average	Variance	Average	Variance	Average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Distributive	81/25	60/7	92/25	14/5	85/25	71/6
Cooperative	40/25	89/7	68/26	71/5	00/39	11/7
Procedural	97/18	55/4	57/19	82/4	21/19	66/4
Total	19/70	22/18	18/72	06/12	98/70	04/16

Table 8: Average and variance for organizational justice and its factors among the two genders

	Male		Female		Total	
	Average	Variance	Average	Variance	Average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Distributive	70/22	03/7	45/26	50/6	85/25	71/6
Cooperative	80/23	03/7	31/26	07/7	00/39	11/7
Procedural	96/16	13/4	63/19	64/4	21/19	66/4
Total	46/63	32/17	40/72	44/15	98/70	04/16

Table 9: Average and variance of citizenship behavior among the bureau employees and the members of the faculty.

	Employee		Member of faculty		Total	
	Average	Variance	average	Variance	average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Citizenship behavior	82/131	48/10	38/130	83/9	24/131	22/10

Table 10: Average and variance of citizenship among the employees of two genders

	Male		Female		Total	
	Average	Variance	Average	Variance	Average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Citizenship behavior	35/131	44/9	70/130	85/13	24/131	22/10

Table 11: Average and variance of job satisfaction in bureau employees and members of faculty

	Bureau employee		Member of faculty		Total	
	Average	Variance	Average	Variance	Average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Citizenship behavior	16/64	45/15	11/71	62/8	94/66	56/13

Table 12: Average and variance of job satisfaction among men and women

	Male		Female		Total	
	Average	Variance	Average	Variance	Average	Variance
Organizational justice						
Citizenship behavior	59/65	47/13	16/74	86/11	94/66	56/13

The Findings about the Hypotheses: In this section, the research hypotheses are studied.

The first hypothesis was that there was a positive relationship between organizational justice and the job satisfaction.

The second hypothesis was that between the distribution factor of organizational justice and job satisfaction; there was a positive relationship.

The third hypothesis was that there was a positive relationship between the cooperative factor of organizational justice and the job satisfaction.

The fourth hypothesis was that there was a positive relationship between the procedural factor of organizational justice and the job satisfaction.

So we can see in the Table 13, all the factors of organizational justice, that is the distribution factor of organizational justice and procedural factor of organizational justice; have a positive and meaningful relationship with the job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). Also the organizational justice has generally a positive and meaningful relationship with the job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). Therefore, the hypotheses 1 to 4 are confirmed.

The fifth hypothesis was that there was a relationship between the citizenship behavior and the job satisfaction.

The result of the Table 14 shows that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between the citizenship behavior and job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). Therefore, the next hypothesis i.e. the fifth one is also confirmed.

The sixth hypothesis was that the citizenship behavior was different in two different genders.

Table 15 compares the citizenship behavior in two groups of male and female employees of Mohaghegh Ardebili University, using the test t. The results of this comparison suggest that there is no meaningful difference between the male and female employees in showing average citizenship behavior. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis will not be confirmed.

The seventh hypothesis was that organizational justice was different in two different genders.

The table 16 shows that between the two groups of male and female employees, there is a meaningful difference over the average organizational justice ($P < 0.01$).

That is the average of organizational justice was higher among female employees than male employees. Hence, the seventh hypothesis is confirmed.

The eighth hypothesis was that job satisfaction is different among the two genders.

Table 17 shows that between the two groups of employees of men and women, there was a meaningful relationship over the average of job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). That is, the average job satisfaction among female employees was higher than that of males. So, the eighth hypothesis is also confirmed.

Question: Which one of the organizational justice variables and citizenship behavior variables can predict the job satisfaction?

Considering the results of the Table 18, we could say that the two organizational justice and citizenship variables are able to predict the job satisfaction. Also, among the scales of organizational justice; the procedural factor of organizational justice can predict the highest variance of job satisfaction.

Side Bar Findings: Table 19 shows that between the two groups of bureau employees and members of faculty, there is no meaningful difference over the average of organizational justice and citizenship behavior ($P > 0.05$). But on job satisfaction, there is a meaningful difference between the two groups of bureau employees and members of faculty ($P < 0.001$). That is the average of job satisfaction is higher among the members of faculty.

Table 20 shows that there is a meaningful difference between the two groups of married and single employees over the average organizational justice ($P < 0.01$). This means that organizational justice is felt higher among the married employees, but over the citizenship behavior, there is no meaningful difference between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). Also over the job satisfaction, there is a meaningful difference between married and single employees ($P < 0.001$). That is the average of job satisfaction is higher among the single employees.

As it can be seen in the Table 21, all the variables entered in the table have a meaningful relationship with the job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$) and this relationship between working experience and discrimination feeling; and job satisfaction is seen more than other variables and is negative and at the same time meaningful.

Considering the results of Table 22, we could say that two variables of organizational justice and citizenship behavior are capable of predicting job satisfaction among the male employees. Also, among the scales of organizational justice, procedural factors predict the highest variance of job satisfaction for male employees, but the cooperative factor does not have the same capability.

According to the results by the Table 23, we can say that the two variables of organizational justice and citizenship behavior are capable of predicting job satisfaction among the female employees.

According to the results of the Table 24, we could say that among the variables, only the procedural factor of organizational justice can predict the job satisfaction among the bureau employees of the university.

According to the results of the Table 25, we could say that two variables of procedural factors of organizational justice and citizenship behavior are able to predict the job satisfaction among the members of faculty. And the citizenship predicts the highest variance for job satisfaction.

Table 13: Assessing the relationship between organizational justice and its factors with job satisfaction of employees using Pearson incorporation ratio

Variables	Job satisfaction	
	P	r
Distributive factor of organizational justice	001/0	**51/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice	001/0	**54/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice	001/0	**63/0
Organizational justice	001/0	**64/0

Table 14: Assessing the relationship between the citizenship behavior and job satisfaction of employees using Pearson incorporation ratio

Variables	Job satisfaction	
	P	r
Citizenship behavior	001/0	**24/0

Table 15: The comparison of average and variance of male and female employees in their citizenship behaviors

Variable	Gender	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Citizenship behavior	Male	35/131	4/9	31/0	75/0

Table 16: Comparison of the average and the variance of male and female employees over organizational justice

Variable	Gender	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Organizational justice	Male	46/63	44/15	85/2	005/0

Table 17: Comparison of average and variance of male and female employees over job satisfaction

Variable	Gender	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Job satisfaction	Male	59/65	47/13	25/3-	001/0

Table 18: Regression ratio of multi-variable organizational justice and citizenship behavior with job satisfaction

Model	R	R ²	Modified R	Std. standard	
1	69/0	48/0	47/0	82/9	
Model	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig
Regression	83/16942	4	71/4235	90/43	001/0
Remained	63/17846	185	46/96		
Total	47/34789	189			
Model	Non-Standard Ratio		Standard Ratio		Sig
	B	Std.Error	Beta	T	
Constant	55/9-	79/9	-	97/0-	33/0
Citizenship behavior	28/0	07/0	21/0	92/3	001/0
Distributive factor of organizational justice	40/0	14/0	19/0	83/2	005/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice	30/0	14/0	15/0	07/2	039/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice	12/1	22/0	38/0	93/4	001/0

Table 19: Comparison of the average and variance of bureau employees and members of faculty in organizational justice, citizenship behavior and job satisfaction.

Variable	Organizational rank	\bar{x}	SD	t	ρ
Organizational justice	Bureau employees	19/70	22/18	83/0-	40/0
		18/72	06/12		
Citizenship behavior	Bureau employees	82/131	48/10	95/0	34/0
		38/130	83/9		
Job satisfaction	Bureau employees	16/64	45/15	56/3-	001/0
		11/71	62/8		

Table 20: Comparison of average and variance of married and single employees over organizational justice, citizenship behavior and job satisfaction

Variable	Organizational rank	\bar{x}	SD	t	ρ
Organizational justice	Married employees	40/72	44/15	85/2	005/0
	Single employees	46/63	32/17		
Citizenship behavior	Married employees	35/131	44/9	31/0	75/0
	Single employees	70/130	83/13		
Job satisfaction	Married employees	59/65	47/13	25/3-	001/0
	Single employees	16/74	86/11		

Table 21: Assessing the relationship between organizational justice and its factors and employees job satisfaction, using Pearson incorporation ratio

Variables	Job satisfaction	
	r	P
Age	**22/0-	001/0
Type of employment	**23/0-	001/0
Education	**23/0	001/0
Working experience	**49/0-	001/0
Income per month	**24/0	001/0
No. of children	**30/0-	001/0
Trend to make absent	**44/0-	001/0
Feeling of discrimination at work	**52/0-	001/0
Struggle	**40/0-	001/0
Working stress	**29/0-	001/0

Table 22: Multi-variable regression ratio of organizational justice and citizenship behavior with job satisfaction of male employees

Model	R	R ²	Modified R		Std. standard
1	77/0	59/0	58/0		64/8
Model	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig
Regression	83/17276	4	71/4319	90/57	001/0
Remained	63/11575	155	46/74		
Total	47/28852	159			
Model	Non-Standard Ratio		Standard Ratio		Sig
	B	Std.Error	Beta	T	
Constant	26/11-	88/10	-	03/1-	30/0
Citizenship behavior	21/0	07/0	15/0	80/2	006/0
Distributive factor of organizational justice	57/0	14/0	27/0	20/4	001/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice	16/0	14/0	08/0	26/1	21/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice	46/1	22/0	50/0	82/6	001/0

Table 23: Multi-variable regression ratio of organizational justice and citizenship behavior with job satisfaction of female employees

Model	R	R ²	R	Std. standard		
1	99/0	99/0	99/0	06/1		
Model	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig	
Regression	83/4051	4	71/1012	90/897	001/0	
Remained	63/28	25	46/1			
Total	47/4080	29				
		Non-Standard Ratio		Standard Ratio		
		-----		-----		
Model		B	Std.Error	Beta	T	Sig
Constant		04/21	69/3	-	97/5	001/0
Citizenship behavior		21/0	02/0	21/0	11/8	001/0
Distributive factor of organizational justice		20/0-	05/0	12/0-	53/3-	002/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice		30/2	14/0	40/1	86/19	001/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice		55/1-	20/0	54/0-	48/7-	001/0

Table 24: Multi-variable regression ratio of organizational justice and citizenship behavior with job satisfaction among the bureau employees

Model	R	R ²	R	Std.		
1	75/0	56/0	55/0	34/10		
Model	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig	
Regression	83/15340	4	71/3835	90/35	001/0	
Remained	63/11665	109	46/107			
Total	47/27005	113				
		Non-Standard Ratio		Standard Ratio		
		-----		-----		
Model		B	Std.Error	Beta	T	Sig
Constant		55/0-	79/12	-	04/0-	96/0
Citizenship behavior		12/0	09/0	08/0	34/1	18/0
Distributive factor of organizational justice		35/0	22/0	17/0	55/1	12/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice		17/0	19/0	08/0	89/0	37/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice		82/1	35/0	53/0	20/5	001/0

Table 25: Multi-variable regression ratio of organizational justice and citizenship behavior with job satisfaction among the members of faculty

Model	R	R ²	R	Std.		
1	85/0	72/0	71/0	64/4		
Model	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig	
Regression	83/4047	4	71/1011	90/46	001/0	
Remained	63/1532	71	46/21			
Total	47/5579	75				
		Non-Standard Ratio		Standard Ratio		
		-----		-----		
Model		B	Std.Error	Beta	T	Sig
Constant		16/24-	15/8	-	97/2-	004/0
Citizenship behavior		61/0	05/0	70/0	79/10	001/0
Distributive factor of organizational justice		06/0	11/0	03/0	57/0	56/0
Cooperative factor of organizational justice		13/0	13/0	08/0	96/0	33/0
Procedural factor of organizational justice		51/0	17/0	28/0	98/2	004/0

RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The difference between this study and others is that we studied the relationship between citizenship behavior and organizational justice; and job satisfaction. The first to fourth hypotheses said that there was a meaningful relationship between organizational justice and its factors (distributive factor of organizational justice, cooperative factor of organizational justice and procedural factor of organizational justice); and the job satisfaction.

The results showed that all the factors of organizational justice that is distributive factor of organizational justice, cooperative factor of organizational justice and procedural factor of organizational justice; have a positive and meaningful relationship with the job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). Also, organizational justice has generally a positive and meaningful relationship with job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$).

This finding complies with the findings of researches conducted by Deutsch, Folger and Imani, [4, 7, 33].

The fifth hypothesis was that there was a relationship between job satisfaction and the citizenship behavior. The results suggested that there was a positive and meaningful relationship between citizenship behavior and the job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$).

This finding corresponds with the results of researches done by Organ, Goudarzvand Chegini *et al* and E. Eskew *et al*. [20, 1, 2]. In general, we could say that social participation shows the responsible participation of an individual in the activities done by an organization.

The next results suggested that there was no meaningful difference between the two groups of male and female employees. But there was a meaningful difference between them over the organizational justice, so that the average feeling of organizational justice among the female employees, was higher than male employees. Also, the difference was meaningful over the average job satisfaction. It means the average job satisfaction was higher among female employees than male employees.

The question of this study was that which variables of organizational justice and citizenship behavior can predict the job satisfaction?

The results showed that the two variables of organizational justice and citizenship behavior; are capable of predicting the job satisfaction. Also, among the scales of organizational justice, procedural factor of organizational justice, predicts the highest variance of job satisfaction.

Suggestion for Future Researches:

- Considering the relationships between the organizational justice and job satisfaction in this study, we suggest the organizations to use values in order to create organizational justice.
- Considering the relationships between citizenship behavior and job satisfaction in this study, we suggest that more attention is paid to citizenship behaviors, which consequently leads to higher job performance among the employees of an organization.
- Besides the questionnaire, other information gathering methods like interviews can also be used.

We suggest that in future researches, organizational justice and citizenship behavior; will be studied together with variables such as organizational commitment.

REFERENCES

1. Goudarzvand Chegini, Mehrdad, 2009. The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, American Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 1(2): 171-174.
2. Eskew, E. Don, 1993. The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior, Employee Responsibilities and Rights J., 6(3): 185-194.
3. Adams, J.S., 1965. Inequity in social exchange. In: Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), Advances in experimental social Psychol., 2: 267-299.
4. Deutsch, M., 1975. Equity, equality and need: what determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? J. Social. 31: 317-372.
5. Leventhal, G.S., 1976. The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. Advances in Experimental Social Psychol., 9: 91-131.
6. James, K., 1993. The social context of organizational justice: cultural, inter group and structural effects on justice behaviors and perceptions. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., pp: 21-50.
7. Folger, R. and M.A. Konovsky, 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. Academy of Management J., 32(1): 115-130.

8. Cropanzano, R. and J. Greenberg, 1997. Progress in organizational justice: tunneling through the maze. In: Cooper, C.L. Robertson, I.T. (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychol.*, 12: 317-372.
9. Martí'nez-Tur, V., J.M. Peiro', J.Y. Ramos and C. Moliner, 2006. Justice perceptions as predictors of customer satisfaction: the impact of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *J. Applied Social Psychol.*, 36(1): 100-119.
10. Sweeney, P.D. and D.B. McFarlin, 1997. Process and outcome: gender differences in the assessment of justice. *J. Organizational Behavior*, 18: 3-98.
11. Robbins, S.P., 2001. *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Upper N.J. Saddle River, S.R. Robinson and E.W. Morrison, 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *J. Organizational Behavior*, 21: 525-546.
12. Alexander, S. and M. Ruderman, 1987. The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior, *Social Justice Res.*, 1(2): 177-198.
13. McFarlin, D. and P.D. Sweeney, 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management J.*, 35(3): 626-637.
14. Cropanzano, R. and R Folger, 1991. Procedural justice and worker motivation. In: Steers, R.M. Porter, L.W. (Eds.), *Motivation and Work Behavior*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
15. Cropanzano, R. and M. Randall, 1993. Justice in the workplace: a historical review. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., pp: 3-20.
16. Williams, L.J. and S.E. Anderson, 1991. Job satisfactory and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role behaviours, *J. Manage.*, 17: 601-617.
17. Omar, F., F.W. Halim, A.Z. Zainah, H. Farhadi, R. Nasir and R. Khairudin, 2011. Stress and Job Satisfaction as Antecedents of Workplace Deviant Behavior. *World Applied Sciences J.*, 12(SPSHD): 46-51.
18. Tett, R.P. and J.P. Meyer, 2006. Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention and Turnover: Path Analyses based on Meta-Analytic Findings, *Personnel Psychol.*, 46(2): 259-293.
19. Lawler, E. and E. III, 1977. Reward systems. In J.R. Hackman and J.L. Suttle, (Eds.), *Improving Life at Work: Behavioral Science Approaches to Organizational Changes*, Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
20. Witt, L.A. and L.G. Nye, 1992. Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 77(6): 910-917.
21. Cedwyn, F. and R. Awamleh, 2006. Impact of Organizational justice in an expatriate work environment, *Management Research News*. 29(11): 701-712.
22. Irving, G.P., D.F. Coleman and D.R. Bobocel, 2005. The Moderating Effect of Negative Affectivity in the Procedural Justice-Job Satisfaction Relation. *Canadian J. Behavioural Sci.*, 37(1): 20-32.
23. Shokerkon, H. and A. Neamii, 2003. survey simple regression and multiple regression between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *J. Education and Psychol.*, 201: 57-70.
24. Imani, Javad, 2006. survey relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among teachers of exceptional children school in Bandar Abbas. Azad Islamic free university.
25. Podsakoff, P.M., S. MacKenzie, B. Pain and D. Bachrach, 2000. organisational citizenshipbehaviour: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research, *J., Manage.*, 26(3): 513-563.
26. Salami, S.O., 2007. Moderating effect of trait EI on the relationship between emotional labour and organisational citizenship behaviour, *European J. Social Sci.*, 5(2): 142-150.
27. Salami, S.O., 2009. Conflict Resolution Strategies and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence, *Europe's J. Psychol.*, 2: 41-63.
28. Walz, S.M. and B.P. Niehoff, 2000. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Their Relationship to Organizational Effectiveness, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Res.*, 24(3): 301-319.
29. Organ, D.W., 1988. *Organisational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington.
30. Khazaei, K., A. Khalkhali and N. Eslami, 2011. Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Performance of School Teachers in West of Mazandaran Province. *World Applied Sciences J.*, 13(2): 324-330.

31. MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff and R. Fetter, 1991. Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50(1): 123-150.
32. Motowidlo, S.J., 2000. Some Basic Issues Related to Contextual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Human Resource Management, *Human Resource Management Rev.*, 10(1): 115-126.
33. Podsakoff, P.M. and S.B. MacKenzie, 1994. Organisational citizenship behaviour and sales unit effectiveness. *J. Marketing Res.*, 31: 351-363.
34. Reisel, W.D., T.M. Probst, S. Chia, C.M. Maloles and C.J. König, 2010. The Effects of Job Insecurity on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Deviant Behavior and Negative Emotions of Employees, *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 40(1): 74-91.
35. Podsakoff, P.M. and S.B. MacKenzie, 1997. Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestion for Future Research, *Human Performance*, 10(2): 133-151.