Review Article

Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Review on Conceptual and Practice Perspective

Wasantha Bandara

Doctoral Student, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Kelaniya Sri Lanka.

Abstract - *Organizational justice means the perception of people regarding justice on justice issues in the organization. The purpose of this paper is to identify the theoretical aspect of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). This paper will be discussed four dimensions of Organizational Justice (OJ) and five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB); organizational justice and its relationship with citizenship behavior are one of the basic and important subjects of successful organizations. In the current competitive world, making sense of organizational justice in employees increases the functional ability and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational justice's dimensions consist of distributive justice, procedural justice, Interpersonal Justice, and informational justice. Substantially Organizational citizenship behavior has been linked to overall organizational performance and effectiveness. Thus, these types of employee behaviors are important to compete among the competitors and achieve a competitive advantage in the Business. The author followed literature reviews as the main research strategy while given special attention to the addressed relationship with OJ and OCB.*

Keywords - *Perception of People, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Organizational Justice*

I. INTRODUCTION

Justice is considered as a major concern in our daily life, both in-home or work-related issues, especially when decisions are made regarding limited resources. Issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organizations, policymaking, and policy implications that affect decision-maker makers and the people who are affected by such decisions require special attention in respect of justice. (Colquitt, Greenberg, Zapta-Phelan 2005)

Nowadays in the competitive world organizations need employee whom performance goes beyond their traditional job descriptions or formal duties as a vital source of organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, employees exhibit a higher level of performance and act more than their job description when they believe they are treated fairly at the workplace. In other words, employees' job performance may increase or decrease in relation to perceptions of inequitable outcomes. The fair treatment promotes increase efficiency of the organization. Human resources are a crucial factor of the organization, and their job satisfaction effect increases the performance of the organization.

Organizations, in order to compete in a global sense and comply with customer demands, try to select which employee that is doing their jobs over his duties and job description (Senobari.M, 2008). In the past, employees were assessed by job description and job specification but today's over duties behavior is important. These behaviors consider as the concept of social behaviors, over duties behaviors, contextual performance organization, citizenship behavior, and spontaneous behavior. Today these behaviors are an integral part of performance management and entered into various organizational aspects.

Organizational justice describes the individual (or group) perception of the fairness of treatment receive from an organization and their behaviors reaction to such perception. (James,1993). And also, organizational justice is a key factor associate with the success of every organization. In order to keep employees satisfied and loyal to the organization, the organization needs to be fair in its system regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and informational justice.

When an employee feels that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are inclined to show a more positive attitude and behaviors like organizational citizenship. Human resource is considered as a most powerful resource of an organization to make it prosperous all other resources like monitory resources and natural resources; also dependent on talented and capable human resource for their optimal utilization. Every employee wants justice in the working environment in terms of fair procedures used to determine reward, distribution of rewards, promotion, and interaction with supervisors to make them satisfied and committed with their work

and organization. When employees are treated fairly overall in the organization, they feel the need for reciprocal response to the organization to the organization in positive behavior. (Behrens, 2008)

Human resources of today's organizations find a key position in the priorities agenda of all concerns. Irrespective of the sales volume, the budget, or the manufacturing processes, the central element which performs the work and gives its final shape is the human resources. An employee at any position has some definite role to play as per the job. The employee provides his services to the organization accordingly and delivers results.

II. PURPOSE of the STUDY

The main purpose of this paper is to theoretical examining organizational justice and their dimensions how far relate to the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in organizations. This paper is important for any businesses which want to create organizational justice and organizational effectiveness while achieving their competitive advantage. This paper expected to find the best factors that affect to the increased Organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is identified factor as important to increase the performance of the organization. (Deluga, 1994). The relative people and the firm are noted as a needed research priority in this organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Kahandawaarachchi, Dissanayake & Maitra, 2016). Meanwhile, leaders are always looking for employees who inhibit the behaviors and principles that make up Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. However, managers and leaders can help to encourage these behaviors, which should have a positive impact on culture and engagement. (Greenberg, 1986)

II. METHODOLOGY

This paper follows a deductive approach in which arguments and explanations are mainly supported by empirical evidence, and associated theoretical contends. Alongside, the author reviewed journal articles and industry publications to review the concept and applications pertained to Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The literature review was utilized as the main resource and supportive tool.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and Organizational Justice (OJ) have been widely addressed in management research mainly during the five last decades (Greenberg & Tyler, 1987; Organ,

1988; Moorman, 1991; Moorman & Niehoff, 1993; Mackenzie & Podsakoff, 1997; Cunha &Rego, 2008). OCB has been defined as work-related behavior that is discretionary in nature, not related to the formal organizational reward system, and in total promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). The organ was referring to the type of Behaviour that is not enforced by the organization as a job requirement or the job description, but a personnel choice such that its absence is not perceived as a crime.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Justice and its execution are one of the essential and innate human needs that permanently its availability has, during history, prepared appropriate cases to develop human communities. Ideas related to justice have progressed paralleled to development and improvement of human community, and its domain has lasted to western researches from the philosophy and religions view of thought. After the industrial revolution and mechanizing human communities, organizations have such domination on human life that, from birth to death, anyone is directly dependent on them, and living without organizations is recently unimaginable. So, justice execution in society depends on justice availability in organizations. The first research on organization justice turned to the early 1960s. After 1990, a new generation of western studies about organization justice started that resulted in distinguishing 3 sorts of justice, included distribution, procedure, and interaction justice in organizations (Fouladvand, 1986).
Research on organizational justice has demonstrated that concerns about fairness can affect the attitudes and behaviors of employees (for reviews, see Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003; Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Justice scholars have focused on distributive justice, the perceived fairness of decision outcomes (J. S. Adams, 1965; Leventhal, 1976), and procedural justice, the perceived fairness of decision-making processes (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut& Walker, 1975). More recent work has focused on interpersonal justice (sincerity and respect) and informational justice (adequate, honest explanations), which are often combined under the interactional justice heading (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993). Employees have significant roles in various decision-making processes in organizations. It is sometimes questioned whether the decisions towards employees are fair or not (Colquitt et al., 2001). The behaviors of employees toward justice became an area of study by the increasing importance of the concept of justice in organizations (Greenberg, 1990). It is generally observed that the recent organizational theories focused mostly on interpersonal interactions and the problems based on these interactions. In this context, it is seen that the concept of "social justice" is adapted to organizations, and accordingly, the concept of "organizational justice", which refers to the just

distribution of organizational outputs depending on organizational relations, has been developed concurrently (Ozmen et al., 2007). Similarly, Tatum and others (2003) point out the adaptation of the concept of justice into organizational justice and emerging of it as an important field of study in industrial and organizational psychology (Eberlin and Tatum, 2008; Bolat, 2010).

Organizational justice refers essentially to people's perceptions of justice and equality in organizations (Greenberg, 1996). Researchers of Organizational behavior identified four types of organizational justice that are distributive, interactional, informational, and procedural justice... (Colquitt, Greenberg, Zapta-Phelan 2005). Historically, the concept of organizational justice is originated from the equity theory (Homans, 1961). Basically, equity theory states that perceptions of injustice are the source of motivation for individuals (Adams, 1965)

Another way to see organizational justice means the perception of individuals and groups regarding fair treatment that they received from the organization and their resultant reactions in behaviors to such perceptions. According to (Greenberg Baron 2008), organizational justice can be defined as "The study of people's perceptions of fairness in an organization." As organizational justice is a versatile concept, so it covers everything from the system of payment to the treatment of your boss. Another author Greenberg (1990), stated that organizational justice that means perceptions of people regarding fair treatment they received from the organization played a vital role in effective organizational functioning.

Organizational justice is a perceptual variable and refers to the presence of justice in the distribution of outcomes, implementation of decisions, and interaction between authority figures with employees in the organization (Colquitt, 2001). The research has suggested distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice as dimensions of perceived organizational justice at workplaces (e.g., Colquitt, 2001; Golparvar&Rafizadeh, 2010). Distributive justice focuses on employees' beliefs about mastery of justice rules in the distribution of outcomes in an organization, and procedural justice focuses on employees' perception about the presence of justice rules in decision making and administration of decisions at workplaces. On the other hand, interpersonal justice focuses on the presence of justice in social interactions that take place between individuals and others (especially supervisors) in organizations. Finally, informational justice focuses on just information distribution in an organization and how information regarding decisions is disseminated and explained to others (Ishak & Alam, 2009). According to Moorman (1991), justice perceptions are important in predicting the occurrence of OCBs. From an exchange theory perspective, OCBs are means for an employee to reciprocate fair treatment from the

organization (Moorman, 1991). When justice rules are violated in the organization, employees will likely believe that the social exchange has been violated and accordingly respond to this justice violation in the form of decreased OCBs (Blackely, Andrews & Moorman, 2005). Previous researches reported a positive relationship between some of the perceived organizational justice dimensions and OCBs. In a meta-analysis review of 55 studies, Organ and Ryan (1995) found that perceived justice was a predictor of OCBs. Cohen-charash & Specter (2001), in another meta-analytic study, reported the significant positive relationship between interactional and procedural justice with some dimensions of OCBs. Williams, Pitre & Zainuba (2002) reported a significant positive relationship between interactional justice and OCB. The underlying mechanism about the relationship between some perceived organizational justice dimensions and some OCBs facets is that, when the organization applies the just rules at workplaces, inform employees that they are valued by the organization. When employees perceived they are valued members of an organization, they are more likely to engage in OCBs as a form of social exchange (Eisenberger, Fasolo& Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Also, when an organization allows its members to criticize unjust rules, it ensures employees that the organization will care about their human rights (Eisenberger et al., 1990).

A. Distributive Justice

Historically, Distributive justice had been the topic of interest of social psychologists (Steiner & Rolland, 2006). As the name implies, distributive justice means fairness in the distribution of rewards and benefits. Different researchers defined this dimension of organizational justice. Distributive justice can be defined as: "The individual's perception on whether the gains they earned are distributed fairly. Individuals make judgments on the appropriateness of justice distribution by comparing their outcome to their previous outcomes or to the outcomes of the others" (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, p.21). According to Greenberg and Baron (2008, p.46), distributive justice means "the form of organizational justice that focuses on people's beliefs that they have received fair amounts of valued work-related outcomes (e.g., pay, recognition, etc.)".

A study was conducted by Ang et al. (2003) on two workers groups (one group consisted of workers of Singapore and the other was a foreign group; Chinese employees working in Singapore) regarding their feeling about distributive justice. Foreign workers were not paid fairly according to their work, so they showed higher levels of distributive injustice, and their productivity was reduced because they received less, and as a result, they produced less. This study showed that how much people were keenly sensitive to the fair and just distribution of resources and rewards. If people feel that their work assignments and

rewards to them are fair, they will show more satisfaction in their work. In the business world, the fast-food chain KFC is not only famous due to its delicious chicken and food services but also for the fair performance appraisal systems established for the employees. Company officials are very careful to adhere to distributive justice practices, and the good performance of employees is fairly rewarded (cited in Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

B. Interactional justice

Research on interactional justice, which is also considered as part of procedural justice, was started by Bies and Moag (1986) and Tyler and Bias (1990). Interactional justice is an important characteristic of successful organizations; it means that employees perceive that they are treated fairly by their supervisors. Quality of treatment received from the supervisor or decision-maker is considered as interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is also related to the proper performance of the formal decision-making process. This type of organizational justice is defined as: "Interpersonal justice means people's perceptions of the fairness of the manner in which they are treated by others (typically, authority figures)" (Greenberg & Beron, 2008, p.48).
According to Ayden and Kepenekci (2008), interactional justice is a complement of procedural justice. Decision-maker treatment is very important for those who are affected by such a decision.
The decision-maker should give respect to others, be truthful, courteous, and ready to give a reasonable explanation of his decision, and open two-way communication.

Interactional justice is an important characteristic of successful organizations; it means that employees perceive that they are treated fairly by their supervisors. Quality of treatment received from the supervisor or decision-maker is considered as interactional justice (Bies, 1986). Interactional justice is also related to the proper performance of the formal decision-making process. This type of organizational justice is defined as: "Interpersonal justice means people's perceptions of the fairness of the manner in which they are treated by others (typically, authority figures)" (Greenberg, 1996).

C. Procedural Justice

Employees are not only interested in fair outcomes but also interested in a fair process for the determination of their outcomes. Research on procedural justice was started in the 1970s by Thibaut and Walker (1975). Procedural justice can be seen as an extension of equity theory in the perspective of the allocation process (Deutsch, 1975; Eventual, 1976). The focus of Folger's (1977) research was shifted from the reaction of people on injustice outcomes to the reaction of people on injustice procedures. Many authors defined

procedural justice in various ways. Folger and Cropanzano (1998, p.26) defined procedural justice as "fairness issues concerning the methods, mechanisms, and processes employed to determine outcomes". According to Greenberg and Baron (2008, p.47): "People's perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcomes they receive" is known to be procedural justice. According to Greenberg and Colquitt (2005), procedural justice criteria included the following factors: Voice in making of decisions, consistency in applying rules, accuracy in the use of information, opportunity to be heard, safe guards against bias. Procedural justice has great significance in the organization because, according to Greenberg and Beron (2008), fairness did not mean that employees were only interested in fair outcomes (distributive justice), but they also interested in fair processes used in the determination of their outcomes (i.e., procedural justice). It was a key concern of every organization to maintain procedural justice as a regular practice because decisions based on unfair practices were not accepted by employees. In fact, in the case of procedural injustice, people did not only consider their outcomes as unfair but also reject the entire system by considering that unfair (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001).

D. Informational Justice

Informational justice also plays an important role in the success of an organization because people perceive that organizational decisions are based on fair information. The precise definition of informational justice proposed by the author is as follows: According to Greenberg and Baron (2008, p.48), "Informational justice means the people's perceptions of the fairness of the information used as the basis for making a decision". Research showed that there was a higher level of fairness in perceptions of employees when people explain outcomes with detail (high informational justice) and when outcomes were explained to them in a manner that showed a message of dignity and respect to them (high interpersonal justice). If both informational and interactional justice were combined, then the results were additive, and together their results became magnified (Colquitt, 2001). All four types of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice) are correlated which each other (Colquitt, 2001) but are distinct aspects of organizational justice so have different effects (Greenberg, 1993, 1994). Informational justices refer to the behavior of the actors in transmitting the information. In general, informational justice focuses on the behavior of decision-makers (Colquitt J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C., 2005). In other words, informational justice indicates how the information is presented in society fairly in terms of location, time, and situation.

V. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Since the 1930s, organizational citizenship behavior was a topic of various studies (S.J., 2000). The significance of "willingness to cooperate" from employees was introduced in addition to the literature on organizational behavior by Chester Barnard. Organizational citizenship behaviors are those behaviors for which employees are neither rewarded by the organization in monetary terms nor employees are forced to show such behaviors, but it contributes a lot to organizational effectiveness. It's all about the matter of emotional attachment to the organization and the matter of the personal choice of the employee.

Organizational citizenship behavior is; volunteer behaviors of workers which ensure the improvement of the organization. This concept is very popular and attracts attention recently (Mackenzie and others., 1999: 396). At the end of researches in the last 20 years, it is found out that organizational and individual performance develops with OCB (Organ and Lingl, 1995). Researches especially focus on the scope of this behavior, factors that cause this behavior, its effects of on workers and organization, and relations between sector and culture. In this study, theory and empiric developments are overviewed, and an application about the issue is completed.

Five dimensions of Dennis Organ (altruism, kindness, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civil virtuous) evaluate OCB perfectly (Konovsky and Organ, 1996). In this study, OCB is taken into consideration from the point of industry employees in Sri Lanka. Success, gratification, and some demographic aspects of industry employees and their relationship and differences with OCB level are researched and analyzed in this study.

A. Definition of the concept of OCB

Organ (1988) defines OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization Organ's definition of OCB includes three critical aspects that are central to this construct:

1. First, OCBs are thought of as discretionary behaviors, which are not part of the job description, and are performed by the employee as a result of personal choice.
2. Second, OCBs go above and beyond that, which is an enforceable requirement of the job description.
3. Finally, OCBs contribute positively to overall organizational effectiveness.

At the same time, Organ's (1988) definition of OCB has generated a great deal of criticism. The very nature of the construct makes it difficult to operationally define. Critics started questioning whether or not OCBs, as defined by Organ, were discretionary in nature. Organ (1997), in response to criticisms, notes that since his original definition, jobs have moved away from a clearly defined set of tasks and responsibilities and have evolved into much more ambiguous roles. Without a defined role, it quickly becomes difficult to define what is discretionary.

B. What is Organizational Citizenship Behaviour?

Most employees understand that their primary duty is to do the work that is assigned to them, stay away from behaviors that could be deemed troublesome, and deliver work that is acceptable and beneficial to the organization. (Organ, 1997)

Organizational citizenship behavior deals with the actions and behaviors that are not required by workers. They are not critical to the job but benefit the team and encourage even greater organizational functioning and efficiency.

This is typically categorized as a worker "**going above and beyond**" or "**giving their all**." They look at their job as more than just a paycheck and strive to do all they can to make their work environment run smoothly, even if it has a minimal connection to their current duties.

Usually, these behaviors are seen as positive by managers and business leaders, and the importance and impact of these behaviors should be noted. (Behrens, 2008)

C. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Types and Examples

There are various ways that employees can show organizational citizenship, but there are five agreed-upon types and principles that employees can exemplify when engaging in OCB. They are related to some of the common links from an earlier cited study. Each one also includes an example of how a worker could utilize this principle in their workday. (Behrens, 2008)

1. Altruism

This type of Organizational Citizenship Behavior is when a person decides to help someone else without expecting anything in return. In a business setting, this would likely take the form of a worker choosing to help a co-worker finish a project or a set of tasks even though the work does not necessarily relate to what they need to get done in their regular workday. (Senobari.M, 2008)

2. Courtesy

This is when a worker is considerate or polite to those they work with. This could look like a worker taking care to watch their noise levels if they need to speak on the phone with clients or checking in with co-workers about a troubling personal issue that could impact their performance. (James, 1993)

3. Sportsmanship

This principle means an employee decides to stay in good spirits even when something does not go their way or when something that creates a considerable amount of annoyance or frustration. In a regular business setting, this could be exemplified by a worker refraining from complaining or gossiping about a rejected project proposal**.** (James, 1993)

4. Conscientiousness

When employees go above and beyond, the quality of conscientiousness is likely at work. Coming into work early to finish a project, working to ensure team goals are exceeded for the quarter, developing a new way to approach a process or procedure even when this duty is not outlined in their job description are all ways that workers can exemplify this trait. (Senobari, 2008)

5. Civic Virtue

This is when a worker represents the company they are associated within a positive light**.** This could occur within or outside of the business. It encourages a sense of community and strong interpersonal ties between co-workers. Employees could engage in this type of Organizational Citizenship Behavior by speaking favorably about the organization to that outside of it, participating in charity projects the company participates in, and planning or attending company-sanctioned social events.

(Deluga, 1994) Found that job satisfaction of the employees is a strong factor of OCB. Behavior is given the positive effects of organizational citizenship behavior both at the corporate level and individual level (Adams, 1965)

VI. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Justice perceptions may influence OCB by prompting an employee to define his or her relationship with the organization as one of social exchange. In a social exchange process, employees perceiving fair treatment and trust in managers go beyond formal job requirements and voluntarily perform acts that benefit the organization (Deluga, 1994). The influence of different dimensions of organizational justice (procedural, distributive, interactional, and informational)on organizational citizenship behavior is a widely researched topic and hence explains the importance of organizational justice in an organization(Cohen-Charash, 2001)

VII. CASE REVIEWS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Most multinational organizations are considered their employee relationship mechanism as Organizational citizenship behavior. Most organizations tried to empower their employees, and they expected to increase their employee relationships while increasing employee engagement to the company. Very few studies in which OJ (Organizational Justice) contributes to the effectiveness of an organization have been tested empirically. An important premise of this paper was that organizational citizenship behavior is not a clear-cut construct because the boundary between extra-role and in-role behavior is not defined properly, and it is variant from employees.

To employees, also, same happened for of organizational justice. Employees usually give different preferences forgiving different perceptions of justice for organizations. The result raises important questions about how OCB and OJ are measured. This paper examined the facets of OCB of employees and workplace justice as predictors of organizational effectiveness. Despite the contribution of various past studies, this study has some limitations.

.

VIII. LIMITATION AND DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

An important premise of this research was that organizational citizenship behavior is not clear-cut identification behavior of employees. An important premise of this research was that organizational citizenship behavior is not a clear-cut construct because the boundary between extra-role and in-role behavior is not defined properly and varies from employee to employee; the same happened to organizational justice. Employees usually give different preferences forgiving different perceptions of justice for organizations. Employees play a vital role to contribute innovation and of an organization proved employee bond is established (Dissanayake, Wasantha, &Jinadasa, 2017). The result raises important questions about how Cobrand OJ is measured. This study examined the facets of OCB of employees and workplace justice as predictors of organizational effectiveness. Despite the contribution of various past studies, this study has some limitations. One of the most basic limitations of the present paper is that most of the studies reviewed are based upon cross-sectional, self-reported data. This reliance precludes us from making strong statements about our results. The second limitation of the study is that possibly more effective organizations' employees are more positive while describing OCB and OJ.

IX. DISCUTION AND CONCLUTION

This paper generally supports the identification of theoretical aspects of Organizational justice with their dimensions and Organizational citizenship behavior and their dimensions. Discussion and recommendation for future research the paper have no limitations. The information was derived from perceptual measures on a single survey instrument. However, attitudinal and behavioral measures are suitable for this type of as-assessment because they represent unique individual

responses (Dorfman, 1996). The fact that our initial theoretical model was not supported in all cultures strengthens our belief that the results were not entirely attributable to common. It is commonly believed that employees are the most important asset of an organization. The long-term viability and effectiveness of any organization critically depend on the skills, expertise, competencies, and proactive behaviors, which include organizational citizenship behavior and perception of justice (Organizational Justice). Further research on internal marketing-related o people involvement with organizational performances within services is noted in recent studies. Jayampathi & Dissanayake, 2018; Nirmali, Ali Khathibi & FerdousAzam, 2018). And this study's results show the same. So, Business Organizations should encourage their employees to engage in OCB and Perceive Justice to raise its practical significance. Only when employees have a high level of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and perception on Organizational Justice does Organizational effectiveness rise to achieve their objectives.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, J., Inequity in social exchange. New York: Academic Press,(1965)

[2] 267-299.

[3] Behrens, K., Investigating the High-performance work system. World Academy of Science, (2008) 289-303.

[4] Bies, R. &. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. Roy Lewicki., (1986).

[5] Cohen-Charash, Y. &., The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, (2001) 278-321.

[6] Colquitt J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C., What is organizational justice: a historical analysis, (2005) 3-57.

[7] Colquitt, J. A., greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. , What is organizational justice? A historical overview., (2005)

[8] Deluga, R. J., Supervision trust-building, leader-member exchange, and OCB, Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, (1994) 315-326.

[9] Dissanayake, D.M.R., Wastantha, H.L.N. and Jinadasa, M.P.K., The Role of Organizational Creativity towards Innovations: A Conceptual Review on Services Sector Research Directions, Journal of Social Sciences – Sri Lanka, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. 09 (01) (2017) 12-19.

[10] Eisenberger.R., Perceive supervisor support: Contributions to Perceived organizational support and employee retention. J.Appl.Psychol, (2002) 565-573.

[11] Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A., Behaviors in the organization, Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd., (2008).

[12] Greenberg, J., The quest for justice on the job. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publication., (1996).

[13] Greenberg.J., Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, (1986) 71-73.

[14] Homans, G., Social behavior: Its elementary forms. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul.,(1961).

[15] Kahandawaarachchi LKK, Dissanayake D.M.R & Maitra R ., Role of Relative Agency of Consumers in Brand Building Conceptual Review for Marketing Implications and Future Studies, Sri Lanka. Journal of Marketing, 2 (2016) 31-53.

[16] James, K., The social context of organizational justice: cultural intergroup and structural effect on justice behaviors and perceptions. In Justice in the workplace: In K. James, Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management , (1993) 21-50Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NT.

[17] Sanka Jayampathi, G.A.& Dissanayake,D.M.R., Impact of Brand Citizenship Factors towards Sales Force Motivation: A Conceptual Review on Financial Leasing Service Sector of Sri Lanka, Singaporean Journal of Business, Economics, and Management Studies (SJBEM), 6(9) (2018) 1-9. DOI: 10.12816/0051204

[18] Moshref-Javadi, M. D., Organizational justice in the shadow of Alavi justice. journel of Modiriyate farda, (2006) 15-16.

[19] Nirmali,A.K.A., Ali Khathibi,A. & Ferdous Azam, S.M., Exploring Employees Brand Knowledge in Sri Lankan Banking Sector, European Journal of Social Sciences Studies, 3(1) (2018) 14-23, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1283767

[20] Organ, D. W., Organizational citizenship behavior: it's constructed clean-up time , Human Performance.., (1997).

[21] Place, E., Ballenger, J., Wasonga, T.A., Piveral, J.,& Edmonds, C., Principals perspectives of social justice in public schools. International journal of management, (2010) 531-543.

[22] Rioux, S.M. and Penner, L.A., The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: a motivational analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, (2001) 1306-14.

[23] S.J., O. F., Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Proposal for a New Dimension in Counsellor Education, Canadian Journal of Counselling, (2000) 34.

[24] Senobari.M., Organizational citizenship behavior: definitions, dimensions and impact factor.Journal of Tosse Ensani Police., (2008).

[25] Wayne SJ,Shore LM, and Liden RC ., Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. Acad.Management J. (2002) 21(5) 82-111.