

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND TRUST IN MANAGER AS PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR AMONG BANK EMPLOYEES

OJO, SolomonYinde¹, BANKOLE, Rafiu Akanji², ADEBOLA Toluwalope³

Department of Human Resource Development,^{1,3}

Osun State University, Osogbo,

Okuku Campus, Osun State, Nigeria

Department of Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management²

Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria

DOI: 10.36108/ljerhrm/0202.02.0171

Abstract

*This study investigated the influence of perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. Essentially, the issue of organizational justice, trust in managers and organizational commitment are subjects of interest in organizational behaviour and human resource management and as such this could be investigated in the banking industry in order to assess how they influence organizational citizenship behaviour. The study was a survey which employed Ex-Post Factor design. The design was found appropriate because the variables of interest were already in existence in the study area. Data was collected from 186 respondents. Using a structured questionnaire collected data were analysed using the inferential and descriptive statistics of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. The result revealed that perceived organizational justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour [$r(184)=.51^{**}$, $P<.01$]; organizational commitment was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees [$r(184)=.48^{**}$, $P<.01$]; trust in managers was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees [$t(184)=.36^{**}$, $P<.0.1$]; perceived interactional justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour ($t(184)=6.37<.05$); perceived procedural justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour ($t(184)=.30^{**}$, $P<.01$); perceived distributive justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees ($r(184)=.43^{**}$, $P<.01$). Finally, the findings revealed that the predictor variables (perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager) showed significantly independent and joint prediction of organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees ($F=78.74$, $P<.05$, $R^2=.56.12$). It was concluded that organizational justice, trust in manager and organizational commitment significantly were significantly related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees respectively and jointly. It was therefore recommended that organizational citizenship behavior should be more encouraged in the banking industry and other allied industries.*

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment, Trust in Manager, Predictors, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behaviour is seen as a collection of volunteer and non-obligatory behavior that is not defined in the official employee job descriptions but contribute to effective improvement of task and roles in an organization (Cohen, 2000 cited in Tamunomiebi and Onah, 2019). Organizational citizenship behaviors become important as they assist to achieve organizational goals and contribute to its effectiveness (Allen & Rush, 1998). Many empirical studies have found that organizations receive benefits from Organizational citizenship behaviors in many ways. They are customer satisfaction, quality of the product, quantity of the product and services, performance in sales, and returns (Koys, 2001). There are many significant benefits of OCB for the individual as well as organization. Based on the conceptual work of Organ (1988), Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) found five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: They are “*Altruism*: Discretionary behavior on the part of employees that have the effect of helping a specific other with an organizationally relevant problem. *Conscientiousness*: Discretionary behaviors on the part of the employee that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks, and so forth. *Sportsmanship*: Willingness of the employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining to avoid complaining, petty grievances, railing against real or imagined slights, and making federal cases out of small potatoes *Courtesy*: Discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work related problems with others from occurring. *Civic virtue*: 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” (Podsakoff, 1990).

On the other hand, researchers and scholars in the area of organizational psychology, human resource management and organizational behavior have more often paid much attention on organizational justice perceptions. Elovainio, (2005) have defined organizational justice as fairness and honest treatment to employees in the organization. Some other scholars Hubbel and Assad (2005) said that it is about the process of these outcome are fair or not. Cremer (2005) described that organizational justice is the important controlling aspect in all activities of any organizations.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) encompasses all behaviors that are not considered to be part of employee’s formal duties in the organization and that contributes to the enhancement of organizational performance. (Organ, 1997). Examples of organizational citizenship behavior include fruitful activities such as assisting co-workers in performing work-related tasks, working extra hours without pay, going an extra mile in making a newly appointed employee feel welcomed, and abiding by informal codes of conduct established to preserve harmony. OCB is multidimensional in orientation and application in OB literature about OCB. While examining the OCB literature, Podsakoff et al., (2000), found more than dimensions of OCB. According to (Organ, 2006), two of the most commonly-cited OCB dimensions are altruism and compliance. Altruism is defined as the discretionary helping behaviors, which benefit specific individuals, whereas compliance refers to the cooperative behaviors that help increased efficiency. Williams and Anderson (1991) conducted a literature review of studies of organizational citizenship behavior in which they revealed the existence of two kinds of OCBs: (a) OCBO- behaviors that profit the organization as a whole (e.g., preserves and safeguards company’s resources, engage in activities that enhance organization’s image) and (b) OCBI- actions and activities that serve

particular employees and thereby enhance the functional corporate culture of the organization (e.g., going an extra mile in making a newly hired fellow employee feel welcomed, sharing ideas with co-workers on how to increase their effectiveness and efficiency at work.

A number of factors can influence organizational citizenship behaviour. These include organizational justice, organizational commitment, trust in manager, leadership styles. In this study however, emphasis shall be laid on organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in managers. These shall be discussed below clearly.

Distributive Justice

In the studies conducted by Sezen (2001) distributive justice was described as the kind of justice that looks at the distribution of organizational gains to deserving staff. Toremén and Tan (2010) defined distributive justice as employee perceptions about fair distribution of organizational resources and benefits. The origins of distributive justice may be traced to Adams's (1965) equity theory which claims that people compare the ratios of their own perceived work outcomes to their own perceived work inputs with the corresponding ratios of co-workers. In assessing distributive justice, individuals evaluate their work inputs (e.g., skills and motivation) relative to the outcomes received from the organization (e.g., pay and promotions). Research has shown that perceptions of distributive justice are linked to a number of employee related outcomes such as: pay satisfaction; satisfaction with leaders; and employee turnover intentions.

Procedural Justice

In the studies of conducting legal research on dispute resolution processes, Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced the role of procedural justice as the amount of process control provided to people affected by the procedures and their outcomes. Though the concept of procedural justice originates from legal research, it has become one of the most researched topics in organizational psychology and human resource management (Colquitt, 2001), and is receiving increased attention among strategy researchers (Luo, 2007).

Interactional Justice

The third dimension is interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986) which concerns the fairness of the interpersonal treatment individuals are given during the implementation of procedures. Cropanzano, (2002) simply refer to interactional justice as "usually operationalized as one-to-one transactions between individuals". According to Bies (1986) interactional justice focuses on employees' perceptions of the interpersonal behaviour exercised during the representation of decisions and procedures. Interactional justice is related to the quality of relationships between individuals within organizations. Although some scholars view interactional justice as a single construct, others have proposed two dimensions of interactional justice (Bies, 1986). The two dimensions of interactional justice proposed are interpersonal and informational justice. These two dimensions of interactional justice are related to each other. However, research recommends that both concepts should be looked at differently since it has differential consequence on justice perceptions (Colquitt, 2001).

Interpersonal Justice

In the early 1990's the scope of justice research expanded as scholars began to research the social side of justice. Bies and Moag (1986) introduced the third concept of justice which entails interpersonal treatment that employees receive from organizational decision makers. As with

distributive justice and procedural justice, there is substantial empirical support for the effect of fair interpersonal treatment on individuals' attitudes and behaviors (Brockner & Greenberg, 1990). Interpersonal justice "reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities and third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes" (Colquitt, 2001). Interpersonal sensitivity also known as interpersonal justice is also emphasized in interactional justice theory. Bies (1987) maintained that interpersonal communication is one of the behaviors of decision makers that are associated with fair and unfair interpersonal treatment. Attitudes of treating people with dignity, respect, and sincerity are effective communication for alleviating people's feelings of perceived injustice (Bies & Moag, 2006). Shapiro (2002) showed that regular communication and courtship could contribute to understanding and predictability in knowledge-based trust. Lind (2001) noted that "people use overall impressions of fair treatment as a surrogate for interpersonal trust".

Statement of the Problem

Research of organizational citizenship behaviors has been extensive since its introduction around twenty years ago (Bateman & Organ, 1983). The vast majority of organizational citizenship behavior research since has focused on the effects of organizational citizenship behavior on individual and organizational performance. There is consensus in the field that organizational citizenship behaviors are salient behaviors for organizational enterprises (Tan, 2008). However, the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors are not well established. This paper focuses on clearly analyzing the relationship between organizational justice and OCB among bank employees. This paper will also establish the relationship between organizational commitment and OCB among bank employees. The paper will equally look into the relationship between trust in manager and OCB among bank employees

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this work was to examine the influence of perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. The specific objectives of this study include:

- i. To examine the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- ii. To assess the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- iii. To investigate the relationship between trust in manager on organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- iv. To examine the influence of perceived interactional justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- v. To assess the influence of perceived procedural justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- vi. To examine the influence of perceived distributive justice on organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees
- vii. To assess the predictive strength of organizational commitment, organizational justice and trust in manager on organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees

Literature Review

According to Adams (1965) individuals compare the effort they spent and the result they obtained with the effort others in the same workplace spent and the result they obtained. This situation is important for the organizational justice perception of a person who is a member of an organization. According to Guerrero, Andersen and Afifi (2007) equity theory acknowledges that subtle and variable individual factors affect each person's assessment and perception of their relationship with their relational partners. This theory proposes that a person's motivation is based on what he or she considers being fair when compared to others (Redmond, 2010). As noted by Gogia (2010) when applied to the workplace, Equity Theory focuses on an employee's work-compensation relationship or exchange relationship as well as employee's attempt to minimize any sense of unfairness that might result. Equity theory as developed by Adams (1965), considers motivation as the result of a comparison of a worker's perceived outcomes and inputs to the outcomes and inputs of a referent other (Vinchur&Koppes, 2011).

In an organizational context, outcomes may refer to monetary compensation, benefits, flexible work arrangements, salary, career opportunities, psychological rewards like feedback and support from colleagues or supervisor (Pepermans, & Jegers, 2012). Inputs may include the employees' time, expertise, qualifications, experience, intangible personal qualities such as drive and ambition, interpersonal skills, effort and commitment (Pepermans, & Jegers, 2012). Because Equity Theory deals with social relationships and fairness/unfairness, it is also known as The Social Comparisons Theory or Inequity Theory (Vinchur&Koppes, 2011).

Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

In this study, the researcher examines the background of the study and reviews the work of other researchers in this field. Meyer and Allen (2000) developed a three-component model, consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. They defined affective commitment as being based on one's values, normative commitment as being based on obligation, and continuance commitment as being based on calculation of costs and benefits. They argue that these components are differentially linked to variables as antecedents and consequents (Meyer and Allen 2000). Ensher et al. (2001), in a study entitled, "Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCB, and grievances" concluded that all three types of perceived discrimination had an effect on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and OCB. Contrary to the predictions, however, there was no relationship with grievances (Ensher et al. 2001).

Another study was conducted in Nepal by Gautam et al. (2005) on OCB and organizational commitment with a sample size of 450 people in five organizations. The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and OCB (Gautam et al. 2005). Haigh and Pfau (2006), in a study entitled "Bolstering organizational identity, commitment, and citizenship behaviors through the process of inoculation" concluded that organizational identity, organizational commitment, and certain OCBs could be strengthened through internal communication (Haigh and Pfau 2006). Lavelle, (2009), in their study entitled "Commitment, procedural fairness, and organizational citizenship behavior: a multifocal analysis" concluded that: (1) the positive relationship between commitment and OCB, and (2) the mediating effect of commitment on the positive relationship between procedural fairness and

OCB were particularly likely to emerge when the constructs referred to the same target. Support of these target similarity effects was found among layoff survivors (Lavelle et al. 2009).

Ng and Feldman (2011) in a study entitled “Affective organizational commitment and citizenship behavior: Linear and nonlinear moderating effects of organizational tenure,” concluded that organizational tenure moderated the relation nonlinearly. Before 10 years of tenure, the strength of the commitment-OCB relation increased as organizational tenure increased; after that point, the strength of the commitment - OCB relation decreased as organizational tenure increased. In short, the moderating effect of tenure follows a curvilinear pattern (Ng and Feldman 2011).

Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Several studies have found that justly-treated employees are more likely to comply with workplace policies, show extra conscientiousness, and behave altruistically toward others (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In-deed, workers tend to tailor their citizenship behaviors carefully, doling them out to those groups or individuals who have treated them justly and withholding them from those who have not. Justice-inspired employees exhibit OCBs, such as behaving altruistically toward others, these also sound much like employee customer service-oriented behaviors, such as helping others and listening carefully to their needs. Building on this, Bowen, Gilliland and Folger (1999) suggested that just treatment of employees would lead to OCBs that “spill over” to customers (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

This result in customers feeling appropriately treated, thereby yielding customer satisfaction and loyalty. Employee’s perception of organizational justice was found to be positively correlated to extra-role behaviors towards the organization as well as the customer. (Lichtenstein, D. et. al, 2008) Organ (1990) has proposed that distributive-justice concerns may influence citizenship according to predictions derived from equity theory (Adams, 1965). If employees perceive unfair compensation, then they may be less likely to perform OCB because such behaviors are discretionary & falling outside an employee’s formal role requirements. Failure to perform OCB is less likely than failure to perform a duty in the job description that may result in official sanctions or in the sacrifice of incremental rewards provided by the formal reward system. As a response to perceived inequity, an employee may withhold voluntary behaviors to adjust his or her input portion of the equity ratio calculation. (Williams, Pitre & Zainuba, 2002).

Trust in Manager and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Trust is a crucial factor in enhancing the long-term success of an organization. Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995) define trust as an individual’s willingness to be vulnerable in relationships with other people, irrespective of whether the actions and decisions related to the other party can be monitored or controlled. Employees differentiate between two types of trust – trust in others (e.g. supervisors and co-workers) and trust in the organization (Sousa-Lima, Michel & Caetano, 2013). While other factors in the work environment may contribute to employee engagement, employees depend mostly on trust (Agarwal, 2014). Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between trust and employee attitudes and behaviors. Research studies by Tan & Tan (2000) revealed that trust influences the continuance and affective components of organizational commitment, whereas Ferres, Connell & Travaglione (2004) found empirical support for the fundamental role of coworker trust in predicting lowered turnover intentions, greater affective commitment and perceived organizational support. With regards to OCB,

Robinson & Morrison (1995) found that an employee's trust in the organization operationalizes citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham & Cummings (2000) found that an individual's propensity to trust predicted OCB. Sousa-Lima, Michel & Caetano (2013) investigated the importance of organizational trust in facilitating justice perceptions. The results indicated that distributive justice is important in predicting trust in the organization. Altuntas and Baykal (2010) investigated the relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their OCB. The results showed that nurses who trust their managers, organizations and co-workers more regularly demonstrated citizenship behaviours of conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism (Altuntas and Baykal, 2010).

Methodology

This study was a survey. The independent variables, majorly for the study were perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager. The dependent variable was organizational citizenship behaviour.

Population of the study

The population comprised of both male and female employees, who are members of staff of First Bank Nigeria Plc in Osogbo Aiyetoro Branch, Osogbo, Gbongan branch, Osogbo Okefia branch, Ilesha branch in roundabout, Isokun Branch Ilesha and Inisha branch in Osun State. Preliminary survey conducted shows that the population of six (6) branches of First Bank Nigeria Plc in Osun State is put at 218

Sampling and sampling Techniques

Sample for the study was drawn from each population of staff in each branch of the First Bank Plc, Osun State, Nigeria. .

Research Instrument

The instrument that was used for this study shall be questionnaire format. The questionnaire will comprise of four sections, namely Section A, Section B, Section C and Section D.

Section A

The scale contained the socio demographic information of the respondents which include the name of the organization, age, gender, marital status, highest educational qualification, working experience (in years), current position in the organization etc.

Section B was used to measure Organizational Justice Scale. This scale was developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The scale consists of 10 items example of which are: "Distributive justice;" "I believe my compensation is up to the standard and fair"; The rewards I received are quite fair", "I feel that my job responsibility is fairness" etc. Procedural justice Item include: "My supervisor makes sure he/she understands every bank staff member's thoughts before making any decision". Every decision made by my supervisor can be applied to every banking staff member affected by it, "I can raise questions on or make appeals to the decisions made by the bank management" Interactional justice; "When making my job-related decisions. My supervisor would treat me with respect, When making my job-related decisions. My supervisor would discuss the implication of the decision with me", "When making my job-

related decisions, my supervisor would explain the content very clearly". The measure was assessed on a five-point scale, ranging from (1= Extreme Disagreement 2= Disagreement 3= Undecided 4= Agreement 5= Extreme Agreement). The internal consistency reliability of this scale was $\alpha=0.83$ (Niehoff and Moorman 1993).

Section C focused on Organizational Commitment Scale. This scale was developed by Ho, Chang, Shih, & Liang (2009) and Feather and Rauter (2004). The scale consists of 12 items example of which are: Affective Commitment "I am glad that I am able to devote my future career life to this bank, I am happy to talk about my bank with those who are not related to the bank etc". "I am emotionally attached and belonged to this bank; I strongly feel that I am part of the bank". Continuance commitment: "It would be a great loss for me to quit from this bank". "I have the desire to keep working at this bank at this moment". "I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this bank". "The main reason for me to stay at this bank is that other organization won't necessarily provide me with better compensation and benefits: Normative commitment "I think it is unethical to change jobs constantly, the main reasons for me to keep working at this bank are being loyal and ethical". "I was taught to be loyal to the bank I serve and I think that staying at the same bank will have better career development". The measure was assessed on a five-point scale, ranging from (1= Extreme Disagreement 2= Disagreement 3= Undecided 4= Agreement 5= Extreme Agreement). The internal consistency reliability of this scale was $\alpha=0.84$ as reported by Ho, Chang, Shih, & Liang (2009) and Feather and Rauter (2004).

Section D was used to assess Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale. This scale was developed by Lee & Allen (2002). The scale consists of 8 items, examples of which are. "Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems". "Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off" "Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group". "Assist others with their duties". Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image, defend the organization when other employees criticize it, offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization., take action to protect the organization from potential problems. The measure was assessed on a five-point likert-type scale, ranging from (1= Never 2= Seldom 3= Often 4= Almost always 5= Always). The internal consistency reliability of this scale was $\alpha=0.73$ as reported by (Lee & Allen, 2002).

Administration of Research Instrument

The copies of questionnaire were administered by the researcher with the help of branch heads; the researcher will explain all aspects of the questionnaire. Data were collected within two days for the valid and reliable information which supplied by the respondents. The authors interpreted all the aspects of the questionnaire to the respondents. And also, the respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the information supplied.

Method of Data Analysis

The collected data in the study was subjected to computerized statistical data analysis. The statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 was utilized in analyzing the collected data. Both the descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Specifically, the statistical tests of Pearson correlation and multiple regressions were employed in testing the stated hypotheses.

Results

The results of the study are shown in this section. The study utilized both the descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the collected data in the study. The results are clearly presented in different tables in different two sections as shown below

Frequency Distribution of Respondents Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The frequency distribution of the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in this section below

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	N	%
Male	103	55.4
Female	173	44.6
Total	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 1 above revealed that 103 (55.4%) of the respondents were male while 83 (44.6%) were female.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Age Group

Age Group	N	%
20-30 yrs	58	31.2
31-40yrs	63	33.9
41-50yrs	34	16.7
Total	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 2 above revealed that 58(31.2%) of the respondents were within age bracket 20-30 yrs; 63 (33.9%) were within age bracket 31-40yrs; 34 (18.3%) of the respondents were within age bracket 41-50yrs 31 (16.9%) were within age bracket 51yrs age and above.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

Marital Status	N	%
Single	64	34.4
Married	122	65.6
Total	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 3 above revealed that 64 (34.4%) of the respondents were single; while 122 (65.6%) were married

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Highest Educational Qualification

Highest Educational Qualification	N	%
SSCE/NECO	05	2.7
NCE/OND/A Level	43	23.1
BSC/HND	68	36.6
Post Graduate Diploma	32	17.2
Master Degree	30	16.1
Others	8	4.3
TOTAL	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 4 above revealed that 5(2.7%) of the respondents were holders of SSCE/NECO; 43(23.1%) were holders of NCE/OND/A Level; 68 (36.6%) were holders of BSc/HND; 32(17.2%) were holders of postgraduate Diploma holders; 30 (16.1%) were holders of Masters Degree 8 (4.3%) were holders of other educational qualifications not specified in the study.

Table 5: Distribution of Resources by Job Status

Rank	N	%
Junior Staff	84	45.2
Immediate Staff	52	27.9
Senior Staff	30	16.1
Top Management Staff	20	10.8
Total	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 5 above showed that 84 (45.2%) of the respondents were junior staff ; 52 (27.9%) were intermediate staff; 30 (16.1%) of the respondents were on senior staff while 20 (10.8%) were on top management cadre.

Table 6: Distribution of Resources by Type of Employment

Rank	N	%
Permanent Staff	108	58.1
Temporary Staff	49	26.3
Contract Staff	22	11.8
Casual Staff	7	3.8
Total	186	100

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 6 above showed that 108 (58.1 %) of the respondents were permanent staff; 49 (26.3%) were temporary staff; 22 (11.8%) of the respondents were on contract staff while 7 (3.8%) were on casual staff.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses One

This stated that perceived organizational justice would be significantly and positive related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. The hypothesis was tested by Pearson, r correlation. The result is shown in table 7 below:

Table 7: A Summary Table of Pearson r correlation showing the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Variables	N	X	SD	Df	R	P
Perceived organizational justice	186	42.15	11.27	184	.51**	<.01
Organizational citizenship behaviour	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table above revealed that perceived organizational justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour [$r(184) = .51^{**}$ $P < .01$]. Therefore, the hypothesis one was supported by the result of the study

Hypothesis Two

This stated that organizational commitment would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees. The hypothesis was tested by Pearson r correlation. The result is stated in table:

Table 8: A Summary Table of Pearson r correlation showing the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Variables	N	X	SD	Df	r	P
Organizational commitment	186	49.15	14.17	784	.48**	<.01
Organizational citizenship behaviour	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result of the SPSS output in table 8 above revealed that organizational commitment was positively and significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees [$r(184)=.48^{**}$, $P<.01$]. Therefore, the hypothesis two was supported by the result of the study.

Hypothesis Three

This stated that trust in manager would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among banks employees. The hypothesis was tested by Pearson, r correlation. The result is shown in table 4.11 below:

Table 9: A Summary Table of Pearson, r correlation relationship between trust in manager and organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Variable	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	r	P
Trust in managers	186	12.43	2.84	184	.36**	<.01
Organizational citizenship behavior	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 9 above revealed that trust in managers was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees [$r(184)=.36^{**}$, $P<..01$]. Therefore, the hypothesis there was fully supported by the result of the study.

Hypothesis Four

This stated that perceived interactional justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees. The hypothesis was tested by t-test for independent measures. The result is shown in table 4.12 below:

Table 10: A Summary Table of Pearson, correlation showing the influence of perceived interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Variables	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	r	P
Perceived interactional justice	186	12.36	3.43	184	.55**	<.01
Organizational citizenship	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table 10 above revealed the perceived interactional justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior [$r(184)=.55^{**}$, $P<.0.1$].

Hypothesis Five

This stated that perceived procedural justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees. The hypothesis was tested by Pearson, r correlation is shown in table 4.13 below:

Table 11: A Summary Table of Pearson, Correlation showing the relationship between Perceived Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variables	N	X	SD	Df	r	P
Perceived distributive justice	186	10.45	2.14	184	.30**	<.01
Organizational citizenship behavior.	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table above revealed that perceived procedural justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship [$r(184)=.30^{**}$, $P<.01$]. Therefore, the hypothesis five was fully supported by the result of the study.

Hypothesis Six

This stated that perceived distributive justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employee. The hypothesis test was tested by Pearson, r correlation. The result is shown in table 4.14 below:

Table 12: A Summary Table of Pearson, r correlation showing the relationship between Perceived Distributive Justice and Organizational and Citizenship Behavior

Variables	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	r	P
Perceived distributive justice	186	11.36	3.24	184	.43**	<.01
Organizational citizenship behaviour	186	31.57	9.36			

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2018

The result in table above revealed that perceived distributive justice was significantly ns positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees. $\{r(184)=.43^{**}, P<.01\}$. Therefore, the hypothesis six was fully supported by the result of the study.

Hypothesis Seven

This stated that predictor variables of perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager would show significantly independent and joint prediction of organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. The hypothesis was tested by multiple regression. The result is shown in table below:

Table: A Summary Table of Multiple Regression Showing the Predictive influence of Perceived Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment and Trust in Manager on Organizational Commitment among Bank Employees

Predictors	β	t	p	F	P
Perceived Organizational Justice	.41	20.65	<..01	78.53	<.01
Organizational Commitment	.35	16.12	<.01		
Trust in Manger	.29	10.47	<.01		

Finally, the findings revealed that the predictor variables (perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager) showed significantly independent and joint

prediction of organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees { $F=78.53$, $P<.01$, $R^2=.56.12$ }.

Discussion

The research work centered on influence of perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees.

The first hypothesis one which stated that perceived organizational justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees which was supported by the result of the study. This indicated that bank employees who were more favourably disposed organizational justice reported more organizational citizenship behavior than bank employees who were less favourably disposed to organizational justice. The finding was supported by Muhammad Adeel (2018) who investigated organizational Justice has been considered a significant subject in the operative organizations functioning.

The hypothesis two which stated that organizational commitment would be significantly and positively related to Organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees was supported by the result of the study. The result was supported by Haneswor (2013)..

The hypothesis three which stated that trust in manager would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. This finding revealed that was supported by the result of the study.

The hypothesis four which stated that predictive interactive justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees supported by the result of the study.

The hypothesis five which stated that perceived procedural justice would be significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees. This finding is supported by Hassanreza (2014) Moorman, Niehoff, and Organ (1993) and Konovsky and Pugh (1994).

The hypothesis six which stated perceived distributive justice would be significantly positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees was supported by the result of the study. The finding supported that of Tamizarasu (2015).

The hypothesis seven which stated that predictor variables of perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager would show significantly independent and joint prediction of organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees was fully supported by the result of the study.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, this study concludes that:

Perceived organizational justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank employees.

Organizational commitment was positively and significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Trust in managers was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Perceived interactional justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Perceived procedural justice was significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship among bank employees

Perceived distributive justice was significantly ns positively related to organizational citizenship behavior among bank employees

Recommendations

From the findings and various discussions, some recommendations are here offered:

1. The organization should develop a culture that promotes going the extra mile for customers, colleagues or the organization itself.
2. Also, Organizations should place new employees whenever possible into work units or groups characterized by high levels of OCB.
3. Finally, management of the organization should remember that managers who expect their employees to go above and beyond the call of duty have to set an example by being willing to do so themselves; and recognize that organizations wanting loyalty and sacrifice from their employees should act in ways that make them deserving of such contributions.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and, Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422-436.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). "Inequity in social exchange", in L. Berkowitz, (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Amazue, L. O. (2011). *Roles of cultural variations, self-esteem and gender in work-family conflict*. An unpublished thesis, Department of Psychology University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behaviour*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorserly Press.
- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organization Behaviour*, 24, 491-509.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barling, J. (1994). Work and family: In search of more effective workplace interventions. *Trends in Organizational Behaviour*, 1, 63-73.

- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The function of the executive*. Cambridge, M. A: Harvard University Press.
- Beham, B. (2011). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviour: Empirical evidence from Spanish employees community. *Work and family*, 14(1), 63-80.
- Brummelhuis, L., Lippe, T., & Kluwer, E. S. (2005). *Being there for co-workers and family: How balancing work and family roles affects collegiality at work*. Sociology/ICS Utrecht University, Netherlands.
- Bunderson, J. S. (2001). How work ideologies shape the psychological contracts of professional employees: Doctor's responses to perceived breach. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 22, 717-741.
- Cantisano, G. T., Dominguez, F. M. J. & Depolo, M. (2008). Psychological contract breach and outcomes. Combining meta-analysis and structural equation models. *Psicothema*, 20(3), 487-496.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, M. K., & Williams (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 56, 249-276.
- Chen, G., Gully, S., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research methods*, 4, 62-83.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/Correlation analysis for the behavioural science*: Hillsdale NJ. Erlbaum.
- Deci E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- Devier, A., & Amelie, (2010). Correlates of pro-social behaviour development. *Personal and Individual differences*, 25(7), 1669-1683.
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., Henderson, D. J. & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contact processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1078-1098.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behaviour: *An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, M. A: Addison-Wesley.
- Flap, H. D., & Volker, B. (2001). "Informelerelatiesophet work." *Social Wetenschappapen* 44, 30-47.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Grant, A. M., & Gino, F. (2010). A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate pro-social behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(6), 946-955.

- Guest, D. E., & Conway, N. (1997). *Employee motivation and the psychological contract*. Institute for Personnel and Development.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role-explanation for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560-568.
- Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A. & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 79(4), 617-626.
- Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive*, 2, 213-223.
- Kickul, J. R. & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: Equity sensitive as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitude and behaviour, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, 191-217.
- Kickul, J. R. (2001). Settling the score: The role of organizational justice in the relationship between psychological contract breach and anti-citizenship behaviour. *Employee responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13, 77-94.
- Kickul, J. R., Neuman, G. Parker, C., & Finkl, J. (2002). Settling the score: The role of organizational justice in the relationship between psychological contract breach and anti-citizenship behaviour. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 13, 77-93.
- Kickul, J., Lester, S. W., & Belgio, E. (2004). Attitudinal and Behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management* 4(2), 229-252.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behaviour-human resources research. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 83, 139-149.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L. & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of work-family conflict on correctional staff job satisfaction: An exploratory study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 35-52.
- Lambert, S. J. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 801-815.
- Lee, H. (2001). Willingness and capacity: The determinants of pro-social organizational behaviour among Nurses in the UK. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 12(6), 1029-1048.
- Lester, S. M., Turnley, W. H., Bloodgood, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye: Differences in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attribution for psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 39-56.
- Levinson, H., Prince, C. R., Munden, K. J., Mandl, H. J., & Sooldely, C. M. (1962). *Men, management and mental health*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

- Liu, J., Hiu, C., & Lee, C. (2008). Taking on obligations: Why employee stays. *Organizational Science*, Vol. 15(2), 232-240.
- Luszczynka, A., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). Planning and self-efficacy in the adoption and maintenance of breast self-examination: A longitudinal study on self-regulatory cognitions. *Psychology and Health*, 18, 93-108.
- Mark, H., & Anderson, S. (2008). A conceptual model of the effect of psychological contracts and associated fairness perceptions on customer service organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 102, 1511-1562.
- Marks, A., & Scholarios, D. (2001). *Work-life integration and the psychological contract: An examination of work outcomes for software professionals*. Paper presented at the 10th European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology Conference Prague.
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in pro-social behaviour: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of pro-social behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 836-844.
- Milward, L. J., & Hopkins, L. J. (1998). Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(6), 16-31.
- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 226-256.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 400-410.
- O'Driscoll, M. P., Ilgen, D. R., & Hildreth, K. (1992). Time devoted to job and off-job activities, interrole conflict, and affective experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 272-279.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The "Good Soldier" Syndrome*. Lexington, M. A: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. Podsakoof, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Tamunomiebi, M. D. and Onah, G.O. (2019). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Critical Review of its development in a Diversity*. Available on <file:///C:/Users/hp%202000/Downloads/TamunomiebiM.D.OnahG.O.2019.Organizationalcitizenshipbehaviour.pdf>