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Abstract

This research focuses on the perception of organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) of healthcare professionals working in healthcare organisations. It is also studied how perceptions of organisational justice affect the exhibition of organisational citizenship behaviours, job satisfaction of healthcare professionals and their turnover intention.

A sample of 53 healthcare professionals consisting of general practitioners, doctors, nurses and healthcare assistants was studied. It was found that procedural justice and interactional justice had positive correlations with organisation citizenship behaviours. A positive correlation was found between all types of organisational justice and job satisfaction. A negative correlation was found between all types of organisational justice and turnover intention. The effects of gender on organisational citizenship behaviour, work experience and numbers of hours worked on turnover intention was also discussed.

This research aims to give a new perspective of healthcare organisations to existing literature on organisational justice, organisational citizenship behaviours, job satisfaction and turnover intention.
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1. Introduction

Today’s business environment is constantly changing, every single day, becoming more and more challenging because of globalisation, increasing competition and advancements of technology (Chawla and Sondhi, 2011). This change which is both increasingly rapid, often unpredictable and unprecedented requires very effective human resources management skills for any organisation to not only remain competitive but even survive. One of the key assets an organisation and its human resource management team can cultivate the ability to elicit behaviour of employees that goes beyond the call of duty. This means that employees are willing to go further than asked for the organisation. This behaviour is very difficult to cultivate and can be very difficult for competitors to imitate (Allen and Rush, 1998; Bolino, Turnley and Averett, 2003).

An organization is "a consciously coordinated social entity, with a relatively identifiable boundary, which functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a common goal or a set of goals” (Robbins, 1990). It is a set of different groups of people working different roles, for instance, owners, authorities, directors, managers and operators. All employees of an organisation will work at different levels. There will be higher management, line management and staff. In addition, sometimes there may be support staff such as HR staff or administration. Because of this present hierarchy, every organisation will have codes of conducts, rules and procedures to in the organisation to create a harmonic environment, so that all the workers from top to bottom feel safe and justly treated. In other words, organizations are like societies and communities which are comprised of people who have different roles and set clear boundaries among them depending on their culture and norms.

To achieve maximum results and outcome from any organization, employees’ maximum input is required which depends upon the organizational citizenship behaviour and other values of organization, among them, the most significant & crucial is organizational justice. As a worker is allocated tasks which are decided by the higher management, his or her judgment of those decisions as to whether they are just or unjust is very important because it can change the workers attitude (e.g. turnover intention, job satisfaction, job commitment etc). This can have a large impact on the outcome of carrying out the work designated to them. Justice is very important in an organization and how it is perceived by
employees. It develops great trust between both parties, enhancing efficiency, and improves the level of employees’ citizenship behaviour. Adam’s equity theory also explains this phenomenon. It states that when fair treatment is given to all employees, they are more galvanized and inspired, resulting in positive work attitude (Adams, 1963).

As this study revolves around health care organizations and behaviour of its employees in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intention, it is important to get a brief view of such organizations. In a healthcare setup, the service is provided to humans in the form of cure and care. Sometimes it is the matter of life and death. Therefore, the working environments of these organizations and the culture adopted by them greatly affects the behaviour of care providers and hence, has a great impact on the ones who receive care. Healthcare organizations range from government-funded health services, private hospitals, nursing homes, polyclinics, and solo-general practitioner services. All these places, in respective of the number of employees based on team-oriented culture. The team usually comprises of licensed healthcare professionals and non-licensed governing bodies. Justice and collaboration between the two parties play a vital role in the provision of care services to the clients. Due to the stressful nature of work done by healthcare professionals at all levels ranging from consultants, specialists, resident doctors, general practitioners, nurses, healthcare assistants, and other allied medical professionals. It is mandatory for the organization to keep fairness and justice among all workers in each and every aspect. This avoids unrest and reduces unnecessary stress, the workers will be more satisfied with their allocated job, perform well resulting in successful outcomes, leading to reduced turnover intention. Therefore, it is very significant for healthcare organizations to create a justified environment for all those who work together towards a common goal (curing disease) and all the team-players should perceive this fairness to keep their morale high and achieve the level of work satisfaction.

Healthcare organisations are organisations that are provide health services to the population they serve. There provide a diagnosis of illness or injury, surgical operations, treatment of patients and recovery of patients. These include hospitals, nursing homes and care homes etc. that provide care to the elderly on a long-term basis. Another definition is “Centre that provides health services such as diagnosis of diseases, surgical operations and treatment and recovery of patients (IGI Global, no date) The healthcare organisation is a very complex structure and system. It is burdened with conflicts that are hard to be resolved and a
general lack of supervision and organisational justice make it a very difficult environment to survive and thrive in. The aim of this study is to determine if organisational justice has an effect on the organisational citizenship behaviours of healthcare professionals and have an impact on job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Healthcare organisations are organisations none the less and it is important for them to thrive in the market. These organisations are also businesses and need sustenance like any other organisation.

Healthcare professionals are responsible for maintaining health in human beings. They do this by applying principles and procedures of medicines based on previous evidence and results. Healthcare professionals deal with the study, diagnosis, treatment and prevention of healthcare problems. They are responsible for advice on and application of preventive and curative measures. (WHO, 2007; Gupta et al., 2011). For the purpose of this research, healthcare professionals include general practitioners, doctors, nurses and healthcare assistants.

Where there are many studies and researches carried out on organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour, there is a lack of researches on organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour with respect to healthcare professionals. It can sometimes be hard to think of healthcare professionals as employees but unlike the employee of any other business, healthcare professionals are looking for a job that fulfils their personal needs. Organisational justice is originated from the work of Greenberg (1987), who introduced the concept as “the perception of fairness and equality in an organisation” (Greenberg, 1987). It is how an employee regards or judges the behaviour and actions of the organisation. Organisational justice also takes into account how an employee reacts to the organisation’s behaviour with change in attitude.

The concept of organizational justice is further divided into three types of justice: Distributive justice – fairness in the distribution of location of goods. Originated from the Adam’s theory of equity (1965). Procedural justice – fairness of procedure in making decision (Thibaut and Walker, 1976). Interactional justice – fairness in decision taken. It has two parts. The interpersonal justice related to dignity and respect of a person treated, while the informational justice is related to accurate and adequate information given to a person (Bies, 2001).
It plays key roles in employee productivity, job satisfaction, turnover intention and in the burnout phenomenon of an employee. Therefore, especially in the healthcare sector or industry, organisational justice is so important in protecting the health, physical and mental, of healthcare professionals and boosting their productivity. The lack of implementation of organisational justice - distributive, interactional or procedural justice, in the healthcare organisation can have a number of adverse effects.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour is defined by Organ (1988), as "individual behaviour 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". Organizational citizenship behaviour is divided in five dimensions (Organ, 1988).

Altruism – a helping behaviour, it is an important dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988, 1990, p. 19; Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996; W. C. Borman and Motowidlo, 1997).


Sportsmanship – The definition of sportsmanship is “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining” (Organ, 1990). In other word the people who do not complain when troubled. This is indifferent from other dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Posdakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Ahearne, 1998).

Conscientiousness and civic virtue are remaining two dimensions which are not discussed as they are not considered in this research study.

A lot of work has been done of job satisfaction, from the creation of the concept to work on how to boost satisfaction of employees. Many researchers have contributed to the pool of knowledge we have now and naturally, there are many definitions of job satisfaction. The two most common definitions of job satisfaction are “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1976) and “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997).

Turnover intention is also a concept that has been studied a lot and much research has
been conducted on it. It is defined as “An individual's conscious and deliberate willingness to depart from an organisation” (Tett and Meyer, 1993).

### 1.1 Purpose of this research:

It is of significant importance to build knowledge on the behaviour of employees, what motivates them and what demotivates them. This is the one of the most significant ways in which an organisation’s productivity and efficiency can be improved, by refining one of the key elements of production - labour. The human relations movement really gave rise to all the research into how studying human behaviour can prove to be increasingly helpful in helping an organisation reach its goals and objectives. So much research has already been conducted on how it is organisational citizenship behaviours can be cultivated, these behaviours when directed at the organisation, can give any organisation an opportunity to promote these behaviours further by implementing strategies that encourage organisational citizenship behaviours. There is a lot of evidence proving that organisational citizenship behaviours help an organisation improve its performance overall (Organ, 1988; Allen and Rush, 1998). There is also much research done on organisational justice (Greenberg, 1990a; Cropanzano and Rupp, 2003). However, there is still a very severe lack of any research done on organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours in the healthcare settings. Even though, it is of utmost importance that healthcare professionals are satisfied with their jobs and display organisational citizenship behaviours.

In respect to Organ’s definition (1988) of organisational citizenship behaviour, healthcare professionals might display organisational citizenship behaviour by covering shifts for colleagues who are late or sick, talking to each patient with respect and patience even with the busy and often, extremely stressful work environment, delaying taking breaks or lunches to put the needs of patients first, actively taking part in improving rules and procedures in a healthcare setup to make them easier for both other healthcare professionals or patients, helping orient new staff into the team and making them aware of rules and procedures. The healthcare profession is a profession in which success, wellbeing of the patient, is highly dependent on healthcare professionals going above and beyond - displaying organisational citizenship behaviours.
This study is being conducted to gain more insight into the plight of our healthcare professionals. As mentioned above, there may be thousands of researches on how bad management or no management can affect the work of employees, but it is hardly ever on the management of healthcare professionals. There is hardly any research done on the importance of organisational justice in healthcare organisations. It will be interesting to see the extent to which both these factors, organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours interact in a healthcare organisation and how these factors will influence job satisfaction and turnover intention in our healthcare professionals.

The primary purpose of this thesis was to undertake research on healthcare professionals. This was done for the following reasons:

- This was an effort to extend on findings from previous researches between organizational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2002), turnover intention and organisational citizenship behaviours (Van Scotter, 2000) and various other researches.
- This research will make additional contributions to existing literature.
- This research may be of practical value to management in healthcare organisations and can help improve the working conditions of healthcare professionals and thus provide benefits to healthcare organisations.
- The selection of healthcare professionals is to add another perspective and research dimension to the currently limited research material on organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours in healthcare professionals.
- This study aims to address how organisational justice in healthcare settings can have an impact on job satisfaction and turnover intentions of healthcare professionals, influencing the effectiveness of the healthcare organisation.

1.2 Research Questions:

Research Title: Does organisational justice affect the organisational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals and have impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention in the healthcare organisation? This research title then is divided into the following research questions:
Research question 1: Does organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) in healthcare organisations affect organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals?

Research question 2: Does organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) in healthcare organisations affect job satisfaction of healthcare professionals?

Research question 3: Does organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) in healthcare organisations affect turnover intention in healthcare professionals?

Research question 4: Does gender affect the exhibition of organisational citizenship behaviours by healthcare professionals?

Research question 5: Does the number of hours worked influence turnover intention in healthcare professionals?

Research question 6: Does the number of years of experience influence turnover intention in healthcare professionals?

1.3 Hypothesis:

In light of the existing literature that reveals a strong influence of organisational justice on organisational citizenship behaviour dimensions in employees (Organ, 1988, p. 198, 1990; R. H. Moorman, 1991; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Williams, Pitre and Zainuba, 2002). This research postulates the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis no. 1 (H1): There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 2 (H2): There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals.
Hypothesis no. 3 (H3): There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 4 (H4): There is a significant relationship between gender and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 5 (H5): There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 6 (H6): There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 7 (H7): There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organizations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 8 (H8): There is a negative correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 9 (H9): There is a negative correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 10 (H10): There is a negative correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 11 (H11): There is a negative correlation between experience and turnover intention of healthcare professionals.

Hypothesis no. 12 (H12): There is a positive correlation between number of hours worked and turnover intention of healthcare professionals.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Organisational Justice:

Any decision or action that is thought to be morally right is Justice. This can be based on religion, fairness, pre-existing laws, equity ethics etc. (Pekurinen et al., 2017). The concept of justice among people was first emphasized by Aristotle (Ross, 1925). He stresses that distribution of rewards and resources among people should be equal.

Organisational justice originated from the work of Greenberg in (1987), who defined the concept of organisational justice as an employee’s perception of justice in the practices, actions, rules and procedures of the organisation. It is also suggested that the concept of organisational justice is the employees’ perception of fairness, both in the distribution of justice and the distribution of rewards (wages, promotions etc.) by higher authorities, managers or decision makers (Masterson et al., 2000).

Organisational justice should present in all the work environment, from organisational activities to allocation of rewards, intrinsic and extrinsic and any interaction between colleagues. According to Greenberg, (1987), two intermediary determinants by employees to judge the level of organisational justice. These are social determinants and structural determinants. Structural determinants are based on the perception of justice in rules and procedures surrounding the activities of an organisation such as distribution of rewards, conflict management between colleagues or between employees and organisations, performance appraisals, or allocation of resources etc.

Many researches have come forward with divisions of organisational justice, some claiming there to be three divisions which are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Greenberg, 1990) whereas others suggesting that there are in fact four divisions of organisational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice and interpersonal justice. Informational justice and interpersonal justice are suggested to be sub-divisions of interactional justice (Colquitt, 2001). Some researchers viewed interactional justice as just another sub-division of procedural justice (Tyler and Blader, 2003). Bies, (2001), however, has argued that procedural and interactional justice are separate types of justice. There is no clear consensus on what truly comprises of interactional justice.
2.1.1 Distributive justice:

According to Folgar and Cropanzano (1998), distributive justice is the employees’ perceived fairness of distributions of rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic such as wages, promotions etc. Cohen (1987), defines distributive justice as the allocation of rewards between employees based on proportional shares based on specific rules and standards. Distributive justice often determines, if organisational activities and procedures are fair and ethical and if the employees perceive of them as appropriate (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

Organisational justice is based on the employees’ perception of outcomes. They might feel these outcomes are fair or unfair and employees might compare their rewards, wages with those that other employees receive. It is based on this that employees come to the conclusion of justice, if they are treated fairly or unfairly. This belief or feeling will then influence their attitudes and behaviours towards the organisation. It is crucial for employees to believe they are receiving an equal share of resources and rewards depending on their input.

Organ (1988) suggests that distributive justice is based on three very important principles. These are equity, equality and need. The principle of equity: the idea that the reward received by an employee should be equal to the employee’s input or contribution. A simple example of this could be of an employee working overtime and taking part in more projects. He or she deserves to make more money or receive more rewards than his colleague, who might only work part time. The concept of ceteris paribus (all else equal) applies here. If both these employees made the same amount of money and received the same rewards, this would not be considered fair and would go against the principle of equity.

The principle of equality: This means that all employees should be given the same equal opportunities that would give them rewards regardless of characteristics such as race, gender, religion etc. An example of this could be a manager choosing between two of his employees for a promotion to supervisor. There is a male and a female candidate and they have equal competency. If the manager, chooses the male candidate for gender discriminatory reasons, he would not be serving the principle of equality and the female candidate would perceive this decision as unfair.

The principle of need: This means that the resources should be allocated according to need. This is more relevant to social or non-profit organisations and not competitive for profit
Early, initial studies on distributive justice were conducted by sociologists and psychologists like Adam (1965) etc. Later studies focused more on the effects of negative perceptions of organisational justice. Cohen (1987), found that negative perceptions of distributive justice has a negative effect on job performance and satisfaction. Folger and Cropanzano (1998), found that employees’ perception of unfairness affect job performance and actually had an effect on organisational citizenship behaviours replacing them with what they termed ‘nervous behaviour’.

2.1.2 Procedural Justice:

Greenberg 1991, states that procedural justice is the justice perceived from procedures and policies used in decision making. These perceptions are related to the fairness of policies and procedures employed while making a decision rather than the outcome of that decision. Procedural justice is how the decisions are made for the distribution of rewards or outcomes, in both subjective and objective situations (Konovsky and Freeman, 2000).

Greenberg (1993) classified procedural justice into two subdivisions, informational justice and systemic justice. Where, informational justice is the social side of procedural justice, focusing on explanations provided to employees with clarity and honesty about the procedures that involve them (Greenberg, 1993). It is important for employees to know why policies are in place, why certain procedures are carried out in a certain manner and why outcomes or rewards are distributed in a certain way. The transparency and clarity of procedures is explained. It is mandatory for an organization to keep employees fully aware of the agenda and strategy used to achieve certain goal.

Thibaut and Walker (1976), believe that informational justice gives a voice to employees in the decision making process. It was found that when a supervisor, for example, provides a clear explanation to an employee for refusing his or her request, the employee will feel less dissatisfied towards the decision and will, in turn, perceive the decision-making process as fair than when no explanations are given (Bies and Shapiro, 1987). It is also found
that rejection of any requests made by an employee may be a negative outcome but providing explanation as to why that request was denied will help the employee perceive the process as fair (Shapiro, Buttner and Barry, 1994).

Greenberg (1990), in his study also found that employees perceived performance appraisals to be fairer when feedback and explanation was provided. Systemic justice is more structural. This deals with the implementations of policies and procedures consistently. Systemic justice refers to applying rules and procedures consistently to ensure procedural justice.

Procedural justice is also the perception of justice in the process of resolving conflicts. It is found that valuing the opinions and suggestions of the employees during organisational activities and processes is a very important aspect of a leaders’ implementation of justice (Tyler, 1987). It is also proved that employees’ opinions and suggestions are not heard or considered, the perception of justice in the decision making process will be low (Bos, Wilke and Lind, 1998). Folger (1977), believes that giving voice to the employees that are affected by a decision means that they will be contributing to the decision making process and their perception of justice will be high. It is sign of care and respect to the employees if they are involved in the decision-making process (Tyler and Lind, 1992). It is established that employees consider voicing their concerns, opinions and thoughts as their right and thus employee opinions and suggestions should be encouraged (Lind, Kanfer and Earley, 1990). A meta-analysis found that voice of the employees is a huge determinant of the job satisfaction and job performance of employees (Korsgaard and Roberson, 1995).

2.1.3 Interactional Justice:

Interactional justice is defined as the “quality of interpersonal treatment employees experience when procedures are enacted” (Bies, 2001). It refers to the perception of justice in the explanation and implementation of the procedure. It is the interaction between the employees that are affected by decisions and those who make decisions. The perception of justice relating to any explanations that are provided and the conveying of information such as why procedures are conducted in a certain way is called interactional justice (Barling and Phillips, 1993).
All employees working in an organisation will expect to be treated with respect and dignity and most importantly they expect that they will be given equal treatment. Employees will always seek fair interaction with the organisation and hence if managers treat some employees with respect and others with disrespect, they will not be perceived as fair. Justice is perceived when supervisors’ or managers’ will treat their employees with respect and dignity (Folger and Bies, 1989). According to Colquitt (2001), as mentioned above, interactional justice is divided into two subdivisions. These are interpersonal justice and informational justice. Informational justice has been discussed above.

Interpersonal justice refers to how employees are treated with respect by their managers (Folger and Bies, 1989). It is defined as the way in which an employee is treated by everyone around him. This can include managers, supervisors, colleagues, subordinated etc. It is the dealing of all employees with one another. It is found by Tepper (2000), that verbal forms of aggression such as yelling at employees, talking with disrespect, making fun of them, bullying, harassing and humiliating employees has a negative impact on the perception of justice in employees. Moorman, (1991), found that the police and respectful treatment of employees is a powerful antecedent of the employee’s exhibition of organisational citizenship behaviour.

Effects of Organisational Justice:

Organisational justice is an important concept for organisations and one to be paid attention to by managers as it affects performance, attitudes and success of employees and hence an organisation (Cropanzano and Ambrose, 2015). Employees will display favourable or unfavourable behaviours according to their perception of organisational justice as suggested by Adam’s Equity Theory (Adams, 1965)(Adam). Schnake (2016), found that employees who do not perceive high levels of organisational justice will not do more than is required of them, in their job description, whereas those who do perceive high levels of organisational justice will display dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. An employees’ perception of organisational justice is very important for the organisation as a good perception will increase job satisfaction (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). It will also enhance organisational commitment, in turn reducing turnover intention (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993). It will also increase trust in management (Tyler and Lind, 1992). Perceived
injustice can lead to negative behaviours which may even be aggressive. These behaviours are termed organisational retaliation behaviours (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). Employees may resign (Aquino et al., 1997) and there may be high rates of absenteeism (de Boer, Harink and Heijboer, 2002). It is proved that employees who are satisfied with organisational justice in their organisations perform much higher than those employees who are less satisfied (Greenberg, 1990).

2.2 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour:

There seems to be a very early awareness of extra role behaviour which dates back to the late 1930. As early as 1938, extra role behaviour was not only observed but defined in a study about the interest of employees to promote wellbeing of the organisations they worked for (Barnard, 1938). Most recent researches on organisational citizenship behaviour borrow a lot from Barnard’s work on organisational citizenship behaviours and his early work on extra role behaviour.

Organisational citizenship behaviour came from the work of Katz and Kahn (1966), who worked on the concept of extra role behaviour. The term organisational citizenship behaviour or OCB was coined by Organ, (1988). He stated, as mentioned before, “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation (Organ, 1988). He then, later, modified his statement and said that organisational citizenship behaviour is “the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997). It is considered organisational citizenship behaviour as cooperative behaviours that have positive results or consequences for an organisation, but these behaviours are not required, rarely formally recognised and rewarded (Van Dyne et al., 2000).

This concept of OCB did not get much recognition as acceptance in the organizational environment. Several other researchers and scholars worked on this thought of school and improved and suggested more sophisticated concepts of OCB in late 80s and 90s. Although the basic principle and the core of idea revolves around the same idea. Some of which are,

- Extra-role behaviour (Dyne, Cummings and McLean Parks, 1995).
- Prosocial organizational behaviours (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; O’Reilly and

- Organizational spontaneity (George and Brief, 1992; George and Jones, 1997).
- Contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Borman, White and Dorsey, 1995; W. Borman and Motowidlo, 1997).

There are 3 main divisions of which OCB is based and they are related both the organization and the employees. These are personal employees’ traits, attitude and management factors. The most important of these three is Leadership and management role as it can generate healthy and productive attitude among employees. The last two are modifications whereas the first is the least modifiable factor. There are 3 main divisions of which OCB is based and they are related both the organization and the employees. These are personal employees’ traits, attitude and management factors. The most important of these three is Leadership and management role as it can generate healthy and productive attitude among employees. The last two are modifications whereas the first is the least modifiable factor. The attitude of employees towards job are measured in terms of job stress, work satisfaction, job involvement, work commitment, inspiration and healthy and growing atmosphere among all the members of an organization, both horizontally and vertically.

Organ et al. (2006a) 2006, called these attitudes ‘morale’. In a study conducted, he found that the correlation between organisational citizenship behaviours and morale is 0.69. He also found a very strong correlation between job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviours (0.9). He suggests that the employees that are more satisfied with their jobs are more likely to exhibit the dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. He emphasized that organisational citizenship behaviours require helping manners from employees, such as a desire to help fellow colleagues, be punctual to work, help new employees get oriented with work or acquainted with other staff. This can also be done by taking into account management decisions and considering them, going the extra mile for the company etc. (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990). It is also said that organisational citizenship behaviours can be described as the sense of an employee’s involvement with intention in organisational activities, mandatory or otherwise (extracurricular activities such as staff charity days, staff parties etc), without expecting any benefit or reward, intrinsic or extrinsic (George and Brief, 1992).
The researcher Cohen and Vigoda (2000), identified 5 key contributions of organisational citizenship behaviour that are linked to improving organisational performance through improving employee performance. These 5 contributions are explained in the following lines. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour encourages employees to do more for their organisations. This could be going the extra mile on a work assignment, taking on extra work to help management. It is proved that employee productivity levels increase. Employees are encouraged to stay and keep working for the organisation. This means that turnover intention will be reduced as employees to not want to leave the current organisation they are working for. This provides an attraction to new employees as well. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour can help stop fluctuations in organisational performance due to employee performance. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour provides stability in performance of employees. It is proven that Organisational Citizenship Behaviour facilitates and gives way to better coordination between employees of an organisation and groups of people. There is more cooperation among the employees and this can give rise to better teamwork. This will help organisations reach the requirements of the contemporary environment better.

Taking the Organisational Citizenship Behaviours into account in context to their massive influence on the performance of an organisation, organisational citizenship behaviour is regarded as of the most important and relevant indicators of the overall organisation’s wellbeing and performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Ahearne, 1998). Cohen and Vigoda (2000), outlines another 7 of the most important and positive on sequences of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.

- Organisational citizenship behaviour helps to improve employee performance at all levels of hierarchy within an organisation. It improves performance on both high (managerial) and low (employee) levels.
- Organisational resources that are scarce can be allocated more effectively and efficiently if the employees of that organisational have a sense of organisational citizenship behaviours.
- Organisational citizenship behaviour can also help cut down on organisational expenditures because the organisation’s employees with have a more positive attitude towards benefits etc.
- Organisational citizenship behaviour can be crucial in creating a welcoming and
productive environment for all segments of the organisation.

- A strong presence of organizational citizenship behaviour will help create a cohesive working environment which can be an attraction to new or prospective employees and a great support system to current employees of the organisation.
- Organisational Citizenship Behaviour will, as mentioned before maintaining the continuity of organisational performance and make employee performance more stable.
- Organisational Citizenship behaviour will help encourage employees to embrace opportunities that are presented by demonstrating civic virtue behaviour.

The behaviour of employees, more importantly, organisational citizenship behaviours and satisfaction are key indicators of the individual performance level of employees (Koys, 2001). Organ has done a lot of work on organisational citizenship behaviour and further presented three basic conditions for any behaviour to be called as organisational citizenship behaviour (1997), which are given below:

- Organisational citizenship behaviour cannot be defined in any contract of employment or job description. It cannot be required of the employee.
- Organisational citizenship behaviours should only be conducted on the employee’s own free will.
- There should be no positive or negative reinforcement associated with the organisational citizenship behaviour. This means that this behaviour which will contribute positively towards the effectiveness and performance of the organisation cannot have a punishment or reward if it performed or not performed.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour can be differentiated into three aspects or types. (Influence of interactional justice on the turnover behavioural decision in an organization (Muzumdar, 2012).

- Discretionary Behaviours - variables of likes and dislikes. One might do a certain task that is not required of me because he likes his manager or his subordinate encouraged him.
- Going the extra mile - doing more than is requirement of the job description. This could be in better quality of work rather than necessarily doing more work.
- Should contribute to the overall organisational effectiveness. Individual behaviour has
Organisational Behaviour is present in every organisation. Some organisations may have a lack of it and some might have many positive organisational citizenship behaviours. It has an inversely proportional relation to turnover intention of employees. This means that the higher the organisational citizenship behaviour, the less employees want to leave the organisation they work for, the higher the employee involvement in the organisation's activities. It has been proved that organisational citizenship behaviours have an influential impact on the turnover ratio of the organisation (Muzumdar, 2012).

2.2.1 Types of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour:

There are five different types of dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviours. These are altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship and conscientiousness as described by Organ in 1988 (Organ, 1988). On the other hand William and Anderson (1991) gave the framework of organisational citizenship behaviours and divided organisational citizenship behaviour into two different types, OCB Individual and OCB Organizational. OCB-I refers to the organisational citizenship behaviours that are directed towards an individual such as altruism and courtesy. OCB-O, on the other hand are all the organisational citizenship behaviours that are directed towards an organisation such as sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness. Different researches explain the existence of around 40 different types of organisational citizenship behaviours but Organ’s five dimensions are still valid today (Lepine, Erez and Johnson, 2002). This study will, therefore, consider three of the Organ’s five dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour (Altruism, Courtesy and Sportsmanship). Many researchers conducted experiments on Organ’s five dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. Podsakoff et al (1990) validated the construction of a tool in the form of a questionnaire to measure the five dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. This questionnaire consists of 20 questions covering all the five dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. There are four questions on each dimension: altruism, civic virtue, courtesy, sportsmanship and conscientiousness. These questions have high validity and reliability and have been used in numerous researches since then.

Altruism: It is one of the types of organisational citizenship behaviour and generally means
to do things regardless of one’s own self. To do something for someone else, that provides no benefit to yourself and may even be a hassle of nuisance. It refers to discretionary assistance to employees who are in need. This can be in respect to organisational duties, jobs or tasks. It can often be very difficult to clearly give the definition of altruism and differentiate altruism from duty and loyalty. It can often be labelled as egoism (Krebs, 1991; Dambrun and Ricard, 2011). While, egoism is directed towards self, altruism is doing things for others, regardless of self (Batson, 2010). There are two different types of altruism, normative altruism and autonomous altruism. Normative altruism is directed by a rewards, intrinsic rewards or extrinsic rewards. Whereas, on the other hand, autonomous altruism is above any kind of rewards. This altruism is hard to find and cultivate as usually human beings do things for some sort of rewards, whether it be to gain favour with a manager or if an employee is looking for a raise or promotion. There are many examples of altruism such as; when a new employee joins an organisation, the more experienced colleagues should help assist the newcomer in orienting in the work environment and help them get acquainted to their job responsibilities. This can be by helping them by showing them what to do and how certain tasks are done in the organisation. The goal is to make the new employee feel comfortable in the new work environment. There have been different terms for this behaviour that are used in different researches. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) labelled it the helping behaviour concept and credit this behaviour with solving making workplace problems. Whereas, Moorman and Blakely (1995) labelled the individual’s supportive behaviour as ‘interpersonal helping behaviour.’

**Courtes**: It is also another important dimension of organisational citizenship behaviour which is crucial to cultivate in employees. This will help prevent conflicts from arising in the workplace. Courtesy can be simple things such informing employees their work schedules etc. (Organ, 1988). It is the attitude of preventing other people from any suffering for one’s own benefit. He also suggests that, courtesy includes helping behaviours that are taken on the employee’s own initiative, to involve themselves in tasks or responsibilities that require initial information.

**Sportsmanship**: It is another organisational citizenship behaviour towards others in an organisation in unfavourable conditions in an effort to maintain an efficient and pleasing work environment. This can be really important in many different types of organisations. When a sales company takes a loss on a specific product, it can be easy to blame teams or
certain employees for that loss. Similarly, in a healthcare setting, if a patient falls ill while under care or dies, it would be detrimental to the healthcare organisation if healthcare professionals were complaining and putting blame on each other. Sportsmanship is linked to tolerating and showing endurance against negative working conditions (Organ, 1988). Sportsmanship is a trait of an individual or an organisational citizenship behaviour that can often save the reputation of an organisation from negative external factors (Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, 1996). In many researches comparing other dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour, sportsmanship, is one that is not given much attention as compared to the others. In a study conducted on organisational citizenship behaviour in sales representatives working in sales, the authors argue that sales persons show a high level of sportsmanship i.e. tolerance even when they have negative experiences and hear negative responses. They often endure bad behaviour without complaint (Posdakoff and MacKenzie, 1994).

**Conscientiousness:** It is an organisational citizenship behaviour directed towards the organisation. It is an attitude with a high level of awareness of the organisation and its issues and level of consciousness. It is an extra role behaviour that means going above and beyond for the organisation. It is complying with the organisation’s requirements or demands, such as a certain dress code, absence rate etc. According to Organ (1988), a few characteristics of conscientiousness can be low absence rates, being regular and on time, completing all given tasks before deadlines etc. Achieving any tasks that have no rewards or working overtime with or without pay can be other examples of this type of organisational citizenship behaviour (Schnake, Dumler and Cochran, 1993). The term ‘obedience’ has been used when describing the function of conscientiousness. It plays a crucial role in improving organisational citizenship behaviour (Graham, 1991). Moorman and Blakely (1995), describe it as working extra hours and putting in additional efforts to enhance wellbeing of the organisation.

**Civic Virtue:** It is all about righteous behaviour towards an organisation. It shows absolute loyalty to the organisation. This organisational citizenship behaviour shows that the employees have a genuine concern in the wellbeing of the organisation and a deep interest in the policies and strategies of the organisation. This is the employee working hard for the betterment of the organisation, taking account of and contributing to changes in the framework of the organisation, observing or scouting the environment for any hazards to the organisation etc. (Organ, 1988). This is a participation in organisational life that in a way that
deals with the policies and running of the organisation on a management level. This requires commitment through joining activities including involvement in decision making regarding policies and strategies etc. (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

2.2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Action:

A study was conducted on the employee performance levels in a paper mill factory. This is an important study that emphasized on core performance. The researchers found that there is a very close correlation between employee performance, quality and quantity, at different dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour. They found that altruism has an important positive effect on quality, and sportsmanship along with altruism can have an associate effect which can be observed in the level of performance of the employees (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997).

Similarly, civic virtue encourages employees demonstrate their full potential. If civic virtue is lacking as an organisational citizenship behaviour in an employee, they will fail to contribute their optimal effort to the goals of the organisation. It is very important for employees to be aware of organisational values and goals, for them to be able to combine their own goals with those of the organisation. Those employees displaying conscientiousness, an organisational citizenship behaviour, will comply with the goals of their organisation rather than pursuing individual interests. This will then increase the reliability of organisational functioning, providing stability to the performance of the organisation (Parasuraman, Berry and Zeithaml, 1991).

Podsakoff et al. (2000) explained the benefits of Organisational citizenship behaviour for organizational success in terms of these variables, which are performance quality (18%), performance quantity (19%), financial efficiency indicator (25%) and custom service indicator (38%).

Overall OCB has fascinating on the employees in terms of job satisfaction, job commitment, performance level, intention to remain committed to their work and finally on the success of the organization. Major effects are therefore accumulated as;

- Increased productivity for both employees and organization
- Availability of resources/facilitation of work among colleagues
- Reduced turnover intention among employees
- Generate strong system of procedural justice
- Quality leadership

2.2.3 Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour:

Many researches have shown us that there is an effect on organisational outcomes due to organisational justice. It is suggested that organisational justice can help improve work performance of employees (Wang, Doong and Lin, 2007). If employees feel the actions of their organisation are fair and just, they will contribute more to the organisation which is ultimately beneficial to the development of the organisation (Demirkiran, Taskaya and Dinc, 2016). It has also been found that lack of organisational justice and lead to negative behaviour in employees such as theft, sabotage, withdrawal etc. (Fox, Spector and Miles, 2001). It is important to note that it is the perception of justice that plays a crucial role in the enhancement of organizational citizenship behaviours (Organ, 1988). Multiple pieces of research found that both distributive justice and procedural justice are directly related to the employee’s commitment to displaying extra role behaviours (Korsgaard and M. Schweiger, 1995; Farh, Earley and Lin, 1997; Skarlicki and Latham, 1997).

The perception of justice for an employee determines the quality of relationships within the organisations. Good working relationships are essential to the smooth functioning of an organisation (Swalhi, Zgoulli and Hofaidhllaoui, 2017). Whenever employees perceive fair treatment from organisation, that is if they feel there is the presence of organisational justice, employees will feel a sense of obligation to give back to the organisation in return (Ghosh, Sekiguchi and Gurunathan, 2017). Similarly, when this perception of organisational justice will be high, it will enhance the employee’s positive attitude towards their own organisations and also contribute positively to organisational citizenship behaviours (Özbek, Yoldash and Tang, 2016). In a study conducted on nurses, Pekurinen et al. (2017), state that lack of organisational justice can have a negative effect on the behaviour of nurses towards each other and can even have a negative effect on patient-nurse interactions. They found that lack of organisational justice and deter collaboration or teamwork and even change the nurses’ behaviour towards their patients. Nastiezaie and Jenaabadi (2016), also show in their research that the presence organisational justice has a significant and positive correlation with positive organisational citizenship behaviour.
On the other hand, employees that are treated with organisational injustice, might perform negatively and display negative behaviour. DeMore et al. (1988), found that low perceived equity is a possible indicator for vandalism. It was found by Ambrose et al. (2002) that organisational injustice was the most common cause of workplace sabotage. In a similar study done on Korean employees and it was found that perceived injustice during work is associate with increased risk of occupational disease and absenteeism (Min et al., 2014). The other study found that lack of organisational justice led to counterproductive work behaviour among Chinese public servants (Mingzheng et al., 2014). Another study conducted by a researcher which outlined that procedural injustice is the lead motivator for deviant behaviour in the workplace (Michel and Hargis, 2017).

In today’s world primary care setups and healthcare organisations are under immense pressure because of multiple reasons. One of these reasons is inability attract and retain healthcare professionals. The extent of organisational citizenship behaviour in doctors, specifically, is independent of age and length of service. However, the stress of the job and lack of job security affects the organisational citizenship behaviour of doctors (Boerner, Düschke and Schwämmle, 2005). A lack of organisational justice in an organisation will increase the stress and strain among doctors affecting how they behave and what organisational citizenship behaviours they exhibit.

Organ (1990), identifies organisational justice as one of the most influencing factors on organisational citizenship behaviour. He claims that should there be existence of fairness and equality in the organisation, employees will tend to demonstrate more organisational citizenship behaviours in response (Organ, 1990). Many researchers have recognised the effect of organisational justice in enhancing organisational citizenship behaviour (Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Moorman and Miner, 1998; Williams, Nichols and Conroy, 2002).

Organ and Ryan (1995), suggested that the perceived sense of fairness and equality in organisations is one of the best predictors of organisational citizenship behaviours. It is indicated that organisational justice plays a pivotal role in creating organisational citizenship behaviours in an organisation (Williams, Nichols and Conroy, 2002).
According to Organ (1988), the relationship between organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour relies on the principles of the social exchange theory. The social exchange theory requires mutual interaction, a give and take. In response to fair treatment of employees by the organisation, employees will display extra role behaviours in favour of the organisation. Drawing from the social exchange theory, Moorman also claims that there is a strong correlation between procedural justice and organisational citizenship behaviour dimensions (1991). He found that altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue and sportsmanship display strong correlations with procedural justice. The study by Moorman failed to establish a relationship between courtesy and procedural justice (1991). Management and higher authorities who make policies for an organization also affect OCB hugely (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 2006b) and this in terms of instrumental leadership (Procedural Justice), supportive leadership (Distributive Justice) and transformational leadership (Informational Justice).

2.3 Job Satisfaction:

Job satisfaction is instilling positive psychological conditions that are encouraged by suitable working conditions, appropriate benefits and rewards, intrinsic and extrinsic, performance appraisals constructive experiences etc. (Locke, 1976). There are a number of definitions of job satisfactions throughout literature and there seems to be no consensus on what job satisfaction truly is. Some say that job satisfaction is attributed to external factors making the employee feel a certain way about their jobs. Hoppock (1935), believes that job satisfaction is a combination of physiological, environmental and psychological factors making the person feel satisfied or dissatisfied about their job. Vroom (1964), believes that once an individual is effectively oriented into their roles at work, they will experience job satisfaction. This definition is more focused on the employees’ role in the workplace. This is one of the most popular definition of job satisfaction, “the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs” (Spector, 1997). Another very similar definition is given by Agho et al. (1993), “the extent to which people like their job”. The difference in both only being that Spector (1997) also mentions dissatisfaction. With so many definitions and theories surrounding the concept, it is clear that job satisfaction is a multifaceted construct, one that considers feelings of employees, and also considers how intrinsic and extrinsic job elements may affect them (Robbins and Judge, 2007).
Job satisfaction is extremely important for the efficiency and overall effectiveness of an organisation’s functionality and performance. Job satisfaction is one of the most useful resources to validate and further improve the actions and workings of an organisation as well as providing feedback to employees to improve their future performance.

The individuals’ behaviour in their workplace is linked closely to their job satisfaction (Davis et al., 1985). Negative behaviour or attitudes towards one’s job is an indication of job satisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). Job satisfaction is also said to the extent to which individuals are content with the rewards he or she gets out of their job. Aziri (2011), found that job satisfaction is a feeling that appears as a result of the individual's perception of how well their job meets their needs, whether they be financial needs or psychological ones. Cranny et al. (1992) suggest something similar to Aziri (2011) and state that the employee’s reaction to their job will be based on a comparison of outcomes i.e. what the actual outcomes are and what the desired outcomes are. An employee who is satisfied with their job will meet and exceed the requirements of their job (Schnake, 2016). Employees who are dissatisfied will show negative behaviours such as burnout, aggression in the workplace and withdrawal (Spector, 1997), all of which will have a detrimental effect to the organisation’s success.

There are many theories of job satisfaction and it is important to discuss the most important that have contributed greatly to literature and research on the concept. One of the earliest and fundamental studies on job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies conducted between 1924 and 1933 by Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger. The studies originally aimed to find out the effects of different working conditions of the productivity of workers. It was found that indeed changes to conditions of the workers did affect productivity, but it was later found that the changes in productivity were in fact from being observed instead of the changes in working conditions. This study gave rise to the idea that workers were motivated by reasons other than pay sometimes.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs is the most prominent theory of motivation. One that gave rise to a job satisfaction theory. According to this Maslow, 1943, all humans will seek to satisfy five basic needs in their life. The needs are in the shape of a pyramid and the ones at the bottom need to be satisfied before the next one on top can be satisfied (Robbins and Coulter, 2007). From the bottom of the pyramid to the job, these needs are - psychological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs and self-actualisation.
Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory is one of the earliest theories on job satisfaction and was founded in the 1950s. It is also known as the motivator - Hygiene Theory. It is believe that there are factors in a job that create satisfaction (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). These are referred to as motivators. Then there are some factors that can lead to dissatisfaction if they are not present. These are referred to as hygiene factors. According to Herzberg four factor theory, there are four motivators which are recognition, advancement, achievement and responsibility. There are total of five hygiene factors which are monetary rewards, suitable working conditions, competent management, administration and policy, and peer relationship. Herzberg reiterates that it is necessary for hygiene factors to be present at an adequate level in order for employees to feel neutrally about their jobs. Robbins and Judge (2007), state that the Herzberg Two Factor theory implicates that job satisfaction may just be the absence of job dissatisfaction and vice versa. They state that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction might not be opposite ends of the spectrum.

Adam’s Equity Theory has been mentioned a number of times in the research as it contributed a lot to the concepts of organisational justice and job satisfaction. This theory is based on social comparison.

Many studies have found that there is a significant relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction (Yaghoubi, Afshar and Javadi, 2012). Some studies have found procedural justice to be the best predictor of job satisfaction (Masterson et al., 2000; Clay-Warner, Reynolds and Roman, 2005), whereas some found distributive justice to be the best predictor of job satisfaction (Schappe, 1998; Colquitt et al., 2001; Thompson and Phua, 2012). It is discovered that feelings of inequality can cause job stress, absenteeism and job dissatisfaction (Martin and Nagao, 1989). There was a strong relationship found in equity perceptions and job satisfaction (Vroom, 1964).

Blegen and Mueller (1987), conducted a research on the job satisfaction of nurses and found that distribution of income had a strong positive correlation with job satisfaction if the distribution was perceived to be fair. A correlation of 0.52 was found between the fair distribution of income and job satisfaction (Agho, Mueller and Price, 1993). Witt and Nye (1992), found a correlation coefficient of 0.23 between organizational justice and job satisfaction, in a meta-analysis of 300 studies.
The relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice in Jordan was investigated and found that there was a positive correlation between all three dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction (Al-Zu’bi, 2010). In a study, conducted in Saudi Arabia on the effects of organisational justice perceptions on job satisfaction, it was found that these perceptions affected both all employees regardless of nationality, i.e. Saudi or Non-Saudi (Elamin and Alomaim, 2011).

2.3.1 **Link between organisational justice and job satisfaction:**

Positive perception of organisational justice in employees is an important antecedent to employees’ job satisfaction. This will promote positive behaviour in employees (Saifi and Shahzad, 2017). Another researcher examined the relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction and found that organisational justice, mostly distributive and interactional justice relate positively to job satisfaction (Saifi and Shahzad, 2017). It is also established that employee perceptions of organisational justice have been found to be very strong predictors of job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, turnover intentions (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2002). According to a study conducted by Organ (1988), the analogue between job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour is nearly 0.4. Several observations have been made to demonstrate that job satisfaction positively affects the job performance and results produced by employees.

It is observed that organisational commitment and job satisfaction are related and have effect on each other (Mowday, Steers and Porter, 1979). Ostroff (1992) conducted a study, measuring job satisfaction in teachers, considering many variables such as salary, supervision, administration, career advancement, communication etc. In a study conducted with workers in a clothing store in Hong Kong, it was found there is high correlation between satisfaction and performance (Leung, 1997). It is proven that there is a significant link between job satisfaction and performance. The higher the job satisfaction is, the higher the performance will be (Susanty and Miradipta, 2013).

2.4 **Turnover Intention:**

Turnover intention is an important phenomenon, one that is necessary for management to understand and try to combat as it can lead to incurring huge costs. Turnover
intention is hard to study and there is no clear definition in literature. This could be because of how the term is perceived to be clear and easy to understand. It is said that turnover intention is often the very last stage in an employee’s decision making process before he or she leaves the organisation (Steers, 1977; Mowday, Steers and Porter, 1979). Tett and Meyer, 1993 (p. 262), agree stating that turnover intention as ‘the last sequence of withdrawal cognitions. This practice is named an ‘identity exit’ by Petriglieri (2011).

According to Ajzen and Fishbein (2004), turnover intention is the individuals ‘behavioural intention’ to leave the organisation he or she works for. Turnover intention was also defined as ‘the extent to which an employee plans to leave the organisation (Lacity, Iyer and Rudramuniyaiah, 2008).

This behavioural intention as Ajzen and Fishbein (2004), call it is actually a very reliable determinant of the behaviour actually taking form (Jaros et al., 1993; Muliawan, Green and Robb, 2009). Several studies have found that turnover intention does lead to actual turnover and the two have a positive correlation (Jaros et al., 1993; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Hendrix et al., 1998; Muliawan, Green and Robb, 2009).

Petriglieri (2011), stated that turnover is actually an escape mechanism and a coping strategy to help deal with the current situation at work. Employees may leave the organisation permanently or could just move to different departments within the organisation so turnover can be permanent or just a horizontal move within the organisation (Kirpal, 2004).

There have been many theoretical models that attempt to explain turnover intentions (Mobley, 1977; Morrell et al., 2008; Petriglieri, 2011). The most popular model is the job resources-demands model (Bakker, Demerouti and Verbeke, 2004). This model also referred to as the JD-R model, provides explanations for why employees may choose to leave the organisations they work for. One of them most common causes that came to light was job demands leading to burnout in employees and hence turnover intention (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Demerouti and Bakker, 2007). It was found that when job demands exceed resources then it will cause exhaustion in employees which is the opposite of engagement. Schaufeli and Bakker(2004), stated that there is an established link in between burnout and turnover intention. The organisational citizenship behaviour and work engagement have a negative relationship with turnover intention, whereas alienation in the work place and
burnout have positive relationships with turnover intentions (Plooy and Roodt, 2010).

Another model was proposed by Jacobs in 2005 which is dependent on employee perceptions. According to Jacob (2006), employee perceptions, positive or negative, of organisational culture will influence turnover intention in employees. There has been a lot of research done with different mediators such as job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviours, organisational justice, organisational commitment and so on (Boshoff et al., 2002; Wasti, 2003). Individual perceptions are hence on key importance because they influence on the decision-making process of the employee in deciding whether to stay with the organisation or leave and work elsewhere.

Petriglieri (2011), contributed a lot to the knowledge we have today on turnover intention and has a theory of identity threat responses. This theory suggests that when individuals or employees are faced with an identity threat, they come up with possible coping strategies for themselves against this identity threat. These coping strategies are based on the strength of the threat and depends on how much support the individuals believe they have. Identity exit is one of the coping strategies that deal with the problem by eliminating it and this model has great relevance to turnover and turnover intentions.

It is important to realise that often leaving a job or resigning may not be an option for an employee because of various reasons. There are many personal reasons an employee may not want to leave a job or labour market. An employee is unlikely to leave their job if they believe it will be difficult to find another job and they do not have finances to sustain them in the time they look for another job (Bothma and Bergenholtz, 2013). So external employment opportunities have a big influence on turnover intention and this is proved by many studies (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Brown, 1996; Agarwal et al., 2012).

Turnover intention leading to actual turnover has significant costs (Bothma and Bergenholtz, 2013). Costs increase because of the costs in the hiring process and then there are costs associated to re-training individuals (Sulu, Ceylan and Kaynak, 2010; Bothma and Roodt, 2013). There are a number of negative side effects or consequences of employees leaving to the organisation (Mobley, 1977; Greyling and Stanz, 2010). High skill employees are especially important to organisations and losing them can be very disruptive for an organisation, especially ones that deliver services to customers.
2.4.1 Organisational Justice and Turnover Intentions:

There have been many studies done on organisational justice and turnover intentions and the role of organisational justice has gained more importance when discussing turnover intentions (Erdogan, 2002).

The social exchange theory was crucial to understanding that relationships play a very significant role in any organisation. There must be the presence of trust, respect and loyalty if these relationships are to survive (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Niehoff and Moorman (1993), discussed the concept of social exchanges and economic exchanges. They suggested that employees who prefer economic exchanges are more motivated to their job as compared to employees who preferred social exchanges. It is stated that fair organisations will develop employee trust and this leads to low turnover intentions in employees of that organisation (Aryee, Budhwar and Chen, 2002). It is also found that that procedural justice and distributive justice have negative correlations with turnover intention in employees (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2002). On the other hand, a study found that interactional and procedural justice correlated negatively with turnover intention in employees (Byrne, 2005). Brashear et al. further affirm that all three dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour have a negative relationship with turnover intention in employees (2005). There are many more studies that can further affirm the relationship between the organisational justice and turnover intentions. It is analysed that the presence of the perception of organisational justice in employees will boost their output levels (Byrne, 2005). When an attempt is made to instil organisation justice in the organisation, the turnover intention of employees of that organisation will go down or decrease (Kacmar et al., 2011).

The equilibrium between what employees put into the organisation and the rewards (financial and non-financial rewards) they receive is important to maintain and can generate commitment to the organisation leading to low turnover intentions (Allen and Grisaffe, 2001). A study conducted in Taiwan assessed the risk of turnover intention among hospital workers (Tsai, Wu and Chen, 2017). Different variables were used to assess the risk, the most important of which were job stress and organizational citizenship behaviour. The results showed that turnover intention increased proportionally to job stress.

Turnover is defined as the individual movement across the membership boundary of
an organization (Pryce, Albertsen and Nielsen, 2006), there are various determinants for turnover intention among the employees shown from the review of literature; These are gender, job satisfaction, job security (Liou, 1998; Hyun Kim and San Park, 2009; Ucho, Mkavga and Onyishi, 2012).

Increased workload is a profound factor found in most of the health care organizations, the reason for this is shortage of staff and increase in the number of patients. This is also one of the determinants of turnover in health care staff, because of exhaustion, stress and dissatisfaction of reward. The same idea about employees who are overwhelmed with work are more displeased and vulnerable to quit opposed to those who are not given much work (Moore, 2000; Ahuja et al., 2007). This work overload may be due to inadequate staffing, insufficient training, longer work shifts and all of these are flaws in the organizational distributive justice (Thaden, 2007).

Another important factor for increased turnover is gender. Female employees have increased intention to leave the job as compared to male workers (Emiroğlu, Akova and Tanrıverdi, 2015). There may be several factors behind this fact ranging from personal to organizational. These factors can be anything from personal preferences, sexual harassment, a glass ceiling, injustice at work etc.
3. Research Methodology

There are four main goals of this quantitative research; 1) to evaluate organizational justice in healthcare settings with reference to healthcare professionals (Primarily general practitioners/doctor, nurses and healthcare assistants who play very important roles in any healthcare organization), 2) to find the effect of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) on organizational citizenship behaviour, 3) the effect of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) on job satisfaction and 4) the effect of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) on turnover intention. The philosophy behind this research is positivism as a predetermined structured instrument is used for data collection (Saunders., Lewis, and Thornhill, 2015, p. 262). This is an objective study and data collected was used to further confirm our hypotheses. All the participants took part in the study through a questionnaire and then the data collected was reviewed and analysed to formulate a result and recommendations.

3.1 Research Strategy:

As mentioned before, this is a quantitative study. A questionnaire was used to carry out the research as it is convenient, far-reaching and cost and time effective (Wang, Doong and Lin, 2007). It reduces the cost of printing and mailing (O’Sullivan and Rassel, 1999). Online survey has less chance of a missing answer as compared to a printed hard copy of the survey (Schaefer and Dillman, 1998). There is also the threat to online survey that the respondents may not have a computer available or accessible to them or they may lack enough computer skills to complete that survey.

In literature, a survey response rate of up to 50% is considered good (Baruch and Holtom, 2008). All the questions are selected from already constructed instruments. These instruments have been constructed by well-known researchers who have contributed a lot to the study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Validity and reliability have important significance in the design of any research. The
term validity is very crucial for any research and is referred to what we expect to measure. There are three dimensions of validity, validity of instruments used in research, validity of data collected and research findings (Bernard, 2012). The strength of an instruments depends on the validity of data and vice versa. The agreement between perception and actual realistic measurement is validity (O’Sullivan and Rassel, 1999). In addition to the validity of the instrument and valid data, a valid conclusion is needed to achieve the overall validity (Bernard, 2012). The term reliability refers to the persistent consistency of measurement. In other words, the reliable measures produce same result under similar conditions (O’Sullivan and Rassel, 1999). The accuracy in measurement of any survey can be assessed by its validity and reliability (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996; O’Sullivan and Rassel, 1999). The instruments selected to measure organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention, are from existing literature and have been used in multiple researches before. Therefore, there is a high validity and reliability of these instruments and threat to validity and reliability is minimized. The participants of this study will remain anonymous and no personal data is collected from them. The data is analysed by the Statistical Package for Social Science or SPSS to gain the results.

3.2 Population and Sampling:

Our sample element is practicing healthcare professionals, focusing on general practitioners, doctors, nurses and healthcare assistants. We have selected the snow ball sampling technique, a non-probability sampling method as it was difficult to find potential participants due to their busy and stressful schedule. This is also called referral sampling or respondent driven sampling (Heckathorn, 1997). Initially, there was a required sample size of 100 participants but due to lack of time and compliance by participants, 53 responses were recorded.

3.3 Data Collection:

The data is collected by means of a survey as stated, because of convenience. The instruments for organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention are carefully selected from the previous work of researchers. These selected instruments have both validity and reliability. The following different inventories are gathered together with demographic questionnaires, information sheet and consent form in google form:
• Information Sheet.
• Consent Form.
• Demographic Questionnaires.
• Organizational justice scale comprising of 20 items (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).
• Organizational Citizenship Behavior instrument (Podsakoff et al., 1990) – Three of the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior are considered, comprising of 12 items.
• Job satisfaction comprising of 10 items (Goetz et al., 2013).
• Turnover intention scale comprising of 6 items (Bothma and Roodt, 2013).

Demographic information that is used in this research study is age, sex, profession, experience and work hours.

Organizational justice scale is divided into three parts, distributive justice comprising of five items, procedural justice comprising of six items and interactional justice comprising of nine items. The organizational justice scale used in this study is developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Total of 20 items are used in the organizational justice scale. Reliability and validity are very important for any measuring scale. This scale is selected because of its reliability and validity tested in previous research. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is named after Lee Cronbach and widely used for measuring the reliability of any scale. The reliability of the organizational justice scale used in this study is taken from research and is found to be an overall Cronbach’s alfa coefficient of .905 (Gurbuz and Sani Mert, 2009). The sub dimensions of organizational justice scale are found to be distributive justice: .748, procedural justice: .851 and interactional justice: .941 (Gurbuz and Sani Mert, 2009). The overall validity of this organizational justice scale found CFI .92 after confirmatory factor analysis (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). All the items have 5-point Liker scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale (Podsakoff et al., 1990) selected from literature – Three of the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior are considered (altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship), comprising of 12 items (four for each dimensions). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reliability of each dimension is suitably acceptable. The item analysis indicated that the reliability c ang it is above .70 for all
(Nunnally and Bernstein, 2008). The validity of this organizational citizenship behaviour scale found CFI .90 after confirmatory factor analysis. (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). All the items have 5-point Liker scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Job satisfaction comprising of 10 items (Cooper, Rout and Faragher, 1989). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reliability for job satisfaction scale is .86 (Hills, Joyce and Humphreys, 2012). All the items have 7-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Dissatisfied) to 7 (Strongly Satisfied).

Turnover intention scale comprising of 6 items generally known as TIS-6 (Bothma and Roodt, 2013). The reliability of this scale is Cronbach’s alpha .80 (Bothma and Roodt, 2013). All the questionnaires have 5-point Likert type response ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always).

All the instruments and demographic questionnaires were incorporated using Google Forms, an online form building tool, along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and seeking the participants' cooperation. Every step was taken to increase the response rate by sending the information sheet, and constant reminders. The questionnaires are designed attractively in relation to graphics and appropriately in relation to length, visibility and other relevant important details. A thank you note appears at the end with advice to contact researcher if further information is needed. After assembling the research questionnaire, links were sent via mail, text and social media platforms like LinkedIn. Hard copies were also distributed among potential participants with request to forward it to their eligible contacts and spread the message. The time frame given to the respondents to complete the questionnaires are about four weeks with multiple reminders sent to remind participants to complete the survey. The time taken to get the final 53 responses was about 6 weeks.

Different types of scales are used to measure human behaviour and attitudes. Likert scale is the most popular to measure human attitude (Tittle and Hill, 1967), and is widely used for the measurement of attitude and behaviour (Burns and Grove, 1987; Bowling, 2001) The Likert scale has many variables ranging from ranging from 5, 7, 9, and 11-point system, but the most commonly used is a 5-point Likert scale. It has adequate validity and reliability (Maurer and Andrews, 2000) and is also easy and pleasant to complete (Dumas et al., 1999).
The study collects the data in the form of opinions and behavioural variables.

3.4 Data Analysis:

The main purpose of this study is to explore the possible relationship between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention. Screening of the data collected is of utmost importance to increase the quality and accuracy of the data. The data collected are entered in a spreadsheet of Excel and are then encoded first in the following manners on Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 25.

1. Demographic questions are encoded as follows:
   - Sex: 1. Female 2. Male
   - Age: 1. Less than 25 2. 25 than 35 years 3. 36 - 45 years 4. 46 - 55 years
   - 5. 56 - 65 years 6. Above 65 years
   - Experience: 1. Under 5 years 2. 5 -10 years 3. 11 - 15 years 4. 15+ years
   - Working hours/week: 1. Less than 40 hours 2. 40 - 60 hours 3. Above 60 hours

2. Organisational justice instrument are divided into three:
   - Distributive Justice: Five items of distributive justice are encoded as DJ1, DJ2, DJ3, DJ4 and DJ5.
   - Procedural Justice: Six items of distributive justice are encoded as PJ1, PJ2, PJ3, PJ4, PJ5 and PJ6.
   - Interactional Justice: Nine items of distributive justice are encoded as IJ1, IJ2, IJ3, IJ4, IJ5, IJ6, IJ7, IJ8 and IJ9.

3. Organizational citizenship behaviour instrument is divided into three (dimensions considered in this study):
   - Altruism: Four items of altruism are encoded as A1, A2, A3 and A4.
   - Courtesy: Four items of altruism are encoded as C1, C2, C3 and C4.
   - Sportsmanship: Four items of altruism are encoded as S1, S2, S3 and S4.

4. Job Satisfaction: Ten items of job satisfaction are encoded as J1, J2, J3, J4, J5, J6, J7, J8, J9, and J10.

5. Turnover Intentions: Six items of turnover intentions are encoded as T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
and T6.

The research dataset is then analysed on Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 25 for descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis like Pearson’s correlation and t-test.
4. Result

The results of this research study are presented here in two-part, descriptive analysis and correlation analysis. The descriptive analysis measures central tendency and three central tendency methods are mean, median and mode (O’Sullivan and Rassel, 1999). This study has chosen mean and standard deviation (SD), variance between the data of variable and the mean. A common measure of variables in research is standard deviation having suitable variability (O’Sullivan et al., 2003). The t values and significant values depending on significant level shows the effect of all the independent variables. A large t value indicates a big impact of the variable and a small once shows a non-significant impact. Pearson’s r value is used to show correlation between variables in data.

The total responses collected during data collection are 53, out which 41 participants completed the survey online while remaining 12 filled a hard copy of the research questionnaires. Almost an equal number of females (n=26) and males (n=27) completed the research questionnaires. Our sample size consists of 50.1% males and 49.1% females.

The age range of the participants is between 25 to 65. This study divided selected age range in five groups ranging from less than 25 years to 56 – 65 years. Half of the participants belongs to the age group 26 – 35 years (n=25). Similarly, the respondents experience level is divided into four groups. 30.2% of the respondents (n=16) have experience of less than 5 years, 34% of the respondents (n=18) have experience ranging from 6 – 10 years. 26.4% of respondents (n=14) have over 15 years of experience.

Most of our research respondents (n=29) work around 40 – 60 hours. This is 54.7% of total respondents. The number of participants (n=10) work over 60 hours a week and are mostly doctors or general practitioners which is about 18.8%.

The health professional taken in this study are general practitioners, nurses, healthcare assistant. By profession, 49.1% nurses (n-25) completed the research questionnaires while 28.3%) were doctors or general practitioners (n=15 and 18.9% were healthcare assistants (n=10). In short one can see a bird’s eye view of the demographic statistics in table 1 below.
The different variables that are used to make the hypothesis are given in the following table 2. means (M) represents the central tendency of the individual variables and standard deviations (SD). The minimum and maximum score achieved by the respective instruments are also mentioned in the table 2 below.
Table 2: Different variables with mean (M) and standard deviation (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>44.37</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have divided the work hours into three groups. Group 1 (less than 40 hours) (M=18.16, SD=2.94), Group 2 (40 – 60 hours) (M19.17, SD=4.75) and group 3 (above 60 hours) (M=20.40, SD=2.41). Please see table 3 below.

Table 3: Distribution of work hours group with frequency (n), mean (M) and standard deviation (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work hours</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 60 hours</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis no. 1 (H1):** There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that fair allocation of goods in healthcare organization increases the organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship) of healthcare professionals but after the data analysis of the responses it appears that it has weak non-significant positive relationship with all the three dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour as shown below in table 4. A Pearson's r correlation showed that there was a weak non-significant positive relationship between distributive justice and altruism (r = .166, p=.236), courtesy (r = .131, p=.350) and sportsmanship (r = .143, p=.308). Please see table 4 below.

**Hypothesis no. 2 (H2):** There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. This hypothesis assumed that fairness in the procedure within healthcare organization increases the organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship) in healthcare and the study strongly supported this hypothesis. This
hypothesis is strongly supported. A Pearson’s r correlation showed that there was a strong significant positive relationship between procedural justice and altruism (r = .522, p< .001), courtesy (r = .477, p< .001) and a negative relationship with sportsmanship (r = -.170, p=.223). Please see table 4 below.

**Hypothesis no. 3 (H3):** There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that degree to which the people affected by decision treated by dignity and respect (Schermerhorn, 1963) will increase the organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship) of healthcare professionals. This hypothesis strongly supported. A Pearson’s r correlation showed that there was a strong significant positive relationship between interactional justice and altruism (r =.564, p< .001), courtesy (r = -.398, p=.003), and a negative relationship with sportsmanship (r = -.196, p=.159). Please see table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Frequency(n)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.522**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Frequency(n)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.477**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>Frequency(n)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Correlation between different types of organizational justice and dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour.*

**Hypothesis no. 4 (H4):** There is a significant relationship between gender and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that there is a significant difference in the organizational citizenship behaviour of female and male gender, but the research did not support. In other words, female and male respondents exhibited the same level of organizational citizenship behaviour. The mean and standard deviation of the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour used
in this study are given for female and male in table 5. The t-value and p-value are shown in table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number (n)</th>
<th>Mean(M)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Tendency of organizational Citizenship Behaviour in females and males' respondents.

Altruism - An independent samples t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between females (M=16.15, SD=2.98) and males (M=17.03, SD=3.48) in relation to altruism levels [t (51) = -.98, p=.327].

Courtesy - An independent t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between females (M=16.46, SD=3.91) and males (M=16.70, SD=2.81) in relation to courtesy level [t (51) = -.26, p=.796].

Sportsmanship - An independent t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between females (M=15.03, SD=3.20) and males (M=12.70, SD=5.12) in relation to sportsmanship level [t (51) = 1.98, p=.053].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of OCB</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism (equal variances assumed)</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy (equal variances assumed)</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship (equal variances assumed)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Hypothetical t-test analysis of dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Hypothesis no. 5 (H5):** There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that fair allocation of goods in healthcare organization increases the job satisfaction among healthcare professionals. The research supports this hypothesis weakly. A Pearson's r correlation showed that there was a weak non-significant positive relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction (r =.195, p=.163). Please see table 7 below.
Hypothesis no. 6 (H6): There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals. This hypothesis assumed that fairness in the procedure within healthcare organization increases the job satisfaction among healthcare professionals. The research moderately supports the hypothesis. The Pearson’s r correlation showed the moderately strong significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and procedural justice ($r = .356$, $p = .009$). Please see table 7 below.

Hypothesis no. 7 (H7): There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organizations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals. This hypothesis assumed that fairness in the information, decision and interpersonal dealing within healthcare organization increases the job satisfaction among healthcare professionals. The research moderately supports the hypothesis. The Pearson’s r correlation showed the moderately strong significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and interactional justice ($r = .346$, $p = .011$). Please see table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequency(n)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.356**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Correlation between different types of organisational justice and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis no. 8 (H8): There is a negative correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that fair allocation of goods in healthcare organization decreases the turnover intentions among healthcare professionals. The research supports this hypothesis strongly. A Pearson's r correlation showed that there was a strong significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and distributive justice ($r = -.588$, $p < .001$). Please see table 8 below.

Hypothesis no. 9 (H9): There is a negative correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. This hypothesis
assumed that fairness in the procedure within healthcare organization decreases the job turnover intentions among healthcare professionals. The research moderately supports the hypothesis. The Pearson’s $r$ correlation showed the moderately strong significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and procedural justice ($r = -.306, p=.026$). Please see table 8 below.

**Hypothesis no. 10 (H10):** There is a negative correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. This hypothesis assumed that fairness in the information, decision and interpersonal dealing within healthcare organization decreases the turnover intentions among healthcare professionals. The research moderately supports the hypothesis. The Pearson’s $r$ correlation showed the moderately strong significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and interactional justice ($r = -.352, p=.010$). Please see table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td>Frequency(n)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>-.588**</td>
<td>-.306*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$-value</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Correlation between different types of organisational justice and turnover intentions.*

**Hypothesis no. 11 (H11):** There is a negative correlation between experience and turnover intention of healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that there is increase in turnover intentions with increase in experience. This hypothesis is not supported by this research. A Pearson's $r$ correlation showed that there was a weak non-significant positive relationship between experience and turnover intentions ($r=.028, p=.841$). In other words, there is a tendency of turnover intention but is non-significant. Please see table 9 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency(n)</th>
<th>Pearson correlation (r)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9: Correlation between experience and turnover intentions.*
Hypothesis no. 12 (H12): There is a positive correlation between number of hours worked and turnover intention of healthcare professionals. The hypothesis assumed that turnover intention increases with when number of work hours increases. This hypothesis is not supported by this study. A One-Way Analysis of Variance showed there was no significant differences based on work hours in relation to turnover intentions \([F (2, 48) = .84, p = .439]\). Please see table 10 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) between hours worked and turnover intentions.

4.1 Summary of the hypothesis supported and not supported:

The following table 11 shows all the hypothesis made at the beginning of study and result after the completion of this research study. Each hypothesis is labelled whether supported or not supported and can be seen at a glance.

| Hypothesis no. 1 (H1): There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. | Not supported |
| Hypothesis no. 2 (H2): There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 3 (H3): There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 4 (H4): There is a significant relationship between gender and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals. | Not supported |
| Hypothesis no. 5 (H5): There is a positive correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 6 (H6): There is a positive correlation between procedural justice in healthcare organisations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 7 (H7): There is a positive correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organizations and job satisfaction of healthcare professionals | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 8 (H8): There is a negative correlation between distributive justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 9 (H9): There is a negative correlation between procedural | Supported |
justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. MS

| Hypothesis no. 10 (H10): There is a negative correlation between interactional justice in healthcare organisations and turnover intention in healthcare professionals. | Supported |
| Hypothesis no. 11 (H11): There is a negative correlation between experience and turnover intention of healthcare professionals. | Not supported |
| Hypothesis no. 12 (H12): There is a positive correlation between number of hours worked and turnover intention of healthcare professionals. | Not supported |

Table 11: Summary of the hypothesis supported and not supported.
5. Discussion

It is found that there is a positive relationship between both organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours for the most part. This study found that there is a non-significant relationship between distributive justice and all three dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour, altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship. This challenges previous study that proved that distributive justice is a strong predictor of organisational citizenship behaviours (Edwards, 1959; Colquitt et al., 2001; Nadiri and Tanova, 2010). It is also found that altruism was associated with distributive justice (Organ and Konovsky, 1989).

Findings of this study indicate that there is a strong correlation between procedural justice and altruism and courtesy. This is in line with prior studies that show procedural justice as an important indicator of organisational citizenship behaviour (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990; R. H. Moorman, 1991; Tansky, 1993). Farh et al. (1997), found a positive relationship between procedural justice and altruism. Results show a negative correlation between procedural justice and sportsmanship. This is in line with a research conducted by Wan 2017, who found that the perception of procedural justice in employees had negative correlations with courtesy and sportsmanship. Both these results challenge prior studies which find that there is a linear relationship between procedural justice and altruism, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and courtesy (Moorman, 1991). An inverse relationship between procedural justice and sportsmanship shows that if employees perceived procedural justice they would tend to behave negatively.

This study reaffirmed that interactional justice is a strong indicator of organisational citizenship behaviours. The results are the same as results of other research that found that interactional justice is significantly related to organisational citizenship behaviours (R. Moorman, 1991; Lazar, Zinger and Lachterman, 2007). However, once again, interactional justice is found to be negatively correlated to sportsmanship. This challenge the research mentioned above. Previous research has indicated that there is significant relationship between gender and organisational citizenship behaviour (t = 3.50, P = 0.04) (Esmaeil Yaghoubi, 2012), whereas this study found that there was no significant relationship between gender and dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour.

This study concluded that there a moderately positive relationship between divisions
of organisational justice and job satisfaction. There is a weak positive relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction. A moderate positive relationship is present between procedural and interactional justice with job satisfaction. Procedural justice had the most influence followed by interaction justice and then distributive justice. This is consistent with previous research which proves that perception of justice in organisations affects job satisfaction (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993; Lee, 2000; Colquitt et al., 2001; Ismail et al., 2011). Some studies show that only procedural justice influences job satisfaction (Igbaria and Greenhaus, 1992) and some studies show that procedural justice is a stronger influence than distributive justice on job satisfaction (Schaubroeck, May and Brown, 1994; Hashim and Hassan, 2011). This study reaffirms this view. In accordance with previous studies, procedural justice has a more stronger influence on job satisfaction. This means that regardless of if the decision is in favour of the employee or not if the process of decision making is fair, the employee will experience job satisfaction (Bies and Shapiro, 1987; Shapiro and Buttner, 1988). However, Yilmaz and Tesdan (2009), found that perceived injustice during the process of decision making will not hurt job satisfaction as long as the decision itself is perceived to be fair.

As for the relationship between organisational justice and turnover intention, it was found that the perception of justice in organisations will lead to a decrease in turnover intention. In this research, distributive justice was found to have a very strong significant negative effect on turnover intention. Procedural justice and interactional justice also had moderately significant negative effect on turnover intention. The findings of this study are consistent with work done by other prominent researchers who found that all three types of organisational justice: distributive, procedural and interactional justice have significant effects on turnover intention of employees (Lee, 2000; Rahim et al., 2013).

This research also found that there was no real relationship between years of experience and number of hours worked to turnover intention. This could be because of the nature of the profession of healthcare professionals.
5. Limitations of this Research

There were a number of limitations in this research that could have had an effect on the results of this research and it is pointed out in details.

The sample chosen, healthcare professionals, were difficult participants to gather data from as they have many commitments and often cannot find time to take part in other activities. Due to this reason, the sample size was very small and limited to 53 participants. The small sample size may not represent the views of all healthcare professionals. The busy schedule of healthcare professionals is a factor as to why many didn’t participate in the research.

This study did not take into account any other work-related attitudes that could have affected job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviours, perception of organisational justice and turnover intention.

One of the main points to note in this research is that the notion of organisational justice, according to definition, relies entirely on perception (Greenberg, 1987). An organisation is as fair and as equal as the employees perceive it to be. We know that perception is entirely subjective and unique to the individual. What might seem fair to one individual may seem unfair or biased to another (Weiten, 2007), e.g. an organisation might have to make the decision to promote one of two equally qualified individuals. To the one employee who gets promoted, it is a fair decision but to the one who didn’t get promoted, it might seem unfair. And since this judgement is up to the employees, as humans, our judgement can often be biased, favouring the self. Hence, any outcome in our favour can be fair and just and any against us can seem unfair, even though this might not be the case. Hence, organisational justice is a very subjective concept and it can be extremely difficult to measure it.

For employees to regard procedures and the organisational decisions in general as fair, two components need to be taken into account, balance and correctness (Coetzee, 2005). Balance is the first principle of justice and comparisons of balance are made when one person compares the rewards that they receive against what another person receives compared to
how much work they put in. This could be related to healthcare professionals in many ways. A nurse attending to 50 patients a day could expect more rewards or recognition if her peers attend to only 40. Correctness is the second principle of justice according to Coetzee, 2005, and means that all organisational decisions encompass elements of clarity, consistency and accuracy. For example, all nurses or healthcare assistants calling in sick should have a set procedure to follow when they return to work and there should be no inconsistencies in the process.

It is important to take note of this factor because this hurt the reliability of the data collected. It is impossible to measure the presence of organisational justice in the organisation unless we measure it not only quantitatively but also through interviews and in-depth analysis of how the particular set up works. Since data was gathered through a snowball effect, it is impossible to know what organisations the professionals belong from and how procedures are set in those organisations. Since the concept is so dependent on perceptions, it can also be ever evolving. Perceptions can be influenced by things such as age, sex and even day to day based on experience (Coon and Mitterer, 2015).

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour itself can be difficult to measure accurately. Social Desirability Bias plays a massive role in manipulating the accuracy of the results. Social desirability bias is a type of response bias that often researchers encounter (Edwards, 1959). It is the over reporting of good behaviour and underreporting of what is considered to be bad behaviour. It is responding to questions in a way that would be viewed favourably by others. In the research, we found that almost all participants rated themselves very high on organisational citizenship behaviours. This is great but most likely inaccurate. It is important to mention that this bias could have interfered with the interpretation of data.

The definition given by Organ (1988), itself has generated a great deal of criticism. Organisational citizenship behaviours are defined by Organ as discretionary in nature. In today’s world, jobs often have more ambiguous roles. It can be hard to determine what is discretionary. Another thing to mention is how the original instruments were changed to fit our sample and given a perspective to suit our sample of healthcare professionals. This could have impacted our results. Healthcare professionals might also be required by role to display organisational citizenship behaviours. It can be very hard to be a healthcare professional and lack altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship.
6. Conclusion

Healthcare organisations are some of the most complex organisations. Employee job satisfaction and a reduced turnover intention is crucial to the success of such organisations. However, even then, it seems that not much consideration is given to give appropriate training to healthcare managers to deal with the unique issues that might arise due to the nature of the stressful work. It is concluded that organisational justice is a strong indicator of organisational citizenship behaviour and also influences job satisfaction and turnover intention moderately.

Following are some rules Leventhal (1980), proposed to ensure procedural justice in employees. It is believed that for there to be a perception of distributive justice, procedural justice should be present.

- It is important to involve employees in any decisions that affect them.
- There should be opportunities to make changes to any decisions.
- The process should be based on opinions and accurate information as much as possible.
- The decision-making process should always be applied consistently across all employees.
- Bias should be prevented.
- Procedures should be moral and ethical.

Leventhal (1980), believes that the presence of these rules will increase perception of justice. It is crucial for organisations to treat employees with respect and dignity (Colquitt, 2001). Interactional justice is an important influencer of job satisfaction. Organisations should provide adequate training to management to enhance specialist and interpersonal skills. These skills will improve relationships between healthcare professionals and their management. It is crucial in resolving conflict between staff.

This research was carried out in a short amount of time and the sample size was also small. This is a limitation of this research as it effects the accuracy of the findings. This is not a longitudinal study and it becomes difficult to establish links between the different variables that are being studied.
7. Reflection

I had a very good time here in DBS. My time in this MBA postgraduate program was a great learning experience for me. When I started my studies, I had been really out of touch with studying. It took me a great while to get into the mindset of studying.

I kept my attendance really high from the start of the year to the end. This helped me get into the mindset of studying and put pressure on me to keep on top of material. Going to all my classes helped prepare me for the study load and I got to know all my professors. This made me feel comfortable asking them for help out of hours and after classes.

I always had the impression that business itself was an easy topic and it was mostly based around common sense. I was proved wrong in the very first month of the semester. I realised how difficult business can be especially as I had no business background coming from a medical background. A major reason why business can be so difficult is because the business environment is constantly evolving, and it is key to stay on top of all current news and events in the business world. Business is also very inclusive, with almost anything in the external environment having an impact. I also learnt that it was crucial to follow leaders in the business world and learn from their talks and seminars. A big part of business can often be learning from the mistakes of other people and the success of large organisations.

It had over 20 years since I had formally studied a degree. The teaching style was extremely different that was I was used to, what I had experienced studying back in my own home country. It took a while to get used to the formal procedures in DBS. I could not say if the studies were more or less easy here than back home but the teaching style in DBS, definitely encouraged me to think outside of the box, be more in tune with my external environment and make use of the research resources that were available to me. I was definitely taken by surprise as to how much reading and literature review was involved in the entire course. One thing I admired greatly about the professors was how they were well versed in their area of expertise and knew who said what. I hope to be more knowledgeable and be able to recall that knowledge immediately when I need it.

One thing that proved to be a great difficulty for me was language. English is my
second language and I had great trouble with most of my subjects because of it. The public speaking parts of my modules made me very anxious and put a lot of pressure on me. There was also a great deal of writing involved in my projects and hence it took multiple proof readings to get the grammar correct and my sentences clear and cohesive. I realise that I still have a long way to go to improve my language skills and know that as a manager I will need to have great communication skills and a good command over groups of people. I work on improving my language skills by striking conversations with different people, watching documentaries and the many readings involved, definitely helped. I feel much more confident in publicly speaking, a great deal of that confidence comes from lecturers and peers making me feel comfortable within the classroom.

All my modules comprised of subjects which were completely new to me. I enjoyed Human Resource Management a great deal as I realised how technical the subject really was. My lecturer in the subject was extremely knowledgeable and good at engaging the classroom. Financial Analysis and International management were very interesting subjects and gave words like globalisation and analysis a whole new perspective for me. Ethics and Professional Development really worked to refine me as a person as I learnt a lot about myself through writing the portfolio and taking assessments to judge my abilities. I learnt how Risk Management is crucial even in daily life doing everyday tasks.

All my continuous assessments and projects challenged me and pushed me out of my comfort zone. While I struggled on time management and procrastination with individual projects, I still found them much better than team projects. I realise that teamwork is an essential part of business and without it, no business can thrive on a large scale in the long run. I still faced a lot of difficulties in working in teams and groups. It can often be difficult to reach mutually agreeable decisions because everyone has different temperaments. Another major struggle I experienced in group projects was how if one team member was late in submitting their part, it would create a time lapse that was very difficult to cover and put a lot of pressure on other team members.

My Master’s Dissertation is one of biggest accomplishments in this year and also was one of the hardest tasks to accomplish. I faced a number of difficulties at the very start. One of the biggest was data collection. I grossly overestimated how many people would be willing to respond to the questionnaire and underestimated how much time it would take. Data
collection was made even more difficult because of all the GDPR and data collection laws that are now in place. I was not able to gather data from institutions like Irish Medical Council (IMC) and HSE which would have made data collection much more easier. I realised many participants were not compliant and would not take the time out for a research until and unless it was affiliated with some large organisation or IMC. It took a number of tries to make the questionnaire error free and user friendly. I encountered a lot of problem with data analysis which I was underestimating as well. Once I had the data, I realised that we had not been given any tools or knowledge on how to analyse that data. I feel like Research Methods should have covered at least the basics on analysis of data and compilation of results and how to operate software like SPSS and excel should be taught. There were also problems faced when fulfilling the word count.

Overall, my entire postgraduate programme and dissertation was an enriching experience and made me feel capable and accomplished. It boosted my confidence and made me ready to encounter some of the challenges that I would be facing in management roles.
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9. Appendices

Appendix – A: Research questionnaires (hard copy). All the construct along with information sheet and consent form compiled together.

Research Questionnaires

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

PROJECT TITLE
Does organizational justice affect the organizational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals and have impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention in the healthcare organization?

You are being asked to take part in a research study which aims to establish the link between the lack of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour of healthcare professionals. In addition to this, the study will also determine the level of job satisfaction and turnover intention. This topic is chosen for a master’s dissertation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN
In this study, you will be asked to fill a questionnaire which consists of six sections which are given below:

* Consent form
* Demographic details
* Organizational justice scale
* Organizational citizenship behaviour scale
* Job satisfaction scale
* Turnover intention scale

After completion of the survey, the form will be coded to secure the identity and data. Every step will be taken to safeguard privacy and confidentiality and all information provided is treated as confidential and will not be released by the researcher in any condition to a third party unless required to do so by law. The collected data will be analysed to conclude the result of the study.

TIME COMMITMENT
This questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. We hope that this research can help current and prospective healthcare professionals, making their daily work less stressful and more fulfilling.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS
You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation required from you. You have the right to ask that any data you have supplied to that point be withdrawn/destroyed.

You have the right to omit or refuse to answer or respond to any question that is asked of you.

You have the right to have your questions about the procedures answered unless answering these questions would interfere with the study’s outcome. If you have any questions after reading this information sheet, you should ask the researcher before the study begins.

CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY
The research study will use the data collected in the dissertation, publication and conferences. The whole record will be destroyed after the approval of the dissertation. The data I collect does not contain any personal information and no IP addresses are recorded.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
If you have any questions regarding this questionnaire or research, you are encouraged to contact either
me or my supervisor Dr Garry Prentice at the contact information provided below.

Syed Jilani  
MBA Student  
Dublin Business School, Dublin  
Email: draamir.jilani@gmail.com  
Phone: +353899434079

Dr Garry Prentice  
Lecturer Psychology  
Dublin Business School, Dublin  
Email: garry.prentice@dbs.ie  
Phone: +353 1 4178731

Consent

By signing below, you are agreeing that:
(1) you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet
(2) questions about your participation in this study have been answered satisfactorily,
(3) you are aware of the potential risks (if any), and
(4) you are taking part in this research study voluntarily (without coercion).

Signature ----------------------------

Demography

This section outlines the age, sex, marital status, education, qualification and training of general practitioners over the four time periods.

Age: □ Less than 25 □ 25 than 35 years □ 36 - 45 years
□ 46 - 55 years □ 56 - 65 years □ Above 65 years

Sex: □ Male □ Female □ Others

Experience □ Under 5 years □ 5 -10 years □ 11 - 15 years
□ 15+ years

Regarding your Profession, are you (Check that apply)?

- General Practitioner/Doctor □
- Nurse □
- Healthcare Assistant □
- Other □

Please specify if other -------------------------------

Working hours/week

□ Less than 40 hours □ 40 - 60 hours □ Above 60 hours
**Organizational Justice**

This section outlines the three categories of organizational justice, perceptions of fairness in the workplace, i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional justice and aims to ascertain the extent of the three types of organizational justice. Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question from 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree.

### A. Distributive Justice (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work schedule is fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think that my level of pay is fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I consider my work load to be quite fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Procedural Justice (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job decisions are made by the management in an unbiased manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The management makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To make job decisions, the management collects accurate and complete information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The management clarifies decisions and provide additional information when requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected Employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An employee can challenge or appeal job decisions made by the higher authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Interactional Justice (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When decisions are made about my job, the management treat me with kindness and consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When decisions are made about my job, the management treats me with respect and dignity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When decisions are made about my job, the management is sensitive to my personal needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When decisions are made about my job, the management deals with me in a truthful manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When decisions are made about my job, the management shows concern for my rights as an employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Concerning decisions made about my job, the management discusses the implications of the decisions with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The management offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When making decisions about my job, the management offers explanations that make sense to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
The management explains very clearly any decision made about my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The following section aims to ascertain the extent three of the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour i.e. altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship. Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question from 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree.

1. Altruism  (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I help others who have heavy workloads. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
2. I help others who have been absent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
3. I willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
4. I help orient new people even though it is not required. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. Courtesy  (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I consult with other individuals who might be affected by my actions or decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
2. I do not abuse the rights of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
3. I take steps to prevent problems with other doctors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
4. I inform management before taking any important actions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

3. Sportsmanship (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
2. I tend to make “mountains out of molehills” (makes problems bigger than they are). (R). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
3. I constantly talk about wanting to quit my job. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
4. I always focus on what’s wrong with my situation, rather than the positive side of it. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Job Satisfaction

The following section aims to ascertain the extent of job satisfaction. Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question from 1=Extremely dissatisfied to 7=Extremely satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I experience a variety in my job. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
2. I have the opportunity to make use of all my abilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
3. I have the freedom to choose my working method. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
4. I am satisfied with the level of responsibility. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
5. I am satisfied with physical working condition. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
6. I am satisfied with the hours of work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
7. I am satisfied with my income. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
8. I am satisfied with recognition for my work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
9. I am satisfied with my colleagues and fellow workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
10. Overall job satisfaction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

**Turnover Intention**

The following section aims to ascertain the extent to which you intend to stay at the organisation. Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question: Please select one from 1=Never/very satisfying/highly unlikely to 5=Always/totally dissatisfying/highly likely.

| 1. How often have you considered leaving your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. How satisfying is your job in fulfilling your personal needs? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. How often do you look forward to another day at work? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

You have now completed this questionnaire. I appreciate the time you have taken to aid me in my analysis by providing very valuable insight. If you would like the results of this research shared with you, please email me at draamir.jilani@gmail.com. Once again, I greatly appreciate your efforts into making this research possible. Thank you.
Appendix – B:

Dataset of the responses on Excel spreadsheet can be viewed by clicking the following icon.

![Thesis Dataset.xlsx](image)

Appendix – C:

Dataset of the responses on SPSS can be viewed by clicking following icon.

![Thesis dataset SPSS.sav](image)