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Abstract

In this paper, the significance of the relationship between implementation of procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior in the Hamrahe Aval Company will be evaluated. With the help of past research and evaluation of the background of the topic, the model and hypothesis proposed with be studied and survey will be used for collection of information and deriving the main hypothesis which evaluates the significance of the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. For evaluating the topic, questionnaire was used where based on the Niehoff and Moorman organizational justice questionnaire and combination and revision of the questions and making them endemic, necessary items for evaluation were designed and cases evaluated were prepared. The questionnaire validity was confirmed due to using items from previous studies and opinion of experienced professors and thus confidence was gained in the questionnaire. For testing the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach’s alpha method was used. After evaluation and analysis of responses with the help of SPSS software and obtaining needed correlations, results were discussed where organizational justice had meaningful influence on organizational citizenship behavior and this effect was the largest and each component of organizational justice had a two way correlation with the other components.
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Introduction

This paper initially defines some key words such as justice and next generalizes them to various levels particularly in organizations. The first definitions of justice go back to Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. One of the most important questions of Socrates was about the nature of justice. After him, his pupil Plato in the book of Republic, named a discussion “Justice” which is the first and oldest descriptive discussion about it in ancient political philosophy (Marami, 1999: 15). Plato in the book of Republic sought to answer the question that why a knowledgeable person such as Socrates the scientist was sentenced to death in the time’s society of Greece. His motivation was analysis and explanation of justice in Athens and what the concept of justice is (Kazemi, 2000: 26).

Lexically, justice is equivalent to order and mannerism and in philosophy it has been defined as anything being in its place. The equivalent term for justice in French and English is justice and in Latin is justitia (Akhavan Kazemi, 2003: 27). In Persian “dad” is equivalent to justice and “justness” and “just behavior” is equivalent to justice. A judge is also equivalent to a just person (Parsiman Dictionary). The discussion of justice in the meaning of proportionality as opposed to unproportionality refers to overall and sum of the universal system (Parsiman Dictionary). Yet, discussion of justice as opposed to oppression, in the opinion of any individual and every member is different from another. In justice by its first definition «overall benevolence» is under consideration and in justice in its second definition, the issue of individual right is under consideration (Tajalye Payam, Professor Motehari, p: 408).

Theoretical Background of the Research

1- Organizational Justice

Justice is a multi-dimensional and broad concept and in various fields and branches, it has a philosophical meaning of lack of discrimination and fair observance of differences (Mardani, Heydari, 2009: 48). In another place, justice has been interpreted as (observance of rights in expression of being and lack of refraining from expression and forgiveness to all being)) (Nahjolbalagheh, Hekmat 429). Justice in organizations is defined by the three following factors all of which refer to the method of fair treatment of the organization of various strata and avoidance of discrimination:
1- Equality: payment of appropriate and fair wages and benefits as well as equal look at all employees as a member of the organization.
2- Neutrality: not taking sides in decisions related to selection and promotion.
3- Lack of discrimination: refraining from any kind of discrimination and granting right of appeal to employees namely right of re-consideration of decisions (Sadeghi, 2009).

According to research in this domain, up to now three kinds of justice are known in the work environment:

• Distributive Justice

Distributive justice refers to fairness of various occupational consequences such as income, job plan and job responsibility (Naami and Shekarshekan, 2004: 58). Distributive justice shows the individual’s perception of the level of justice in distribution and allocation of sources of rewards. This kind of organizational justice has root in the theory of equality of Adams (1965). In another
definition of distributive justice, it is considered fair distribution of organizational resources. Distributive justice determines the perception of employees regarding payment, promotion and similar consequences (Choudhary et al, 2012).

● **Procedural Justice**
This kind of justice refers to adoption of justice in organizational procedures namely regardless of the fact that the basis and content of law should be just, the process from which the law should emanate should also be just (Chiu & Chao Min, 2010). Procedural justice is related with formal decision making policies. Overall, research suggests that if organizational processes and procedures are perceived as fair, the partners will be more satisfied. Distributive justice suggests that satisfaction is one of the functions of income, but procedural justice proposes that satisfaction is one of the functions of the process of “steps for reaching a decision” (Shafei et al, 2010).
Leventhal considers six norms for correct implementation of justice in an organization which are:
1- Law of stability: is a state where allocation of procedures should be stable during time and for all.
2- Law of prevention of prejudice and mal-intent: is a state where acquisition of personal interests of decision makers in the process of allocation should be refrained from.
3- Law of correctness: refers to usefulness of information used in the process of allocation.
4- Law of ability for revision: refers to existence of opportunities for change of unfair decision.
5- Law of representativeness: is a state where needs, values and outlooks of all influenced sections should be point of attention by the process of allocation.
6- Ethical law: based on this law, the process of allocation should be compatible with moral and conscientious values. Organizational procedures show a method based upon which the organization allocates resources.

● **Interactive (Relational) Justice**
Interactive justice refers to just treatment of an occupied person in most official methods that have been ratified (Terry & Biss, 1990: 77). Research has introduced two classes of interactive justice. Information and inter individual justice where both classes significantly cover each other. Perceptions of interactive justice results from trust- promoting behaviors of supervisors such as «usability, qualification, adaptability, wisdom, fairness, benevolence, loyalty, clarity, commitment to promises, power of acceptance and general trust» (Elamin et al, 2011).

**Relationship with other organizational constituents**
In evaluation and analysis of the reason for importance of implementation of administrative justice, the objective is clearly perceivable. The major purpose of organizational justice at the level of organizational performance is reaching two definitions, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and in a panoramic and comprehensive level, it is reaching a competitive advantage and organizational sustainability. Organizational justice has direct and close correlation with job satisfaction where with increase or decrease in either of them, the other is also completely affected.
Relationship between organizational justice with job satisfaction and organizational civil behavior

Job satisfaction is an outlook about how an individual feels towards jobs overall or towards its various domains. Job satisfaction has 5 domains which are: 1- happiness with the job, 2- happiness with supervision, 3- happiness with colleagues, 4- happiness with the income and 5- happiness with promotions.

From the sum of these domains, overall job satisfaction results. Based on research in the past, it can be concluded that meaningful correlation exists between organizational justice and individual’s job satisfaction. The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction root from theories that can be placed under the title of reactionary content theories. These theories pay attention to the method of individuals’ response to unfair interventions and behaviors.

One of the consequences of organizational justice that has recently gained attention is organizational civil behavior and its various domains. Smith (1991) defines civil behavior as one which is not considered part of the official duties of employees; yet, it is desired and useful for the company such as timeliness, helping colleagues, volunteering in performing tasks, presentation of innovative suggestions for progress of work and not wasting time. Based on the theory of organizational justice, it can be predicted that employees react with respect to existence or lack of organizational justice in the work place. One of these reactions is increase or decrease in outputs. If staff sees lack of observance of justice in the organization, they become afflicted with a kind of negative tension. As a result, for decreasing this tension, they will decrease the level of their inputs and participations. In such cases, it is possible that their civil behavior decreases (Saadatitabar, Emami, 2011). In other words, if employees feel injustice cognitively, they will try to achieve justice by decreasing their inputs. Yet, frequently they select inputs that do not have direct correlation with their performance. The reason is that otherwise, it will affect their future reward. Therefore, they decrease their citizenship behavior, because these behaviors are voluntary and their decrease or omission will not bring decreased reward with it (Titrek et al, 2014). Various researches show that organizational justice among employees has direct correlation with job satisfaction, organizational commitment and commitment to job ethics (Gharaibehl et al, 2015).

2- Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The expression organizational citizenship behavior refers to supra-role activities and behaviors (behavior outside the description of the job and communicated duties) of company employees which improve its effectiveness (Jafareh & Sajadinejhad, 2015: 124).

Organizational citizenship behavior increases social capital and leads to strengthening and effectiveness of company performance (Faruk-Unal, 2013). The reason is that it is believed that these behaviors reflect beyond role in performance measurement, influences participation of staff in programs and can be an influential factor on job involvement, organizational commitment and self esteem. Many organizations face the topic of injustice and unfair distribution of achievements and demands of the organization which lead to weakness of employee spirits and
down grade of their spirit of endeavor and activity. Therefore, observance of justice is the secret to sustenance and persistence of the trend of development and advancement of the organization and its employees (Jafareh & Sajadinejhad, 2015: 124). Numerous studies in the past have tried to classify behaviors and reasons for their expression. Topics such as perception, motivation, job outlooks and etc are among cases that address the root of many of the behaviors of people in the work environment. Organ (1988) for the first time used the expression of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and considered it useful behaviors that have not been mentioned in the description of the job; yet, employees express them in helping others with their duties in a tangible way. In another definition, OCB has been defined as background performance: a broad domain of behavior that has not been clearly stated, but influences the organization’s livelihood (Gholipour & Khalili, 2013: 58). OCB are behaviors that are useful for the organization, yet, they are not considered part of main elements of the job. These behaviors frequently occur with the purpose of supporting resources; even though, they may not be directly followed by personal gains (Mendoza & Lara, 2007: 56). Organizational citizenship behavior happens in relation with the occupation. Yet, it has no correlation with the official reward system and its expression leads to increased efficiency of the enterprise (Organ, 1990). In this regard, Organ notes that organizational citizenship behavior is seen as a desired condition. The reason is that this behavior on the one hand increases existing and accessible resources and on the other hand, decreases the need for formal and costly control mechanisms (Organ, cited in Becton et al, 2008). Organizational citizenship behavior represents work activities that are relevant, voluntary and discretionary and directly and implicitly have been organized by way of formal description and the occupation and reward systems and ultimately promote efficiency and effectiveness of the organization (Gholamhosseini et al, 2010: 14). Organizational citizenship behavior is considered unofficial helps that staff can freely perform without attention to formal sanctions and rewards as an individual or refrain from doing them (Gholipour, 2014: 58). Organizational citizenship behavior has two domains, humanitarianism and general acceptance (Smith, Organ and Near, 2004). Citizenship behaviors overall have two general components: first that they are not directly capable of being strengthened (for example, there is no need that technically they be part of the job of individuals). Second that they result from special and extra ordinary endeavors that organizations expect from their staff for achieving success (Bolino & Turnley, 2002). The most prevalent useful definition of the overall structure of organizational citizenship behavior is: a group of personal behaviors that help the social and psycho-cognitive weave in which job performance should take place (Organ, 1997).

Many researchers have evaluated influential factors on citizenship behavior of individuals in various organizations. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, attrition and negative efficiency, wear down, job stress and organizational support are some of these variables that their increase or decrease leads to creation of citizenship behaviors in the organization (Firmansyah et al, 2014) (Tabatabaii et al, 2015).

Employee performance should be continuously evaluated so senior management of the organization can reevaluate enterprise planning and observance of involved variables in citizenship behavior based on this performance in various levels (Mirzaii, 2012).
3- Various Citizenship Behaviors in the Organization

Citizenship behaviors in the organization are classified into 3 domains which are:

1- Organizational information: this term describes behaviors that their necessity and desirability have been identified and have been accepted in a logical structure of order and rules. Behaviors such as respect for organizational laws, complete performance of duties and performing them with attention to enterprise resources can be mentioned.

2- Organizational loyalty: this loyalty to the organization includes loyalty to the self, other individuals in company units and sections and represents the level of devotion of employees in the path of organizational interest and support and defending it.

3- Organizational participation: this term appears with involvement in management of the organization. For example, we can mention meetings, sharing of opinions with others and awareness of current issues of the company (Hosseini et al, 2010: 15).

Evolutionary trajectory of organizational citizenship behavior variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarianism</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Manners and Kindness</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Acceptance</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Chivalry</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarianism</td>
<td>Subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior has created an evolution in the domain of enterprise behavior. This concept has definitely led companies into becoming innovative, flexible, profitable and responsible with respect to their sustenance and success. Organ (1988) has presented a multi-dimensional scale for organizational citizenship behavior. This scale consists of five dimensions which form the structure of OCB which are:

1- **Humanitarianism**: helping colleagues and staff in performing duties in irregular conditions which is a kind of voluntary help.

2- **Responsibility**: performance of duties specified in a way beyond what is expected. Examples are showing up at work on time, using time effectively, effort to follow organizational regulations even if they are not compatible with their personality and spirits.

3- **Chivalry**: emphasis on positive aspects of the organization instead of negative.

4- **Civil knowledge**: requires support of administrative operations of the organization (social participation-support-duty).

5- **Manners and respectfulness**: consultation with others before taking an action, informing before acting and exchange of information (this dimension represents the style of behavior of individuals with colleagues, supervisors and company customers). In this situation, staff endeavors to take necessary steps for prevention of occurrence of work problems of their colleagues in the organizational unit and consultation sessions between directors and staff are
Organ reminds that all five dimensions of citizenship behavior may not manifest themselves at the same time.

Research Hypotheses

● Main hypothesis
Role of organizational justice has positive effect on implementation of organizational citizenship behavior in the mobile communications company (Hamrahe Aval).

● Minor hypotheses
1- Role of distributive justice has positive effect on implementation of organizational citizenship behavior in the mobile communications company (Hamrahe Aval).
2- Role of interactive (relational) justice has positive effect on implementation of organizational citizenship behavior in the mobile communications company (Hamrahe Aval).
3- Role of procedural justice has positive effect on implementation of organizational citizenship behavior in the mobile communications company (Hamrahe Aval).

Method of Research

This paper was prepared with regards to discovering the phenomenon of meaningfulness of the relationship between implementation of procedural justice with organizational citizenship in the Hamrahe Aval Company. The method of research considering the nature of the topic was descriptive-survey such that with the help of studies and evaluation of the topic background, the presented model and hypothesis was researched and survey was used for collection of information and deduction of the main hypothesis which was meaningfulness of the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship. Methods of data collection in this research were of two kind, library investigation and field study. With regards to data collection, information related to the topic literature and research background was extruded from library investigation and for data collection for confirmation or rejection of the research hypotheses, field study was used. To evaluate the topic, questionnaire was used which was based on the Niehoff and Moorman organizational justice questionnaire (1983, this questionnaire has 20 items and analyzes 3 kinds of organizational justice with a 5-factor Likert scoring system) where items were combined and revised and made endemic so necessary questions can be designed and evaluated. The questionnaire validity was confirmed by use of items from previous studies and acquiring opinions of expert professors in this field and thus confidence was gained in the questionnaire. For evaluation of the reliability of the test, the Cronbach’s alpha method was used. After evaluation and analysis of the responses with the help of SPSS software and obtaining needed correlations, the results were discussed which showed that organizational justice has meaningful influence on organizational citizenship behavior and each of the components of organizational justice were correlated two by two with each other.

Analysis of the Results

Analysis of the data has special importance for evaluation of the accuracy and confirmation of the hypotheses for any kind of research. Now a days, in most research dependent on collected information from the topic under study, analysis of information is among the most fundamental
and important sections of the research. Raw data is analyzed using statistical techniques and after processing is placed in the view of users in the form of information.

For statistical analysis and responding to the problems formulated or decision making regarding rejection or confirmation of a hypothesis, the researcher can use various methods. Application of any of these methods is dependent on conditions that the researcher needs to consider in relation with his or her research. These methods can be divided into two classes: descriptive and inferential statistics.

For analysis of the collected data, initially at a descriptive level and using central statistical indices (such as the mean and median) and distributive statistical indices (such as standard deviation and variance), each of the variables of the research including organizational citizenship and organizational justice will be presented. Next, at the inferential level and based on statistical tests, rejection or acceptance of hypotheses will be evaluated. In analytic statistics of this research, for testing significance of correlations and evaluation of the research hypotheses, multivariable regression method has been used.

1- Descriptive findings

The following table shows the results obtained in the descriptive statistics section;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>2/64</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>3/96</td>
<td>0/453</td>
<td>0/206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/27</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>4/93</td>
<td>2/89</td>
<td>0/670</td>
<td>0/449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/75</td>
<td>1/25</td>
<td>5/00</td>
<td>2/84</td>
<td>0/807</td>
<td>0/652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/25</td>
<td>1/63</td>
<td>4/88</td>
<td>2/83</td>
<td>0/688</td>
<td>0/474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational justice</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/67</td>
<td>1/33</td>
<td>5/00</td>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>0/703</td>
<td>0/495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the findings in the above table, mean score of the index of organizational citizenship is 3/96, organizational justice 2/89 and indices of organizational justice including distributive, procedural and relational justice are 2/84, 2/83 and 3/14 respectively.

2- Evaluation of the reliability of the research indices

In this section for evaluating the reliability of the research indices, the Cronbach’s alpha method has been used. By calculation of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, we can gain confidence in the qualification of the sampling. This index has a range of zero to 1. If it is close to one, the data under consideration are appropriate for analysis and otherwise, the results of analysis for the data under consideration is not very appropriate. More precisely, if the value for the Cronbach’s alpha is less than 0/50, data will not be appropriate for factor analysis and if it is between 0/50 and
0/69, factor analysis might be performed with increased carefullness. Yet, if the value is higher than 0/70, correlation between the data is appropriate for factor analysis.

Considering the results from factor analysis using SPSS software (Table 2) with obtaining of a Cronbach’s alpha of 0/883 for the index of organizational citizenship and 0/904 for organizational justice, reliability has been confirmed.

### Table 2- Calculation of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for evaluation of reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0/883</td>
<td>Confirmation of reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0/904</td>
<td>Confirmation of reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3- Inferential statistics

In this section for evaluation of the relationship between research variables and also prioritization of influential factors, multivariable regression test and obtaining model coefficient for evaluation of level of influence of each of the components of organizational justice (predicting or independent variables) on the level of organizational citizenship behavior (criterion or dependent variable) will be used. The following tables show the results of this test.

### Table 3- Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R squared</th>
<th>Moderated squared</th>
<th>R Predicted deviation</th>
<th>standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/466</td>
<td>0/412</td>
<td>0/427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predicting variables: distributive justice, procedural justice, relational justice

### Table 4- ANOVA* analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean of squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>1/674</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0/558</td>
<td>3/054</td>
<td>0/038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>8/404</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0/183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10/078</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variabale: organizational citizenship
Predicting variables: distributive justice, procedural justice, relational justice

### Table 5- Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Non coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Constant</td>
<td>3/226</td>
<td>0/297</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/866</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>0/57</td>
<td>0/166</td>
<td>0/101</td>
<td>1/342</td>
<td>0/034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>0/338</td>
<td>0/201</td>
<td>0/512</td>
<td>1/679</td>
<td>0/020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent variable: organizational citizenship

As shown in the above table, considering the model coefficients obtained, the most influential factors on organizational citizenship are in order procedural justice, relational justice and distributive justice. Additionally, considering R squared in Table 3, 46 percent of the changes in the dependent variable (organizational citizenship) is related to the independent variable under consideration (components of organizational justice).

For a more precise evaluation, the two by two correlation between each of the components has been used in the follows using the Pearson’s correlation coefficient. Table 6 shows the results of this test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization citizenship</th>
<th>Organization justice</th>
<th>Distributive justice</th>
<th>Procedural justice</th>
<th>Relational justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization citizenship</td>
<td>Pearson correlation coefficient (r)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization justice</td>
<td>Pearson correlation coefficient (r)</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>Pearson correlation coefficient (r)</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>Pearson correlation coefficient (r)</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6- Correlation Matrix (Pearson)
7- Discussion and Conclusion

Considering the above table, it is observed that the correlation between all research variables is meaningful (p<0.05) and positive and meaningful correlation exists with organizational justice and its constituents and organizational citizenship. In other words, with increased level of organizational justice and its constituents including distributive, procedural and relational justice, the level of organizational citizenship behavior also increases. Therefore, the research hypothesis is confirmed and the opposing hypothesis is rejected with a 95% statistical confidence. The above correlation matrix also confirms presence of two by two correlation between constituents of organizational justice.

The main purpose of this research was evaluation of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Results obtained showed that three dimensions of organizational justice mentioned above have positive and meaningful effect on organizational citizenship behavior. This positive and meaningful correlation in the organization is very important. The reason is that this relationship in the organization leads to increased promotion of citizenship behavior. For evaluation of the hypothesis stating that a correlation exists between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior using the data collected from the questionnaires, it can be perceived that the variable of procedural justice has direct and meaningful correlation with the three variables of organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that correlation exists between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior is confirmed. According to the opinion of researchers, use of fair procedures by the management leads to trust in staff. The reason is that it resolves the feeling of exploitation and stimulates the trust of personnel to have mutual relationship in a positive way in the organization. In other words, just methods in decision making, communication and implementation of decisions as a value provides the platform for satisfaction of employees in the domain of incentives. The main mechanism involved in such relationship most probably is related with the emotional and cognitive nature of satisfaction and special emotional and cognitive states. Presence of criteria of procedural justice such as timely equality, kindness and manner, explanation, openness to revision and sectional awareness creates emotional states such as hopefulness and happiness in individuals. Therefore, these states create the context for sense of satisfaction from benefits.

With performance of this study, the significant role of procedural justice in realization of organizational justice and high percentage of influence on organizational citizenship behavior is completely shown. With observance of organizational justice, personnel satisfaction and desire for activities and goals and the company sustenance and growth are promoted. Additionally, correct organizational justice is implemented.
8- Suggestions

Considering the research performed, the following suggestions are made.
A) Since organizational justice is correlated with employee job satisfaction and job satisfaction is a psychological and emotional reaction towards one’s job and organization, directors should establish fairness and deservance in payments, distribution of well-fare facilities, promotion and advancement of staff, regulation and formulation of rules, procedures and decision makings and official structures.
B) From a contractual point of view, interaction between a staff member and organizational factors leads to a psychological contract between the employee and the company. The more the supervisor in this interaction pays attention to the personality needs of individuals and treats them respectively, the more this psychological contract is supported and significantly influences acquisition of and behavior of organizational citizenship. Therefore, it is suggested that directors with observance of these cases promote procedural justice and as a result organizational citizenship behavior.
C) Considering the results obtained, it is suggested that for correct establishment of procedural justice in the organization, every 6 months or a year, survey forms are distributed among personnel so the results can be implemented for improvement of performance of organizational justice which has direct influence on the performance of employees and organizational citizenship.
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