

# The Prison Journal

<http://tpj.sagepub.com/>

---

## The Association of Distributive and Procedural Justice With Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Eric G. Lambert and Nancy L. Hogan

*The Prison Journal* published online 18 June 2013

DOI: 10.1177/0032885513490491

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://tpj.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/06/10/0032885513490491>

A more recent version of this article was published on - Aug 1, 2013

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

Pennsylvania Prison Society

Additional services and information for *The Prison Journal* can be found at:

**Email Alerts:** <http://tpj.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://tpj.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

[Version of Record - Aug 1, 2013](#)

>> [OnlineFirst Version of Record - Jun 18, 2013](#)

[What is This?](#)

# The Association of Distributive and Procedural Justice With Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The Prison Journal  
XX(X) 1–22  
© 2013 SAGE Publications  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0032885513490491  
tpj.sagepub.com  


Eric G. Lambert<sup>1</sup> and Nancy L. Hogan<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

The nucleus of any correctional organization is its correctional staff. There are expected in-role behaviors and duties of the staff, but extra-role behaviors (referred to as organizational citizenship behavior) also are important for correctional organizations. However, there has been little research on correctional staff organizational citizenship behavior. Based on social exchange theory, organizational justice should be important in shaping the organizational citizenship behavior of correctional staff. Distributive and procedural justice are two salient dimensions of organizational justice. Survey data from staff at a private prison indicated that procedural justice had a significant positive relationship with organizational citizenship behavior, but distributive justice had a nonsignificant association.

## Keywords

correctional staff, organizational citizenship behavior, distributive justice, procedural justice

---

<sup>1</sup>Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

<sup>2</sup>Ferris State University, Big Rapids, MI, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Eric G. Lambert, Department of Criminal Justice, Wayne State University, 3281 Faculty Administration Building, Detroit, MI 48202, USA.

Email: dz9258@wayne.edu

Staff are the driving force of correctional institutions, typically accounting for over 70% of a facility's budget (Camp & Lambert, 2005). In this labor-intensive environment, staff are a valuable resource responsible for numerous tasks and duties to ensure a safe, secure, humane, and ultimately well-run correctional facility. While working with a population that is held against their will, correctional employees are exposed to a unique experience not found in most organizations (Brough & Williams, 2007). Thus, there is the potential that staff can have both positive and negative effects on a correctional facility, while at the same time the workplace factors can have effects on staff. Because of the uniqueness of correctional work and the fact that staff are vital for the proper functioning of a correctional facility, the past several decades have seen considerable research on the forces that affect and influence staff members. A growing body of literature has investigated correctional staff, especially the causes and effects of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. While this research has been instrumental in better understanding how workplace forces impact correctional staff, there are many other areas yet to be explored. Organizational citizenship behavior among correctional staff is one area that requires additional research.

Some workers put forth the bare minimum effort required at work and other workers are go-getters who go the extra mile at work (Turnipseed & Rassuli, 2005). Organizational citizenship behavior is extra-role behavior of going above and beyond what is expected at work. According to Blakely, Andrews, and Moorman (2005), "Organizational citizenship behaviors are job behaviors that exist outside the technical core of the job yet serve the organization by supporting the psychological and social context of work" (p. 259). Organizational citizenship behavior can help organizations by creating more pleasant and effective work environments (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). As noted by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997), organizational citizenship behavior "lubricates the social machinery of the organization" (p. 135). Organizational citizenship behavior has also been tied to higher productivity (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). In the end, organizational citizenship behavior facilitates the effectiveness and efficiency of work within an organization (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zacur, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Despite the potential benefits, little is known about how different aspects of the work environment affect organizational citizenship behavior. The current study examined the relationship between organizational fairness (employee perceptions of how fairly they are treated by the organization) and organizational citizenship. Specifically, the association of the two salient dimensions of organizational justice of distributive justice (perceptions of fairness in outcomes) and procedural justice (perceptions of fairness of the procedures to

arrive at important employee outcomes) with organizational citizenship behavior were explored among staff at a Midwestern prison.

## Literature Review

### *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Katz (1964) is generally credited for developing the concept now known as organizational citizenship behavior. He indicated that some employees would go above and beyond the call of duty to help the organization to be successful and labeled this as extra-role behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is a form of prosocial behavior. Bateman and Organ (1983) coined the term *organizational citizenship behavior*, and this is the term most frequently used in the literature and in this study. Organ (1988) saw 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” (p. 4). There are three important elements to the definition of organizational citizenship behavior. First, it is a discretionary behavior by a worker that is not required as part of the job (i.e., not role-prescribed; Kohan & Mazmanian, 2003; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004). As such, it is behavior that is a personal choice (Kohan & Mazmanian, 2003; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). The second element of organizational citizenship behavior is that it is done not to benefit directly the person but is done to support coworkers and the organization (Smith et al., 1983). The third element is that there is no guaranteed reward for engaging in organizational citizenship behavior because it is outside of the prescribed job duties (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004). Organizational citizenship behavior, therefore, is defined as workplace employee extra-role behavior that is discretionary and not explicitly rewarded, which distinguishes it from in-role expected job tasks (Marinova, Moon, & Van Dyne, 2010; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2009). This does not mean that organizational citizenship behavior is never recognized or rewarded within organizations; however, individual acts of organizational citizenship behavior are not guaranteed to be either recognized or rewarded because the behavior is above and beyond what is required in the job (Organ, 1997). Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, and Rosner (2005) pointed out that “the rewards are uncertain and the relationship is indirect” (p. 305).

Two major forms of organizational citizenship behavior are compliance and altruism (Marinova et al., 2010; Smith et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Compliance means following the rules and making sure not to waste organizational resources and time and includes avoiding excessive breaks,

returning from breaks on time, and proper use of organizational supplies (Smith et al., 1983; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) defined compliance as obedience to organizational rules. Compliance and using time efficiently are part of organizational citizenship behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 2005). The opposite of compliance is intentional behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interests of the organization, such as cutting corners, taking longer than allowed breaks, slacking off on work when not being monitored, and purposely using organizational resources in a wasteful manner (Dalal, 2005). Altruism refers to staff members volunteering to do work or help coworkers without being asked (Donavan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004; Podsakoff et al., 2000). The opposite of altruistic behavior is selfish or self-centered behavior, including not helping coworkers, not doing work unless specifically ordered to do so, and generally looking out solely for oneself (Lambert, 2010).

### *Organizational Justice*

Organizational justice refers to employee perceptions that they are treated fairly by the employing organization (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 1987a). Distributive and procedural justice are two salient dimensions of organizational justice (Clay-Warner, Reynolds, & Roman, 2005). Distributive justice deals with the perceptions by employees in terms of organizational outcomes (e.g., evaluations, pay, amount of work assigned, job assignments, shift assignments, and punishments; Greenberg, 1982; Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). The idea of distributive justice goes back to the equity theory proposed by Adams (1963). Equity theory holds that the outcomes need to be fair based on the inputs of employees and that outcomes must be consistent with what is received by others in similar situations (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). Distributive justice is based on the equity exchange principle (Lambert, 2003; Taxman & Gordon, 2009).

Procedural justice refers to employees' perceptions that the process of arriving at salient worker outcomes is fair and just (Greenberg, 1982, 1987b, 1990a; Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). Procedural justice is based on views of the fairness of the processes by which important reward and punishment decisions are made, such as evaluations, promotions, terminations, and so on (Greenberg, 1987b, 1990b). The focus of procedural justice as a powerful force took shape under the work of Lind and Tyler (1988) who reported that, many times, procedural justice was more important than distributive justice in predicting outcomes. In general, people desire processes and procedures to be reasonable, fair, consistent, and transparent (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Taxman & Gordon, 2009). While distributive justice and procedural justice

are both dimensions under the umbrella concept of organizational justice, they are distinct from one another. Distributive justice deals with the ends and procedural justice with the means (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). Sometimes the right outcome can be reached using the wrong process and, vice versa, the right process can lead to the wrong outcome (Landy, Barnes-Farrell, & Cleveland, 1980). Moreover, the research reports that the importance of procedural justice is not purely instrumental because people are interested in fair processes overall even if the processes do not directly affect outcomes or them personally (Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990; Tyler, 1990; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

### *Correctional Staff Studies*

There have been only a limited number of studies concerning organizational citizenship behavior among correctional staff. Treating organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor variable, Lambert (2010) reported it had a positive association with both job satisfaction and life satisfaction and a negative association with job burnout and turnover intent. Culliver, Sigler, and McNeely (1991) found that organizational commitment was positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior. Culliver et al. further reported that there was no significant association between organizational citizenship behavior and empathy or concern for others. Culliver et al. reported that no personal demographic characteristics were associated with organizational citizenship behavior; however, they did not specify which personal demographic characteristics were included in their study. Lambert, Hogan, and Griffin (2008) observed that organizational commitment had a significant positive relationship with organizational citizenship, while job stress had a negative association. Job involvement had a nonsignificant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. No personal characteristic (e.g., age, gender, race, educational level, etc.) had a significant association with organizational citizenship behavior. The findings reported by Culliver et al. (1991) and Lambert et al. (2008) indicated that organizational citizenship may be influenced by workplace factors. Moreover, the limited research to date points to the need to explore further how different aspects of the work environment relate to organizational citizenship of correctional staff. Distributive and procedural justice are two workplace factors that should be related to organizational citizenship behavior.

A small but growing body of research has examined the effects of distributive and procedural justice among correctional staff. Distributive justice and procedural justice have been positively linked with life satisfaction and negatively linked with job burnout and turnover among correctional staff (Lambert

et al., 2010). Procedural justice has been found to be correlated with lowered fear of being victimized at work (Taxman & Gordon, 2009). Furthermore, distributive and procedural justice have been observed to be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment and negatively related with job stress among correctional staff (Lambert, 2003; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Lambert, Hogan, & Jiang, 2008; Lambert et al., 2010; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006). This small but growing body of research indicates that distributive and procedural justice are associated with various outcomes for correctional staff. What is not known is if or how either form of organizational justice is linked with organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Research Focus**

Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2004) noted that organizational citizenship behavior does not operate in a vacuum. Rather, it operates within the overall work environment. They contended that workplace factors play a role in whether staff engage in organizational citizenship behavior or not. Social exchange is important in organizations (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008). It helps build long-term relationships. It also can explain why some employees have higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior than others. Social exchange theory states that social interactions at work influence the attitudes and behaviors of employees (Dalal, 2005). It also asserts that how people are treated results in unspoken obligations towards those who have treated them in a given manner (Blau, 1964; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). Social exchange theory is based on the concept of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960; Kamdar, McAllister, & Turban, 2006). If the treatment is positive, the employee is more likely to feel a need to reciprocate in a positive way (Walumbwa et al., 2010). Conversely, if workers feel that they are treated unfairly, then the chances increase that they will respond negatively. Organ (1990) contended that one of the driving forces for workers to engage in organizational citizenship behavior was if the organization treated them fairly. Thau, Aquino, and Bommer (2008) pointed out that under social exchange theory, the norm of “reciprocity obligates people to respond positively to favorable treatment from others and to respond negatively to unfavorable treatment” (p. 299).

Organizational justice should influence the behavior of employees. Organizational justice has been linked with higher work performance in general (i.e., higher levels of in-role behaviors; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Based on social exchange theory, employees “will direct their reciprocation efforts toward the source of any benefit they receive” (Skarlicki & Latham, 1996, p. 166). Organizational justice signifies that employees are valued and respected

(Walumbwa et al., 2010). It can also create a motivation to go above and beyond what is expected at work (Kamdar et al., 2006). When employees judge both dimensions of organizational justice as high, a positive social exchange is created, resulting in higher engagement in organizational citizenship behavior (Walumbwa et al., 2010). Staff members who feel that the outcomes and processes are fair are probably more likely to put forth efforts to help the organization. Conversely, staff members who feel that they are unjustly treated are more likely to withdraw from the organization and put forth less beneficial efforts on behalf of the organization. The following were hypothesized:

*Hypothesis 1:* Distributive justice was predicted to have a positive association with organizational citizenship behaviors among correctional staff.

*Hypothesis 2:* Procedural justice was predicted to have a positive association with organizational citizenship behaviors among correctional staff.

## Method

### *Participants*

All the available staff at a private prison were surveyed.<sup>1</sup> Of the 220 staff members, 200 were surveyed. Some of the staff were not available during the week of the survey due to sick leave, administrative leave, vacation leave, and so on. The staff represented all the positions at the prison except the administration. The survey packet contained a cover letter, the survey, a bifurcated raffle ticket, and a return envelope. The cover letter explained the nature of the study and indicated that participation was voluntary and that responses would be anonymous. Staff were given time to complete the survey during their shift and mail the survey back to the researchers in a provided stamped envelope. To increase participation, a random raffle drawing was held in which several cash awards ranging from US\$50 to US\$100 were provided to staff. Staff could participate in the raffle by returning half of the raffle ticket and the survey instrument, regardless of whether they had completed it or not. The raffle tickets were removed before any of the surveys were examined to ensure anonymity of the participants. A total of US\$500 was given away at a raffle held a month after the survey at an employee function. Any unclaimed prizes were donated to the employee organization. A total of 160 usable surveys were returned, which represented a response rate of 80%, based on the 200 staff-provided surveys. The prison was a high-security prison that was contracted by the state to house approximately 450 juvenile inmates sentenced as adult offenders. All the inmates were serving long sentences for serious crimes, particularly for violence.



Approximately 62% of the participants indicated that they were correctional officers, and about 59% reported they were men. The mean age was 35.77, with a standard deviation of 10.82, and the age of the participants ranged from 19 to 68 years. The average tenure at the prison was 20.64 months, with a standard deviation of 13.84, ranging from 1 to 53 months. As the prison had only been open for less than 5 years prior to the time of the survey, none of the staff had more than 53 months at the prison. Approximately 53% of the participants indicated that they did not have a college degree. 79% of the participants reported they were White; 11% indicated they were Black, 2% Hispanic, 3% Native American, and 4% were another race. The typical participant had been employed in the field of criminal justice for 2 years, and the number of years of experience in criminal justice ranged from 0 to 34 years. At the time of the survey, institutional records indicated that approximately 81% of all staff were White, 61% were male, and about 66% were correctional officers. Staff had an average age of 34 and an average tenure of about 19 months. The participants, therefore, appeared to be representative of the entire correctional staff population in terms of personal characteristics.

## Variables

*Dependent Variable.* The dependent variable (organizational citizenship behavior) was measured using eight items (see Appendix) adapted from Smith et al. (1983). These items asked about altruistic and compliance behavior at work, and these items have been used frequently in past research (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2009). The responses to the items were summed together to form an index measuring organizational citizenship behavior, which had a Cronbach's alpha value of .80 for internal reliability.

*Independent Variables.* The two main independent variables were distributive justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice was measured by summing five items (see Appendix) from Price and Mueller (1986), and the index had a Cronbach's alpha value of .95. Seven items (see Appendix) from prior studies were summed to measure procedural justice (Lambert et al., 2007; Saylor & Wright, 1992; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996), and the resulting index had a Cronbach's alpha value of .87.

The personal characteristics of position, gender, age, tenure, educational level, and race were selected more as control than explanatory variables. Position measured whether the participant was a correctional officer (coded 1) or not (coded 0). Gender was measured as men = 1 and women = 0. Age was measured in continuous years. Tenure at the prison was measured in continuous months. The responses to the highest educational level were

collapsed into a dichotomous variable representing whether the participant had earned a college degree (coded 1) or not (coded 0). The different racial/ethnic groups were reduced into a variable measuring whether the participant was White (coded 1) or non-White (coded 0). The number of years working in the criminal justice field was measured in continuous years.

## Findings

Univariate statistics for the variables are presented in Table 1. There appeared to be significant variation in both the dependent and independent variables (i.e., none were constants). In addition, based on various statistical tests, the variables appeared to be normally distributed. Principal axis factor analysis was conducted for each of the indexes, and the results indicated that the items loaded on the predicted factor. This demonstrates convergent validity. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha values for the indexes were .80 or above, which indicates acceptable internal reliability of the index variables.

Ordinary least squares regression (OLS) was estimated with organizational citizenship as the dependent variable and the distributive and procedural justice indexes and personal characteristics the independent variables. The variation inflation factor statistic (VIF scores ranged from 1.11 to 2.24) and the tolerance statistic (tolerance values were from .45 to .97) were within the accepted value ranges; therefore, there appeared to be no issue with collinearity or multicollinearity (Maruyama, 1998; Mueller, 1996). In addition, the issues of outliers, influential cases, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of residuals, and independence of errors in the regression analysis were tested and were found not to be a problem (Berry, 1993; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The results are presented in Table 2. The  $R^2$  for the regression equation was .17, which means that the independent variables explained about 17% of the observed variance in the organizational citizenship behavior index. The only personal characteristic to have a statistically significant association with organizational citizenship behavior was the total number of years worked in the field of criminal justice. It had a positive association, which means that an increase in the number of years worked in the field was associated with higher levels of engagement in organizational citizenship behavior. Position, gender, age, tenure, educational level, and race all had non-significant associations with the organizational citizenship behavior variable. Procedural justice had a positive relationship, which means that increases in perceptions of the fairness of procedures were associated with increases in self-reported engagement in behavior going above and beyond what was expected at work. Distributive justice, on the other hand, had a nonsignificant association with the organizational citizenship behavior measure.

**Table 1.** Univariate Statistics.

Variable	Description	Md	Min	Max	Mn	SD
Position	62% were custody officers (coded 1) 38% noncustody positions (coded 0)	1	0	1	0.62	0.49
Gender	59% were men (coded 1) 41% were women (coded 0)	1	0	1	0.59	0.49
Age	Measured in continuous years	33	19	68	35.77	10.82
Tenure	Months working at the facility	17	1	53	20.64	13.84
Educational level	47% had a college degree (coded 1) 53% had no college degree (coded 0)	0	0	1	0.47	0.50
Race	79% were White (coded 1) 21% were Nonwhite (coded 0)	1	0	1	0.79	0.40
Number of years working in CJ	Number of years employed in the criminal justice field	2.0	0	34	3.70	5.28
Distributive justice	5 item additive index, $\alpha = .95$	15	5	25	13.42	5.21
Procedural justice	7 item additive index, $\alpha = .87$	20	7	33	20.26	6.13
Org. citizenship	8 item additive index, $\alpha = .80$	31	12	40	31.00	4.69

Note: Md stands for the median value, Min for the minimum value, Max for the maximum value, Mn for the mean value, SD for the standard deviation value,  $\alpha$  the Cronbach's alpha value for internal reliability, CJ stands for criminal justice field, and Org. Citizenship for organizational citizenship behaviors. The number of participants was 160.

## Discussion

There are three basic models for the importance of distributive and procedural justice in influencing employee outcomes (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). The first model is that both dimensions of organizational justice are important in influencing the attitudes and behaviors of employees because both are desired equally by employees. Second, the personal outcome model holds that distributive justice is more important because it directly affects the person, such as pay, promotion, and evaluation (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Under this model, people focus more on distributive justice in order to

**Table 2.** Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results With Organizational Citizenship as the Dependent Variable.

Variable	B	$\beta$
Position	-1.64	-.17
Gender	-0.27	-.03
Age	-0.01	-.02
Tenure	-0.01	-.04
Race	-1.03	-.09
Number of years working in CJ	0.15	.18*
Distributive justice	0.03	.04
Procedural justice	0.18	.23*
F = 3.99 (df = 7, 152)		R <sup>2</sup> = .17**

Note: See Table 1 for a description of the variables and how they were coded. B represents the unstandardized regression coefficient,  $\beta$  the standardized regression coefficient, CJ for the criminal justice field, and *df* degrees of freedom.

\* $p \leq .05$ . \*\* $p \leq .01$ .

maximize their outcomes (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). Finally, the group-value model postulates that procedural justice is a more powerful dimension of organizational justice for employees because it represents a sense of a level playing field stressed by society (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Clay-Warner et al., 2005). The results of the current study support the group-value model in that procedural justice had a significant association while distributive justice had a non-significant association with organizational citizenship behavior.

Procedural justice may create a sense of harmony and respect in the workplace that can lead to employees to go above and beyond in helping coworkers and looking out for the organization through compliance (Lind & Earley, 1992). Procedural justice sends a message to staff that ethical behavior is valued by the organization and, as such, can increase the level of engagement in organizational citizenship behavior (Walumbwa et al., 2010). According to Leventhal (1980), positive views of procedural justice are likely to result when the process is viewed as ethical, is consistently applied, and has allowed employees input into the development and carrying out of the process and procedures. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) find procedural justice goes to the heart of the legitimacy of an organization. Some outcomes, such as pay, may be out the power of administrators. Having fair and open processes is something over which administrators have control. In a sense, there is truth to the old adage that 'nobody likes a stacked deck.' It could be, therefore, that employees see procedural justice as more important and representative of the

organization. It is also important to note that part of the organizational citizenship behavior measure was altruistic behavior towards coworkers, which fits into the group-value model previously mentioned. This model holds that fairness in the workplace in procedures for all, not just the specific person, is critical. A sense of fairness in the processes and procedures could create a more pleasant workplace that encourages staff members to help one another (Tyler, DeGoey, & Smith, 1996). Perceptions of fair procedures may create a sense of cooperation rather than competition among staff members, leading to higher engagement in extra-role behaviors. Why procedural justice is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior, but not distributive justice, needs further exploration.

The finding that procedural justice has a significant correlation with organizational citizenship, but not distributive justice, should be positive information for correctional administrators. Of the two, procedural justice is usually more within the control of administrators and can be changed more easily than distributive justice outcomes. As Martin and Bennett (1996) notes, “the economic costs of acting in a procedurally fair manner—treating individuals with respect, providing advance notice of and justification for actions—are minimal” (p. 100). One of the first steps in improving procedural justice in a correctional institution is communication. Staff members need to be solicited for their views on the fairness of procedures and processes in the organization, as well as recommendations for changes. Thibaut and Walker (1975) termed this as allowing employees a “voice” in the process. Research has shown that allowing people to be heard provides them with a greater sense of fairness in the process (Greenberg, 1982). The communication has to be open, honest, meaningful, and in both directions. There can be no fear of retaliation or punishment for things brought up that management needs, but may not wish, to hear (Cohen, 1985). Transparency and consistency in processes and procedures are needed (Lambert et al., 2007; Leventhal, 1980), and favoritism must be avoided. Staff members will easily see through procedures that are not fair, open, and honest. Trust is a critical element to build perceptions of fairness in procedural justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Administrators need to build this trust by making sure their statements and actions match one another and if problems arise to be forthright about these problems (Wong & Cummins, 2009). Staff members need to be provided an honest explanation of how important decisions are made and why they were made (Joy & Witt, 1992).

While improving perceptions of the fairness of procedures should hopefully increase organizational citizenship behaviors, this does not imply that perceptions of distributive justice should be disregarded. While distributive justice did not have a significant relationship with organizational citizenship

behavior in this study, it does not mean that it has no effects in the workplace. As noted earlier, distributive justice has been positively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and negatively associated with job stress and turnover intent (Lambert, 2003; Lambert et al., 2007, 2010). In addition, the effects of both dimensions of organizational justice may be contextual and situational and, as such, distributive justice may be related to organizational citizenship behavior among staff at other types or correctional facilities.

Of the six personal characteristics included more as control than explanatory variables, only the number of years working in the field of criminal justice had a significant association. Greater criminal justice work history was associated with increased involvement in organizational citizenship behaviors. These results may indicate that as seniority increases, many employees may become more invested in the workplace and increasingly see themselves as an integral part of the total organization. A positive identity may not only lead to extra-role behaviors, but may encourage others to look at the senior employee as role models. Past research findings support the positive influence of organizational commitment on citizenship behavior (Lambert et al., 2008). The other personal characteristics of position, gender, age, tenure, and race had nonsignificant effects on organizational citizenship behavior in the multivariate analysis. It would appear that these variables are not predictors of organizational citizenship among staff in this study. The finding that most personal characteristics are not significant predictors is supported by the results reported by Culliver et al. (1991) who reported that no personal demographic characteristics in their study were associated with organizational citizenship behavior. This, of course, is good news for correctional administrators, as changes to institutional procedures are often within the scope of an administrator's discretion, whereas employee personal characteristics are not.

As with most research, the current study has limitations. This was a single preliminary study at one private prison that housed juvenile offenders tried as adults. The results need to be replicated with staff at other correctional facilities in order to determine whether the results apply to correctional staff in general or only those in the current study. Future research is needed to determine whether the effects of distributive justice and procedural justice vary by type of correctional facility, such as juvenile, jail, prison, private, public, region, nation, and so on. It is possible that findings may be contextual and situational and would vary by different types of correctional organizations. Only multiple studies can demonstrate the true effects of distributive and procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior among correctional staff. While procedural justice was found to be positively associated with going above and beyond at work, a causal relationship cannot be drawn from

the current study, which was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. As the two dimensions of organizational justice accounted for only 17% of the variance in the dependent variable, this means that other variables are important in explaining the different levels of organizational citizenship observed among the staff members in this study. These variables need to be identified and understood. Furthermore, more in-depth and detailed measures of distributive and procedural justice should be used and tested. In this study, composite measures of both dimensions of justice were used. It could be that specific outcomes and procedures are more important than others in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors.

In addition, other dimensions of organizational justice need to be examined to see what, if any, relationship they have with organizational citizenship behavior. Another dimension of organizational justice found to be important in explaining employee outcomes is transactional or interactional justice (Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). Transactional justice focuses on how workers are treated within the organization by supervisors, managers, and administrators (Bies & Moag, 1986). Employee perceptions of whether the organization treats them with respect and dignity may be important in explaining differing levels of organizational citizenship behavior by staff (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). As transactional justice was not measured in the current study, its relationship with organizational citizenship behavior remains to be studied.

More in-depth measures of organizational citizenship behavior should be utilized to determine whether the findings vary. In this study, a composite measure of the dimensions of altruism and compliance was utilized. Besides altruism and compliance, other and newer dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior have been proposed, such as sportsmanship, civic virtue, and courtesy (Organ et al., 2006). Sportsmanship is a willingness of workers to tolerate inconveniences and impositions of work while maintaining a good attitude and not complaining incessantly as well as not blowing things out of proportion and being supportive of organizational changes designed to aid the growth of the organization (Marinova et al., 2010; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Sportsmanship also includes efforts of a person to be the peacemaker at work so as to ensure that there is a smooth interaction with employees in the workplace (Organ, 1990). Civic virtue refers becoming actively involved in organizational activities to make it a more pleasant place to work, such as attending voluntary meetings, keeping abreast of changes and developments, and willingly engaging in employee activities (Law, Wong, & Chen, 2005; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Courtesy is when employees help avoid or resolve conflicts in the workplace in a quick and efficient manner and includes being polite, considerate, and respectful

of others at work (Law et al., 2005; Organ, 1997). Research is required to determine whether and how distributive and procedural justice are linked with other dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, it remains to be determined if and how organizational justice affects counterproductive work behavior, such as gossiping, sabotage, and theft, as well as other malicious behaviors (Bowling & Gruys, 2010; Dalal, 2005; Dunlap & Lee, 2004). There has been little research on both organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior in the field of institutional corrections, even though both, in theory, appear to be important. It is clear that much more research is needed.

## Conclusion

In a nutshell, workplace factors matter. Although it should be intuitive that treating employees fairly will yield positive results, in reality, many times policies and procedures are made in a vacuum, without taking into account the effects on staff. This study sends the message to correctional administrators that by creating a fair and equitable environment, workers will be more inclined to go above and beyond what is normally expected in the course of their duties. It's a win-win situation, not only because positive outcomes counteract costly negative outcomes such as turnover, but a positive work environment for employees may have an indirect influence on inmate behavior.

## Appendix

Unless noted otherwise, the below items were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *uncertain*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *agree*.

### *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

1. I frequently volunteer to do things without being asked;
2. I often take time away from my job to help others with their work without asking for a reward;
3. Sometimes I will coast during part of the work day when there is little work to do rather than trying to find new work (reverse coded);
4. If possible, I take extra unauthorized breaks (reverse coded);
5. I put forth a great deal of effort at work;
6. I often try to help fellow employees so they will become more productive;