

The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) With Employee Engagement as a Mediator

Erna Ekawati¹, Heru Kurnianto Tjahjono², Fauziyah³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

Corresponding Author: **Erna Ekawati**
Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

Abstract: This study aims at analyzing the influence of Procedural Justice, and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) by mediating Employee Engagement. Survey methods with questionnaires were used as data collection techniques. Structural Equation Modeling was used as the data analysis technique. The results showed that organizational climate and employee engagement have a positive and significant effect on OCB; procedural justice and organizational climate have a positive and significant effect on employee engagement, while procedural justice has no significant influence on organizational citizenship behavior, which means rejecting the hypothesis in this study. Organizational climate is the dominant variable in influencing organizational citizenship behavior, therefor special attention and improvement must be made by management.

Keywords: procedural justice, organizational climate, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior

INTRODUCTION

Banking is a sector that has a large influence on the economy of a country. Bank as a company has a dependency on employees. Employees have a big role in determining the achievement of company goals. To advance a bank, optimal employee contributions are needed. When employees are willing to do their best and have a strong psychological desire to produce related results to their work, it can help to achieve the organization's goals so that employees' management or human resources becomes very important to do. The employees' psychological condition should be the focus of company management in managing human resources. Moreover, if they are willing to move voluntarily outside of his job description or responsibility for the progress of the company where he works or is called organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of course it will benefit the company (Garay, 2006).

Companies that possessed high OCB employees will have better performance than companies with low OCB employees. An example of OCB's behavior are helping colleagues, giving good advice to the company, being willing to work overtime on their own choice, and tolerating unpleasant things in the work environment (Robbins & Judge, 2015). Companies that posessed many employees with high OCB certainly will give benefit greatly. Giving many benefits, it is important for a company to know the level of employees' OCB and learn the factors that can increase OCB.

According to Podsakoff et al (2000), OCB is very important for companies because it contributes to company performance. These contributions are to increase the productivity of fellow co-workers, the productivity of company managers, efficiency of company management resources, etc. OCB is strongly influenced by close relationships between employees, employee relations with the company, employee relations with their work or commonly called employee engagement (Saks, 2006). At the other hands, the research of Taghinezhad et al (2015) shows that the results of procedural justice have a positive and significant effect on OCB. Meanwhile, the research of Ukkas and Latif (2017) proves that organizational climate has a positive and significant effect on OCB. Yulianti's research (2016) shows procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on employee engagement, while Ratliff (2012) proves that organizational climate has a positive and significant effect on employee engagement. Based on the results of the last 2 studies, it can be interpreted that employee engagement mediates the influence of procedural justice and organizational climate on OCB.

Employee engagement is behaviors that employees obtained after feeling satisfied with their work, then having self-awareness to contribute to the company where they work (Croston, 2008). Employee engagement is not temporary, but is more sustainable or continuous because it is based on self-awareness and not coercion to contribute to the company. Employee engagement allows employees to interpret and be

proud of their work and the company work (McPhie and Rose, 2008). Employee engagement can make employees become loyal and do not want to move to other companies and always want to contribute more for the company (Macey and Schneider, 2008).

Banking is always required to continue to improve its competitiveness through quality improvement. Justice in a company is very important to note, because if there is an injustice there will be dissatisfaction within the employees which will give a negative impact to the company. The employees' good perception on the company that is important to be formed by company management is the organizational climate. According to Gibson et al (2011), the organizational climate is a general collective picture of the expectations and feelings of employees that are shaped by a work atmosphere or work environment that improves company performance. Organizational climate becomes important to be created because it becomes the employee's perception of the company and becomes the basis for continuous employee behavior.

Based on the problems found in the banking sector, several existence theories and with the support of previous research, the researcher feels that it is needed to conduct a research with the title "The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior with Employee Engagement as A Mediator". This research is not a replica of any pure journal hence consists of several supporting journals used as the theoretical basis and interrelationship between variables to form the title of this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ et al (2006) states that OCB is employee voluntary behavior that is not directly related to the compensation system but contributes to the effectiveness of the organization. The basic thing that distinguishes OCB from ordinary work activities is that OCB is done voluntarily or for its own choice and the activity is outside the job description of the position and the activity has a positive impact on the company. Companies that have employees with high OCB will have better company performance than companies that have employees with low OCB (Robbins & Judge, 2015).

Organ et al (2006) states that to measure the high and low behavior of OCB employees of a company, it can use 5 OCB dimensions, namely altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportmanship, and civic virtue. Altruism measures employee voluntary behavior in helping colleagues who are experiencing obstacles or difficulties. Courtesy measures the behavior of employees who always maintain good relations between fellow employees to avoid internal problems among fellow employees in a company. Conscientiousness measures employee behavior that always exceeds company expectations, such as coming before working hours. Sportmanship measures the behavior of

employees who accept or tolerate company decisions or circumstances even though they are not ideal. While civic virtue measures the behavior of employees who care about the sustainability of the company and are always involved in activities organized by the company.

B. Employee Engagement

Schaufeli et al (2006) explained that employee engagement is positive thinking to solve work-related matters and is characterized by 3 dimensions of employee engagement, namely vigor, dedication and absorption. Vigor explains about employees with mental endurance and high levels of energy while working. Dedication explains about high employee involvement, enthusiasm, and pride in work. While absorption explains about employees who are fully concentrated and happy to be involved with the company so that time is not felt when working.

Actually some previous researchers used different terms in defining engagement. The terms used by previous researchers are employee engagement and work engagement. The two terms do not indicate a difference in defining employee engagement. Employee engagement and work engagement are formed by several similar characteristics as proposed by Schaufeli et al (2006), namely vigor, dedication, and absorption.

C. Procedural Justice

Colquitt (2001) argues that procedural justice is the employee's perception of justice based on the company's management procedures where he works. Tjahjono (2007); Tjahjono et al. (2015) emphasizes that procedural justice is what individuals feel for justice in relation to procedures or rules in policy making within organizations. Tjahjono (2009); Palupi (2013); Palupi & Tjahjono (2016) states that the negative impact of employee perceptions of managerial policies that are unfair is that they can trigger negative emotions and potentially encourage employee behavior to reciprocate unfair treatment.

Furthermore, regarding the importance of procedural justice for the company, if the employee's perception in evaluating the company's procedural justice is fair, it will trigger employees to contribute more to the company because procedural justice explains organizational outcomes in the form of individual attitudes towards the organization (Tjahjono, 2008). Tjahjono (2007) in his modifying research from Colquitt (2001), stated that there were 7 indicators to measure procedural justice. The seven indicators are process control, decision control, consistency, unbiased, accurate information, capable of correction, and ethics and morals.

D. Organizational Climate

Gibson et al (2011) stated that organizational climate is a direct or indirect assessment of the nature of the work environment by employees, which is assumed to be the main force in influencing employee behavior. Furnham and Goodstein (1997) explain that organizational climate is an

“The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) With Employee Engagement as a Mediator”

employee's perception of things that take place in an organizational environment. According to Stringer (in Wirawan, 2007), organizational climate is something that can be measured in a work environment that affects motivation and behavior that is perceived directly or indirectly by employees.

So important is the organizational climate because it becomes the basis of the behavior of members of the organization. Organizational climate measurement in this study uses the dimensions of Furnham and Goodstein's (1997) theory with reasons more complete in describing organizational ideas than other theories. The dimensions of Furnham and Goodstein's (1997) theories are role clarity, respect, reward systems, communication, career development, planning and decision making, innovation, relationship, quality of service, teamwork and support, conflict management, commitment and morale, training and learning, and direction.

F. Hypothesis

Based on previous researches in the introduction, the hypothesis proposed in this study are:

- H1: Procedural justice has a positive effect on OCB
- H2: Organizational climate has a positive effect on OCB
- H3: Employee engagement has a positive effect on OCB
- H4: Procedural justice has a positive influence on employee engagement
- H5: Organizational climate has a positive effect on employee engagement

Based on previous researches and hypotheses, the proposed research model includes OCB variables, employee engagement, procedural justice and organizational climate presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Research Model

RESEARCH METHODS

The location of this study is at PD BPR Bank Sleman. The population/employee of PD BPR Bank Sleman is 130 people. The census method is used in taking the sample; the research respondents are all members of the population. Survey

methods with questionnaires are used as data collection techniques.

Structural Equation Modeling or SEM is used as a data analysis technique. SEM is used since it has the ability to analyze measurement models and structural models simultaneously. This analysis technique can be used after the model has passed the data quality test, SEM assumptions, and meets the goodness-of-fit criteria before the hypothesis test is carried out.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Validity Test

Validity test is used to test whether a measuring instrument (indicator) can explain the measured variable. The validity test in this study will use the convergent validity test in SEM. Based on the results of data analysis, there are 1 indicator that does not pass the validity test, namely the EE12 indicator that measures absorption dimensions in employee engagement variables. The EE12 indicator is declared not to pass the validity test because it has a value of C.R. amounting to 1.464 which means it is still below the value of 1.96. in addition, the standardized estimate value is 0.147, which means it is still below the value of 0.5. The EE12 indicator must be discarded and cannot be used in the subsequent analysis.

B. Reliability Test

Reliability shows the consistency of indicators in measuring Latent or Construct variables. It has good or reliable reliability if the value of Construct Reliability ≥ 0.70 (Ferdinand, 2014). Based on the results of the data analysis, it was found that there was no Construct Reliability value that was smaller than 0.70. So all indicators in this study consistently measure the constructs measured or it can also be explained that reliability is met and data can be used for further analysis.

C. Outliers Evaluation

The results of the data analysis showed that there was no z-score ≥ 3.29 which means there was no univariate outlier problem (Jauhar, et al., 2016). The *chi-square* limit value for analyzing multivariate outliers is 82.720 resulting from 47 free degrees (number of variable indicators) at a significance level of 0.001. This study is free of multivariate outliers because the results of data processing indicate that the highest mahalanobis distance value is 76.567 which is still below 82.720.

D. Normality Evaluation

Based on the results of data analysis, there is still a critical ratio skewness value $> \pm 2.58$ and the critical ratio of the multivariate test is 11.210 which is still above ± 2.58 . These results indicate that the data are not normally distributed univariate and multivariate, thus the data have not met the requirements in the normality test.

Bootstrapping test is used to test abnormal models so that it is still acceptable (Ghozali, 2010). A bootstrap distribution in the form of histograms with the Bollen-Stine

“The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) With Employee Engagement as a Mediator”

procedure is used in this research. The results of the bootstrapping test are presented in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Bootstrap Distribution Histogram

Based on the bootstrap distribution histogram in Figure 2, the average *chi-square* value with a sample bootstrap 1000 and p

= 0.053 is 1487.061. The value of 1487.061 shows the cluster value in the center of multivariate 1487.061 and the *chi-square* distribution is normal because there are several values above and below 1487.061 which are almost balanced (histograms are shaped like bells).

E. Multicollinearity Evaluation

Multicollinearity can be detected from correlations between exogenous variables. According to Maruyama (1998), the identification of multicollinearity problems was analyzed from correlation values between exogenous variables greater than 0.9. The results of data processing show that the correlation value between exogenous variables is 0.523, which means it is still below the value of 0.9.

F. Goodness-of-Fit Evaluation

After SEM assumption test, the next analysis is the suitability of the model will be tested by looking at some Goodness-of-fit criteria including *chi-square*, probability, CMIN / DF, GFI, AGFI, TLI, CFI, RMSEA, and PRATIO values. Tests on the full conformity of the SEM model in more detail are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Goodness-of-Fit Evaluation

Goodness-of-fit index	Cut-off value	Results	Evaluation
Chi-square (df=1020)	< 1095.411	1895.934	Bad Fit
Probability	≥ 0.05	0.000	Bad Fit
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.605	Poor Fit
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.563	Poor Fit
TLI	≥ 0.95	0.714	Poor Fit
CFI	≥ 0.95	0.731	Poor Fit
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.086	Marginal Fit
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.859	Good Fit
PRATIO	> 0.90	0.944	Good Fit

Based on table 1, the values of CMIN / DF and PRATIO have met the conditions indicated by the CMIN / DF value of 1.859 is below the cut-off value of 2.00 and the PRATIO value of 0.944 is above the cut-off value of 0.90. Solimun (2002) explains that if there are one or two goodness-of-fit criteria that have met the requirements, it can be said that the built research model is good.

G. Hypothesis

If the model has fulfilled all the assumptions of SEM and test the suitability of the model with the goodness-of-fit criteria, then the hypothesis is tested. The hypothesis test criteria is reject the null hypothesis or accept the research hypothesis if the value of Critical Ratio (C.R.) > 1.96. The results of processing hypothetical test data are presented in table 2.

Table 2. Hypothesis Test

Regression Weights	Estimate	C.R.	Exp.
OCB ← Procedural Justice	-0.032	-1.209	H1 rejected
OCB ← Organizational Climate	0.134	2.802	H2 accepted
OCB ← Employee Engagement	0.306	2.921	H3 accepted
Employee Engagement ← Procedural Justice	0.222	3.084	H4 accepted
Employee Engagement ← Organizational Climate	0.316	3.845	H5 accepted

1. Hypothesis 1

Test results for hypothesis 1 in table 2. that is the influence of procedural justice on OCB produces a value of C.R.

amounting to -1.209, which means it is smaller than 1.96. Based on these results it can be explained that hypothesis 1 is

“The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) With Employee Engagement as a Mediator”

rejected, which means procedural justice does not significantly influence OCB.

Based on these results, it can be explained that procedural justice does not have a direct role in increasing or decreasing employees' OCB at PD BPR Bank Sleman. The results of this study are not in line with Taghinezhad et al (2015).

2. Hypothesis 2

Test results for hypothesis 2 in table 2. that is the influence of organizational climate on OCB produces a value of C.R. amounting to 2.802 which means greater than 1.96. Based on these results it can be explained that hypothesis 2 is accepted, which means that the organizational climate has a positive and significant effect on OCB.

Organizational climate is a perception shared by all members of the organization toward their organization and its environment (Robbins & Judge, 2015). Employee behavior that is formed from a positive organizational climate will give rise to voluntary behavior from the employees to contribute more to their company beyond their role or in other words increasing OCB. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Ukkas and Latif (2017).

3. Hypothesis 3

Test results for hypothesis 3 in table 2. The influence of employee engagement on OCB results in a value of C.R. amounting to 2.921 which means greater than 1.96. Based on these results it can be explained that hypothesis 4 is accepted, which means that employee engagement has a positive and significant effect on OCB.

Employees who have a positive attitude and willingness to help the company achieve organizational goals will, of course, willing to work more for their company even if it exceeds their role. High employee engagement will also result in high OCB level. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Sridhar and Thiruvankadam (2014).

4. Hypothesis 4

Test results for hypothesis 4 in table 2. The influence of procedural justice on employee engagement produces a value of C.R. amounting to 3.084 which means greater than 1.96. Based on these results it can be explained that hypothesis 6 is

accepted, which means procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on employee engagement.

Fairness of the company, in which the employees think that their company considers their opinions in running all the decision-making processes and procedures, will initiate the employees' feeling of involvement and their feeling of being valued by the company's management. As the result, employees will voluntarily help company management in making decisions or help whenever the company is facing problems. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Yulianti (2016).

5. Hypothesis 5

Test results for hypothesis 5 in table 2. The influence of organizational climate on employee engagement produces a value of C.R. amounting to 3.845 which means greater than 1.96. Based on these results it can be explained that hypothesis 7 is accepted, which means that the organizational climate has a positive and significant effect on employee engagement.

If the employees are very supportive, the organizational climate by means of individual employees are compatible with the environment where they work; it can make initiate their comfortable feeling while working and desire to give the best for their environment or company where they work. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Ratliff (2012).

H. Path Analysis

Path analysis can analyze how strong the influence of a variable compared to other variables on endogenous variables. The results of path analysis in this study are very important because they can find out the dominant variables that affect OCB. These results can give input to the management of PD BPR Bank Sleman so that they can be given special attention to improve or even overhaul in order to further increase OCB. The results of path analysis are presented in table 3.

Table 3. Path Analysis

No.	Influence among variables	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Total Effect
1.	Procedural Justice → OCB	-0.113	0.240	0.127
2.	Organizational Climate → OCB	0.449	<u>0.318</u>	<u>0.758</u>
3.	Employee Engagement → OCB	<u>0.708</u>	0	0.708

Based on the results of data analysis presented in table 3, it can be concluded that employee engagement variables provide the dominant or most direct influence on OCB compared to other variables which are equal to 0.708. Organizational

climate variables have the greatest influence on the indirect influence of OCB which is equal to 0.318. While for total influence, organizational climate variables have the greatest or most dominant influence on OCB.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research conducted on PD BPR Bank Sleman employees, it can be concluded:

1. Procedural justice does not have a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior which means rejecting the hypothesis in this study
2. Organizational climates have a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior
3. Employee engagement has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior
4. Procedural justice has a positive and significant influence on employee engagement
5. Organizational climates have a positive and significant effect on employee engagement

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results of the study, discussion and conclusions, the suggestions that can be given are as follows:

1. Based on the results of inferential statistics, the organizational climate in PD BPR Bank Sleman are the most dominant or greatest variables in influencing the increase in organizational citizenship behavior. The management of PD BPR Bank Sleman should pay special attention to maintaining and improving the organizational climate and employee engagement in order to improve organizational citizenship behavior even better.
2. For the next researcher, considering the limited sample in this study (only at PD BPR Bank Sleman) it is advisable to do research with samples on a broader scale by conducting research in many companies or wider population.

REFERENCES

1. Colquitt, J.A., Lepine J.A., and Wesson, M.J. (2009). *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. New York: McGraw-Hill-Irwin.
2. Croston, D. (2008). *Employee Engagement: The people-first approach to Building A Business*. Australia : Moonston Media.
3. Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A., & Chen, P.Y. (2002). Using Social Exchange Theory to Distinguish Procedural from Interactional Justice. *Group and Organization Management*. 27 (3) : 324-351.
4. Davis, K. (2010). *Organizational Behavior – Human Behavior at Work 13th Edition*. New Delhi: Mcgraw Hill Company.
5. Davis, K. and Newstrom, J.W. (2002). *Perilaku dalam Organisasi, Cetakan Ketujuh*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
6. Ferdinand, A. (2014). *Structural Equation Modeling dalam Penelitian Manajemen*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
7. Furnham, L. & Goodstein, R. (1997). *The organizational climate questionnaire (OCQ)*. Annual: 2, Consulting, 29, 163-181.
8. Garay, H.D.V. (2006). Kinerja extra-role dan kebijakan kompensasi. *Sinergi Kajian Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 8, No. 1, 33-42.
9. Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly Jr, J.H., and Konopaske, R. (2011). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes. Fourteenth edition*. New York : McGraw-Hill.
10. Ghozali, I. (2014). *Model Persamaan Struktural Konsep dan Aplikasi dengan Program Amos 22.0*. Semarang : Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
11. Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. (2003). *Behavior In Organization : Understanding And Managing The Human Side Of Work*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall.
12. Jauhar. J.B., Ghani A.A., and Islam, R. (2016). *Brain Drain: Propensity for Malaysian Professionals to Leave for Singapore*. Singapore : Springer.
13. Karismawan. (2005). *Iklim Kerja Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
14. Kazmi, R., Amjad, S., & Khan, D. (2008). Occupational Stress and its effect on Job Performance: A case study of medical house officers of district Abbotabad. *Journal of Ayub Medical College*. 20(3), 135-139.
15. Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior An Evidence-Based Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
16. Macey, W.H. and Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial Kreitner, Robert dan A. Kinicki*. (2013). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Buku 1, Edisi kesembilan. Jakarta : Salemba Empat.
17. Maruyama, G. (1998). *Basics of Structural Equation Modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
18. McPhie, N.A.G. and Rose, M.M. (2008) The Power of Federal Employee Engagement. *Journal a Report to The President And The Congress of The United States by The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board*.
19. Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2011). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management 4 th Edition*. New York : McGraw-Hill.
20. Organ, D., Podsakof W., and MacKenzie, S.B. (2006) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
21. Palupi, M. (2013). Pengaruh keadilan kompensasi, kebijakan rotasi karyawan dan komitmen afektif pada perilaku retaliasi pns kantor “x” di yogyakarta. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 8(1): 15-24.
22. Palupi, M. & Tjahjono, H.K. (2016). A model of religiosity and organizational justice: The impact on commitment and dysfunctional behavior. *Proceedings of the 27th International Business Information Management Association Conference - Innovation Management and*

“The Influence of Prosedural Justice and Organizational Climate on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) With Employee Engagement as a Mediator”

Education Excellence Vision 2020: From Regional Development Sustainability to Global Economic Growth

23. Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., and Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
24. Ratliff, R. M. (2012). *Effect of Organizational Climate on Job Performance and Employee Engagement*. Dissertation. Walden University.
25. Rivai, V. and Sagala, E.J. (2014). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
26. Robinson, D., Perryman S., and Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
27. Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Vol 21. No 7. pp: 600-619. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
28. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A. B., and Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement Of Work Engagement With A Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Volume 66 Number 4: hal. 701-716
29. Schiemann, W.A. (2011). *Aligment Capability Engagement*. Jakarta: PPM Manajemen
30. Sekarwangi, E., and Meiyanto, S.IJK. (2014). Pengaruh Stress Kerja dan Keadilan Organisasi terhadap Employee engagement. Thesis. *Magister Profesi Psikologi Universitas Gadjah Mada*. Yogyakarta.
31. Solimun. (2002). *Structural Equation Modeling Lisrel dan Amos*. Penerbit Universitas Negeri Malang. Malang.
32. Sridhar, A and Thiruvenskadam, T. (2014). Impact of Employee Engagement on Organization Citizenship Behaviour. *BVIMSR's Journal of Management Research*. 6 Issue - 2 : October.
33. Taghinezhad, Fakhredin, M. Safavi, A. Raiesifar, & S.H. Yahyavi. (2015). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior among Iranian Nurse. *BMC Research Note*. 8, hal 547.
34. Tjahjono, H.K. (2007). Validasi item-item keadilan distributif dan keadilan prosedural: aplikasi structural equation modeling dengan cofirmatory factor analysis (CFA). *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen STIE YKPN*, 18(2): 115-123.
35. Tjahjono, H.K. (2008). Studi literatur pengaruh keadilan distributif dan keadilan prosedural pada konsekuensinya dengan teknik meta analisis. *Jurnal Psikologi*, Vol 35 (1): 21-40
36. Tjahjono, H.K. (2009). Pengaruh keadilan organisasional pada perilaku retaliasi (balas dendam) di tempat kerja. *Jurnal Manajemen, Ekonomi dan EP*, 6 (1): 1-80
37. Tjahjono, H.K., Palupi, M. & Dirgahayu, P. (2015). Career perception at the republic indonesia police organization impact of distributive fairness and career satisfaction on affective commitment. *International Journal of Administrative Science and Organization*, 22 (2): 130-135.
38. Ukkas, I and Latif, D. (2017). Pengaruh iklim organisasi dan komitmen organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Jurnal Equilibrium*, Vo l. 06 No. 01 Februari.
39. Vigoda, E. (2002). Stress – Related Aftermaths to Workplace Politics : The Relationship among Politics, Job Distress and Aggressive Behavior in Organizations, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, p. 571 – 591
40. Welbourne, T.M. (2007), *Employee engagement : beyond the fad and into the executive suite*, John wiley & Son Inc.
41. Wirawan, (2007). *Budaya dan Iklim Organisasi*. Jakarta : Salemba Empat
42. Yulianti, P. (2016). Procedural Justice, Organizational Trust, Organizational Identification dan Pengaruhnya pada Employee Engagement. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori dan Terapan*. No. 3, Desember 2016.