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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between organizational justice, integrity and organizational citizenship behavior. The study was conducted in Gaziantep, Turkey with 252 participants who are teachers and managers at different schools. Three different scales with high reliability and validity were used to measure the relationship by employing hierarchical regression analyses. ModeGraph-I was used to make a further analysis of the data. The analysis showed that organizational justice has a moderating effect on the relationship between integrity and organizational citizenship behavior (p< .001). Managers and educators should give importance to organizational justice to have more efficient organizations and better output.
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Introduction

School leaders have been trying to motivate teachers for a long time, which is a major and challenging issue because of the uncertainty of achieving this result. Output, quantity, quality, and commitment beyond the traditional role-related behaviors can be regarded as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Organizational citizenship behaviors are defined as behaviors not rewarded formally by organizations (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006) and it is very difficult task for school leaders to make their teachers display OCB. That is because in doing so, employees have no expectations with respect to a formal reward system, which encourages OCB and results in high efficiency and output. Extra-role behaviors encourage the efficiency, which is needed for organizations (Organ et al., 2006).

Indeed, voluntary adaptable behaviors rooting from informal relations are expected more than those from an organization-controlled environment (Smith, Carroll & Ashford, 1995). Barnard (1968, 1938) mentioned an informal cooperative system as a facilitator of a formal system. Later, Katz (1964) and Katz and Kahn (1966) wrote the initial articles about the issue. Katz (1964) wrote that “an organization which depends solely upon its blueprints for prescribed behavior is a fragile social system” (Katz, 1964, p. 132).

Greenberg (1987) mentioned the organizational justice (OJ) with regard to how an employee judges the behavior of an organization and an employee’s resulting attitude and behavior. Justice is an idea that is morally right according to the culture, religion or law of a nation or an organization (Ozfidan & Ugurlu, 2015). Teachers react to what happens at their school, and fairness is crucial for organizations because perceptions of injustice can affect job attitudes. Justice may include fair pay and equal opportunities for promotion. Barsky, Kaplan, and Beal (2011) noted how “emotional reactions shape judgments of fairness and how incidental emotional experiences and ambient moods influence the occurrence and appraisal of justice events in the workplace” (p. 1). Distributive justice is fairness related to the decision outcomes. Procedural justice is the fairness of the procedures leading to outcomes, which are the same or equal. When employees realize that they have a role in a process requiring ethics or accuracy, their procedural justice is enhanced (Leventhal, 1980). Interactional justice is that which an individual receives as they make decisions, and they can receive promotions by explaining their decisions (Bies, & Moag, 1986). Bond, Leung and Wan (1982) analyzed reward collection, and they realized that collectivist and individual cultures have different understandings of equality and justice. Mostly in Western countries, an employee’s race or ethnicity or sex is of no importance in terms of compensation, which means a fair wage should be given to the employee without regard to those attributes.

Some allege that integrity is word-action consistency and congruence between an actor’s values and the values of observers judging that action (Tomlinson,
This term dates back to the 1300’s and is derived from the word integer in Latin, which means wholeness. Integrity was originally termed as trustworthiness and honesty (Yukl, & Van Fleet, 1992). Simons (2002) described behavioral integrity as the perceived pattern of alignment between an actor’s words and his/her deeds. A system’s depth can function as an important factor in identifying integrity because of their congruence. That system can evolve in time as it changes the meaning of integrity if people resolve discrepancies between words and deeds.

Organizations have always wanted to manage the actions of employees. They want their employees to perform the tasks given to them and to show OCB. Counterproductive behaviors, which like the use of drugs, drinking alcohol at work, and theft are undesirable for employees (Rotundo, & Sackett, 2002). Most of the time these situations are unobservable, but they do exit (Hulras, Uggen, & McMorris, 2000). The absence of integrity inherent in absenteeism or sabotage can be seen in between 33% to 75 % of all employees (Harper, 1990).

Few studies about integrity exist for Turkey, but it is known that counterproductive behaviors are quite widespread in the United States and other countries, which can cost billions of dollars annually (Arbak, Ozer & Karagonlar, 2004; Gruys, 1999). Indeed, according to the Camara and Schneider (1994) counterproductive behaviors cost 200 million dollars annually in the United States. Therefore integrity, honesty, is the critical trait needed by individuals. Employee trustworthiness and integrity constitute major traits rated highly by employers (Dunn, Mount, Barrick, & Ones, 1995).

A scientific way to assess integrity is crucial as deviant acts are signs of lack of integrity, which might lead to harm done to an organization and their desire to show OCB might possibly decrease. Demir, Kapukaya, and Ozfidan (2015) studied organizational deviance in Turkish universities and found that deviance can found in terms of insulted or can be targeted to employees in unfair behaviors, gossiping and lying. Some researchers have studied the relationship between counter work behaviors and OCB (Hunt, 1996; Spector & Fox, 2002). A lack of integrity and OCB can be seen as opposite ends of the same continuum. If OCB is positive and lacks integrity, then OCB is negative. Kelloway, Loughkin, Barling, and Nault (2002) realized that a negative association existed between OCB and a lack of integrity. Lee and Allen’s (2002) study confirmed the previous results. To measure integrity, scales are mainly used in Western countries unlike Turkish companies. Rather Turkish companies tend to observe and test their employees.

In this study integrity, OCB and Organizational Justice were studied by taking OJ as a moderator. The relationship between Integrity and OCB was posited to be affected by OJ as a moderator in that the more justice that exists in educational institutions, the more OCB can be observed. The relationships are shown in Figure 1.
Methodology

The research model is a correlational model as it aims to analyze the relationship among integrity, OCB and OJ.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between organizational justice, integrity and organizational citizenship behavior. Some studies have analyzed the relationship between OJ and OCB; however, few studies have examined the relationship among the variables. To address this issue, this study conducted a detailed examination of OJ as moderator on the relationship between integrity and OCB.

Participants

Participants in this study were 250 teachers working at different schools in Gaziantep, Turkey. The participants were chosen with convenience sampling among the population of teachers in Gaziantep in the 2015-2016 academic years.
Measures

In this research integrity, OCB and OJ scales were employed. The integrity scale, which was developed by Bilgic, Bilmaz, Esgin and Sahin (2011) has a .78 Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient. The scale has lying, manipulating and insincerity sub dimensions. Final scores of the participants were reversed so that the more points they received, the more honest they were. The OJ scale which was adopted by Ozmen, Arnak and Ozeri (2007) from Colquitt (2001) has three sub dimensions of distributive, procedural, interpersonal justice and their alpha coefficient were found to be .94, .86 and .88 respectively. The OCB scale which was adopted from Podsakoff et al. (1990) by Univar (2006) has .76 for altruism, .53 for courtesy, and .69 for sportsmanship.

Procedure

Missing values, outliers, normality, multicollinearity checks were performed before data was analyzed in SPSS 20 for Mac by employing hierarchical multiple linear regression model. In the model OCB was a dependent variable whereas integrity and OJ were regarded as independent variables.

A moderator variable specifies when or under what conditions a predictor variable influences a dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). A moderator variable may either reduce or enhance the direction of the relationship between a predictor variable and a dependent variable, or it may even change the direction of the relationship between the two variables from positive to negative or vice versa (Lindley & Walker, 1993). In Figure 1, variables were reflected as Y, K and M. In step one, the effect of centered scores of the Y predictor and the K predictor were analyzed. Next, the F moderator variable was added to the model. Finally, the multiplication of Y and F scores was added so that the effect of this addition can be seen. Baron and Kenny (1986) stated that if the interaction of variables is found to be significant, then a moderation effect is seen. To make some other analysis, ModeGraph-I by Jose (2008) was used to produce slope values and moderation graphs.

Results

As can be seen from Table 1, female teachers comprised slightly more of the sample than male teachers. More than half of the teachers were between 31 and 40 years old. Secondary schools comprised the majority of the school types. Teachers between 1-10 years of seniority were almost half of the sample. Other branch teachers were more than form teachers.
Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary level</th>
<th>Deep sea</th>
<th>Coral reef</th>
<th>Coast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical density</td>
<td>33.25%</td>
<td>35.73%</td>
<td>36.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word frequency</td>
<td>84.68%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>83.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic level</th>
<th>T-unit length</th>
<th>14.28</th>
<th>13.24</th>
<th>13.54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential cohesion</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse level</th>
<th>Casual cohesion</th>
<th>0.585</th>
<th>0.258</th>
<th>0.364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech of rate (wpm)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Table 2, among all variables the lying sub dimension had the highest mean with 4.47 of 5. This means teachers have more tendencies to lying in schools. What is interesting is that deceiving had the lowest mean of 3.00. Teachers’ perceptions about integrity are that they may lie often but not deceive others as much as they lie. However, as the S.D is 1.07, which is more than other factors, teachers’ answers vary in this sub dimension more than any other dimension. The mean, standard deviation and the standard error of mean of the variables are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation and standard error of mean of the variables in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_lying</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_decieving</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_insincerity</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Justice General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ_Distributive</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ_Transactional</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ_interacational</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Citizenship General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC_Alturism</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV_Sportmanship</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV_Courtesy</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of the hierarchical multiple linear analyses about the moderation effect of OJ on the relationship between integrity and OC are explained below in Table 2. First, the independent variable of integrity level \(z\) scores significantly predicts OC. In the next step, OJ scores were added to the model, which resulted in the significant prediction of integrity and OJ. In the last step, the moderator, which is multiplication of \(z\) scores of integrity and OC, was added to the model. As a
result of this step, the moderator (integrity and OC) significantly predicted OJ. This also means that there is a significant curve of teachers whose OC scores are different in the relationship between integrity and OJ.

*Table 3* shows the interaction of integrity (z-values D) and OJ (Z-values of OJ) has a moderator effect on OCB. One unit of interaction causes an increase on .299 unit of OCB. (β = .299; p<.000). Explained total variance was .257 meaning that 25.7% of OCB is explained by the interaction. In educational institutions, teachers who have high integrity and organizational justice will have higher OCB ($\Delta R^2 = .257; p<.001$). See *Table 3*.

*Table 3*: Regression analysis showing the moderation effect of OJ on the relationship between integrity and OC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender_dummy</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender_dummy</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zscore (Integrity General)</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender_dummy</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zscore (Integrity General)</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zscore (OJ General)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81
Notes: ΔR² = .257*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. OJ: Organizational Justice

Data were then inserted into the Mod Graph- I program to visualize the results in the regression model. According to the graph drawn in Figure 2, the more the integrity score of teachers increases on horizontal axis, the larger the OC scores in the vertical axis.

As it is seen with pink line, the more organizational justice occurs the more integrity predicts OJ in educational institutions. Therefore, it is crucial that more importance be given to Organizational Justice in educational institutions so that teachers have more integrity and OCB.

Figure 2: The Graph of moderation effect of teachers’ OJ scores on the relationship between integrity and OC
Some researchers have worked on integrity and job performance like Klehe and Latham (2003) and found a positive relationship between them. Flint, Halley and McNally (2012) found a relationship between OJ and OCB. Sozer (2004) concluded that very few companies use an integrity test to recruit staff. Karapinar (2005) found similar results when she scrutinized integrity, turnover intentions, absenteeism and OJ. Hackman and Oldham (1980) mentioned the importance of job satisfaction; however, they did not add organizational commitment to this model though it is a crucial element in organizational behavior. According to Bateman and Organ, organizational commitment was found to be a predictor of OCB.

From the point of view of culture and its dimensions, Turkey is quite collectivistic and has a relationship orientation (Hofstede, 1980; Ozfidan, Burlbaw, & Aydin, 2018), and power distance and uncertainty avoidance can be added to the Turkish culture as well. This collectivist culture determines the relationship between employer and employee. Employers would like to see their company as a father and that their father take cares of their problems. Rather than merit, loyalty is expected most of the time. So, these thoughts may persuade employees to display that OCBs. OCBs are linked with commitment and satisfaction in Turkish educational institutions. Loyalty, and helping are constituents of OCB. Thus, collectivist culture nurtures OCBs through satisfaction and commitment in this study.

Considering the amount of unemployment in Turkey, OCBs can be seen as a must for the Turkish workforce. There is no other option for the employees as they do not want to be unemployed. So, courtesy and working without complaining can be seen easily in the Turkish context as is seen in the study. Organizational justice is a crucial determinant of OCB (Moorman, 1991). OJ predicts OCB more than job satisfaction. Though not known properly, trust plays an important role and a mediating variable (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). In this current study justice had a moderating effect on OCB. The results indicate that employees who think their actions are regarded legitimate are more likely to engage in OCB. This finding is similar to Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch’s (1994) study in which OJ and OCB are consistently related.
Conclusion

Integrity of teachers has a positive effect on OCB. A teacher whose integrity is high will tend to show OCB. The integrity of teachers predicts the OCB of teachers significantly. The moderating effect of OJ on the relationship between integrity and OCB was shown in the regression analysis. Therefore, it is clear that OJ has a moderating effect on the relationship between those two variables.

Practical Implications

This study found a solid predictive effect of OJ on OCB; thus, institutions having high OJ and integrity will have more benefits than others which have not. Their outputs will certainly be more than any other institutions.

Recommendations

To improve school effectiveness and efficiency, pre-service and in-service training should be given about OJ, OCB and integrity. There might be other factors, which moderate the integrity and OCB other than OJ, for example job satisfaction and burn out. Education institutions and ministries should encourage organizational justice in any educational institution. In future studies, rather than teachers who have experience at school, some teacher candidates can be used as participants so that they can get more reliable integrity and OJ scores as experienced teachers may inflate their ratings on the different scales. Samples from other cities and countries would add depth to this kind of study. Lastly, qualitative studies can be blended with quantitative studies.
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