THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Influence of Informational Justice Practices on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Public Servants in Kenya

John Chegenye

Ph.D. Student (HRM), Department of Business and Procurement,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Dr. Clive Mukanzi

Senior Lecturer, Department of Business and Procurement,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Dr. Julius Miroga

Lecturer, Department of Business and Procurement,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Abstract:

This study investigated influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior of public servants in Kenya. The effect of justice perceptions on organizational outcomes has been documented by many scholars yet the theoretical mechanisms underlying those effects are less clear. Among all justice variables research on informational justice, its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour, and particularly in developing countries like Kenya is quite limited. Informational justice referred to the fairness of information provided to employees, its adequacy, quality, honest, and genuineness. This study hypothesized that when employees perceive information fairness, they display organizational citizenship behaviors; an organizational outcome that enable them to work beyond job requirements, compromise difficult and foster positive work climate which enhance efficiency and effectiveness. Such a relationship is based on the social exchange and organizational support theories which relies on the norm of reciprocity. The study adopted a cross-sectional research design based on deductive research approach and used quantitative descriptive research methods for data collection and analysis, to investigate the relationship. All public servants in Kenya were targeted but 375 respondents were selected using simple random sampling technique for the study. A piloted structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Data was analyzed using percentages, frequencies and means, and correlation and regression coefficients. The study found a positive and significant influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour and concluded that informational justice was an important factor in building organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya.

Keywords: Organizational justice, informational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Study

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is one of the most important organizational variables (Mihaela, 2016) because it supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place (Organ, 1997). According to Dalal (2005) OCB consists of an employee's ability to persist with enthusiasm, conform to organizational rules and regulations, assist other employees, and openly defend the organization's objectives. Jahingir, Akbar, and Hag (2014) concur that OCB make employees work beyond the call of duty and exceed the basic requirement of their jobs. Mohit and Santosh (2016) on the other hand argue that OCB fosters a positive climate of efficiency and effectiveness in the organization. It actually represents the characteristics of a committed and loyal employee (Romle, Mohd, & Sofian, 2016).

Organizational citizenship behaviours are needed in an organization because it is naturally related to high job performance, cost reduction, retention, and job satisfaction (Rashid, Amin, & Salleh, 2014). Since OCB is an individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal rewards system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988) they make employees ready to compromise difficulties and act under rules and regulations (Mohamed & Anisa, 2012) and they generally lubricate the social machinery and capital in an organization (Jain, 2016). Hence the need for it to be adopted and promoted by any organization that aims to scale above ordinary performance. These behaviors support the organization's social and psychological contexts that serve as the critical catalyst for task accomplishment (Arif, Tjutfu, & Eeng, 2017). Golparvar and Zahra (2012) argue that one variable that could be likened to organizational citizenship behavior is how employees look at justice practices in their organization. Organizational justice is considered as one of the political necessities of organizational behaviour (Fatimah, Amiraa, & Halim, 2011). This is because it enhances interest, loyalty, and trust of people to the organization. It also adds to

the human and social investment of the organizations as it helps explain how a worker perceives fairness, his behavioral reaction to such perceptions, and how these perceptions affect his/her and the organizational outcomes (Noruzy et al., 2011). According to Muharram-Zadeh (2012), organizational justice has the potential to create enormous benefits for organizations and employees such as engagement in OCBs.

As confirmed by Karriker and Williams (2009) widely accepted organizational justice dimensions include distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. This categorization is shared by Cropanzano, Rupp and Meghan (2016) who refers to the dimensions as the big three dimensions of organizational justice but notes that although the three-factor model continues to be widely used, and characterizes much of the work on justice and OCB, it is not the only structural approach to organizational justice concept. As such, Colquitt and Rodell (2015) have advanced an alternative four-model structure which breaks interactional justice into interpersonal and informational justice. The main reason for the introduction of the four-model structure is found in Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, and Porter (2001), and Greenberg (1993) who contemplate that almost from its introduction, the interactional justice construct has suffered from lack of clarity. Karriker and Williams (2009) the four-model structure is needed in order to make a distinction between interactional justice and procedural justice, where interactional justice should concern itself to the fairness of interpersonal communication while procedures and their enactments to procedural justice. Colquitt and Rodell (2015) confirm that this would make communication an interactional matter.

Introduced by Bies and Moag (1986), interactional justice focuses on the quality of fairness people receive in procedural treatment or when procedures are implemented (Anak, Ida, & Gusti, 2016). Interactional unfairness occurs when employees are judged unfairly and treated without respect and dignity and majorly focuses mostly on interpersonal interactions (Cropanzano & Stein, 2009). Similarly, in interactional unfairness an individual is easier to blame untimely information and inadequate explanations to the supervisors who deliberately have more control over discretionary behavior (Cheung, 2013). Therefore as interactional justice facets, interpersonal justice focuses on presence of justice in social interactions that take place between individuals and others, especially supervisors in the organizations while informational justice focuses on just information distribution in organization and how information regarding decisions is disseminated and explained to others (Golparvar & Zahra, 2012). Greenberg (1994) suggested that informational justice primarily alters reactions to procedures because explanations provide the information needed to evaluate structural aspects of processes. The basis of this study is to identify the influence of informational justice on OCB of public servants in Kenya. Jawahar and Stone (2017) acknowledges that while the effect of justice perceptions on organizational outcomes has been documented by many scholars (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Colquitt et al., 2001; and Dalal, 2005), the theoretical mechanisms underlying those effects are less clear.

According to Songür, Basım, and Şeşen (2008) in the review of literature, among all justice perception variables, procedural justice is the type of justice whose relationship with OCB has been investigated the most, followed by distributive justice, while the amount of research on interactional justice with OCB is quite limited. Therefore, the need to study informational justice as a dimension of organizational justice is necessary. Similarly, most of the earlier studies on organizational justice have focused on different industries in already developed countries. Kenya as a developing country requires focused approach to understand employees and identify policies that will help improve performance and overall organizational effectiveness to bring it at par with developed nations in the just treatment of employees. This study will fill this gap. The link between informational justice and outcomes like OCB can be explained by the fact that when higher authorities and managers keep their employees informed about organizational matters, they inspire feelings of loyalty and voluntary compliance to policies and rules in the employee (Srivastava, 2015). It is true that when employees feel that the organization communication they get is done sensitively and respectfully and that their seniors treat them with politeness and dignity they are more likely to argue that the information was given out fairly (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Informational justice reflects the fairness of the explicit explanations and a justification provided about decisions and provides not only information about the specific events, but also an explanation of the rules that govern the relationship (Jawahar & Stone, 2017).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The Kenyan public sector faces a myriad of human resource counterproductive work behaviours (Mbwiria, 2010; Karanja, 2016). These behaviours include absenteeism, frequent industrial actions, abuse of public property, corruption, bribery, patronage, lateness, and high turnover rates of productive employees (Guyo, 2015). Chegenye, Mbithi, and Musiega (2015), note these behaviours have resulted in poor service delivery in the public sector and denied Kenya's quality services. It has also resulted in economic decline which has led to stagnation in the country's growth at below 10% for the last decades (World bank, 2018). Citing inequity in the pay structure and lack of adequate and timely information that explains the disparities in pay structure, performance appraisal results and overall employees' outcomes as the major reasons, the Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (2013) points out that the global standard percentage of available productive man-hours in Kenya is at 35% against the international standard of 75%. Irrespective of the reform initiated in the public sector, especially the public service, the trend of poor performance and service delivery still manifests in the public service in Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 2016). The main purpose of this study was to establish the influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior of public servants in Kenya. Informational justice focuses on just information distribution in organization and how information regarding decisions is disseminated and explained to individuals in the organization (Golparvar & Zahra, 2012). The link between informational justice and outcomes like OCB can be explained when higher authorities and managers in an organization keep their employees informed about organizational matters (Srivastava, 2015). When employees feel that the organization communication they

get is done sensitively and respectfully and that their seniors treat them with politeness and dignity they are more likely to argument that the information was given out fairly (Cohen-Charash& Spector, 2001). Informational justice reflects the fairness of the explicit explanations and a justification provided about decisions made, and provides not only information about organizational events, but also an explanation of the rules that govern the relationship of organizational members (Jawahar& Stone, 2017).

Studies have established a link between informational justice and a variety of organizational outcomes. (Mohamed, 2014) revealed after a study on how organizational justice influenced quality performance among healthcare workers and found a positive relationship with quality performance. Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) found an equitable exchange relationship between managers and employees motivated employees to act per organizational norms that emphasized on service quality. Colquitt et al.'s (2001) study indicated that informational justice was significantly related to trust and was a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. A study by Jawahar (2007) on appraisal systems established that informational justice perceptions were significantly related to satisfaction with appraisal feedback and with the manager or supervisor. Thurston and McNall (2010) established that informational justice was positively associated with satisfaction with the supervisor which leads employees to improve their organizational outcomes. Gachunga (2010) did a study based on the influence of individual performance management processes on perceptions of organizational justice in Kenya. The study found that discussing with employee's possible means of self-improvement, their personal development needs as well as their objectives for improvement was positively associated with positive organizational behaviors. Hence informational justice is a good predictor of organizational outcomes like OCB.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to analyze the influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior of public servants in Kenya.

1.4. Hypothesis of the Study

The study hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of public servants in Kenya.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Review

Researchers have sought to understand the unique variance in OCB accounted for by different types of organizational justice (Neil, Jones, & Uggerslev, 2008). However, as Greenberg and Lind (2000) notes a clear picture of the exact nature of the relationships has not emerged. In this perspective researchers often rely on social exchange theories and consider organizations as serving as forums for economic and social exchange, with relationships characterized by exchanges of symbolic and less tangible resources (Blau, 1964) and regulated by rules of exchange, such as the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). This study adopted the social exchange theory in order to explain the relationship between informational justice and OCB of public servants in Kenya. According to Homans (1961) Social exchange refers to the exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly between at least two people. Blau (1964) views social exchange as a social behavior that may result in both economic and social outcomes which bring satisfaction when people receive fair returns for their expenditure. As espoused by Kabasakal et al. (2011), human interactions are transactions where people exchange resources in the hope of certain benefits. Notably, Coyle-Shapiro et al. (2004) consider an employment relationship as a transaction and hence a process of resource exchange governed by the norm of reciprocity and encompassing both ongoing conferment of benefits and continual rebalancing of expectations and obligations.

In a work relation, when workers think they can get a high-quality exchange relationship with the organization, they are likely to reciprocate by developing norms that promote positive behavior (Kizilos, Cummings, & Cummings, 2013) and favorable consequences to organizations (Funda, 2010). The more the employer fulfills obligations and meets expectations, the more employees feel secure and satisfied and consequently obligated to reciprocate (Coyle-Shapiro Morrow, 2006). In this argument, when the needs of individual workers are considered, they reciprocate with favorable attitudes and behavior (Gould-Williams & Davies, 2005), and the extent to which organizations manage their relationship with employees, it makes them likely to engage in OCB (Bukhari, Ali, Shazad, & Bashir, 2009). In an organizational setting, employees will feel more secure to develop confidence in their organization if they are treated fairly, and get information they need without concealment (Hong & Tang-Hua, 2014). In information justice employees always consider whether the reasons underlying a resource allocation decision are clearly, truthfully, and adequately explained to any affected parties (Jawahar & Stone, 2017). According to Colquitt (2001) subordinate trust supervisors who communicate in an informationally just manner such that the extent to which the supervisor candidly and thoroughly communicates the rationale for the processes used in making decisions and allocating resources and tailors this communication to the specific needs of the employee makes employees perceive justice.

2.2. Review on Informational Justice

Informational justice speaks to the fairness of information provided to employees about organizational procedures used in distributions of outcomes and other related to issues (Fariba, Sardar, & Mozafar, 2013). It entails not

only providing employees with adequate, good quality, honest information but also demonstrating genuineness in the intent of the information being provided (Greenberg, 1993). It refers to people's perceptions of the fairness of the information used as the basis for making a decision (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). Informational justice deals with giving explanations on why certain procedures were followed or why outcomes were distributed the way that they were (Colquitt et al., 2001). It is based on clarity on performance goals and standards setting, providing timely feedback, the clarity of expectations, and explanations of how the performance appraisal outcome will be arrived at (Thurston & McNall, 2010).

The link between informational justice and outcomes like OCB can be explained by the fact that when higher authorities and managers keep their employees informed about organizational matters, they inspire feelings of loyalty and voluntary compliance to policies and rules in the employee (Srivastava, 2015). It is true that when employees feel that the organization communication they get is done sensitively and respectfully and that their seniors treat them with politeness and dignity they are more likely to argue that the information was given out fairly (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). As put forward by Greenberg and Baron (2008), informational justice is thought to consist of factors that enhance individual perceptions of the efficacy of explanations provided by organizational agents.

Scott, Garza, Conlon, & Kim (2014) on the other hand argue that managers have a fair amount of control over informational justice because it is less constrained by the organizational system. Contentedly, adequate explanations made by managers help employees to evaluate and understand the structural aspects of procedures and allocations process (Colquitt et al., 2001). Research has shown that there is a higher level of fairness perceptions in employees when they are explained to outcomes in detail (Karanja, 2016). Informational justice plays an important role in the success of an organization because employees will perceive that organizational decisions made are based on fair information (Mutero, 2017). Studies have established a link between informational justice and a variety of organizational outcomes. Mohamed (2014), in a study on how organizational justice influenced quality performance among healthcare workers, he found a positive relationship with quality performance. Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) found an equitable exchange relationship between managers and employees motivated employees to act per organizational norms that emphasized service quality. Colquitt et al.'s (2001) study indicated that informational justice was significantly related to trust and was a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behaviours.

A study by Jawahar (2007) on appraisal systems established that informational justice perceptions were significantly related to satisfaction with appraisal feedback and with the manager or supervisor. Thurston and McNall (2010) established that informational justice was positively associated with satisfaction with the supervisor which led to improvement in employees' organizational outcomes. Gachunga (2010) did a study based on the influence of individual performance management processes and perceptions of organizational justice in Kenya. The study found that discussing with employee's possible means of self-improvement, their personal development needs as well as their objectives for improvement was positively associated with positive organizational behaviors.

2.3. Review on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Many studies have identified individual behaviors in organizations and classified them and their causes (Khaled, Moein, Yousef, & Malihi, 2015). One such behaviour is organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). According to Wei, Mian, and Hai (2012) OCB has been recognized as shaping the social and psychological context where core job responsibilities are accomplished and uniquely contributes to overall performance. Organ (1997) defined OCB as performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. OCB is critical to an effective organization since it encompasses behaviours that do not directly relate to task performance but are important to the overall performance of the organization (Bateman & Organ, 1983). OCB is a function of the employee's ability, motivation, and opportunity (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) have acknowledged that attitudes such as OCB can be influenced by supervisors through their behavior, or how they shape the working environment. Wei, Mian, and Hai (2012) held early assumptions on OCB which linked it to prosocial motives, and a desire to benefit other people (Organ, 1988). Eisenberger, Hutchinson, and Sowa (1986), concurs that it is OCB is built on the social exchange theory that attributes employees' decisions about the amount of effort they are willing to expend for their organizations to how much the organizations contribute to their well-being. Scholars therefore agree that Citizenship behaviors have been developed to explore employee characteristics that are cooperative and helpful and that provide a constructive contribution to the organization (Carter, 2010; Abuiyada & Chou, 2012).

What organizational citizenship behaviors means is doing a better job, making an effort above and beyond formal requirements and filling the gap between procedures and regulations and exerting exceptionally good behavior for the sake of the organization and informally supporting its members (Mohammed, Habib, & Alias, 2011). Described as a clear contract between an individual employee and the organization, Aval, Haddadi, and Keikha (2017) contemplate that although OCB cannot be strengthened directly, it is a special and extraordinary endeavor that organizations expect from their members to achieve success (Harper, 2015). This is because OCB is a driving behaviour that causes consolidation of the relationship between goals of employees and those of the firm, which provide avenues for achieving overall aims of the organization (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2012). The OCB model proposed by Organ (1988) show it as measured using five fundamental factors. These factors include altruism (being helpful), courtesy (being polite and courteous), conscientiousness (having attention to detail for prevention or minimizing errors), civic virtue (demonstrating interest and involvement), and sportsmanship (acceptance of changes and performing without complaining) (Mathur & Kumari, 2013). Alkahtani (2015) confirms that Organ (1988) was the first person to differentiate discretionary behaviors from other such prescribed behaviors and labeled them Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). After Organ many

researchers have worked on OCB and have kept on identifying different dimensions of OCB with over thirty dimensions being identified.

Notably, although Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Paine (2000) identified and classified these dimensions into seven: helping Behaviour, Sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development, Hosseinkhani and Giyaove (2015) have noted a huge overlap in the dimensions. Golparvar and Zahra (2012) notes that the three dimensions of OCBs identified in literature are helping behaviors, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Miao and Kim (2010) consider helping behaviours as of a worker being helpful to coworkers or other people with little interest in being rewarded for that efforts; sportsmanship as refraining from complaining about trivial matters, and civic virtue as a responsible participation in the social life of the organization such as staying up-to-date with important issues of the organization. Hosseinkhani and Giyaove (2015) agree to the classification which considers altruism and conscientiousness as useful behaviors, while sportsmanship and courtesy as components of being active in preventing damage to an organization.

Summarily, Yadav and Punia (2013) notes that although researchers have different views with respect to dimensionality of OCB; two- altruism and generalized compliance (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983); three- organizational obedience, organization commitment and organization participation (Graham, 1991); seven helping, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Paine, 2000; Oplatka, 2006), one most used taxonomies was that propounded by Organ (1988) of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. Pradhan, Lalatendu, and Kumar (2016) defines altruism a behaviour that builds the work system to be more dynamic because an employee can offer one's unutilized time for assisting colleagues on their key tasks (Bambale et al., 2011). Acts of civic virtue propels employees for providing suggestions on saving resources, cutting down the costs which may influence individual efficiency and organizational productivity (Shahin, Naftchali, & Pool, 2014). Conscientiousness breeds individual employee's compliance with company policies, enhancing reliability and maintaining consistency in one's work schedules (Bukhari et al., 2009). Sportsmanship disseminates an individual's strength from complaining about trivial matters. Williams and Anderson's (1991) evaluation of this classification later grouped altruism and courtesy as individual-directed behaviour (OCB-I) while civic virtue, Conscientiousness and sportsmanship, were grouped as organization-directed behaviour (OCB-O). Alzayed, Jauhar, and Mohaidin (2017) cite three behaviors that capture OCB as organizational obedience, organizational loyalty, and organizational participation.

Researchers have identified the importance of OCB to organizations. These include helping employees to do more than their usual job duties and provide performance that is beyond expectations through increasing co-worker productivity; helping in the coordination of activities within and across workgroups (Demir, 2015); reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions, strengthening the organizational ability to attract and retain the best employees, and increasing the stability of the organization's performance enabling it to adapt more to environmental changes (Bambale, Shamsudin, & Subramanian, 2011). Ciner, Karcioğlu, and Aliogullari (2013) reveal that OCB is necessary for the good functioning of an organization while Sergio et al. (2017) note that OCB help employees extend beyond the performance indicators in the formal job description and surpass the minimum role requirements.

2.4. Relationship between Information Justice and OCB

Organizational justice has been viewed as one of the key components that influence organizational citizenship behaviors (Ploychompoo, 2017). Establishing justice in the work environment is an effective tool that can be adopted by organizations seeking innovation, creativity and initiative (Abdallah, 2015). Informational justice, being one of the facets of organizational justice, and an aspect of interactional justice, is one such tool that can aptly fit in improving organizational output. Informational justice, interpreted as the justice which refers to whether one is truthful and provides adequate justifications when things go badly (Colquitt & Rodell, 2015). According to Moorman and Byrne (2005), to understand the relationships between justice and OCB, researchers often rely on social exchange theories. Such researchers view organizations as serving as forums for economic exchange, where there is an exchange of fulfilling in-role expectations for pay, and as forums for social exchange relationships (Blau, 1964), which tend to develop over time where two parties become increasingly trusting of, and loyal to, each other (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The social exchange mechanism explains the linkage between justice processes and OCB through the interactional activities between the employees and their supervisors (Fletcher, 2001). Employees derive their fairness perceptions of the organization (Organ, 1988), their organization's support to them in the form of feedback and their actual professional growth, all of which activate the norm of reciprocity in social exchange relationships that leads employees to repay their organizations through performing OCB (Blakely et al., 2005). OCB enable employees to have a good soldier syndrome where they have the willingness to invest effort and energy in their social environment with no expectations of formal reward (Abdasi & Rana, 2012).

Kumar, Jena, & Kumar (2016) take OCB to be critical for the success of today's organization as they inherently strive for employees to extend their discretionary behaviors beyond the expected normal duties. Therefore, organizational citizenship behavior is one of the most widely linked outcomes of Organizational Justice (Shruti & Padmakumari, 2013), which is based on the exchange relationship of social or economic resources (Ariani, 2013). Carter (2010) posits that OCB, which is a measure of contextual performance, is dependent on the social exchange theory. Being a social exchange behavior, it is viewed as give-and-take of materials and non-material goods that are based on the norm of reciprocity (Nasheena & Akhtar, 2016). OCB can therefore be supported by high-quality relationship between employees and the organization, and between subordinates and supervisors (Mushtang, Ashfaq, & Warraich, 2014). As a reciprocity behavior,

Linda and Eisenberger (2002) contemplate that the norm of reciprocity makes workers and employers relook at their differences and similarities to value each other and consider the contract between them to be like a trade-off of effort and loyalty. Chiaburu et al. (2015), note that employee-organizational relationships are based on reciprocity.

Literature associating justice practices with citizenship in organizations is wide. In a study by Moorman (1991) which investigated how justice practices were related to citizenship behavior in organizations in two management firms in the United States, the outcome of the study proved that the relationship was positive and significant. Organ and Moorman (1993) investigating Fairness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior and interested in finding out the connections between these variables using literature review noticed that there was ample evidence in support of the importance of fairness in accounting for OCB. Colquitt et al. (2001) reviewing 183 empirical studies on organizational justice found an overwhelming relationship among all justice constructs and many outcomes found in organizations that included satisfaction with one's job, commitment to the organization, evaluation of authority, OCB, a tendency to withdrawal, and overall performance. Based on the explanation of Fassina, Jones, and Uggerslev (2008), there has been more research focus on the hierarchical decision-making contexts relating to resource allocation known as the exchange perspective, and very little attention on the encounter perspective which focuses on the justice concerns raised by people in their everyday encounters in organizations not tied to allocation decisions.

Bies (2005) posit that the encounter perspective, the people's perception of the fairness of the day-to-day interpersonal treatment they experience from organizational authorities, the interactional justice, is very critical. Therefore, Petty and Krosnick (1995) argue that, events relating to interactional justice are likely experienced more frequently than events relating to other justice types and thus relative to procedural and distributive justice, interactional justice might be more impactful in general, and more predictive of OCB. Therefore the importance of informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour cannot be overemphasized. Many studies have proved the role played by informational justice as a component of interactional justice. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) in a meta-analytic study noted that whereas procedural justice predicted unique variance of 1 per cent in OCB-O and not in OCB-I, in contrast, informational justice accounted for unique variance of 1 per cent each in both OCB-O and OCB-I. Likewise, Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002) did a study on an Indian public sector organization to testing a social exchange model of work attitudes and behavior. The study hypothesized that three dimensions of justice; distributive, procedural, and interactional were related to the trust employees put in their supervisor and that this would influence work attitudes like turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, task performance and job satisfaction of employees. Using 179 supervisor- subordinate dyads who responded to a questionnaire, the study found that distributive justice correlated to turnover intentions, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior; Procedural justice correlated to Job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment, whereas Interactional justice, in terms of informational and interpersonal justice correlated to all the dimensions.

Golparvar and Zahra (2012) did a study on full time employees of a petrochemical industry in Iran using a questionnaire. The study hypothesized the existence of positive relationships between perceived organizational justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, informational and interpersonal) and OCBs. The findings of this study showed that among total sample, only interpersonal justice was positively and significantly correlated with helping behavior ($r = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$), with civic virtue ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$) and with sportsmanship ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.05$). Procedural, distributive and informational justice did not show significant correlation with OCB attributes. However, when the relationship was moderated by equity sensitivity, informational justice was found to be positively and significantly correlated with civic virtue ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.05$). The researchers noted that their results were not consistent with the findings of some previous researches on direct links between justice dimensions and OCB (Podsakoff et al, 2000; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Williams et al, 2002). The main focus of informational justice is on explanations given on why certain procedures were followed or why outcomes were distributed the way that they were (Colquitt et al., 2001).

According to Jawahar and Stone (2017) informational justice primarily helps alter reactions to procedures because when explanations are given they provide the information needed to evaluate structural aspects of the processes. Scott, Garza, Conlon, and Kim (2014) agree that managers and supervisors have a fair amount of control over informational justice. As articulated by Jawahar and Stone (2017) an individual's immediate supervisor is the source of interactional justice. Supervisors, by showing sensitivity and treating employees with respect and dignity may be able to mitigate the negative effects of an unfavourable organizational outcomes. Subordinate employees will trust supervisors who communicate to them in an informationally just manner. Colquitt (2001) supposes that employees will perceive informational justice when supervisor candidly and thoroughly communicates to them and provide adequate rationale for the processes used in making decisions, and tailoring this communication to the specific needs of each employee. As construed by Jawahar and Stone (2011), informational justice reflects the fairness of the explicit explanations and justifications provided about decisions made and provides not only information about the specific event, but also an explanation of the rules that governed those events and their relationship. Mutero (2017) concurs and posit that performance appraisals is one excellent opportunity for demonstrating informational justice.

This is because informational justice is based on clarity on setting of performance goals and standards, providing feedback in a timely manner, the clarity of expectations and explanations of how the performance appraisal outcome was reached (Thurston Jr & McNall, 2010). A study on appraisal systems established that informational justice perceptions were significantly related to satisfaction with appraisal feedback and satisfaction with the appraiser, the manager or supervisor (Jawahar, 2007). Further, as established in a study by Otto and Mamatoglu (2015) informational justice is associated with affective commitment, turnover intentions, personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion, and is a predictor of OCB. this relationship is hypothesized in the following conceptual framework.

Figure 1: Showing Conceptual Framework (Colquitt, 2001)

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopted a cross-sectional research survey design based on the quantitative research approach. The main aim of a cross-sectional survey design is to collect data at one point in time using a questionnaire and statistically analysing the data to describe trends about responses to questionnaire statements and to test the research hypotheses (Leedy&Ormrod, 2010). According to Creswell (2014), as an example of a survey research, cross-sectional survey design can be used to describe trends, to determine individual opinions about policy issues, and to help identify important beliefs and attitudes. The main advantage of a cross-sectional design is its ability to measure current attitudes or practices and provide information in a short amount of time, apart from allowing the use both qualitative and quantitative methods in data collection and analysis (Blaikeie, 2010).

The quantitative approach was adopted due to the need of collecting and using numerical data (Gill & Johnson, 2010; Namusonge, 2010). As espoused by Kothari (2014), quantitative research deals with quantities and provides an opportunity to examine relationships between variables measured numerically and analyzed using a range of statistical techniques which would enable the generation of findings to the population from a representative sample at a lower cost. Saunders (2016), quips that quantitative research is grounded in the positivism philosophy and the deductive approach. According to Mkansi and Acheampong (2012) positivism philosophy holds that collecting data about an observable reality and searching for regularities and causal relationships within variables will lead to the creation of a new theory or new generalizations. Noting that positivism perspective on nature of knowledge is objective, and that knowledge exists out there waiting to be discovered, Mutua (2020) postulates that, positivism philosophy uses objectivist ontology and realistic epistemology and is largely associated with quantitative research. Saunders et al. (2014) believes that the creation of a new theory or new generalizations is generally a deductive approach which commences with the development and testing of hypotheses using a research strategy and making true conclusions that are logically derived from a set of proven premises.

3.2. Target Population

The target population of this study comprised of all public servants in Kenya, currently totaling to 740 000 (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2019). The study population was 11671 public servants working in national government ministries spread in the counties of Kisumu, Nandi, Kakamega, and Vihiga. The study population was distributed as shown in the following table

	Ministry	Kakamega	Vihiga	Nandi	Kisumu	Total
1	Interior and Coordination	2035	805	1836	2092	6768
2	Labour and Social Protection	60	20	75	98	253
3	Information & communication	145	85	100	280	610
4	Public Service, youth & Gender	50	20	40	50	160
5	Environment and Forestry	80	30	70	70	250
6	Lands	70	20	80	120	290
7	Transport and infrastructure	230	80	160	310	780
8	MOEST	300	200	300	300	1100
9	National Treasury	120	20	80	180	500
10	Energy	250	100	220	250	820
	Total	3580	1380	2961	3750	11671

Table 1: Target Population
Source: (GHRIS, 2019)

This target population was chosen because all the employees are managed by the Public Service Commission of Kenya, the public service is the face of government and a body that helps in the provision of government services to the people (GoK, 2013), and because currently, there are many complaints about service delivery by the public servants in

Kenya such as cases of abuse of public office, nepotism in recruitment and promotion of employees, absenteeism, poor performance of, industrial actions, and loss of man-hours among other ills in the sector (Kempe, 2012).

3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

This study adopted a probability sampling technique in order to provide an equal opportunity to each item in the entire population of being picked up and given a chance of being included in the sample (Sekaran&Bougie, 2013). The importance of probability sampling is its assumption that the population elements under study are usually already grouped into sub-populations and lists of those sub-populations exist or can be created (Gujarati & Porter, 2010). A three-stage cluster sampling design was adopted because the total area under study was very big (Kothari, 2014). Clustering helped in reducing the cost by concentrating the survey in selected clusters by dividing the country into relatively smaller units, the present counties as it would be near impossible to study this population in the whole country as noted by Cochran (1977).

In the first stage of clustering, Purposive sampling with a maximum variation technique was used to select four counties in the country (Pongah, 2016). In the selection of these counties, financial, accessibility, and time constraints were taken into consideration (Guyo, 2015). Consequently, the counties were categorized based on their communities and their cultural orientations. In this case, Kakamega, Nandi, Kisumu, and Vihiga counties were selected respectively since they met the criteria for selection. These four counties constituted 10% of the acceptable minimum sample for large units (Saunders, et al., 2012). In the second stage, a self-weighted stratified sampling technique was used to categorize the public servants in their respective ministries. The self-weighted technique ensured that the number of public servants selected from each ministry would be proportionate to their total population size in that ministry and to the sample size. This was done by dividing the population of employees in each ministry by the total number of employees in all the ministries and by the sample size.

Gupta and Gupta (2009) confirm that stratified sampling is regarded as the most efficient system of sampling where all essential group members of a homogeneous section of a population are included in a given study. In addition, Cooper and Schindler (2011) say that the use of stratified sampling is because it increases a sample's statistical efficiency, provides adequate data for analyzing the various sub-populations, and enables different research methods and procedures to be used in different strata. The third multiple-stage sampling involved the use of simple random sampling technique in the selection of the final respondents to participate in the study. Simple random sampling is a more practical approach in the selection of a sample because it offers no biasedness by providing every element with an equal chance of being selected (Cooper & Schindler, 2011; Mkansi&Acheampong, 2012; Kothari, 2014). In cases where random sampling could not work, purpose sampling would apply as noted by Kothari (2014) where some participants would be selected deliberately. The use of multi-stage sampling design in the survey of public servants has been applied in many studies. Such studies include Iyoke, Onah, and Onwasigwe (2006) on the effect of socio-demographic characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards adolescent sexuality education. Guyo (2015) applied it in a study on the role of human resource management in the development of organizational citizenship behavior among public servants in Kenya. Karanja (2016) applied this technique in the study of the effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment in public secondary schools and commercial banks in Kenya. Mutero (2017) used the same technique in the study of the influence of organizational justice on employee engagement in energy solutions provider in Kenya. Table 2 illustrates how employees were selected from each ministry according to their staff establishment and the final sample size of 375 participants.

	Ministry	Kakamega	Vihiga	Nandi	Kisumu	Total	Proportion %	Sample Size
1	Interior and Coordination	2035	805	1836	2092	6768	59	221
2	Labour and Social Protection	60	20	75	98	253	2.2	8
3	Information & communication	145	85	100	280	610	5.2	20
4	Public Service, youth & Gender	50	20	40	50	160	1.4	5
5	Environment and Forestry	80	30	70	70	250	2.2	8
6	Lands	70	20	80	120	290	2.4	9
7	Transport and infrastructure	230	80	160	310	780	6.7	25
8	MOEST	300	200	300	300	1100	9.5	36
9	National Treasury	120	20	80	180	500	4.3	16
10	Energy	250	100	220	250	820	7.1	27
	Total	3580	1380	2961	3750	11671	100	375

Table 2: Sample Size Design

The study used the following formula by Kothari (2014) to calculate the sample size of 375 participants who were used to determine the influence of information justice on OCB.

$$n = \frac{z^2 p.q.N}{\sigma^2(N-1) + z^2 p.q}$$

3.4. Data Collection Instrument and Pilot Study

The main instrument used in data collection from the selected participants was a structured questionnaire. This questionnaire had both close and open-ended statements. The questionnaire was structured because all its statements were presented with the same wording and in the same order to all respondents who were expected to reply to the same set of statements using the same five-point Likert scale (Kothari, 2014). The importance of using a structured questionnaire was because of its ability to enable this study to close the responses to given themes of the variables under investigation (Mugenda&Mugenda, 2014). The questionnaire had six statements for the independent variable and nine for the dependent variable. Before data was collected the questionnaire was subjected to a pilot study in order to reduce the chances of instrumentation error and to make the questionnaire more reliable and valid. The essence of a pilot study was to improve the quality and efficiency of the main study, examine the randomization and blinding process, increase the researchers' experience with the study methods, and to provide estimates for sample size calculation (Leon, Davis, & Kraemer, 2011). According to Junyong (2017) 10% of the sample size, equivalent to thirty-six (36) participants, and as advocated by Creswell (2010) through the rule of thumb, was selected randomly from the ministry of education among primary school teachers. The results of reliability from the pilot study were as indicated on the following table 3.3.

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Informational Justice	6	.865
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	9	.912

Table 3: Results for Reliability

The results on the table shows that the instrument returned a highly acceptable score for reliability since all the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the variables were above 0.70. The overall Cronbach's Alpha was 0.838. The instrument was reviewed based on the pre-test experience. The study also found the instruments construct, which also helps in determining criterion validity, and indicates the extent to which a measurement instrument accurately represents a construct that is being measured, and that the variables chosen by a researcher to represent a hypothetical construct capture the essence of that hypothetical construct (Leon, Davis, & Kraemer, 2011) to be within acceptable range. The test for construct validity was done using exploratory factor analysis. The reason for using exploratory factor analysis was because the statements used had been selected from several other studies, modified and reset to suit the requirements of this current study (Karriker& Williams, 2009). Through this analysis the items in Likert table were reduced accordingly with four items left for informational justice and eight items for organizational citizenship behavior. This questionnaire was used in the collection of data.

3.5. Data Collection, Analysis and Presentation

This study aimed at collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was collected using the statements on the Likert table while qualitative data was collected using the open-ended statements. During data collection, all ethical requirements were adhered. The respondents were assured of their privacy and the privacy of the data collected, their free will in participation and withdrawal, and that the data collected could only be used for academic purposes only. They were also informed not to indicate their names anywhere on the questionnaire and that in giving out their responses; no response was correct or wrong. Data analysis was done using both quantitative and qualitative methods through the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). SPSS was selected because it provides more applications which can help in the analysis of very large amount of data and produce statistics which can help understand any set of data collected. The analysis using quantitative and qualitative methods was because they help generate both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics help in determining frequency of occurrence while inferential statistics help in establishing statistical relationships between variables under study (Saunders et al., 2012). The first step in data analysis involved reviewing all the questionnaires to find out their level of completion in filling. Incompletely filled questionnaires and especially those which found to be poorly filled according to the set criteria were rejected and removed from the list of all collected questionnaires. After checking for completeness, the questionnaires which were then cleaned for any errors, and properly coded (Mugenda&Mugenda, 2014). After recoding the data was fed into the computer through the SPSS version 21 software for analysis. Descriptive statistics obtained included simple summaries on means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages (Kothari, 2014) while inferential statistics included Pearson correlation coefficients, and regression coefficients from the simple and multiple linear regression analysis (Gupta, 1996). The purpose of doing correlations was to allow the study to make a prediction on how a variable deviated from the normal and establish whether the independent and dependent variables had expected associations. Through correlation, correlation coefficients (r) index could help determine the direction of the relationship between the variables under study and whether the relationship between the variables was significantly based on the set P-value of 0.05. On the other hand, regression coefficients would help to examine the weight of the independent variable against the dependent variable when dependent variable is regressed on the independent variable (Gujarati & Porter, 2010). The following regression equation was set for testing in this study:

$$Y_{OCB} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon \dots\dots\dots \text{Bivariate regression Model for objective/hypothesis 1}$$

Where:

Y_{OCB} = Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Dependent Variable)

β_0 = Constant (coefficient of intercept)

X_1 = Informational Justice (Independent Variable)

B_1 = Regression coefficient of the independent variable

ε = Error Term, which is assumed to be normally distributed

3.5.1. Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a dimensionality reduction latent variable technique which is used to describe several methods designed to analyze interrelationships within a set of variables which result in the construction of a few hypothetical ones called factors, which contain information that reduces the overall complexity of a dataset by using inherent interdependencies (Leon, Davis, & Kraemer, 2011). Factor analysis is done to summarize interrelationships in order to conceptualize a variable, determine factors underlying it, tell what measures belong together, which ones virtually measure the same thing, and how much they do so (Atkinson, Rosenfeld, & Sit, 2010). It answers the question asked by construct validity of whether the scores on a test measure what the test is supposed to be measuring via addressing whether or not the factors are correlated (Bond & Fox, 2001).

To meet the statistical and conceptual assumptions regarding the appropriateness of factor analysis, all variables included were set and measured at metric level, the sample size to variable ratio was above the recommended 5:1 threshold at 6:1, the correlation matrix for the variables was checked and found to contain substantial coefficient of the relationship of greater than 0.30 between variables, all variables had a Kaiser-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy greater than 0.50, and Bartlett's test of sphericity less than the set level of significance of 0.05 (Field 2009).

Factor analysis was done through SPSS's dimension reduction principal component analysis as the method of extraction since it is more common and usually yields results similar to common factor analysis. Since theoretical grounds for a correlation between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior do exist, the study performed factor analyses using oblique rotation models, which does permit cross-factor loadings, together with Kaiser Normalization. Furthermore, the latent root (Eigenvalue) criterion, the examination of the Scree Plot as well as an examination of the pattern matrix was used to determine the number of Factors. During an examination of the pattern matrix, the cut off value was set to 0.4, and items cross-loading over 0.4 were removed. The factor analysis was conducted iteratively, removing items that did not meet the required standard of inclusion. Numerous factor analyses were therefore performed in each variable to extract questionnaire items which were used to collect data that was used for further analysis of descriptive and inferential statistics. The following sections show the results of the factor analysis.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Introduction

The study sought to establish the influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior among public servants in Kenya. The findings on the response rate, background information of respondents, descriptive and inferential statistics will be discussed in this section.

4.2. Response Rate

This study targeted 375 respondents out of which 290 questionnaires returned were found to be suitable for analysis. This resulted in a response rate of 77% as shown in Table 4.

	Frequency	Percentage
Responded	290	77
Not respondent	85	23
Total	375	100

Table 4: Response Rate

4.3. Background Information

Background information on respondents was categorized into four categories including gender, education level, number of years they had worked, and the organization they work for. Table 5 shows the results.

Information		Frequency	Percent
Gender			
	Male	157	54
	Female	133	46
	Total	290	100
Education Level			
	O-Level	13	5
	Certificate	67	23
	Diploma	111	38
	Bachelors	75	26
	Postgraduate	24	8
	Total	290	100
County			
	Kisumu	93	32
	Nandi	74	26
	Kakamega	89	31
	Vihiga	34	11
	Total	290	100
Ministry			
	Public Service, Youth and Gender Affairs	41	14
	Energy	19	7
	Transport and Infrastructure	14	5
	Interior and Coordination of N. Government	130	44
	Labour and Social Service	10	3
	National Treasury	5	2
	Education, Science and Technology	32	11
	Information, Communication and innovations	32	11
	Environment and Forestry	2	1
	Lands	5	2
	Total	290	100
Work Experience			
	Less than 2 Years	38	13
	3-5 Years	69	24
	6-10 Years	77	27
	Over 10 Years	106	37
	Total	290	100
Job Category			
	Management	33	11
	Non-Management	257	89
	Total	290	100

Table 5: Distribution of Background Information

Table 5 shows gender distribution as 46% women while 54% were men. On education level 5% had o-level education, 23% had certificate qualification, 38% had diplomas, and 26% had bachelor degree while 8% had a postgraduate qualification. On county employed 32% worked in Kisumu County, 26% worked in Nandi County, 31% worked for Kakamega County while 11% were employees in Vihiga County. 14% worked in the public service department, 7% ministry of Energy, transport and infrastructure, 5%, 5% for interior, 2% for treasury, 14% for social service, 1% for environment and Forestry, 11% for education, 11% for ICT, 2% for lands. On work experience 13% had worked for less than 2 years, 24% between 3-5 years, 27% between 6-10 years, and 37% for over 10 years. On job category of the respondents was grouped into management and non-management management staff was represented by 11% of the total response rate while non-management were 89%.

4.4. Descriptive Findings

Descriptive analysis was done to meaningfully describe the distribution of scores using frequencies, percentages, the mean, and standard deviation to give expected summary statistics of the variables.

4.4.1. Descriptive Results for Informational Justice

The scale used to measure this variable had six rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree which were subjected to factor analysis through principal component. Before conducting factor analysis, the items Kaiser measure of sampling adequacy (KMO-MSA) and the Bartlett's test sphericity was done to determine their factor loading in order to identify and retain variables with a high statistical significant influence and which could explain most of the information on procedural justice. The following table shows the results for the KMO and Bartlett's test performed before conducting principal component analysis.

	KMO	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	.911	202.524	28	.000
Informational Justice	.806	78.461	10	.000

Table 6

These result shows that the items used to measure informational justice had a KMO value higher than the recommended value of 0.50 and a significant chi-square value for Bartlett's test of sphericity at the given degree of freedom. The KMO value of 0.806 and the Bartlett's test value of 78.461 at 10df indicate that the items were fit for testing using principal component analysis.

The results for component matrix rotation are shown in Table 7.

	Initial	Extraction	Component Loading	Decision
my supervisor gives adequate explanations on decisions	1.000	.404	Low communality	Removed
My supervisor explains implication of feedback given to me	1.000	.644	.778	Retained
My supervisor offers job instructions that make sense to me.	1.000	.576	.773	Retained
My supervisor explains clearly information on my performance	1.000	.740	.844	Retained
Supervisor allows me to challenge some of decision they make	1.000	.559	.815	Retained
My manager gives me honest feedback about my performance	1.000	.658	.823	Retained

Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix

As shown on the table, five items were found suitable for use for data collection because they loaded on the same factor with coefficients greater than 0.4 and therefore were retained. One item as shown was removed for not satisfying the set criterion. This variable was measured using five items. The five items yielded the results for total variance explained as shown in Table 8.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.258	65.151	65.151	3.258	65.151	65.151
2	.662	13.236	78.386			
3	.509	10.178	88.564			
4	.300	6.008	94.571			
5	.271	5.429	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 8: Total Variance Explained

Based on eigenvalues greater than 1, the four items extracted one component which explained a cumulative value of 65.151% of the total variance in this variable. The variance explained was considered high and adequate for data collection as it is above the recommended variance explained of 0.50. After collecting data, the descriptive results obtained were as shown in Table 9.

Statement	SD		D		N		A		SA		M	SD
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
My supervisor explains implication of feedback given to me	40	14	100	35	81	28	49	17	18	6	2.66	1.077
My Supervisor offers job instructions that make sense to me	54	19	110	38	57	20	52	18	17	6	2.54	1.056
My supervisor explains clearly information on my job performance	38	13	104	36	81	28	49	17	18	6	2.67	1.094
My manager provides honest explanations on my job performance	35	12	98	34	77	27	55	19	25	9	2.78	1.146
Average		18		43		18		15		6		

Table 9: Descriptive Results for Informational Justice

Table 9 shows the responses. For example, on the statement that 'my supervisor gives me clear job instructions,' 49% disagreed, 28% were neutral, while 23% agreed with a mean of 2.66 and standard deviation of 1.077. On the statement, 'my Supervisor provides adequate and timely feedback on my job performance,' 57% disagreed, 20% were neutral, while 24% agreed with a mean of 2.54 and a standard deviation of 1.056. On the statement, 'My supervisor provides adequate explanations on my job performance,' 49% disagreed, 28% were neutral, while 23% agreed with a mean of 2.67 and a standard deviation of 1.094. On the statement 'My Supervisor provides honest explanations about my job performance', 46% disagreed, 27% were neutral while 28% agreed with a mean of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 1.146. On average 79% disagreed with statements on informational justice practices while 21% agreed.

These results show that information sharing in the public service is very low. Most employees do not get adequate information on their performance and neither is the information on employee performance valued by those in management despite the fact that information is a vital tool for employee evaluation and in enhancing their performance. Most employees seem not to be provided with adequate information and instructions on the performance of their duties as supervisors may not be providing the necessary assistance required by employees in the performance of their duties, which may even be harder for new employees who forced are then forced to find out for themselves about what their jobs entail.

4.4.2. Descriptive Results for Organizational Citizenship Behavior

This study sought to examine organizational citizenship behavior among public servants in Kenya. Organizational citizenship behavior was conceptualized using nine statements. These statements were tested to determine their KMO measure of sampling adequacy, the Bartlett's test, and their factor loading in order to identify and retain variables with a high statistical significant influence and which could explain most of the information on OCB. Table 10 shows the results for the KMO and Bartlett's test.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.911
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	202.524
	df	28
	Sig.	.000

Table 10: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Table 10 shows that the items had a KMO value higher than the recommended value of 0.50 and a significant chi-square value for Bartlett's test of sphericity at the given degree of freedom. The results for component rotation matrix analysis were as in Table 10. From the table eight items found suitable and retained for further analysis and for data collection.

	Initial	Extraction	Component Loading	Decision
I always obey rules even when not supervised.	1.000	.805	.898	Retained
I voluntarily attend non-mandatory meetings important for organization's image.	1.000	.796	.885	Retained
I always consider impact of my actions on coworkers.	1.000	.699	.815	Retained
I take fewer days off work and mostly give advance notice if unable to attend.	1.000	.687	.821	Retained
I share out useful information and make innovative suggestions to improve their organization.	1.000	.795	.858	Retained
I spend great deal of time in personal telephone conversations during work hours	1.000	.939	Loading differently	Removed
I willingly help others who have been absent or have heavy workloads.	1.000	.587	.730	Retained
I am punctual at work and mostly remain in on duty	1.000	.675	.810	Retained
It takes initiative to help new employees even when it's not my duty	1.000	.723	.840	Retained

Table 11: Rotated Component Matrix

The eight statements were further analysis to determine the total variance they could explain for the variable. The results are shown in Table 12.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.559	69.484	69.484	5.559	69.484	69.484
2	.579	7.243	76.726			
3	.533	6.660	83.387			
4	.364	4.547	87.933			
5	.345	4.312	92.245			
6	.302	3.775	96.020			
7	.182	2.278	98.298			
8	.136	1.702	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 12: Total Variance Explained

Based on eigenvalues greater than 1, the eight items extracted one component which explained a cumulative value of 69.484% of the total variance in this variable. The total variance explained by the statements was considered high and adequate for data collection as it was above the recommended variance explained of 0.50. After collecting data, descriptive results for the variable are as shown in Table 40.

Statement	SD		D		N		A		SA		M	SD
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
I always obey rules even when not being supervised	54	19	102	35	72	25	32	11	15	5	2.49	1.107
I voluntary attend important but not mandatory organizational meetings	61	21	112	39	58	20	46	16	13	5	2.50	1.076
I am always mindful of the impact of my behavior on others	76	26	103	36	51	17	43	15	17	6	2.32	1.021
I always take fewer days off duty and give notice when absent	66	23	104	36	71	25	37	13	12	4	2.43	1.061
I always share useful information which benefit organization	72	25	104	36	72	25	32	11	10	3	2.57	1.054
I willingly help others who have been absent or have heavy workloads	27	9	64	22	76	27	88	31	35	12	3.16	1.154
I am punctual at work and mostly remain in on duty	35	12	71	25	59	21	88	31	37	13	3.09	1.230
It takes initiative to help new employees even when it's not my duty	17	6	71	25	58	20	100	35	41	14	3.27	1.156
Average		23		36		22		12		5	2.39	1.13

Table 13: Descriptive Results for Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Responses to the statements are as indicated. For example, on the statement that 'I always obey rules even when no one is watching me,' 54% disagreed, 25% were neutral while 16% agreed with a mean of 2.49 and a standard deviation of 1.107. On the statement, 'I always attend important but not mandatory organizational meetings, 60% disagreed, and 20% were neutral while 20% agreed with a mean of 2.50 and a standard deviation of 1.076. On the statement, 'I am always mindful of the effect of my behavior on other members in the organization, 62% disagreed, and 17% were neutral while 21% agreed with a mean of 2.32 and a standard deviation of 1.021. On the statement, 'I always take fewer days off duty and give notice when I am expected to be absent', 59% disagreed, 25% were neutral while 17% agreed with a mean of 2.43 and a standard deviation of 1.061. On the statement, 'I always share useful information which benefit and help improve the organization with other employees,' 61% disagreed, 25% were neutral while 13% agreed with a mean of 2.57 and a standard deviation of 1.054. On average 83% disagreed with statements on organizational citizenship behavior while 17% agreed. This shows that the majority of the respondents who participated in this study do not display citizenship behaviors and therefore they cannot engage in any extra-role behaviors which can benefit the public service and therefore improve its performance.

From these results, it appears that most public servants go to their workplaces to perform their normal duties and cannot engage in any work which can benefit or help improve the public serviceability to provide services to service seekers.

4.5. Inferential Statistical Findings

Correlation and regression analysis are some of the inferential tests used in research analysis. Inferential statistics are a set of methods used in research to make generalizations, estimation, prediction, or decisions. Statistical inference is the process of concluding data that are subject to random variation such as observational errors or sampling variation (Upton, 2008). Statistical inference is used to describe systems of procedures that can be used to conclude datasets arising from systems affected by random variation, such as observational errors, random sampling, or random experimentation

(Freedman, 2008). Correlation refers to a broad class of statistical relationships involving dependence (Creswell, 2010) where the correlation ratio can be used to detect almost any functional dependency (Gujarati & Porter, 2010). Although the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient indicates the strength of a linear relationship between two variables, it does not completely characterize their relationship (Mahdavi, 2013).

Regression analysis is usually carried out to examine the strength of predictive variables against the dependent variable (Kothari, 2014). In regression, the coefficient of determination R-squared is normally used to check how well the model used in a study fits the data collected and to measure how well the regression line represents the data. In regression analysis, if the regression line passes exactly through every point on the scatter plot, it would be able to explain all of the variations in a variable, while when the line is far away from the points it means that the points cannot explain variations in that variable (Shields & Rangarjan, 2013). The coefficient of determination is useful as it gives the proportion of variance of one variable that is predictable from another variable and it will be used as the main statistic to determine the relationships.

4.5.1. Correlation Analysis

Table 46 shows the correlation results for the variables. The table shows that the independent variable had a positive and significant relationship with the independent variable with $R = 0.324$, $P = 0.000$.

		Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Informational Justice
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	290	
Informational Justice	Pearson Correlation	.324**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	290	290
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Table 14: Correlation Analysis

These results mean that an increase in informational justice practice in the public service in Kenya would result in a 0.324 increase in organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya. The results confirm that information is a very important element in organizational functioning. That free flow of information among members of an organization builds good relations. Since information is important in making decisions, it should always be made available to all members of an organization, on a timely basis, it should be accurate, fairly obtained and it must be adequate in all its aspects. When information is inadequate or untrue it leads to the perceptions of injustice and cannot enhance individual perceptions of the efficacy of explanations provided by the organizational agents as just keeping employees informed is often viewed by people as a fairness issue (Bies & Moag, 1986). Workplace information exchange between decision implementers and employees has a positive effect as the organization uses the information to influence and steer desired attitudes on the job (Gichira, 2016). In an organization, people believe they are considered an important part of the organization when officials or representative takes the time to explain to them the rationale behind a decision and how the decision outcome will affect them (Bies & Moag, 1986). A study by Greenberg (1990) found that workers perceived their performance appraisals as being fairer when numerical evaluations were accompanied by written narratives explaining their ratings than when no such written explanations were given.

Hence it is not only the procedures used to determine outcomes that influence perceptions of informational justice but also the explanations for those procedures (Cohen- Charash & Spector, 2001). Bies, Shapiro, and Cummings (1988) have also confirmed that perceptions of procedural justice can be enhanced only when explanations were believed to be adequately reasoned and sincerely communicated. Since this correlation is significant at 0.324 and the p-value 0.000 is less than the set significant level of 0.05, this study rejects the null hypothesis that informational justice does not influence organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya. The importance of informational justice is in its focus on explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were applied in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain manner and the truthfulness and justification of such information when provided to employees.

4.5.2. Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is usually carried out to examine the strength of predictive variables against the dependent variable (Kothari, 2014). In this study organizational citizenship behaviour was to be regressed against distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. In regression, the coefficient of determination R squared is normally used to check how well the model used in a study fits the data collected and to measure how well the regression line represents the data such that if the regression line passes exactly through every point on the scatter plot, it would be able to explain all of the variations, and the further the line is away from the points the less it can explain (Shields & Rangarjan, 2013). The coefficient of determination is useful as it gives the proportion of variance of one variable that is predictable from another variable and it will be used as the main statistic to determine the relationships. The following bivariate regression model was set for testing in line with the objectives and hypotheses of the study.

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \varepsilon$ Model for hypothesis 1

The result from the regression test is shown in the following table.

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.324 ^a	.105	.102	.64914		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Informational Justice						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.243	1	14.243	33.801	.000 ^b
	Residual	121.358	288	.421		
	Total	135.601	289			
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Informational Justice						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.827	.118		15.444	.000
	Informational Justice	.264	.045	.324	5.814	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour						

Table 15: Regression Results for Informational Justice and OCB

Table 15: Regression Results for Informational Justice and OCB

The model summary results reveal the relationship between informational justice and OCBs had $R^2 = 0.105$. This implies that informational justice could account for 10.5% of the total variance in OCBs of public servants in and the rest, 89.5% could be accounted for by other related variables. The ANOVA results reveal $F(1, 288) = 33.801$, $P < 0.05$ (sig. = 0.000). According to the results, the computed F value, 33.801 is far high than the critical F-value and is greater than 1 meaning that the total variance in OCB explained by informational justice is large than the variance not explained since the $P = 0.000$, which is equivalent to zero for the observed F-value. This implies that informational justice has a significant influence on the OCB of public servants in Kenya. The regression coefficients show the relationship between OCB with informational justice, $B_4 = .264$ is significant with $t = 5.814$, $P = .000$. The significance of the observed t-value, which is greater than the critical value, provides further evidence that interpersonal justice is significantly related to OCBs of public servants in Kenya and gives a basis to reject the null hypothesis as a unit increase in informational justice results in 0.264 units increase in OCBs of public servants in Kenya. The constant of the relationship, which represents the average value of OCB when the informational justice value is set to zero, is 1.827. This result, therefore, means that informational justice has a positive and significant relationship with the OCBs of public servants in Kenya under the following regression equation and therefore the null hypothesis 'Informational justice does not influence organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya' is rejected.

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + e$$

Where

Y_{OCB} = Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

β_0 = constant (coefficient of intercept)

X_4 = Informational Justice

e = error

Hence

$$Y_{OCB} = 1.827 + 0.264X_4 + e$$

4.6. Discussion of the Results

The findings of this study indicate that there is a low level of information justice among public servants in Kenya. This is because majority of the participants disagreed with the statements which were used to measure this construct. From the findings it is true for this study to indicate that information sharing in the public service is very low. Most employees do not get adequate information on their performance and neither is the information on employee performance valued by those in management despite the fact that information is a vital tool for employee evaluation and in enhancing their performance. Most employees seem not to be provided with adequate information and instructions on the performance of their duties. Supervisors may not be providing the necessary assistance required by employees in the performance of their duties, which may even be harder for new employees who could be forced to source for this information out for themselves. Similarly, based on the rating of organizational citizenship behaviour, the findings indicate that majority of employees do not engage in these extra role behaviours. The findings on descriptive statistics therefore show that most public servants may only be going to their workplaces to perform the normal assigned duties and cannot

engage in any work which can benefit or help improve the public service ability to provide services to service seekers. This may be the reason for increased levels of counterproductive work behaviours like absenteeism, lateness, misuse of public properties among other vices. However, the findings from inferential statistics indicate a moderate relationship between informational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour of $R=0.324$. The correlation results show that improvement in informational justice will improve organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya. This is shown by the coefficient of determination results which show that informational justice explains a substantial and significant variance in organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya.

5. Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

5.1. Summary of Findings

The aim of this study was to find out the influence of informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior of public servants in Kenya. The study examined a target population of 11671 public servants working in the national government ministries and spread in four counties of Kakamega, Vihiga, Kisumu, and Nandi. A probability random sampling approach was used to select 376 participants out of this population. The findings of the study indicate that 77% of the participants responded to the questionnaire. This rate was well above that recommended by Babbie (2002) of 50% and found to be adequate for analysis. The results from the pilot test returned an acceptable reliability determined by Cronbach's alpha. The quantitative data collected was analyzed using SPSS version 21 software where descriptive and inferential statistics based on the objectives and hypotheses set were obtained.

The descriptive statistics obtained included frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for each statement were obtained. In inferential statistics were correlation and regression coefficients. The results of descriptive analysis revealed that majority of respondents did not agree with the statements that were set to test informational justice based on the frequencies and percentages. Likewise, the results indicated existence of a lack of consensus among the respondents based on the standard deviations from each statement used. These meant that although there was lack of agreement on the statement, these views could not have been shared by all the respondents. The descriptive results may therefore indicate that informational justice is not well practiced in the public service in Kenya. This may also mean that employees may not be getting immediate feedback on their performance, decisions made are not satisfactorily explained, and neither does the supervisor provide honest information required by employees in the performance of their functions and duties in the organization.

The findings from the inferential analysis show that informational justice had a positive correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour among public servants in Kenya based on the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. The meaning of this indicator is that when employees get adequate, timely, reliable and honest information regarding their performance, and regarding activities and programmes in the organization, they are likely to display organizational citizenship behaviour. Based on the results from regression coefficient of determination, informational justice explained a substantial number of total variations in organizational citizenship behaviour of public servants in Kenya based. Similarly, as obtained from the ANOVA results, the F-value observed was significantly different from zero at the given degrees of freedom and was greater than the critical F-value. This indicated that there was a significant relationship between informational justice and OCBs of public servants in Kenya. The beta value for the relationship between informational justice and OCB, the observed t-value for the coefficient were all significantly different from zero and greater than the critical t-value showing the important role played by informational justice on behaviour and attitude of public servants in Kenya.

As espoused by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, and Porter, (2001) informational justice is considered as one of the categories, together with interpersonal justice, of interactional justice. Informational justice refers to people's perceptions of the fairness of the information used as the basis for making a decision (Greenberg & Baron 2008). It entails not only providing employees with adequate, good quality, honest information but also demonstrating genuineness in the intent of the procedures. Informational justice deals with giving explanations on why certain procedures were followed or why outcomes were distributed the way that they were (Colquitt et al., 2001). It is based on clarity on performance goals setting and standards, providing timely feedback, clarity of expectations, and explanations of how the performance appraisal outcome will be arrived (Thurston Jr & McNall, 2010). To evaluate how informational justice is practiced in public service in Kenya, four statements were used.

5.2. Conclusion

The overall findings show that when informational justice has a synergistic link it impacts positively on OCB. Therefore, Senior Management in the Public Service should consider implementing justice practices. This is because managers have a fair amount of control over informational and adequate explanations they give to employee help them to evaluate and understand the structural aspects of procedures and allocations process (Colquitt et al., 2001). The link between informational justice and employee outcomes like OCB can be explained by the fact that when higher authorities and managers keep their employees informed about organizational matters, they tend to inspire feelings of loyalty and voluntary compliance to policies and rules in the employees (Srivastava, 2015). It is true that when employees feel that the communication they get is done sensitively and respectfully and their seniors treat them with politeness and dignity they are more likely to argue that the information given out was done fairly. Therefore, it is important and critical for managers in the public service to consider the dissemination of organizational information to employees as critical in enabling them to work extra hard and display discretionary behaviors like OCB.

5.3. Management Implication

The study justifies that when employees get adequate information about their work outcomes and have a good interpersonal relationship with their superiors and among themselves at the workplace, then it is very possible to have public servants exhibiting behaviors like OCB. The government of Kenya, other organizations, other scholars and policymakers, all stakeholders, and the international community, should pay attention to the use of the power of information to elicit employees' behaviours and attitudes towards organizational citizenship behaviour. This is because, justice, in any aspect such as informational justice, is a vital force that drives the building of a healthy organization and plays a key role in shaping attitudes such as satisfaction, commitment, and extra-role behaviors like OCB. The link between informational justice and employee outcomes like OCB can be explained by the fact that managers and supervisors should always keep their employees informed about organizational matters as this will inspire feelings of loyalty and voluntary compliance to policies and rules in the employee. When employees feel that the communication from authority figures in the organization is done sensitively and respectfully and that they are treated with politeness and dignity they are more likely to perceive the information to be fair.

Managers and supervisors have a fair amount of control over organizational information and the less this information is constrained by the organizational system the more it becomes valuable to employees and the more it becomes perceived as fair and justice by employees. Adequate explanations of organization information to employees help them to evaluate and understand the structural aspects of procedures and allocations process used in the organization. To increase organizational citizenship behaviour among employees must receive to ensure proper and adequate dissimulation of organizational information. There is a higher level of fairness perceptions in employees when outcomes are well explained to them. Informational justice plays an important role in the success of an organization because employees will perceive that organizational decisions made are based on fair information. Interpersonal justices can be taken to imply workers' perceptions of how they are fairly treated by those in authority. It includes interpersonal communication, truthfulness, respect, the propriety of questions, justification, honesty, courtesy, timely feedback, and respect for rights. Interpersonal justice is evidenced by a supervisor's respectful and polite treatment of employees. Respectful and polite treatment of employees can reduce the perception of damaged self-esteem, especially when seeking negative feedback.

5.4. Proposed Areas for Further Research

Due to research constraints given in the first chapter, this study could not exhaust all the factors that contribute to organizational citizenship behaviour. Only informational justice was studied in determining to what extent it determines Organizational Citizenship Behavior of public servants in Kenya. The study concentrated on Public servants in Kenya and specifically in four Sub-Counties of Kakamega, Vihiga, Nandi, and Kisumu. Employees of other organizations could be studied as well to determine whether the results found here can still count.

6. References

- i. Abdallah, T. (2015). The Impact of Practicing Interactional Justice on Employees Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the Jordanian Ministry of Justice. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(8), 170-181.
- ii. Abuiyada, H. S., & Chou, S. Y. (2012). A two-factor model of Organizational citizenship behaviour in organizations. *European journal of business and management*, 4(3), 134-144.
- iii. Alkahtani, A. (2015). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Rewards. *International Business Research*, 8(4), 210-222.
- iv. Alzayed, M., Jauhar, J., & Mohaidin, Z. (2017). The mediating effect of affective organizational commitment in the relationship between organization justice and organization citizenship behaviour: A conceptual model. *Asian social science*, 13 (5), 34-45.
- v. Anak, P. A., Ida, D. B., & Gusti, U. B. (2016). The Role of Perceived Organizational Support to Increase Effect of Organizational Justice Dimension on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(8-iii), 57-68.
- vi. Arif, P. P., Tjutfu, Y., & Eng, A. (2017). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in state owned banking. *Universal journal of management* 5(1), 32-38.
- vii. Aryee, S., Budhwar, S. P., & Chen, X. Z. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 267-285.
- viii. Aval, S. M., Haddadi, E., & Keikha, A. (2017). Investigating the effects of organizational citizenship behavior components on organizational Agility. *Interdisciplinary journal of education*, 1(2), 56-67.
- ix. Bambale, A. J., Shamsudin, F. M., & Subramanian, C. A. (2011). Stimulating organizational citizen behaviour; research for theory development; exploration of leadership paradigms. *International journal of academic research in business and social science*, 1(Special Issue), 10-23.
- x. Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- xi. Bies, R. J. (2005). Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct? In J. Greenberg, & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 85-112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- xii. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). International Justice: communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.

- xiii. Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- xiv. Bukhari, Z. U., Ali, U., Shazad, K., & Bashir, S. (2009). Determinants of Organizational Citizen Behaviour in Pakistan. *International Review business paper*, 5(2), 132-150.
- xv. Carter, G. (2010). *The relationship among social exchange, OCB and employee behaviour*. Pepperdine: Pepperdine University.
- xvi. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2012). *Employee engagement Factsheet*. London: CIPD.
- xvii. Cheung, M. F. (2013). The mediating role of perceived organizational support in the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 34(6), 2013, 551-572.
- xviii. Ciner, O., Karcioğlu, F., & Aliogullari, Z. D. (2013). The relationship between organizational silence and organizational citizen behaviour: A survey study in the province of Erzurum, Turkey. *Procedia-social and behavioural science*, 99(1), 314-321.
- xix. Cohen-Charash, U., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- xx. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., & Porter, C. O. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- xxi. Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2015). Measuring justice and fairness. In C. & (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of justice in work organizations* (pp. 187–202). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- xxii. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 425–445.
- xxiii. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory. An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- xxiv. Cropanzano, R., & Stein, J. H. (2009). *Organizational Justice & Behavioral Ethics: Promises & Prospects*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 19(1), 193–233.
- xxv. Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organization citizen behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- xxvi. Eisenberger, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(1), 500-507.
- xxvii. Fariba, R., Sardar, M., & Mozafar, Y. (2013). Relationship of Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment of the Staff in General Directorate of Youth and Sports in ChaharmahalVaBakhtiari Province. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(3), 696-700.
- xxviii. Fassina, N. E., Jones, D. A., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2008). Meta-analytic tests of relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behavior: testing agent-system and shared-variance models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 805-828.
- xxix. Fatimah, O., Amiraa, M. A., & Halim, W. F. (2011). The Relationships between Organizational Justice, OCB and Job Satisfaction. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities*, 19(1), 115 – 121.
- xxx. Funda, O. (2010). *Determinants of organizational citizen behaviour among knowledge workers: The role of job characteristics, job satisfaction and organizational commitment*. Middle East Technical University.
- xxxi. Gachunga, H. (2010). *Influence of Individual Performance Management Processes on Perceptions of Organizational Justice in Kenya*. Thesis. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- xxxii. Golparvar, M., & Zahra, J. (2012). The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and OCBs with Consider Moderating Role of Equity Sensitivity: Some Cultural Implications. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 4(2), 28-31.
- xxxiii. Gould-Williams, J., & Davies, F. (2005). Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practice on employee outcomes – An analysis of public sector workers. *Public Management Review*, 7(1), 1-24.
- xxxiv. Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. (2008). *Behaviors in organization*. Dorling Kindersley: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- xxxv. Greenberg, J. (1993). The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and Informational Classes of Organizational Justice. *Justice in the Workplace. Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, 1(4), 79–103.
- xxxvi. Guyo, A. G. (2015). *Role of human resources management in development of organizational citizen behaviour among civil servants in Kenya*. Nairobi: JKUAT.
- xxxvii. Harper, P. J. (2015). Exploring forms of organizational citizenship behavior: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of management and marketing research*, 18(1), 1-15.
- xxxviii. Hong, C., & Tang-Hua, J. (2014). The effects of organizational justice on organizational citizen behaviour in the Chinese context: The mediating effect of social exchange relationship. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science*, 1(S1), 48-69.
- xxxix. Hosseinkhani, M., & Giyaove, Q. (2015). Moderating Role of Perceived Justice in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Evidence from Iran). *Review of European Studies*; 7(11), 285-291.
- xl. Jahingir, N., Akbar, M. M., & Hag, M. (2014). Organizational citizen behaviour; its nature and antecedents. *BRAC University journal* 1(2), 75-85.
- xli. Jain, A. K. (2016). Volunteerism, affective commitment and citizenship behavior: A n empirical study in India. *Journal of management psychology*, 31(3), 657-671.

- xlii. Jawahar, I. M., & Stone, T. H. (2011). Fairness perceptions and satisfaction with components of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(4), 297–312.
- xlili. Jawahar, M. I. (2007). The Influence of Perceptions of Fairness on Performance Appraisal Reactions. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(4), 735–744.
- xliv. Jawahar, I., & Stone, T. H. (2017). Do career satisfaction and support mediate the effects of justice on organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour? *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 34(1), 215–228.
- xlvi. Karanja, G. W. (2016). Effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment in public secondary schools and commercial banks in Kenya. Nairobi: JKUAT.
- xlvi. Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis. (2013). A comparative study on public-private sector wage differentials in Kenya. Nairobi: KIPPRA.
- xlvi. Khaled, N., Moein, A., Yousef, A., & Maliheh, D. (2015). Organizational citizenship behaviour and Bank profitability in an Iranian bank. *Asian social science*, 11(12), 125-139.
- xlvi. Kizilos, M. K., Cummings, C., & Cummings, T. G. (2013). How high-involvement work practices increases organization performance; the role of organizational citizen behaviour. *Journal of applied behavioral science*, 49(4), 413-436.
- xlix. Mathur, S., & Kumari, P. (2013). Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Store Executives. *Human Resource Management Research*, 3(4), 124-149.
- l. Miao, R., & Kim, H. G. (2010). Perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and employee performance: A Chinese empirical study. *Journal of Service Science & Management*, 3(1), 257-264.
- li. Mihaela, M. (2016). Managers and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Scientific Bulletin*, 21(41), 14-20.
- lii. Mohamed, S. (2014). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Quality Performance among Healthcare Workers: A Pilot Study. *Scientific World Journal*, 1(1), 725-757.
- liii. Mohamed, S. M., & Anisa, H. (2012). Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizen behaviour. *The IUP journal of organizational behaviour*, 10(3), 7-25.
- liv. Mohammed, J., Habib, F. Q., & Alias, M. A. (2011). Job satisfaction and Organizational Citizen Behaviour: An Empirical study and Higher Learning Institutions. *Asia Academy of Management Journal*, 16(2), 149-165.
- lv. Mohit, Y., & Santosh, R. (2016). Role clarity and organizational citizen behaviour; Does tenure matter? A study on Indian power sector. *Global business review* 17(3s), 207-224.
- lvi. Neil, F. E., Jones, D. A., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2008). Meta-analytic tests of relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behavior: testing agent-system and shared-variance models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29 (1), 805–828.
- lvii. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- lviii. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. M.A: Lexington Books.
- lix. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- lx. Petty, R. E., & Krosnick (Eds.), J. A. (1995). *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- lxi. Ploychompoo, K. (2017). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 6(3), 116-130.
- lxii. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Paine, J. B. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(1), 28-41.
- lxiii. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Paine, J. B. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-533.
- lxiv. Pradhan, K. R., Lalatendu, J. K., & Kumar, I. G. (2016). Effects of work-life Balance on Organizational Citizen Behaviour. *Global business review*, 17(35), 155-295.
- lxv. Rashid, I. M., Amin, A. B., & Salleh, M. (2014). The role of leader-member exchange in elevating local government employee's organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical evidence from East Coast Malaysia. *international journal of business and social sciences*, 161-169.
- lxvi. Republic of Kenya. (2016). *Performance rewards and sanctions framework for public service*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- lxvii. Romle, A. R., Mohd, N. F., & Sofian, N. S. (2016). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and high-performance organization from the perspective of the students in the higher education institution in Malaysia. *Journal of scientific research and development*, 3(5), 37-42.
- lxviii. Scott, A. B., Garza, S. A., Conlon, E. D., & Kim, J. Y. (2014). Why Do Managers Act Fairly in the First Place? A Daily Investigation of Hot and Cold Motives and Discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1571–1591.
- lxix. Shahin, A., Naftchali, S. J., & Pool, J. K. (2014). Developing a model for the influence of perceived organizational climate on organizational behaviour and performance based on balanced score card. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance management*, 63(3), 290-307.

- lxx. Songür, N., Basım, N. H., &Şeşen, H. (2008). The Antecedent Role of Justice Perception in Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *TODAİE's Review of Public Administration*, 2(4), 87-111.
- lxxi. Srivastava, U. R. (2015). Multiple Dimensions of Organizational Justice and Work-Related Outcomes among Health-Care Professionals. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 5(1), 666-685.
- lxxii. Thurston, W. P., & McNall, L. (2010). Justice Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(3), 201-228.
- lxxiii. Wei, Z., Mian, Z., & Hai, L. (2012). Performance appraisal process and organizational citizenship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(7), 732-752.
- lxxiv. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management* 17(3), 601-617.
- lxxv. World bank. (2018). Public sector reforms. What works and why? Washington D.C: World Bank.
- lxxvi. Yadav, P., & Punia, B. K. (2013). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review of Antecedent, Correlates, Outcomes and Future Research Directions. *IJHPD*, 2(2), 1-19.