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How do Justice Perceptions Influence Employees’ OCB?

An Organizational Identification Perspective

ABSTRACT

Based on the widely accepted relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), this study sets out to simultaneously examine and compare two mechanisms—social exchange and organizational identification, through which employees are activated to engage in OCB. Our analysis focus on the second view that employees engage in OCB because they identify with their organization. Resulting from a natural psychological tendency of “in-group favorism” to enhance the identity, as well as an identity-congruent behavior orientation, employees with higher organizational identification involve in more OCBs that directly benefit their organization (OCBO). We collected survey data from 161 middle school teachers and test our hypotheses. The results suggest that procedural justice is positively associated with OCB through two mechanisms. Social exchange is a main mediator in the relationship of procedural justice and OCBI. As for the relationship between procedural justice and OCBO, organizational identification has greater mediation effect than social exchange. The difference between the identification perspective and previous ones lies in that they will lead to different natures of OCB, as well as offer different incentive for the OCB’s sustaining. We finally discuss the implications and directions for future research.
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Over two decades have passed since Organ and his colleagues (cf. Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) first proposed the “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” (OCB) construct. Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behaviors 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.” OCB, a type of behavior that organizations desire but can rarely require through contracts, plays a significant role in improving organizational functioning. Researchers have identified four major categories of antecedents to OCB, including individual (including disposition), task, organizational and leadership characteristics (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Except for in the analysis of the dispositional antecedents, most of these studies used social exchange theory as the theoretical framework to explain why employees perform OCB (e.g., Settoon et al., 1996, Brandes, Dharwadkar, & Wheatley, 2004). Within the social exchange framework, employees’ justice perceptions have been identified among the focal antecedents to OCB (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, Fahr, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Despite the enormous literature on the antecedents of OCB through the social exchange paradigm, three issues remain to be addressed more adequately. First, researchers do not measure social exchange directly, but use proxies such as POS (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998), trust (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) or LMX (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 2000). Using proxies for social exchange has some disadvantages. For example, using POS emphasizes more of the support for the employee provided by the organization but just assume that employees should provide to the organization in exchange for that support. Second, there are different forms or levels of social exchange. Cole, Schaninger and Harris (2002a) proposed that there exists a social exchange network at the workplace that involves three forms of the social exchange: organization-member exchange (OMX), leader-member exchange (LMX) and team-member exchange (TMX). Until now, there has been no research that considers the effects of all three levels of social exchange as a group on OCB. Finally, Moorman and Byrne (2005) argued that organizational identification may be an important alternative mechanism through which procedural justice perceptions affect OCB. Olkkonen and Lipponen (2006) provided some initial supports for that argument. It would be meaningful to study both social exchange and organizational identification at the same time to study their relative effects on
OCB.

The present study is an attempt to address these three issues by studying the relationship between procedural justice and OCB in an integrated framework that includes the parallel mediating effects of social exchange and organizational identification. By combining the social identification perspective with existing research on OCB using the social exchange framework, we propose that social exchange is positively associated with individual-oriented OCB (OCBI), while organizational identification is the main reason that leads to organizational-oriented OCB (OCBO). In short, different motivations lead to different pattern of OCB. We test three hypotheses using a sample of 152 teachers in a high school in Guangdong, PRC discuss our results and suggest theoretical as well as practical implications of adding the identification perspective to explain factors leading to OCB.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND OCB
—THE SOCIAL EXCHANGE PERSPECTIVE

Procedural Justice and OCB

Organizational justice perception is chosen as a context to discuss various OCB-initiating mechanisms because it is one of the most widely supported stable antecedents of OCB found in the literature (e.g., Fahr, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ & Moorman, 1993). Among different kinds of justice, procedural justice, which is defined as the fairness of the process by which outcomes are determined (Lind & Tyler, 1988), is the most consistently stable predictor of OCB. A recent meta-analysis (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001) showed that employees’ level of OCB could be well predicted by their procedural justice perceptions (weighted mean $r = .23$). The weighted mean correlation between procedural justice and two specific facets of OCB, altruism and conscientiousness, were .11 and .20 respectively. These differential effects of procedural justice on different facets of OCB provide us with a good platform to test for the existence of the possible mechanisms that may lead to employees’ OCB.

Social exchange as a mediator

In his early discussion of OCB, Organ (1988) proposed that employees’ perception of the fairness
of supervisors leads to employee citizenship behaviors because a social exchange relationship develops between the two parties. This mediating effect may be understood in terms of the nature of social exchange and why individuals would be willing to enter into social exchange relationships. According to Blau (1964), social exchange refers to relationships that entail unspecified future obligations. We need to take two important aspects into consideration when we discuss the nature of social exchange. First, social exchange is still a form of “exchange,” because, like economic exchange, social exchange also involves an obligation or generates an expectation of some return for a contribution. Second, the rewards of social exchange are delivered by the other party. The relationship itself is not considered as a reward in exchange theory. Blau clarified the nature of social exchange as concern “with extrinsic benefits, not primarily with the rewards intrinsic to the association itself” (Blau, 1964, p.89). Third, social exchange is distinguished from economic exchange, because the exact nature or time of the return is unspecified and social exchange does not occur on a quid pro quo or calculated basis (Blau, 1964).

Research on the “social exchange” mechanism that activates OCB has two implications: First, the mutual trust and long-term focus that underlie social exchange relationships ensure that OCB will be reciprocated in the long run (Organ 1990). Employees will, therefore, be more willing to perform OCB if they expect long-term benefits, even though they will not receive instantaneous return. At the same time, to keep or reinforce this kind of OCB, the party that is favored needs to supply some kind of reward to the OCB performer. In organizations, perceived justice is a good reference for employees to judge whether they could trust their organization in the social exchange relationship, which further affects how much they are involved in social exchange activities (Lind, 2001). Previous studies have conceptually and empirically shown that perceived justice by employees has profound effects on engendering social exchange relationships (see, e.g., Organ, 1988; 1990; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000).

The second implication of this social exchange view of OCB is that OCB may be activated through a network of exchange relationships with different parties inside the organization. The Workplace Social Exchange Network (Cole, Schaninger & Harris, 2002) suggests that there are many social
exchanges that may take place between an employee and various targets inside the organization, including the employees’ exchange with (a) the organization (referred to as organization-member exchange, OMX), (b) their supervisors (referred to as leader-member exchange, LMX), and (c) their work group (referred to as team-member exchange, TMX). Previous research has developed measures of LMX and TMX, but, unfortunately, there is no good measure of the quality of an individual employee’s exchange with the whole organization, i.e., OMX. Perceived organizational support (POS) is the primary proxy OMX, but this proxy has a disadvantage in that it emphasizes more of the support for the employee provided by the organization and that the idea that employees give something back to the organization in exchange for that support is assumed. In this study, we measure the employees’ perceived social exchange relationship with their organization directly in order to capture OMX more accurately.

Following the suggestive evidence that procedural justice affects social exchanges and taking the three forms of social exchange into the consideration, we hypothesize:

\[H1a: \text{Higher levels of perceived procedural justice are associated with higher levels of social exchange, specifically associated with higher levels of OML, LMX and TMX.}\]

Social exchange theory emphasizes interactions among social entities, such as a group of people or the whole organization (e.g., Bishop et al., 2000; Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005). Williams and Anderson (1991) first identified the two broad categories of OCB in their empirical and conceptual work and labeled them as OCBO and OCBI. OCBO are behaviors that benefit the organization in general. OCBI are behaviors that immediately benefit specific individuals and indirectly through this means contribute to the organization. Comparing MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter’s (1991) widely used five-dimension OCB scale with the two categories of OCBI and OCBO, although researchers have different ideas, a general agreement is that OCBI can be captured by the OCB dimension of altruism, while conscientiousness, including attendance, cleanliness, and punctuality that go beyond normal requirements, captures OCBO (Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997).

With respect to the three forms of social exchange at work, TMX and LMX focus on individuals and OMX focuses on the organization. Following our above theoretical argument, high levels of
TMX and LMX will lead to more OCBI. At the same time, we should note that OCB is “not rewarded by the formal system” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006), so the social exchange process between the individual and the organization is sometimes carried out through specific individuals. We therefore may expect that OMX could also explain OCBI.

Based on these arguments, we further hypothesize:

- **H1b:** Higher levels of OMX are associated with higher levels of OCBI and OCBO.
- **H1c:** Higher levels of TMX and LMX are associated with higher levels of OCBI.
- **H1d:** Procedural justice is positively related to OCBI and OCBO. The relationship between procedural justice and OCBI is mediated by the level of TMX and LMX, while the relationship between procedural justice and OCBO is mediated by the level of OMX.

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND OCB
--- THE SOCIAL IDENTITY PERSPECTIVE

While it is highly likely that employees perform OCB as a form of social exchange with or reciprocity to the organization, we examine if OCB is also be a consequence of other mechanisms that are totally different from any form of “exchange”. Moreover, we expect that this mechanism is activated by the organizational context rather than by individual dispositional factors.

To meet the first requirement, this mechanism should be free of the nature of “exchange”. First, it should not involve an obligation or generate an expectation of some return from the other party. Second, the other party should not actively offer any form of extrinsic reward. To meet the second requirement, this mechanism should be strongly associated with the organizational context, rather than stable within an individual. Employing the implications of studies on self-categorization and social identity theory, we found that employees’ identification with the organization is a possible mechanism that meets our above requirements. In the following section, we explain in detail how this alternative mechanism may work.

**Self-categorization, Social identity, and Organizational Identification**

Pratt (1998, p. 172) posited that organizational identification occurred “when an individual’s beliefs about his or her organization become self-referential”. Our understanding of organizational
identification can be traced back to social identity theory (SIT) and self-categorization theory, which are founded on assumptions that individual behaviors that target the related groups are partly motivated by the esteem-related need to achieve or maintain a positive social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). SIT describes how individuals incorporate knowledge of their group memberships into conceptions of their self-identities and find an answer to the question “Who am I?” in this process. Based on the SIT, self-categorization theory explains what makes people define themselves in terms of one group membership rather than another and answer “How do I come to know who I am in relation to you?” The question of “who am I?” can be answered at varying levels of abstraction (Haslam, 2002), and each of these different levels of self-definition are associated with a distinct set of behaviors.

Using social identity theory as a basis, Mael and Ashforth (1992) defined organizational identification as a specific form of social identification. Employees may perceive anything that could be used to define “the organization,” and then use it as a reference to self-define “who am I in this organization”. Through this process of social identification, the employee perceives him/herself as psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group, as sharing a common destiny and experiencing its successes and failures (Tolman, 1943).

In sum, social identity theory and self-categorization theory help us to understand organizational identification in at least two ways. First, social categorization is viewed as a basic cognitive process, in which a person first needs to perceive information from the environment. In the same sense, employees perceive information from the organizational environment. Second, SIT offers sound evidence about the “in-group favoritism” behavioral outcomes. A series of studies conducted by Tajfel and his colleagues (Tajfel, Flament, Billig & Bundy, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) offered a basic tenet of SIT that so long as people accept a certain social identity, they tend to exhibit behavior serving the in-group to enhance or maintain their self-esteem and social identity, and those with high levels of the social identity generally display more in-group favoritism. Based on these two implications, we consider OCB from this perspective of social identification in the following section.

Procedural Justice affects OCB through Organizational Identification

Organization identification is said to occur when an individual’s beliefs about an organization become self-referential or self-defined. Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ (2004) argued for
a two-step identification mechanism. First, a cognitive process leads the individual to consider him/herself as a member of an organization. Second, other dimensions (evaluative, affective, and behavioral) come into play when cognitive identification is reached. Therefore, information that employees received from their organization may be a reference for self-definition and a basis for judgment on whether or not they are members of the organization. We argue that procedural justice is an important variable leading to employees’ self-definition and to identification with their organizations.

Procedural justice has a psychological meaning in its own right when it confers a sense of dignity, respect, and voice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Lind and Tyler (1988) discussed the perception and judgment of justice. Under the group value model, fair treatment is important at least in part because it conveys information about a person’s status within the group. Perceived procedural justice reinforces one’s sense of being respected and being considered as a member of an organization, as well as sharing a common membership with other members in the same organization. In this case, organizational identity will become more salient, which results in higher organizational identification of the employees. Therefore, perceived organizational justice is an important factor that affects one’s organizational identification.

Organizational identification, in turn, may affect OCB. First, early experimental research on “in-group favoritism” offers us some clues about the relationship between organizational identification and OCB. It has been found that group members have a tendency to behave (e.g., in performance evaluations and reward allocations) in favor of the in-groups to which they belong and against another out-groups, even though group membership was constructed randomly or on the bases of trivial criteria (Tajfel, Flament, Billig & Bundy, 1971; Brewer & Silver, 1979; Brewer, 1979; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). Second, it is via the identification process that individuals coordinate their views according to the group’s shared values, beliefs and behavior, and, following Kelman (1958), displaying identity-congruent behavior and acting like an organization member is the simplest form of organizational identification. In this sense, we argue that acting like a good citizen in the organization is a good signal of organizational identification. This kind of behavior that benefits the organization as a whole is exactly what we defined as OCBO. As a result, we posit specific hypotheses on OCBO (but
not OCBI) as the outcome variable.

$H_{2a}$: Higher levels of perceived procedural justice are associated with higher levels of organizational identification.

$H_{2b}$: Controlling for the effect of social exchange, higher levels of organizational identification are associated with higher levels of OCBO.

$H_{2c}$: Procedural justice is positively related with OCBO, and this relationship is mediated by the level of organizational identification after controlling for the effects of social exchange.

We summarize our hypotheses in Figure 1. On top of the classical framework that social exchange mediates the effects of procedural justice on OCB, we argue that there is another important path through which procedural justice affects OCB and that path is organizational identification. Compared with other antecedents of OCB, the effects of identification have a completely different nature.

-------------------------------

Insert Figure 1 about here

-------------------------------

**METHOD**

**Sample**

Participants in this study were 161 teachers from a middle school in a moderately developed town in Guangdong province, the Peoples Republic of China (PRC). The survey was conducted during a pedagogic training session that all the teachers in the school attended. The overall rate of return was 91 percent. The number of valid respondents was 152.

Respondents were asked to answer the first and second part of questionnaire and to give the third part to a colleague who was familiar with her/him. They were asked to directly hand in these questionnaires to the researcher.
Measures

Independent variables

*Perceived Procedural Justice* was measured using seven items from the procedural justice scale developed by Colquitt (2001). The items were chosen to reflect the perceived fairness of those procedures used in the organization.

Dependent variable

The *OCB* of respondents was evaluated by their peers with a version of the five-dimensional scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). Its Chinese version was used by Lam, Hui, and Law (1999).

Mediating Variables

*Social Exchange.* According to the social exchange network in organization theory, we measures social exchange by the self-reported Organization-Member Exchange (OMX), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Team-Member exchange (TMX) scales. Organizational exchange was measured using the eight-item scale developed by Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, and Barksdale (2006). The Chinese version of this scale was developed by Song (2006). Leader-Member Exchange was measured using the seven-item scale developed by Gerstner and Day (1997), and we used the Chinese version that was used by Hui, Law, and Chen (1999). Team-Member Exchange was measured using 11 items scale developed by Seers (1989). We translated and back-translated the scale to verify the equivalence of meaning in the Chinese version and the original version.

*Organizational Identification.* A six-item organizational identification scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) was used to measure organizational identification. Translation and back translation were conducted to verify the meaning equivalence of the scales.

Control variables

Based on a previous study, we chose demographic variables that may have effects on OCB as the control variables, specifically age, education level, marital status, tenure in this organization, tenure with the present supervisor. We also considered positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) (PANAS; Watson and Clark, 1988).
RESULTS

Factor Analyses

We used three tests to verify the distinctiveness of the core variables in this study, perceived procedural justice, OMX, LMX, TMX, organizational identification, OCBI, and OCBO with LISREL 8.50 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001). Since all of the seven scales were unidimensional, we randomly averaged the items of each measure to form three indicators for each construct. As Table 1 shows, the fit indices supported the hypothesized seven-factor model, providing evidence of the construct distinctiveness of OMX, LMX, TMX, and organizational identification.

Tests of Hypotheses

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and zero-order correlations of all the variables. Table 3 presents the results of regression analyses testing Hypotheses 1a–2c.

The Path “Procedural Justice—Social exchange—OCBI and OCBO” (H1a–1d)

Social exchange (OMX, LMX & TMX) was hypothesized to be positively related to perceived procedural justice (H1a), OCBO and OCBI (H1b and H1c). OMX and TMX were found to be positively related to procedural justice (p< .001) and OCBI (p< .01). LMX was positively related to procedural justice (p< .001) but had no relationship with OCBI. Thus, H1a was supported because of the consistent relationship between procedural justice and the three types of social exchange (models 1–3). Moreover, the effects of OMX and TMX on OCBI, which were hypothesized in H1b and H1c, were demonstrated in model 6.
Models 7–9 tested the relationship between perceived procedural justice and OCBI along with the mediation effects of social exchange (H1d). In model 7, procedural justice was found to be significantly associated with OCBI (p< .05), which is consistent with previous studies on the relationship between procedural justice and OCB. In the results from model 8, with the addition of the three social exchange variables (OMX, LMX, TMX), the change in the total R² was marginally significant, and the coefficient of PJ decreased from .29 to .26 compared with the results from model 7. The results from model 8, as we hypothesized, showed that OMX positively influences OCBI but TMX has no relationship with OCBI, and LMX has negative effects on OCBI. In model 9, with the addition of Organizational Identification, there is not any significant change in the R2. In model 11, OMX is found to have a marginally significant effect on OCBO without the control of organizational identification. In sum, in the relationship between procedural justice and OCBI and OCBO through social exchange, OMX is found to be a partial mediator that leads to OCBI and OCBO, TMX is not found to be a mediator that leads to OCBI. As expected, organizational identification is not a mediator in this relationship.

The Path “Procedural Justice—Organizational Identification—OCBO” (H2a–2c)

Organizational identification was hypothesized to be positively related to OCBO (H2a) and perceived procedural justice (H2b). As we hypothesized, we found organizational identification to be positively related to procedural justice (p< .01) (model 4). Model 12 controlled the effects of social exchange (OMX, LMX, TMX) and showed a positive relationship between organizational identification and OCBO (p< .05). Thus, H2a and H2b were supported.

Models 13–15 tested the relationship between perceived procedural justice and OCBO and the mediation effects of organizational identification (H2c). In model 13, procedural justice was found to be significantly associated with OCBO (p< .05), which is consistent with a previous study about the relationship between procedural justice and OCB. In the results from model 14, with the addition of three social exchange variables (OMX, LMX, TMX), there is no significant change in the total R², and the procedural justice coefficient does not decrease by much (from .25 to .24) compared with the results from model 12. As we expected, none of the three forms of social exchange is a mediator in the relationship between procedural justice and OCBO. In model 15, with the addition of organization identification, the total R² changed significantly (ΔR²=.04, p<.05). Thus, as we hypothesized in H2c,
the data provide strong support for the mediating role of organizational identification. In short, organizational identification is a full mediator in the relationship between procedural justice and OCBO. None of the three types of social exchange is found to be a mediator in this relationship.

**DISCUSSION**

An important premise of this study was that OCBs have different natures, which are activated through different mechanisms, specifically in this study, through social exchange and organizational identification. The results support our second group of hypotheses (H2a–2c) and partly support our first group of hypotheses (H1a–1d). Consistent with our model, high levels of perceived procedural justice may lead to high levels of social exchange and organizational identification, and, as a result of their different functions, they will respectively lead to more OCBI and OCBO. Therefore, although the two mechanisms may simultaneously exist when an employee performs OCBs, it is still possible for us to infer the motivation for the OCBs based upon the pattern of the employee’s behaviors.

This study is based on previous research about the relationship between procedural justice and OCB (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ & Moorman, 1993; Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E., 2001) and offered at a consistent result with the previous results in this aspect. When employees perceive higher procedural justice, they will be more likely to engage in OCBs. Using a social exchange approach, when one perceives justice, he/she will get a sense of obligation to compensate the organization for what he/she got from it, as well as acquiring a sense of security in the “exchange” relationship, which will lead to a stable expectation that the performing OCB will bring some rewards in the future. Therefore, social exchange is expected to be related to both OCBI and OCBO. In our study, only organization-member exchange was found to be a partial mediator in the relationship between procedural justice and OCBI. Opposed to previous research, leader-member exchange was not found to be a mediator. One possible explanation is that we used peer-ratings as the measure of OCB.

Compared with previous studies, our first contribution is in using the social exchange network in organizations to test the mediation effects of three kinds of social exchange relationships. The results support and further specify previous findings to some extent. The second contribution of this study is directly measuring the organization-member exchange relationship rather than using any surrogate such
as POS.

The third contribution is that we examine the organizational identification path, which leads to OCB in a new way. The most important differences between the social exchange and organizational identification paths are that they lead to different patterns of behaviors, as well as offering different incentives for sustaining the behaviors. OCBI and OCBO indicate the different patterns here, which will target and benefit different entities. Moreover, if one performs OCB out of a social exchange drive, it is done either to compensate for an obligation from previous interaction or in expectation of some kind of future reward. This reward can be concrete or abstract, specific or general, immediate or delayed—or some combination of these. However, different from the case of social exchange, if one performs OCB out of organizational identification, he/she is motivated to benefit the group with which he/she identifies without an expectation of certain rewards. Therefore, the organization need not pay back anything to reinforce this kind of behavior. This mechanism can be explained by social identity and social categorization theory. First, in-group favoritism is a natural psychological tendency when one becomes a group member and identifies with the group; and second, the organization needs to do nothing to sustain this behavior so long as the member has a strong sense of identity in the organization.

In this study, although we only use perceived justice as an exogenous variable to compare two possible paths through which the employees’ organizational perceptions affect their OCB performance, the implications do not simply stop here. After identifying these two parallel mechanisms, it will be possible for us to explain the relationships between other exogenous factors and OCB from these two approaches.

**Limitations**

As in all research, there are also some limitations in this study. First, although our model offers an explanation for causal relationships, the study design is fundamentally to discern correlational relationships. Second, it should also be noted that OCB encompasses several dimensions of behavior, but according to the previous study, we empirically examined only two dimensions—altruism and conscientiousness—to represent OCBI and OCBO. Third, we conduct this study in a middle school. Further study need to be conducted in other kind of organizations to retest the findings.

**Implications for Further Research**
In most studies on organizational identification, the social identity theory and social categorization theory from sociological research were directly used to develop the construct of “organizational identification” and related theories were directly applied in an organizational context. However, to understand more about the social identity in organizations, further study is needed because organizations are different from other social contexts. Second, different foci of identification exist in organizations. One may have many identities at the same time, but some of them are more salient than the others at a certain moment. We can consider them simultaneously.

Practical Implications

Because identification has been shown to relate to a number of positive outcomes (Riketta, 2005), we suggest that the managers should be made more aware of this important construct. For example, strategies for fostering identification have been discussed (e.g., Rousseau, 1998; van Knippenberg, 2003). Some specific recommendations include (a) honoring the organization’s traditions, rituals, and ceremonies that communicate and objectify the organization’s history, (b) emphasizing core values, beliefs, and behaviors that represent the organizational mission and goals, and (c) communicating stories and myths that reflect the organization’s identity (Cole & Bruch, 2006). Hence, it is necessary to pay attention to management practices that are designed to foster a strong organizational identity in improving employees’ behaviors that benefit the whole organization.

Summary

Overall, our results support the existence of two different mechanisms between perceived procedural justice and OCB. Social exchange leads to more OCBs directed at individuals such as colleagues, while organizational identification activates more OCBs that benefit the whole organization. We pay attention to the latter because an employee will perform this kind of OCB even he/she knows there is no observer at that time and there is no reward in the future.
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Appendix:
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**Figure 1** The conceptual model of the mechanisms that activate OCB
### Table 1 Comparison of Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M_0$</td>
<td>Seven factors</td>
<td>287.11</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_1$</td>
<td>Five factors: OMX, LMX, TMX were combined into one factor.</td>
<td>537.67</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>250.56**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_2$</td>
<td>Four factors: OMX, LMX, TMX, and organizational identification were combined into one factor.</td>
<td>730.74</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>443.63**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_3$</td>
<td>Six factors: OMX and organizational identification were combined into one factor.</td>
<td>490.25</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>203.14**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$

### TABLE 2 Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency Alphas and Correlations$^a$ among Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable $^b$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Organization-Member Exchange</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Leader-Member Exchange</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Team-Member Exchange</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Organizational Identification</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Altruism (OCBI)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Conscientiousness (OCBO)</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ * $p < .05$ (two tailed)    ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)
Table 3  Results of Regression Analyses for Determinants of Altruism (OCBI) and Conscientiousness (OCBO) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>OMX M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
<th>M9</th>
<th>M10</th>
<th>M11</th>
<th>M12</th>
<th>M13</th>
<th>M14</th>
<th>M15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure working in present organization</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure working with present supervisor</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affectivity</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization-Member Exchange (OMX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Member Exchange (TMX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R² (%)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in R² (%)</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.06†</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .1      * p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001