Organizational Citizenship and Organizational Justice Scales' Adaptation to Turkish

Örgütsel Vatandaşlık ve Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeklerinin Türkçeye Uyarlanması

Murat TAŞTAN*   Kürşad YILMAZ**

Ankara Üniversitesi   Dumlupınar Üniversitesi

Abstract

This study was carried out to do the validity and reliability analysis of Turkish form of organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales and to determine its appropriateness to the conditions in Turkey. Originally the scales were developed by Wayne K. Hoy to determine the perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational justice. For the linguistic equivalence, five English teachers were consulted. As for the validity and reliability, the scales were applied to 189 teachers working at the schools in the center of Ankara. As the result of the analyses suggest, the scales can be accepted as valid and reliable tools that can be used in Turkey.

Key words: Organizational citizenship scale, organizational justice scale, Turkey

Öz

Bu çalışma, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Ölçeği ve Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenirlik analizlerini yaparak, Türkiye koşullarına uygunluğunu saptamak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Temel olarak okullardaki örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel adalet ile ilgili görüşleri belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanan ölçeklerin orijinali Wayne K. Hoy tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Dilsel eşdeğerlik çalışması için beş farklı İngilizce öğretmeninin görüşü alınmıştır. Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması için ise, Ankara il merkezindeki ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan 189 öğretmen üzerinde uygulama yapılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda ölçeklerin Türkiye koşullarında kullanılabilecek, geçerli ve güvenilir ölçekler olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Ölçeği, Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeği, Türkiye

Introduction

Recently, it was claimed that voluntary and willing behaviors are based on the aim to perform more beneficial actions for their organizations, so the studies regarding extra role behaviors of employees have started to be done more frequently. Extra role behaviors started to be considered as more important from this point of view. Extra-role behaviors can be defined as the ones that the working people display voluntarily aside from the organizational necessitates. When extra role behaviors are mentioned organizational citizenship is remembered.

---

*   Arş. Gör. Murat Taştan, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi, murattastan@gmail.com
**   Dr. Kürşad Yılmaz, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, kursadyilmaz@gmail.com

Organizational citizenship is one of the topics studied often in recent years. In these studies, relations of various variables have been examined like, organizational citizenship behaviors and job satisfaction of the employees (Moorman, 1993), characteristics of the job (Farh, Podsakof & Organ, 1990), attitudes towards job (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990), performance (Ball, Trevino & Sims, 1994), motivation (Folger, 1993), personal characteristics (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Holmes, Langford, Welch & Welch, 2002), needs (Schnake, 1991), psychological contract (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002), commitment and organizational commitment (Williams, 1988; Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001), leadership and leadership behaviors (Wayne & Green, 1993), trust (Deluga, 1995; Podsakof, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996), values (Burton, 2003), perception of fairness (Martin & Bies, 1991; Moorman, Nichoff & Organ, 1993; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), justice and organizational justice (Moorman, 1991; Sheppard, Lewick & Minton, 1992; Greenberg, 1993a; Eskew, 1993; Tansky, 1993; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996; Allen & Rush, 1998; Chen, Hui & Sego 1998).

One of the most important concepts related with organizational citizenship is organizational justice. Organizational justice is accepted as one of the many organizational premises of organizational citizenship (Yaylacı, 2004). Organizational justice is often related with the perceptions of the employees about justice. There are lots of studies on organizational citizenship in the field of organization. However, these studies have usually been carried out at commercial companies. Hence, organizational citizenship (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005) and organizational justice (Hoy & Tarter, 2004) at educational institutions has been neglected. It is the same in Turkey. A lot of studies have been done in Turkey on organizational citizenship (Özen, 2000; Kamer, 2001; Erdem & Özen, 2002; Köse, Kartal & Kayalı, 2003; Özdemir, 2005; Elçi & Alpkan, 2006) and organizational justice (Wasti, 2001; Yıldırım, 2002; 2003; İşcan & Naktiyok, 2004; Yılmaz, 2004; Yürür, 2005; Tarkan & Tepeci, 2006). Even though there are some studies on educational issues, most of them were carried out at commercial organizations. However, there have been many studies regarding educational organization or educational administration examining the relationship between organizational citizenship and organizational justice or developing a scale for it.

The studies on organizational citizenship are not old. Organ (1988), who did the leading studies regarding this issue, defined organizational citizenship behavior as the voluntary personal behaviors which are not dealt by formal reward system of the organization but supporting it to work effectively. In his definition, Organ (1988) used organizational citizenship concept to show the behaviors directed at providing more benefits to the organizations doing more than they have to. The reason why Organ mentioned these behaviors as voluntary is that they are done willingly and not needed formally. Not performing these actions does not cause any punishment for the employee but they are beneficial for the organization. Therefore, organizational citizenship behaviors are the ones contributing to total performance of the organization (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee & McMurrian, 1997).

Organ (1988) proposed the following definition for the organizational citizenship behavior construct: "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". According to Organ (1988), three basic elements of organizational citizenship behaviors are, their being volunteer, not being directly related with reward system and supporting the effective functioning of the organization. In his studies, Organ (1988) organized organizational citizenship behaviors under five topics as; altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue.

In organizational citizenship behaviors *altruism* includes supporting the volunteer behaviors in a task or problem related with the organization. Altruism is connected with

defining how to help to the other employees at work. *Conscientiousness* is described as employees' performing some of the role behaviors beyond the limit of expectations. That is to say, it is more than fulfilling the requirements of the organization, being respectful and loyal to the rules of the organization sincerely. *Sportsmanship* means refraining from complaining and murmuring about the problems. It is related with avoiding behaving in a negative way. *Courtesy* implies individuals' contact with the others who might be affected from his/her decisions or actions. It is connected with accepting and doing the responsibility of cooperation while cooperating with the other employees. *Civic virtue* denotes being interested in organization policies, informed about them and strive for personal development in such issues. Civic virtue is level of employees' reactions making the management of organization behave properly (Organ, 1988).

One of the variables affecting organizational citizenship behaviors is the perceptions of the employees about justice in the organization; namely, their perceptions about organizational justice. According to Moorman (1991), employees' perceptions of a fair working atmosphere increase the job satisfaction and make citizenship behaviors to be performed.

Organizational behavior scientists' interest in employees' perceptions about organizational justice has increased in the last ten years (Eskew, 1993). Organizational justice concept was first used by Greenberg (1996) as a concept expressing the employees' perceptions about how fair they were treated in the organization and how these perceptions affected loyalty and satisfaction in terms of organization.

There are a lot of classifications concerning the dimensions of organizational justice. Although there are various typologies in the related literature, a theoretical frame involving all types of justice has not been formed (Roch & Shanock, 2006). Nevertheless, the most common classification of organizational justice is distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

Distributive justice is comparison of ratio of benefits considering the balance between input and output of each group (Paterson, Green & Cary, 2002). According to Konovsky (2000), procedural justice is concerned with how the decisions about dispersion and objective and subjective situations. Interactional justice could be defined as connected with the humanistic side of organizational procedures and procedural justice, treatment of the management to the individual (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2000).

The aim of this study is to adapt valid and reliable scales which can be used to define the perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational justice at schools into Turkish.

Method

In this section, the translation studies, target population of the study, data collection techniques, collection of data and analysis are explained.

Translation of the Scales

Before starting the translation of the scales, the permission needed to be able to use them had been taken from Wayne K. Hoy. The original English version of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale for Schools (OCB-Scale) and Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) were firstly translated into Turkish by the academicians studying educational administration. Later on, the same form was re-translated into Turkish by English teachers and their opinions were asked about the previous translation. Then, the same forms were translated by people working as English teachers and these teachers were also asked about the academics' translations. Next, all

of the translated texts were evaluated comparatively. After these steps, the most appropriately translated items were decided to be used in the scales. Later on, experts were consulted for the Turkish forms and teachers were consulted about their clarity and comprehensibility. Considering the directions from consultations, necessary corrections were made. What is more, the scales were translated into English and the original and the latest forms were compared. Finally, the scales took their last forms and were made ready for application.

Sample

According to Kline (1994), analyses such as factor analysis and item analysis must be taken into consideration in determining the sample size in the pre-applications and the number of items must be two times, preferably ten times, greater than the number of the sample (cited by: Büyüköztürk, 2005). It was decided to reach 200 teachers in the study considering that the greater the sample is, the closer the scores will be to the real scores, and the guesses could be likelier (Büyüköztürk, 2005). It is because, Kline (1994) pointed out that a 200-people sample would be enough to come up with reliable factors (Büyüköztürk, 2002b).

The sample was selected using a random sampling method. As it was decided to reach 200 teachers in the research, randomly chosen 200 teachers were applied to for the questionnaire. As a result of the application done, 196 teachers were reached. However, after examining the questionnaires, it was found out that 189 out of 196 could be used.

The sample of the study consisted of 189 primary school teachers working at primary schools at the city center of Ankara. Of the teachers in the study, 62.4 were women; 37.6 % were men. 48.1 % of the participants were regular classroom teachers, 51.9 % were teachers of various subjects; 61.9 % of the teachers were graduates of education faculties. 42.3 % of the participants were aged between 31-40, 35.4 % were aged between 21-30; 42.3 % had between 6-10 years, 22.8 had between 1-5 years, 16.4 had between 11-15 years of seniority in their profession.

Instruments

In the study "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale for Schools - OCB-Scale" was used to determine the perceptions about organizational citizenship behaviors and "Organizational Justice Scale – OJS" was used to determine the perceptions about organizational justice.

The original form of the "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale for Schools" is a Likert type scale and has 12 items. The reply part of the scale is as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Two of the items in the scale scored reversely. The original form of the scale has one dimension. Reliability coefficient of the scale is α = .86'dır (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). While an average score can be determined for each item in the scale, the average score for the whole scale can also be calculated. The means of each item one by one show the item means of the school and the total show the school mean. The high score received from the scale show the high organizational citizenship behavior (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005).

The original form of the "Organizational Justice Scale" is a Likert type scale and has 10 items. The reply part of the scale is as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 from strongly disagree to strongly agree. All of the items in the scale were scored directly. In the original form of the scale, there is only one strong dimension. Factor loads of the items in the scale are higher than .77 and total variance explained is 78%. Reliability coefficient of the form is α = .97. High score obtained from the scale implies the positive perceptions about organizational justice (Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

The reply part of the original form ranged from 1 to 6, from strongly disagree to strongly agree. However, it is not commonly used in Turkey. Therefore the reply part is reorganized as; 1-Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Moderately agree, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree. The scales

were applied and collected by the researchers. During the research no support was taken from any institution.

Analysis

In order to find out about the construct validity of the scales used in the study, Principal Component Analysis (Factor Analysis) was done. After the analysis the items which have factor loads under .30 were excluded from the scale. It was paid attention to the difference between two high factor loads to be minimum 0.10 (Büyüköztürk, 2002a). Before doing the factor analysis, it was checked if the data had been appropriate for the analysis. Barlett test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) tests were used to assess if the data had been appropriate for the analysis. For the reliability studies, Cronbach Alpha Coefficient formula which is an internal consistency technique was used.

Results

In this section, the results of the construct validity and reliability analysis of the scales were stated. The results were given separately for each of the scales.

Construct Validity of the Scales

Before doing factor analysis to the scales, it was checked if the sets of data had been appropriate for factor analysis. There are three different methods to assess if the sets of data are appropriate for factor analysis. These methods are; forming correlation matrix, Barlett test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test. Barlett test, checks the probability of the existence of high rated correlations at least in some of the variables in the correlations matrix. To be able to continue to the analysis, "correlation matrix is the unit matrix" null hypothesis must be rejected. The rejection of the null hypothesis shows that there are high correlations between variables; in other words, data set is appropriate for factor analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion for the adequacy of the sample is and index comparing the size of the observed correlation coefficient and partial correlation coefficient. KMO rate must be above 0.50. Higher is the rate, better is the data set for factor analysis (Kalaycı, 2005). As a result of the information given above, KMO value and Barlett test result of the pre application data set were determined. Barlett test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test results regarding organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales are as below in Table1:

Table 1.

Barlett Test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test Results Regarding Organizational Citizenship and Organizational Justice Scales

	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,89
Organizational citizenship scale		Approx. Chi-Square	979,157
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	66
		Sig.	,000
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,92
Organizational justice scale		Approx. Chi-Square	1305,504
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	45
		Sig.	,000

As the result of the analysis, KMO values of the pre application data sets were found to be .89 for the organizational citizenship scale and .92 for the organizational justice scale. As the KMO values were .89 and .92 > .50, the data set could be considered as appropriate for factor

analysis. Then, it was checked if the Bartlett test results had been meaningful. As seen in Table 1, there are high correlations between the variables; in other words, the pre application data set was regarded as appropriate for the factor analysis.

Item Analysis of the Organizational Citizenship Scale

Before analyzing the organizational citizenship scale, two of the items (2nd and 10th) in the scale were scored reversely. The others were scored directly. In order to define the construct validity of the organizational citizenship scale, factor analysis was done. In Table 2, factor loads of the items and total correlations of them were given.

Table 2.

Factor Loads and Total Correlations of the Items in the Organizational Citizenship Scale

Organizational citizenship scale items	Factor Load	Item-Total Correlation
1. Teachers help the students in their personal time.	.64	.57
2. Teachers waste most of the class time.	-.44	-.43
3. Teachers voluntarily help the new teachers.	.64	.54
4. Teachers volunteer to work in new committees.	.63	.54
5. Teachers volunteer to support extra curricular activities.	.64	.53
6. Teachers come to school and meetings on time.	.71	.63
7. Teachers help their substitutes.	.77	.67
8. Teachers start class on time and use class time effectively.	.70	.61
9. Teachers share the information about various issues.	.74	.66
10. Teachers take most of their time for their personal work.	-.31	-.27
11. Teachers work in the school committees voluntarily.	.82	.75
12. Teachers give innovative suggestions to improve the quality of school.	.81	.72

Variance explained: % 45.66

Eigenvalue of the factor: 5.48

It was seen that the factor loads of all of the items in the organizational citizenship scale had been above .30 and none of the items was excluded from the scale. Scale has one factor. Eigenvalue of the factor is 5.48. Factor loads of the items in the scale vary between .31 and .82. The variance explained by the scale is 45.66%. According to the reliability analysis regarding organizational citizenship scale the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be α = .87.

Corrected Item-total correlations in the scale vary between .27 and .75. When the Table 2 examined, it was seen that total corrected Item-total correlations items had been above .20 which is discrimination index of the items. Thus, it might be stated that these items are consistent with the whole scale.

Item Analysis of the Organizational Justice Scale

Principal Components Analysis was done to define the construct validity of the organizational justice scale. In Table 3, factor loads of the items and total correlations of them were given.

Table 3.

Factor Loads and Total Correlations of the Items in the Organizational Justice Scale

Organizational justice scale items	Factor Load	Item-Total Correlation
1. The behaviors of the principal are consistent.	.79	.73
2. Students are treated fairly in this school.	.69	.64
3. Principal does not try to be popular.	.73	.67
4. Principal treats everyone with dignity and respect them.	.85	.81
5. Nobody is treated like preferential in this school.	.87	.83
6. Principal treats everyone in this school fairly.	.88	.84
7. Teachers in this school do not consider their self interest in their jobs.	.44	.39
8. Principal is loyal to ethical standards.	.78	.74
9. Teachers in this school are involved in decisions about themselves.	.79	.73
10. Teachers are treated fairly in this school.	.89	.85

Variance explained: 61.74 %
Eigenvalue of the factor: 6.17

As seen, the factor loads of all of the items in the organizational justice scale were above .30 and none of the items was excluded from the scale. Scale has one factor. Eigenvalue of the factor is 6.17. Factor loads of the items in the scale vary between .44 and .89. The variance explained by the scale is 61.74 %. According to the reliability analysis regarding organizational citizenship scale the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be $\alpha = .92$.

Total correlations of the items in the scale vary between .39 and .85. When the Table 3 examined, it was seen that total correlation of the items had been above .20 which is discrimination index of the items. Thus, it might be stated that these items are consistent with the whole scale.

Conclusion

Considering the perceptions taken from the teachers working at primary schools, Likert type scales that might be used to define teachers' perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational justice were adapted into Turkish. Factor analysis was done to the originally 12-item organizational citizenship scale and 10-item organizational justice scale after translation. It was decided that the items with the factor loads below .30 were going to be excluded from the scales; however none of the items was excluded. Both of the scales have single factors. After seeing the item analysis, it was decided that the items are reliable; organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales are sufficient to differentiate between the differing levels of perceptions. As for the reliability of the scale, it was defined using the Alpha internal consistency coefficient and seen that the coefficients are sufficient. Depending on the findings in the study, it can be stated that organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales are reliable and valid ones measuring the perceptions of teachers regarding organizational citizenship and organizational justice.

References

Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 247-260.

Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims Jr., H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 299-322.

Burton, C. H. (2003). "An Empirical Investigations of the Interrelationships of Organizational Culture, Managerial Values, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, Washington DC.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002a). *Data Analyses Handbook for Social Sciences.* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002b). Factor Analyses. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 8* (32), 470-483.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2005). Questionnaire Development. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences, 3* (2), 133-148.

Chen, X., Hui, C., & Sego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 922-931.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86* (2), 278-321.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 927-946.

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology, 7*, 1–16.

DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal, 88*, 35-44.

Elçi, M., & Alpkan, L. (2006). The Influences of Ethical Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Hacettepe University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 24* (1), 141–170.

Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*, 53-72.

Erdem, F., & Özen, J. (2002). "The effect of trust in a guide at academic organizations on the development of civil virtue behavior, as a dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour." *Paper presented at the X. National Administrative and Organizational Convention*, Antalya, Turkey.

Eskew, D. E. (1993). The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 185-194.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16*, 705-722.

Folger, R. (1993). Justice, motivation, and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 239-248.

Greenberg, J. (1993a). Justice and organizational citizenship: A commentary on the state of the science. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 249-256.

Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Holmes, S. A., M. Langford, O. J. Welch, & Welch, S. T. (2002). Associations between internal controls and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 14*, 85-99.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management, 18*, 250-259.

İşcan, Ö. F., & Naktiyok, A. (2004). Perceptions of Organizational Commitment and Justice, As Determinants of Employees' Organizational Consistency, *Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences Journal, 59* (1), 181–201.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2005). Faktör Analizi, Ş. Kalaycı (Ed.) *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri* (ss. 321–331). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.

Kamer, M. (2001). "The Effect of Organizational Trust on Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors." Unpublished master Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.

Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management, 26* (3), 489–511.

Köse, S., Kartal, B. & Kayalı, N. (2003). A Research on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and its Relation to Factors of Attitude. *Erciyes University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal, 20*, 1–19.

Martin, C. L., & Bies, R. J. (1991). Just laid off, but still a good citizen? Only if the process is fair. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management.* Miami, FL.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845-855.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 46*, 845–855.

Moorman, R. H., Nichoff, B. P. & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviors: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 6, 209-225.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. *Journal of Marketing, 61*, 85-98.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome.* Canada: Lexington Books.

Özdemir, Y. (2005). "The Relation between Career Stages and Organizational Citizenship Disposition: Sakarya University I.I.B.F. Sample." Unpublished master thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Özen, J. (2000). "Organizational citizenship behavior: A research on applicability of different scales." *Paper presented at the VIII. National Administrative and Organizational Convention*, Nevşehir, Turkey.

Paterson, J. M., Green, A., & Cary, J. (2002). The measurement of organizational justice in organizational change programmes: a reliability, validity and context-sensitivity assessment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 393-408.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leaders' behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*, 259–298.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leaders behavior and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*, 107–142.

Roch, S. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organizational justice in an exchange framework: clarifying organizational justice distinctions. *Journal of Management, 32* (2), 299-322.

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: a review, proposed model, and research agenda. *Human Relations, 44*, 735–759.

Sheppard, B. H., Lewick, R. J., & Minton, J. W. (1992). *Organizational justice: the search for fairness in the workplace.* New York: Lexington Books.

Skarlicki, D., & Latham, G. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior with a labour union: a test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 161–169.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653–663.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: what is the relationship?. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 195-207.

Tarkan, G., & Tepeci, M. (2006). A Research on the Effects of Organizational Justice and Managerial Centralization on Employee Theft: Mersin University Students' Perceptions at the School of Tourism Management and Hotel Administration. *Anatolia: Tourism Research Journal, 17* (2), 137–152.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationship among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 97-105.

Wasti, S. A. (2001). The Concept of Organizational Justice and an Analysis of Reliability and Validity of a Translated Scale in Turkish. *Administrative Research Journal, 1*, 33–50.

Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations, 46*, 1431-1440.

Williams, L. J. (1988). "Affective and Non-Affective Components of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitments as Determinants of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors". Unpublished PhD thesis, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Yaylacı, A. F. (2004). "Public Basic Education School Teachers and Managers Organization Citizenship Behaviors". Unpublished PhD thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

Yıldırım, F. (2002). "Relation in Organizational Commitment and Organizational Justice Within Working Life." Unpublished PhD thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

Yıldırım, F. (2003). "The relation between organizational justice in working life, organization-based self-esteem and certain personal and organizational variables and job satisfaction." *Paper presented at the National Social Sciences Convention*, Ankara, Turkey.

Yılmaz, G. (2004). "The Effect of Perception of Organizational Justice about Human Resources Applications on Employees' Behaviors and Attitudes." Unpublished PhD thesis, İstanbul University, İstanbul.

Yürür, S. (2005). "A Research to Analyze the Relations between Reward Systems and Organizational justice." Unpublished PhD thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa.