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ABSTRACT

Studies in the past have consistently focused on the essential role of organizational citizenship behavior and its relationship with other variables. However, most previous studies paid less attention to organizational citizenship behavior, particularly in public higher education institutions in relation to organizational justice, perceived organizational support, gender and age. Therefore, this study aims at investigating the relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) with organizational citizenship behavior and the mediating role of perceived organizational support on this relationship. In addition, the moderating role of gender and age on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior are also studied. A total of 520 non-academic employees were selected as respondents of this study using convenience sampling. Data of the study were analyzed using Smart PLS-SEM (structural equation modelling) version 3.0. The structural model results proved that all organizational justice have significant influence on organizational citizenship behavior. The result also shows that perceived organizational support has partial mediating effect on the relationships between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior, distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior and between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior. However, the hypotheses that gender and age moderate the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior were not supported. Current study contributes to the present literature by recognizing perceived organizational support as mediator of organizational justice (procedural, distributive, interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior and adding the moderation role of gender and age in one framework of study. Organizations must incorporate and encourage the practice of organizational support into their human resource practices in order to promote organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, the institutions leaders may help cultivating subordinates’ favourable perception of perceived organizational support by passing on clear messages to subordinates that organization cares about and accounted to them.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter is the introductory part of the study consisting of ten sections. The first section provides an overview which cover the content of the chapter. In section two, background of the study is presented followed by problem statement and research question in section three. The fourth section describes purpose and objective of the study. Hypotheses is presented in section five followed by significance of the study in section six. In section seven, the researcher presents scope of the study. The last two sections describe conceptual and operational definition of variables, and organization of the study respectively. Finally, this chapter is closed with summary.

1.2 Background of the Study

Organizations nowadays are confronted with unanticipated challenges. These challenges include changes in technological structure, shocks in economic trends, social changes, and structural transformation. Meeting these challenges is indispensable for survival for the organization but it has become a tough trade to do (Chen, 2010). All these challenges significantly influence the competitive position of an organization and it has become very hard to remain competitive (Singh, 2011).
One possible way to do in this unpredictable situation is to make the best of all the organizational resources. It is believed that arranging, organizing, and managing organizational resources in befitting manner enable organization to meet these challenges (Singh, 2011; Chen, 2010).

Organizational resources are divided into three main categories: financial, physical, and human resources. Although a combination of all these resources is required, yet it is a universal fact that human resource is considered to be lever of competitive advantage (Bowen and Ostroff, 2004). Podsakoff et al (2000) explained that employees provide organizations with unique human resource capabilities that can create a competitive advantage, and that organizational citizenship behavior is one type of behavior that may contribute to that advantage. In addition, organizational citizenship behavior is a mean for the improvement and utilization of human resources and for enhancing organizational viability (Benjamin, 2012).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is anything positive, encouraging and constructive that employees demonstrate at their own will, which supports colleagues and benefits the organization (Organ, 1988). It is one type of behaviors that captures the types of cooperation needed to facilitate task performance in organizations. Organ further defined organizational citizenship behavior as:

“Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p.4). This behavior includes altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Organizational citizenship behaviors improve group performance because they help people work together. Employees who help each other do not have to ask supervisors for help frequently, leaving the supervisors free to do more important tasks. Organ (1988) suggested that high levels of organizational citizenship behavior
should lead to a more efficient organization and help bring new resources into the organization. Similar statement regarding the importance of organizational citizenship behavior to organizational effectiveness and success has also been provided by Nemeth and Staw (1989) who amended that organizational citizenship behavior can be extremely valuable to organizations and can contribute to the performance and their competitive advantage. In addition, organizational citizenship behavior helps to increase satisfaction (Lee, Kim, and Kim, 2013).

In general, organizational citizenship behaviors explain the actions of employees that go above and beyond their job duties for the sake of helping others or the organization as a whole (Organ, 1988). Recently, it is indicated that these same behaviors are applicable to education sector since there has been increasing interest in research on organizational citizenship behavior in education sector reported in literature. Most studies on organizational citizenship behaviors in education that have been reviewed in the last ten years were conducted in non-western countries (Abdul Rauf, 2014; Shahdad, Siddiqui, and Zakaria, 2014; Cameron and Nadler, 2014; Ucho & Ati&z, 2013; Malek and Tie, 2012; Erkutlu, 2011). All these studies, together with a numbers of earlier studies that mostly conducted in western countries, could facilitate a better understanding on organizational citizenship behaviors. Therefore it is interesting to understand significant cross-cultural differences of organizational citizenship behaviors performed related to cultural differences. Loi and Ngo (2010) indicated that there are significant cross cultural differences about this variable performed in different cultural setting. Loi and Ngo (2010) further stated that the unique cultural and institutional features in some emerging economies may have a substantial impact on individual job attitudes and behaviors.

Due to its increased importance, it is crucial to understand the different factors that contribute significantly in forming this desirable behavior within the organization (Organ, 1988). One of the factors observed that affect employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors is their perception of justice in their workplace. Previous studies indicated that there is a significant relationship between
organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Chegini, 2009; Chahal and Mehta 2011, Zeinabadi and Salehi, 2011; Guh et al, 2013; Garg et al, 2013; Ismail, 2014; Shahzad et al, 2014; Al Afari and Elanain, 2014; Elamin and Tlaiss, 2014; Özbek, Yoldash, and Tang, 2015). It appears that when employees of an organization feel a sense of organizational justice, it increases their functional ability and show organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, it becomes clear that organizational justice perceptions have crucial effects on the display of organizational citizenship behaviors. Hence, it is believed that in organizational life employees with a positive organizational justice perception display more organizational citizenship behaviors than others.

Early studies on organizational citizenship behavior were found in western countries. However, recently there is an increasing number of researches on organizational citizenship behavior in non-western countries. For example, scholars found that interactional justice is most frequently associated with organizational citizenship behavior in Portugal (Rego and Cunha, 2010). While distributive justice was strongest predictors of organizational citizenship behavior in Nigeria (Ucho and Atime, 2013). In addition, Iqbal, Azis, and Tasawar (2012) found that procedural justice has positive and strong influence on organizational citizenship behavior in their study in Pakistan. Considering the result of the previous studies, therefore, how these components of organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) affect organizational citizenship behavior in education sector in West Sumatera, Indonesia is necessary.

Besides organizational justice, perceived organizational support has been found to be significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior. A number of prior studies provide evidences which showed significant relation between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior (Goodarzi and Taji, 2015; Nisar et al, 2014; Muhammad, 2014; Chiang and Hsieh, 2012; Chen et al, 2012; Wong, Wong, and Ngo, 2012; Jain, Giga, and Cooper, 2012; Kambu et al, 2012; Paille et al, 2010; Miao and Kim, 2010). The studies showed that positive perception of employees toward organizational support enhances the intensity of
their organizational citizenship behavior. It is consistent with earlier study conducted by Lambert (2000) which reveals that positive discretionary activities by the organization, which benefit the employee, are taken as cues that the organization cares about employees’ well-being.

With regard to the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior, previous studies showed that perceived organizational support is significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior (Goodarzi and Taji, 2015; Nisar et al, 2014; Muhammad, 2014; Chiang and Hsieh, 2012; Chen et al, 2012; Wong, Wong, and Ngo, 2012; Jain, Giga, and Cooper, 2012; Kambu et al, 2012; Paille et al, 2010; Miao and Kim, 2010). However, some scholars identified significant but only moderate or weak relation between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior (Ahmed et al, 2015; Cheung, 2013; Francis, 2012; Sulea et al, 2012). Furthermore, it was found in some other studies that there is no significant relationship between these two constructs (Cho and Treadway, 2011; Elstad et al, 2013; Snape and Redman, 2010; Wickramasinghe and Perera, 2012). This inconsistency result provides a possibility of a moderator.

Gender and age are among demographic variables that have been investigated in some studies in relation to organizational citizenship behavior. Some studies indicated significant relation between gender and organizational citizenship behavior (Tang and Ibrahim, 1998; Lev and Koslowsky, 2012; Malek and Tie, 2012) and between age and organizational citizenship behavior (Mohammad and Habib, 2010; Malek and Tie, 2012; Kuehn and Al-Busaid, 2002).

Based on the findings of previous researches discussed above, this study thus examined the influence of organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) on organizational citizenship behavior in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera, Indonesia. In addition, the mediation effect of perceived organizational support and the moderation effect of
among demographic factors namely gender and age are also investigated. Greater employee perceptions on justice are expected to correspond to a more positive perception of organizational support, leading to better organizational citizenship behavior.

1.3 Problem Statement and Research Question

Like any other organization, higher education institutions throughout the world are facing competition to meet the demand and massive pressures to perform. These pressures may be observed in different degrees and in different forms (Goodman et al, 2013). Specifically, Bikmoradi et al (2010) reveal that higher education face a number of complex challenges with three main issues. First, issue related to organization including academic governance, sustainable mission and responsibility, and problem in appointing managers. Second, issue related to managerial including management style, disharmony between authority and responsibility, and leader capability. Third, issue related to organizational culture such as government culture, centralized-power culture and low level of motivation.

Characteristics of higher education industry is also different from other non-profit organization. The difference relates to a condition which forces every higher education to compete with other higher education institutions (Marginson, 2004). This competition is necessary to keep their existence and position in customer perceptions. Marginson (2004) further noted that higher education institutions compete in creating their contribution to the society.

With the increase of competition, Chong et al (2011) suggested that in order to meet the challenges of competition, as well as to improve the global ranking and enable universities to attract more students including foreign students,
organizational citizenship behavior is critical. Therefore, the importance of organizational citizenship behavior in higher education institutions in Indonesia in relation with justice perceptions needs to be given attention in order to improve organizational citizenship behavior. However, there is a lack of study on organizational citizenship behavior in Indonesia particularly in higher education institution both private and public. According to Hofstede (1991), Indonesia is one country with high collectivity where group interest is above individual interest, thus team work would grow well in Indonesia. Characteristic of Indonesian that highly valued togetherness and helping each other, along with high rank of Indonesia in collectivism dimension, has brought a belief that Indonesian would be able to show high organizational citizenship behavior.

In Indonesia, Long Term Education Plan (referred to as the New Paradigm) has been issued in 1996 and constitutes a radical change in Indonesian higher education policy. Under the New Paradigm, major changes take place in the form that public universities are granted more financial independence. Universities are allowed, and even encouraged, to generate income from external source such as industry and research foundations. Later, directoral general of higher education issued the Higher Education Long Term Strategy (HELTS) : 2003 – 2010 with three main strategies including the enhancement of (1) nation competitiveness; (2) autonomy; and (3) organization health. Higher education institutions are not only provider of science and knowledge but also contribute to economic development and transfer of science and knowledge to the society. Therefore, government encourages higher education institutions’ role in enhancing nation’s competitiveness. In other word, the implementation of new reform and higher education long term strategy lead to increase competition among the educational institutions (Mursidi and Sundiman, 2014).

Related to the increasing competition, Chong et al (2011) suggested that in order to meet the challenges of competition, as well as to improve the global ranking and enable universities to attract more students including foreign students, organizational citizenship behavior is critical. It implies that in order to compete,
therefore, all resources included academicians and non-academic employees need to perform organizational citizenship behavior.

In higher education, more studies were found on organizational citizenship behavior for academician (i.e. Shahdad et al., 2014; Ucho & Atime, 2013; Awang and Wan Ahmad (2015). Few study on organizational citizenship behavior which focus on non-academic employees particularly in higher education. In Indonesia, the existence of ministerial regulations related to performance of academicians tend to create more spirit of competition for academicians/ lecturers. The new Indonesian higher education paradigm and the endorsement of Law No.14 Year 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, provide a number of government programs which support more on the role of academician/lecturer to perform and be professional. However, it is argued that non-academic employees of higher education institutes, both public and private, have not performed as it is expected which cause a poor ability to support mutualistic cooperation in the organization in order to improve the quality of academic performance (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia, 2014). In this study, therefore, non academic employees were considered to be investigated.

Review on earlier studies had identified various factors which contribute to organizational citizenship behavior. These studies range from organizational commitment (Lawrence et al., 2010; Khan and Rasyid, 2012; Suparjo and Darmanto, 2015), leadership (Khan and Rasyid, 2012) organizational justice (Iqbal et al., 2012; Khan and Rasyid, 2012) organizational culture (Suparjo and Darmanto, 2015; Khan and Rasyid, 2012) job satisfaction (Mohammad, Habib and Alias, 2011; Suparjo and Darmanto, 2015). In addition, research has also been conducted on the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and creative organizational climate support (Yulianti, 2014), servan t leadership (Nobari et al., 2014), organizational socialization (Salavatiet et al, 2011), self-efficacy and family supportive organizational perceptions (Paramasivam, 2015), and demographic variable (Malek and Tie, 2012).
In educational setting, prior studies have also been found on organizational citizenship behavior ranging from the location of studies and the educational institution whether in secondary or higher education institution. Studies on organizational citizenship behavior found in secondary education setting were limited. Among them are a study conducted in Sri Lanka by Abdul Rauf (2014) and by Holsblat (2014). In higher education setting, as a focus of the current study, more researches on organizational citizenship behavior have been identified. Among them was a study conducted by Shahdad et al. (2014). In their study, it was found a significant and positive link between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of faculty members in public universities in Pakistan. Similar study had been conducted in Malaysian higher education by Awang and Wan Ahmad (2015). In their study on impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior, only distributive justice and interactional justice that proved to have significant influence on organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, study in public university was also conducted by Ucho and Atime (2013). Ucho and Atimes (2013) study on distributive justice, age and organizational citizenship behavior among non-teaching staff was conducted in public university in Nigeria. Their study proved a significant relationship between distributive justice and altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue of organizational citizenship behavior but not age. They recommended that university managers and stakeholders need to pay attention to distributive justice to increase organizational citizenship behaviours of non-teaching staff. This study was relevant to the current study in terms of respondents (non-teaching staff), and state university. The difference was the object of study was just one particular public university (Benue) while in current study not only one but all public higher education institutions in West Sumatera. In addition, Ucho and Atimes (2013) study only 4 out of 5 dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior developed by Podsakoff (1990).

Despite the increasing number of researches on organizational citizenship behavior, from the period of 2005-2015 have proved that not much attention of scholars has been given to focus on the contribution of organizational justice in enhancing organizational citizenship behavior in higher education institutions in
Indonesia. Some previous studies found in other countries such as a study conducted by Aslam and Sadaqat (2011) who investigated the relationship of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among teaching staff of 5 faculties of university of Punjab and found that organizational justice significantly influence organizational citizenship behavior. In their study, they also used 3 dimensions of organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactional) and the relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. The study found that organizational justice significantly influence organizational citizenship behavior. This result was supported by study of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of faculty members of public universities in Islamabad conducted by Shahzad et al. (2014). Another study investigated distributive justice as one of dimensions of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior of non-teaching staff in public university in Nigeria (Ucho and Atime, 2013). Their study proved a significant relationship between distributive justice and altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue of organizational citizenship behavior but not age. This study relevan to the current study in terms of respondents (non-teaching staff), state university. The difference was the object of study which involved just one particular public university (Benue) while in current study not only one but all public higher education institutions in West Sumatera. In addition, Ucho and Atimes (2013) study only 4 out of 5 dimensions of ocb develop by Podsakoff (1990). Consistent results were also found conducted in higher education in Malaysia (Mohammad, Habib, and Alias, 2010; Khan and Rasyid, 2012) and other two studies were conducted in Turkey (Erkutlu, 2011; Ertu¨rk, 2007).

Despite the result of studies on the relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, there is a lack of study on the relationship of organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior in higher education institutions in Indonesia. In addition, the new Indonesian higher education paradigm and the endorsement of Law No.14 Year 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, provide a number of government programs which support more on the
role of academician /lecturer to perform and be professional. In other words, the implementation of ministerial policies on higher education administration provide more direction toward the encouragement of lecturer performance than non-academic employees in Indonesia. Due to these facts, among the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior that have been identified (organizational commitment, organizational culture, job satisfaction, leadership, organizational justice), organizational justice is more relevant to be examined as predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the study on organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior relationship become important in Indonesian higher education context.

On the other hand, it is argued that non-academic employees or administrative personnel of higher education institutions, both public and private, have not performed as expected which cause a poor ability to support mutualistic cooperation in the organization in order to improve the quality of academic performance (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia, 2014). In addition, this report showed that differences in performance was due to imbalance in empowering them through development program in which more priority has been given to academicians. Therefore, the importance of organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees in higher education institutions in Indonesia in relation with organizational justice needs to be given attention in order to improve organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, organizational justice was selected as predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the study due to fact that the implementation of ministerial policies on higher education administration provide more direction toward the encouragement of lecturer performance than non-academic employees in Indonesia. In addition, from the literature reviewed, organizational justice was found to have crucial effect on the display of organizational citizenship behavior (Iqbal et al, 2012; Khan and Rasyid, 2012).

Perceived organizational support is also a key construct in management and organizational behavior research. Perceived organizational support is a belief in the organization’s willingness to reward employees‘efforts, a belief that the
organization values their contribution and a belief that the organization is concerned about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). It becomes well recognized that perceived organizational support are highly prevalent in the workplace and have strong impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Singh et al. (2015) found that perceived organizational support significantly predicts organizational citizenship behavior. Higher level of perceived organizational support will lead to increased organizational citizenship behavior.

Former study conducted by Nisar et al (2014) found that perceived organizational support has positive and strong influence on organizational citizenship behavior. They argue that positive perception of employees toward organizational support enhances the intensity of their organizational citizenship behavior. This study supports previous empirical study which show the influence of perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behavior (Muhammad, 2014; Lilly and Virick, 2013; Jain et al, 2012; Chiang and Hsieh, 012; Kambu et al, 2012; Paille et al, 2010). Since Indonesia is considered a country with high collectivity (Hofstede, 1991) that highly valued togetherness and helping each other, while perceived organizational support show relationship and support by definition, therefore in the current study, perceived organizational support was selected as predictor of organizational citizenship behavior.

On the other hand, a number of studies showed a positive relationship of organizational justice and perceived organizational support. Guan et al. (2014) in their study at Chinese universities found that procedural and distributive justice contribute to perceived organizational support. Another study by Cheung (2013) found that both informational justice and interpersonal justice dimensions of organizational justice positively related to perceived organizational support. He further explained that employee perceive the availability of organizational aids and care as an outcome of fair interpersonal and informational treatment. In addition, Wong et.al (2012) investigated another dimension of organizational justice in relation with perceived organizational support. It is noticed that distributive justice is positively correlated with perceived organizational support. Similar result was
found by another study by Asgari et al. (2011). Asgari et al. (2011) examined procedural justice in relation with perceived organizational support which showed a positive and strong relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational support.

Considering result of previous studies which investigated the relationship between all the three organizational justice perceptions (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) on perceived organizational support and between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior, the study on mediating role of perceived organizational support on justice and organizational citizenship behavior relationship could have a contribution. Investigation on reported studies found a study with similar model conducted by Moorman et al, (2017). In their study on “does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior”, published on line, showed that procedural justice is an antecedent to perceived organizational support which in turn fully mediate its relationship to organizational citizenship behavior. However, in their study only procedural justice, as one dimension of organizational justice, was examined in the model. Current study extend prior study by Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff (2017)) by examining the mediation role of perceived organizational support on relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior.

Previous studies on perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior reported in literature showed inconsistent results of study. Some studies showed significant (strong) relation of perceived organizational support and organizational relationship behavior. This result was noticed by Singh et al. (2015), Holsblat (2014), Ratsgar et al. (2014), and Chen and Chiu (2008). However other scholars found a significant but moderate or weak relation of perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior (Ahmed et al, 2015; Cheung, 2013; Francis, 2012; Sulea et al., 2012). On the other hand, few other studies found a different result which indicate insignificant association of
these two constructs (Cho and Treadway, 2011; Elstad et al, 2013; Snape and Redman, 2010; Wickramasinghe and Perera, 2012). These findings provide an opportunity to find a moderator for the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior which have not been found in previous studies. In addition, it was recommended by previous studies to examine job characteristics, gender, age, work experience, and so on (Chang, 2014) and work experience and educational status (Goodarzii and Taji, 2015) for future studies since they were not included in the scope of discussion in their study. In the study, therefore, gender and age were examined as moderator on perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship relation.

Review of literature identified that gender and age are among two demography variables that have gain attention of scholar in their studies in relation to organizational citizenship behavior. For instance, study conducted by Rego, Ribeiro, and Cunha (2010) showed that gender correlates negatively with sportsmanship, dimension of organizational citizenship behavior, in which males showing lower scores. Similar study by Kidder (2002) provides positive evidence regarding the influence of gendered identities on self-reported performance of organizational citizenship behavior. She found that gender has a significant effect on the performance civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behavior. Male nurses are likely to report performing more gender-congruent behavior (ocb-civic virtue dimension) than female nurses. With the same logic, female engineers are likely to report performing fewer gendered-incongruent behaviors (ocb-civic virtue dimension) than male engineers.

In educational setting, a study on relation of gender and organizational citizenship behavior was conducted by Malek and Tie (2012). Their study on relationship between demographic variables and organizational citizenship behavior among community college lecturers in Malaysia showed that gender was significantly related to individual initiative dimension of the organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, Lev and kolowsky (2012) studied on gender as moderator of the On-the-job Embeddedness (ONJE)-OCB relationship. Their study
involved Teachers in Junior and Senior high school in Israel. It was found that gender influence organizational citizenship behavior. Result of this study was supported by Awang and Wan Ahmad (2015) who conduct the study which involved academic staff in Malaysian politechnic. According to this study, women are more cautious in their jobs, thus they are more likely to perform organizational citizenship behavior.

Investigation on the relationship of age and organizational citizenship behavior have been conducted by several studies. Malek and Tie (2012) study showed a significant relationship between age and organizational citizenship behavior. They found that senior or older lecturers tend to demonstrate more organizational citizenship behavior than younger lecturers. Mohammad, Habib and Zakaria (2010) in their study found that positive correlations exist among age and organizational citizenship behavior. The finding represents that as employee’s age increase, their level of citizenship behavior will increase relatively. Similarly, Kuehn and Al-Busaid (2002) have found significant relationship between age and organizational citizenship behavior. Older adults are known to conduct themselves on the basis of meeting mutual and moral obligations or internal standards while younger adults have a more transactional focus (Kuehmand Al-Busaid, 2002). Meta-analysis study on the relationship between age and job performance conducted by Ng and Feldman (2008) showed that age demonstrated a significant and positive relationship with self-rating organizational citizenship behavior. Similar result also found in a study conducted by Rego, Riberio, and Cunha (2010). They found that age correlates negatively with sportsmanship, but positively with conscientiousness. Moreover, Cohen (1993) suggested that age is an important antecedent of organizational citizenship behavior because it is considered as main indicator of side bets, a term that used to refer to accumulation of investments valued by individual which would be lost if he or she were to leave the organization.

Considering this conflicting result of relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior relationship together with the relation of gender and age with organizational citizenship behavior
relationship, it is clear that further study need to evaluate the impact of gender and age in moderating the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior relationship.

### 1.4 Research Question

Based on problem statement discussed earlier, research questions formulated in this study are:

Q1: To what extent organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) relates to organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera?  
Q2: Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationships between (procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera?  
Q3: Do gender and age moderate the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera?

### 1.5 Purpose and Objective of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of organizational organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional
justice), perceived organizational support, gender, age, and organizational citizenship behavior among non-academic employees working in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera.

Specifically, this study is aimed at:

1) Examining the relationship between organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera.

2) Examining the mediating effect of perceived organizational support on the relationships among (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera.

3) Examining the moderating effect of gender and age on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in West Sumatera.

1.6 Significance of Study

From literature review, several studies have been focused on the relationships of procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, and perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behavior. Previous study by Moorman et al (2017) examined the mediating effect of perceived organizational support on justice and organizational citizenship behavior relationship. However, Moorman et al (2017) only investigated procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior relationship with perceived organizational support as mediator. Another study by Cheung (2013) examined the role of perceived organizational support as mediator on organizational justice and
organizational citizenship behavior relationship. However, Cheung (2013) investigated only interactional justice in different category (in the form of interpersonal justice and informational justice) based on Mc Dowall and Flether (2004) while current study used interactional justice construct based on Colquit (2001). In addition, the mediation role of perceived organizational support on distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior was also included in the study. Despite organizational citizenship behavior by definition is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system (Organ, 1988), distributive justice, in some prior studies, proved to significantly influence organizational citizenship behavior (Ucho and Atime, 2013 and Awang and Wan Ahmad, 2015). Current study extend the previous study by investigating the role of perceived organizational support as mediator of each organizational justice category (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) in relation to organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the current study investigated the role of perceived organizational support as mediator of organizational justice (procedural, distributive, interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior relationships. In addition, referring to suggestions from previous study, the current study also contribute to the present literature by adding the moderation role of gender and age in one framework of study.

The finding of the study are able to contribute to the body of knowledge in the field of organizational behavior by providing organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior relationship in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera, Indonesian context which could enrich the same studies from different culture. In addition, developing a framework of the relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior which integrate perceived organizational support as mediator and both gender and age moderating the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior in one framework also provide additional contribution.
In terms of practical implications, the present study helps and assists the policy makers of education sector particularly public higher education in West Sumatera, Indonesia to highlight certain guidance which assists in developing strategies and policies to promote justice practices as well as necessary organizational support to be rendered in enhancing citizenship behavior among non-academic employees. Thus, the findings of this study provide the input on human resource practices in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera in particular and Indonesia in general. It finally adds a new approach in human resource management in terms of recruitment, compensation, as well as training and development of non-academic employees performed in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera and also Indonesia in general.

1.7 Scope of Study

This study focuses on examining of the relationship between organizational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice) and organizational citizenship behavior in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera, Indonesia. In analysis, procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice are independent variables while organizational citizenship behavior is dependent variable. In addition, the study evaluates the mediating role of perceived organizational support on relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior, distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior, and between interactional justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, perceived organizational support is mediating variable. There are two variables which play the role as moderator analyzed in the study. They are gender and age which moderate the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior.
The study focuses on individual non-academic employees of public higher education institutions in the province of West Sumatera, Indonesia as unit of analysis. Questionnaire is used as the instrument in data collection in order to achieve the objective of the study.

1.8 Conceptual and Operational Definition of Variables

This section unfolds the conceptual and operational definitions relevant to this study, which are inclusive of organizational citizenship behavior, procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice and perceive organizational support.

1.8.1. Organizational citizenship behavior

According to Organ (1988), the term organizational citizenship behavior refers to anything positive, encouraging and constructive that employees demonstrate at their own will which supports colleagues and finally benefits the organization. In general, organizational citizenship behavior refers to extra role behavior which is not included in official job descriptions, beyond the job requirements, exceeding the job expectations and exhibited voluntarily to contribute to the efficient operation of the organization (Organ, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Robbins and Judge, 2012). The typical examples of organizational citizenship behavior include showing positive attitude and offering to help colleagues, become familiar in the office, helping coworker who may be stressed with deadlines, and performing overtime without expectation of reward.

Robbins and Judge (2012) state that those employees who exhibit the behavior of a “good citizen” support their colleagues in their team, share the extra
work load voluntarily, avoid unnecessary arguments, respect both the soul of the work and written instructions and rules regarding it, and also welcome the obstacles they face during performance of their tasks.

In this particular research, organizational citizenship behavior was adapted from organizational citizenship behavior identified by Organ (1988) which had been assessed by Podsakoff and his colleagues (1990). There are five elements of organizational citizenship behavior that form a global factor of organizational citizenship behavior with twenty four indicators used in the study.

1.8.2. Perceived organizational support

Perceived organizational support refers to “the degree to which employees perceive their employer to be concerned with their well-being and to value their contribution to the organization” (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Thus, organizational systems such as pay, promotions, and job enrichment are more highly valued when employees sense that the organization has selected the programs out of genuine concern for the recipient (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Research shows that high levels of perceived organizational support can create a feeling of obligation among the employees to return their employers’ commitment by engaging in behaviors that support organizational goals. In other words, employees with high perceived organizational support were more sensitive to their manager’s expectations which subsequently enhanced their desire to use the new technology implemented by the organization.

In this study, the eight indicators used were adapted from Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) who selected and formulated perceived organizational support indicators based on the highest loading items of the Survey of Perceived
Organizational Support from 36 indicators initially developed by Eisenberger et al., (1986). These eight indicators used reflect perceived institutional support.

1.8.3 Organizational justice

There are a number of scholars who discuss organizational justice. Byrd and Cropanzano (2001) defined Organizational justice as the study of fairness at work. Another scholar explain that organizational justice pertains to members’ views of whether they are being treated fairly by the organization (Greenberg, 1987). Later Greenberg (1990) define organizational justice as a concept that indicate employees’ perceptions about the extent to which they are treated fairly in organization and how these perceptions affect organizational outcome.

Most researchers have employed three sub-constructs of organizational justice which are procedural, distributive, and interactional justice in their empirical research (Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Erdogan and Liden, 2006; Konovsky, 2000). They have consistently found the three dimensions of organizational justice to berelated, albeit differentially, to employee work-related attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001).

1.8.3.1 Procedural justice

Greenberg (1987) revealed that the term procedural justice has developed from allocation preference theory. This theory proposes a general model of allocation behavior or procedures where the application of the theory almost exclusively to procedural decision rather than its content. The processes of how employee outcomes are determined rather than what outcomes received can be seen as an underpinning of the procedural justice. In a sense, the procedure
that is used to determined employee outcomes might be more important than actual outcomes itself.

Many scholars defined procedural justice in various ways. Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of “the means” used to achieve an end (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). Another definition explained by Colquitt et al., (2005) that procedural justice implies the perceived fairness of the means and procedures used to allocate resources. These procedures generally include promotion, performance assessment, rewards and sharing other organizational opportunities (Roch & Shanok, 2006). According to Greenberg and Colquitt (2005), procedural justice criteria included following factors: voice in making decision, consistency in applying rules, accuracy in use of information, opportunity to be heard, and safeguards against bias. In addition, when managers adhere to certain rules in their decision-making processes and explain the reasons of their decisions logically, procedural justice exists (Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009).

One of the most referred measurement scales of procedural justice found in studies on organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior was Niehoff dan Moorman (1993) scale which consist of 6 indicators. Therefore, in this particular research, procedural justice is measured by six items adapted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993).

1.8.3.2 Distributive justice

Different researchers defined distributive justice in different ways. Earlier study by Alexander and Ruderman (1987) described distributive justice as the perceived fairness regarding the amounts of compensation employees receive. Colquitt et al., (2005) defined distributive justice as the perceived fairness of the allocation of resources by the organization. This view stems from equity theory in which members make judgments about whether the outcomes (e.g.,
performance ratings, pay, promotions) offered by the organization are fair given the amount of effort they have put forth (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

In addition, Greenberg and Baron (2008) revealed distributive justice as the form of organizational justice that focus on people’s beliefs that they have reached fair amount of valued work-related outcome (e.g. pay, recognition, promotion). Another researcher explain distributive justice as a degree to which rewards are allocated in an equitable manner (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005). Hence, distributive justice focuses on people’s belief about receiving fair amounts of work related outcomes and affect worker’s feelings of satisfaction with their work outcomes, such as pay and job assignment.

In this study, distributive justice is measured by five items adapted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) since their scale was used in most prior studies in relation to organizational citizenship behavior.

1.8.3.3 Interactional justice

Bies and Moag (1986) defined interactional justice as the fairness of the interpersonal treatment that one receives at the hands of an authority figure during enactment of organizational processes and distribution of outcomes. It focuses on employees’ perceptions of the interpersonal behavior exercised during the representation of decisions and procedures.

Following the work of this research, other researchers attempt to further define this dimension of organizational justice. Cropanzano et al. (2002) in their study discussed interactional justice refering to the social exchange between employees and their managers. In addition, Bies (2005) revealed interactional justice to represents an interpersonal aspect of fairness during the enactment of
Chapter 3 discusses the appropriate research method for the study. All the variables and the link created in the research framework are presented discussed. This chapter also discuss the research instruments, the sampling process and the method for data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis part of the study. The first part is the preliminary test of the data which include the normality test, validity test and reliability test. The second part of the chapter present the analysis of research findings.

Finally, chapter 5 focus on discussions, conclusion and recommendations for future research. The important findings are discussed in terms of theory and practical implications. The study limitation and recommendations for future research direction are also highlighted.

1.10 Summary

This chapter shows contribution of organizational citizenship behavior on organization in facing world-wide competition. Organizational citizenship behavior had been studied in industries and public sector as well.

In education, a number of recent studies have been conducted in non-western countries as well as western countries in earlier studies. However, in the case of Indonesia included West Sumatera, from the review of literature, there is lack of study on organizational citizenship behavior in public higher education institution and studies which put together procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, organizational justice, perceived organizational support, organizational
citizenship behavior and gender and age in one framework. Thus the effort to enhance organizational citizenship behavior can be achieved knowing that some of independent, mediator and moderator are identified. The purpose of this study is to explore the factors influencing organizational citizenship behavior of non-academic employees working in public higher education institutions in West Sumatera, Indonesia.
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