

**PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND LECTURER WILLINGNESS TO
DEMONSTRATE OCB IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Jeje Abdul Rojak, Abbas Sofwan Matlail Fajar

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Universitas Islam Tribakti Lirboyo Kediri

Correspondence: jejerozaq@yahoo.com

Abstract

This literature study examines how organizational justice, specifically distributive justice in incentive distribution and procedural justice in workload allocation, influences university lecturers' willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behavior. The analysis reveals that distributive justice affects OCB primarily through satisfaction and social comparison mechanisms, where perceived inequity drives reduction in voluntary contributions as a form of psychological equilibrium restoration. Procedural justice affects OCB through trust and organizational identification, where transparent and inclusive processes build confidence that the institution deserves extra effort. The interaction between both justice types produces maximum OCB when both are high. Individual characteristics including career stage and justice need moderate these relationships, while organizational culture and departmental leadership style serve as contextual factors. OCB dimensions including altruism, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship show varying sensitivity to each justice type. The study concludes that without attention to organizational justice, incentive programs alone cannot sustainably improve lecturer OCB. Practical recommendations include regular justice audits, participatory decision making in workload allocation, and leadership development at departmental level.

Keywords: organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, organizational citizenship behavior, lecturer, workload, incentive.

Introduction

Higher education institutions, as complex nonprofit organizations, rely on the dedication of lecturers to carry out the mission of the tridharma (teaching, research, and community service). Beyond performing teaching duties as stipulated in their contracts, universities require voluntary contributions from academic staff, such as mentoring students outside working hours, developing curricula, or participating in administrative activities. This extra-role behavior is known in the literature as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Eddine and Darmawan (2022) explain that organizational citizenship behavior is voluntary behavior that contributes to organizational effectiveness, which makes OCB important for organizations that depend on members' contributions beyond their formal obligations. Lecturers who demonstrate high OCB tend to care more about the success of the institution as a whole, rather than merely fulfilling their formal obligations (Oktarina et al., 2024). However, not all lecturers are willing to provide such additional effort. Psychological factors influence their willingness, one of which is how they perceive fair treatment from the institution where they work.

Organizational justice refers to organizational members' perceptions of whether they are treated fairly across various aspects of their work. In the context of lecturers, two dimensions of justice are particularly relevant: distributive justice, which concerns the allocation of rewards such as salaries, allowances, and promotion opportunities, and procedural justice, which concerns the decision-making process (Nguyen et al., 2021). Lecturers who feel that the workload of teaching, research, and community service is distributed equitably tend to develop positive perceptions of the institution. Conversely, perceived inequity in the distribution of incentives or the allocation of tasks can trigger feelings of unfairness that affect work attitudes and behavior. Consistent with this, Gani (2022) explains that fairness is assessed based on experiences of workload allocation, whereas leaders, on the other hand, judge fairness based on the needs of the system. These perceptions are highly subjective, depending on the comparisons lecturers make with their colleagues or with internal standards.

The incentive system in higher education is often a source of perceived injustice. Lecturers with the same academic rank may receive very different performance allowances because of assessment mechanisms that lack transparency. Some lecturers feel that they work harder but receive smaller rewards than colleagues who have connections or strategic positions. When this injustice is perceived, lecturers tend to reduce their voluntary contributions as a form of psychological equilibrium restoration (Ammari & Howe-Walsh, 2025). The principle of justice in social exchange theory explains that individuals strive to maintain a ratio of contributions to rewards that is comparable to that of others. When this ratio is perceived as unbalanced, tension arises that drives behavioral change, usually by reducing inputs or increasing perceived outputs. According to Hariani and Khairi (2023), a workload that matches a person's capabilities can increase productivity and satisfaction, whereas a workload that is too high or too low will affect the lecturers' health, both mental and physical.

Lecturer workload is also an issue that often gives rise to perceptions of injustice. A lecturer may teach several courses at once, supervise dozens of students, be required to produce publications, and be active in community service. Meanwhile, colleagues in other study programs may have a much lighter workload yet receive similar allowances. This condition is exacerbated by limited supporting resources, such as laboratory assistants or administrative staff, which are unevenly distributed across faculties. Lecturers who feel overloaded and undervalued will experience a decline in their enthusiasm for voluntary work. They choose to focus on minimum mandatory tasks because they believe that additional effort will not result in commensurate recognition or rewards. In fact, according to the findings of Chasanah et al. (2021), rewards that are commensurate with or aligned to the workload can help increase lecturers' work motivation and further improve lecturer performance. This phenomenon illustrates the direct relationship between workload justice and OCB.

Lecturer OCB has tangible consequences for the quality of higher education. Students benefit from lecturers who are willing to set aside time for consultations outside office hours or to provide detailed feedback on assignments. The university's reputation at the national and international levels also depends on lecturers who are willing to work beyond the call of duty, such as serving as journal reviewers, officers of professional associations, or resource persons at various events. Without this extra-role behavior, the function of the university as a dynamic academic institution will be disrupted. The productivity contributed by lecturers will enhance the institution's image and the long-term sustainability of the organization (Mardikaningsih, 2024). A lack of lecturer involvement in academic activities can reduce the quality of teaching, which in turn can lead to stagnation in curriculum development (Rojak, 2023). Therefore, understanding the drivers of OCB, particularly those related to organizational justice, becomes a priority for university administrators who wish to improve organizational effectiveness on a sustainable basis.

Although many studies have confirmed a positive relationship between organizational justice and OCB across various sectors, there is a gap in understanding the specific mechanisms that link the two in the academic environment. The lecturer profession has unique characteristics that distinguish it from office or manufacturing work. High academic autonomy, complex assessment systems, and strong intrinsic motivation among lecturers may moderate or mediate the relationship between perceptions of justice and voluntary behavior. However, efforts to develop such human resource competencies require comprehensive organizational policy support (Oluwatoyin & Mardikaningsih, 2024). Without a clear mapping of how distributive justice in incentive distribution and procedural justice in workload allocation specifically influence OCB, interventions by university management may be poorly targeted. Some efforts to improve justice may not produce the expected changes in OCB because other, more dominant factors are at play.

Another problem relates to the multidimensional nature of OCB itself. Lecturers' voluntary behavior can take the form of altruism toward colleagues, conscientiousness in carrying out duties carefully, sportsmanship in accepting inconveniences, courtesy in communication, and civic virtue, which represents organizational values. Each of these dimensions may have a different relationship with a particular type of organizational justice. Distributive justice in financial incentives may have a stronger influence on behaviors that require sacrificing personal time, whereas procedural justice may be more relevant to behaviors related to identification with the institution. Without a more

detailed analysis, overgeneralization may occur, leading to policy recommendations that fail to consider the distinctive features of each OCB dimension in the lecturer population.

Pressure on the higher education sector to improve productivity and global competitiveness has grown in recent years. Universities are expected to produce high-quality graduates, reputable publications, and community service with a real impact on society, all with resources that are often limited. Under these conditions, relying solely on lecturers' formal duties is not enough. Voluntary contributions that go beyond job descriptions are needed. Understanding how justice in incentive distribution and workload allocation can foster OCB is therefore very important, because it offers a way to improve institutional performance without significantly increasing staff numbers. In other words, organizational justice policies are a relatively inexpensive instrument with the potential to produce a major impact on university effectiveness.

This study aims to elaborate the mechanisms linking organizational justice, specifically distributive justice in incentive distribution and procedural justice in workload allocation, with lecturers' organizational citizenship behavior. This aim includes identifying which dimensions of justice are most relevant to each type of OCB, explaining psychological processes such as satisfaction, trust, and organizational commitment that mediate the relationship, and mapping the contextual factors in the academic environment that strengthen or weaken it. Theoretically, this study is expected to enrich the organizational justice framework by adapting it to the context of the lecturer profession. Practically, the results of this synthesis provide guidance for university leaders in designing fair incentive and work allocation systems to increase lecturers' voluntary contributions.

Method

This study was designed as a qualitative literature study aimed at synthesizing scattered knowledge on the relationship between organizational justice and lecturers' OCB. As emphasized by Snyder (2019), a literature review as a research methodology requires systematic and transparent procedures for searching, evaluating, and synthesizing various written sources. This approach was chosen because it allows the integration of findings from various disciplines, including human resource management, industrial psychology, and educational administration. The process began with the establishment of clear inclusion criteria, namely journal articles, books, and proceedings that discuss organizational justice, OCB, and lecturers as subjects. The search was conducted in databases such as PubMed, ERIC, and PsycINFO using combinations of relevant keywords. After the screening stage, the selected articles were analyzed thematically.

The guidance of Mohajan (2018) on qualitative research methodology was used to direct the interpretation of textual data. The analysis was carried out by repeatedly reading each article to identify initial codes related to the dimensions of justice, types of OCB, and linking mechanisms. These codes were then grouped into broader themes, such as distributive justice and satisfaction-based OCB, procedural justice and trust-based OCB, and the moderation by individual lecturer characteristics. The synthesis process involved constant comparison across findings to identify both consistent patterns and contradictory findings. The final result of this process is a conceptual framework that explains how and under what conditions organizational justice influences lecturers' OCB, which is then elaborated in the discussion section.

Results and Discussion

Distributive justice in the context of lecturer incentives is closely related to perceptions of whether the rewards received are commensurate with the contributions made. When a lecturer feels that the scientific publications produced, the teaching hours delivered, and the community service activities carried out are rewarded proportionally, he or she tends to develop a feeling of satisfaction. This satisfaction then becomes the foundation for the emergence of voluntary behavior (Rahma et al., 2024). Feeling valued fosters greater contributions to organizational productivity (Oluwatosin et al.,

2021). The findings of Mardikaningsih and Putra (2021) explain that satisfaction has a significant influence on work productivity, so that satisfaction becomes one of the important aspects linking positive work experiences with the contributions made by lecturers. Lecturers who are satisfied with their incentives do not feel the need to reduce their extra contributions because there is no imbalance to be restored. Conversely, dissatisfaction stemming from distributive inequity triggers a psychological compensation mechanism in which lecturers, consciously or unconsciously, reduce OCB as a form of retaliation or correction for the perceived inequity.

The psychological process linking distributive justice and OCB is not direct, but is mediated by cognitive evaluation of the input-output ratio. Lecturers make social comparisons with colleagues who have similar qualifications and workloads. When this comparison reveals a disadvantageous inequity, feelings of inequity arise that trigger emotional tension. To relieve this tension, lecturers may alter their inputs by reducing voluntary contributions (DongLong et al., 2020). Interestingly, this reduction is often not perceived as a deliberate act, but rather as a gradual decline in intrinsic motivation. Lecturers who were previously willing to mentor additional students begin to decline similar requests. Those who used to be active in study program meetings begin to choose to attend passively. These subtle behavioral changes are what often escape management's observation.

Procedural justice in workload allocation has a somewhat different influence on OCB compared to distributive justice. Fair procedures, such as transparency in course allocation, equal opportunities to choose schedules, and clear appeal mechanisms, build lecturers' trust in the institution. This trust then becomes psychological capital that encourages OCB. Lecturers who believe that decision-making processes are conducted fairly will be more willing to contribute beyond their formal duties because they are confident that their extra work will be recognized and taken into account in the future. A fairly managed organization, as perceived by lecturers, in which all voices from various parties are heard before important decisions are made, will foster trust in that leadership system (Gani, 2024). The application of procedural justice principles in decision-making processes can build lecturers' positive perceptions of the university and support the formation of more positive work attitudes (Bangsu et al., 2023). This trust functions as a bridge between procedural uncertainty and long-term commitment. Without trust, even the most sophisticated procedures will be regarded as mere formalities.

The role of communication in procedural justice cannot be overlooked. Lecturers who are given adequate explanations of how workloads are determined and how incentive allocation decisions are made demonstrate higher levels of OCB. This explanation, which is referred to in the literature as informational justice, gives lecturers a sense that they are treated with respect and regarded as legitimate stakeholders. This sense of being respected triggers a psychological reciprocity mechanism. Lecturers tend to repay respectful treatment by demonstrating behavior that benefits the organization, such as helping overwhelmed colleagues or voluntarily taking on additional tasks. Conversely, a lack of honest communication about unfavorable decisions triggers a perception that the institution is hiding something, which erodes OCB.

The interaction between distributive justice and procedural justice produces a more complex effect. When both types of justice are high, lecturers' OCB reaches its maximum level. However, when one is low, the impact on OCB depends on which one lecturers consider more important. Lecturers with a material value orientation may be more affected by distributive inequity, whereas lecturers with a relational value orientation may respond more to procedural inequity. Research shows that for senior lecturers who have reached a secure position, procedural justice becomes more important because they are less dependent on short-term financial incentives (Lee & Rhee, 2023). Meanwhile, junior lecturers who are still building their careers may be more sensitive to distributive justice because incentives are highly meaningful for their professional advancement. Justice in the incentives provided is a motivational factor for lecturers (Dahar & Mardikaningsih, 2022). Mapping these differences is important for targeted interventions.

The organizational culture context of the university moderates the strength of the relationship between justice and OCB. A strong organizational culture can enhance organizational identity and

shape collaborative relationships among members (Irfan et al., 2024). In universities with a strong collegial culture, procedural justice tends to have a greater influence because norms of reciprocity and a sense of togetherness are already embedded. Lecturers in a collegial environment feel emotionally bound to their colleagues and the institution, so fair treatment in processes strengthens these bonds, which are then expressed through OCB. Thus, universities need to pay attention to lecturers' well-being to encourage their involvement in the organization (Darmawan et al., 2022). Conversely, in universities with a competitive, individualistic culture, distributive justice becomes more dominant. Lecturers tend to explicitly calculate personal gains and losses, so inequity in rewards directly triggers a more drastic reduction in OCB. Understanding the local culture of the university is important before designing justice policies.

The impact of organizational justice on OCB also varies across OCB dimensions. Altruistic behavior, such as helping new lecturers who struggle to adapt, is more responsive to procedural justice. This behavior requires identification with the group and a strong sense of belonging. Procedural justice builds a sense that the institution is a fair system worthy of support (Darmawan et al., 2020). Meanwhile, conscientiousness, namely carrying out duties carefully beyond minimum standards, is more responsive to distributive justice. Lecturers who feel that their incentives are fair will be motivated to maintain high performance as a form of consistency with the rewards they receive. Sportsmanship, namely accepting inconveniences without complaining, is influenced by both types of justice almost equally, because it requires psychological resilience derived from overall satisfaction with the system. This is consistent with the statement by Irfan, Sigita and Hariani (2023) that job satisfaction provides motivation for lecturer performance.

The social identification mechanism acts as a link between procedural justice and OCB in the form of civic virtue. High procedural justice makes lecturers proud to be part of the university. They internalize the institution's values and goals as their own. This identification process then encourages OCB that represents these values, such as acting as a good ambassador of the university in external forums or voluntarily promoting study programs on social media. This behavior is not driven by direct external rewards, but by the desire to maintain a positive self-image as a good member of the organization (Du et al., 2012). Low procedural justice, conversely, triggers disidentification, in which lecturers psychologically distance themselves from the institution, manifesting in a decline in all forms of OCB.

The resources available to lecturers moderate the impact of inequity on OCB. Lecturers who have abundant personal resources, such as a broad professional network, strong family support, or additional income from outside sources, tend to be more resilient to the negative effects of inequity. They can maintain OCB because their voluntary contributions are less dependent on the rewards provided by the institution. Conversely, lecturers with limited resources who rely heavily on salaries and allowances from the university will be severely affected by inequity. For this group, even the slightest distributive inequity can trigger a significant reduction in OCB. This finding suggests that justice policies must take into account the heterogeneity of resources among lecturers, for example by providing special support for lecturers with heavier economic burdens.

The temporal dimension of justice perceptions also influences OCB. Episodic inequity, such as a single unfair incentive distribution, may have a limited short-term impact on OCB. Lecturers tend to give the institution the benefit of the doubt and wait for patterns of behavior in the future. However, chronic inequity, which persists over several evaluation periods, will crystallize the perception that the institution is indeed unjust (Darmawan, 2024). At this point, OCB declines permanently and is difficult to restore even when the institution later implements fairer policies. The damage to trust that has occurred requires time and consistent effort to repair. The implication is that university leaders must detect and correct inequity early, before negative perceptions become deeply rooted beliefs. If a leader continues to apply fair procedures despite facing difficulties, members will realize that these principles can be trusted (Irfan & Sajjapong, 2023).

Social comparison occurs not only with internal colleagues but also with lecturers at other universities. Globalization and academic mobility have made it easier for lecturers to learn the standards of incentives and workload at other institutions. When a lecturer feels that his or her university is less fair

than external standards, feelings of dissatisfaction may arise even though internally he or she is treated the same as colleagues. This external reference adds complexity to the relationship between justice and OCB. A university whose incentives are lower than the market but whose procedures are highly fair may still be able to maintain a reasonable level of OCB. However, when internal justice is low and external standards are high, a double effect occurs that is highly damaging to OCB. Under these conditions, lecturers not only feel treated inequitably internally but also feel absolutely disadvantaged.

Interactional justice, which is the aspect of organizational justice concerning the quality of interpersonal treatment in the implementation of policies, has a unique relationship with OCB. Lecturers who receive respectful treatment from their direct supervisors, even when the decisions they receive are unfavorable, tend to maintain OCB at a higher level. This respectful treatment signals that lecturers are valued as persons, not merely as instruments of production. This signal triggers a strong reciprocity mechanism at the personal level (Pham et al., 2024). Lecturers will repay their supervisors' kindness by demonstrating helping behavior that may not directly benefit the supervisor but benefits the department or the university as a whole. This phenomenon explains why some departments with limited resources but good leadership can maintain high work morale, while other departments with abundant resources but poor leadership have low OCB.

Individual lecturer characteristics such as personal values, justice need, and positive or negative affectivity influence their sensitivity to inequity. Lecturers with a high justice need, namely those who care deeply about equal treatment for everyone, will respond to even the slightest inequity with a drastic decline in OCB. For them, inequity is a violation of the moral principles that govern communal life (Hooi, 2015). Conversely, lecturers with a low justice need may be more pragmatic and will continue to demonstrate OCB as long as inequity does not directly harm them materially. These individual differences emphasize the need for a flexible approach in human resource management policy. Efforts to improve justice should be accompanied by communication that explains the rationale for policies to those with a high justice need, while for pragmatic lecturers, material incentives may be more effective.

The lecturer's career stage also influences how justice affects OCB. Lecturers at the early career stage (Asisten Ahli) tend to be highly responsive to distributive justice because they greatly need incentives to meet basic needs and build the foundation of their careers. They are also more likely to withhold OCB until they are confident that the institution will treat them fairly. Lecturers at the mid-career stage (Lektor Kepala), who already have financial and professional stability, are more responsive to procedural justice. They want to be respected and involved in decision making. Lecturers at the late career stage (professors) who are approaching retirement may be more responsive to interactional justice, because financial and career rewards are no longer as relevant, but a sense of being personally valued remains important. Mapping these career stages is important for management in tailoring strategies to maintain OCB in each segment of lecturers.

Policies perceived as consistently just over time build the institution's reputation as a fair organization (Eddine et al., 2023). This reputation, which is an intangible asset, enables the university to obtain OCB from lecturers even when, in certain situations, policies must be less favorable to individuals. Lecturers will give the benefit of the doubt that the inequity they experience is temporary and will be corrected in the future (Główniewicz et al., 2024). Conversely, universities with a poor reputation for justice will find it difficult to request OCB because every policy will be interpreted negatively. Building a reputation for justice requires time and consistency, but once formed, it becomes a mechanism that sustains OCB at low cost. Even small incidents of inequity can damage a hard-won reputation, so vigilance in every decision on resource and workload allocation is essential. This is consistent with the findings of Irfan and Hariani (2022), who explain that the better the work environment, the higher job satisfaction will be, and the greater the workload, the lower job satisfaction will be.

Organizational justice interacts with leadership style at the departmental level. Transformational leadership, which inspires and provides individualized attention, can strengthen the positive impact of justice on OCB. Transformational leaders not only implement fair policies but also articulate the meaning behind them, linking them to a shared mission and vision (Yasir et al., 2023). According to Mardikaningsih

et al. (2022) leadership has a positive and significant effect on OCB. Leaders' behavior can encourage members to demonstrate voluntary behavior beyond formal task demands. Lecturers led by transformational leaders tend to see justice not as a procedural obligation but as an expression of shared values. Conversely, transactional leadership that focuses only on compliance with rules can weaken the impact of justice because lecturers see justice merely as a mechanistic matter. Thus, developing leadership capacity at the departmental level is an important complement to justice policies at the university level.

The relationship between organizational justice and lecturers' OCB is complex and mediated by various psychological variables such as satisfaction, trust, identification, and reputation. Distributive justice in incentives has a stronger influence on conscientiousness-type OCB, while procedural justice in workload allocation has a stronger influence on altruistic OCB and OCB in the form of civic virtue. Individual characteristics such as career stage, justice need, and personal resources moderate the strength of this relationship. Organizational culture and leadership style at the departmental level also act as contextual factors that strengthen or weaken the impact of justice. Understanding this complexity is important for designing targeted interventions to increase lecturers' voluntary contributions by improving perceptions of justice.

Conclusion

Organizational justice significantly influences lecturers' organizational citizenship behavior through complex psychological mechanisms. Distributive justice in incentive distribution affects OCB primarily through satisfaction and social comparison, in which perceived inequity drives a reduction in voluntary contributions as a form of psychological equilibrium restoration. Procedural justice in workload allocation affects OCB through trust and organizational identification, in which transparent and inclusive procedures build confidence that the institution deserves support. These two types of justice interact, with maximum impact when both are high and minimum impact when both are low. Individual lecturer characteristics, including career stage and justice need, moderate the strength of this relationship, while organizational culture and departmental leadership style serve as contextual factors. Without attention to justice, efforts to improve OCB through material incentives alone will not succeed, because procedural and interactional aspects are equally important.

For university leaders, the implication of these findings is the need for regular justice audits covering all three dimensions of justice, namely distributive, procedural, and interactional. Incentive systems must be designed with clear formulas, published transparently, and re-evaluated through a participatory process. Workload allocation needs to involve lecturers in decision making, at a minimum through legitimate representatives. For future research, it is recommended to empirically test the model generated by this literature study using cross-sectional or longitudinal surveys across different types of higher education institutions. Qualitative research with a phenomenological approach is also needed to capture lecturers' subjective experiences of justice and how those experiences are translated into decisions to demonstrate or withhold OCB. For human resource management practitioners in universities, the operational recommendations are to integrate justice indicators into the performance appraisal system for department heads and to provide safe and responsive grievance channels for lecturers who feel they have been treated inequitably.

Bibliography

- Ammari, S., & Howe-Walsh, L. (2025). Fairness of Reward for Academics: Perception Disparity Between Academics and Senior HR Managers. *Studies in Higher Education*, 51(1), 1–17.
- Bangsu, M., Darmawan, D., Hardyansah, R., Suwito, S., & Mujito, M. (2023). The Implications of Remuneration, Procedural Justice Principles, and Work Environment Factors on Employee Retention Rate. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(3), 26–32.
- Chasanah, U., Dahar, D., Putra, A. R., & Sinambela, E. A. (2021). Wages and Work Environment as Factors for Workers' Motivation. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 43–52.
- Dahar, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). The Influence of Compensation and Work Environment on the Performance of Sub-District Employees. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(1), 28–32.

- Darmawan, D. (2024). Distribution of Six Major Factors Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 22(4), 47–58.
- Darmawan, D., Irfan, M., & Al Hakim, Y. R. (2022). Leadership and Employee Welfare in Improving Organizational Productivity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 173–176.
- Darmawan, D., Mardikaningsih, R., Sinambela, E. A., Arifin, S., Putra, A. R., Hariani, M., Irfan, M., Al Hakim, Y. R., & Issalillah, F. (2020). The Quality of Human Resources, Job Performance and Employee Loyalty. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(3), 2580–2592.
- DongLong, Z., Taejun, C., Julie, A., & Sang-Hun, L. (2020). The Structural Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in University Faculty in China: The Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(1), 167–179.
- Du, J., Choi, J. N., & Hashem, F. (2012). Interaction Between One's Own and Others' Procedural Justice Perceptions and Citizenship Behaviors in Organizational Teams: The Moderating Role of Group Identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16(4), 289–302.
- Eddine, B. A. S., & Darmawan, D. (2022). The Effects of Quality of Work Life and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Job Performance of Government Employees in Surabaya City. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 69–76.
- Eddine, B. A. S., Darmawan, D., Mardikaningsih, R., & Sinambela, E. A. (2023). The Effect of Knowledge Management and Quality of Work Life on Employee Commitment. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1), 87–100.
- Gani, A. (2022). Procedural Justice and Negotiation in Day-to-Day Interactions between Leaders and Subordinates. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 177–206.
- Gani, A. (2024). Leadership and Organizational Commitment: An Analysis of Mechanisms for Building Employee Loyalty and Delongingness. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(1), 439–464.
- Główniewicz, M., Burdziej, S., & Wojcik, A. D. (2024). The Effect of Organisational Justice, Academic Identification and Legitimacy of Academic Authorities on Student Loyalty. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 79(1), e12583.
- Hariani, M., & Khairi, M. (2023). How to Manage Excessive Workload and Burnout. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 55–68.
- Hooi, W. L. (2015). Relationship Between Organisational Justice and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Examining the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. In: *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Management 2015*, 330–333.
- Irfan, M., & Hariani, M. (2022). The Effect of Work Environment and Workload on Employee Satisfaction. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 11–18.
- Irfan, M., Al-Hakim, Y. R., Sigita, D. S., Arifin, S., & Putra, A. R. (2024). The Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Performance: A Review of Theory and Practice. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 29–37.
- Irfan, M., Sigita, D. S., & Hariani, M. (2023). Optimizing Employee Performance through Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A Case Study in a Surabaya-Based Company. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(1), 12–15.
- Lee, H.-W., & Rhee, D.-Y. (2023). Effects of Organizational Justice on Employee Satisfaction: Integrating the Exchange and the Value-Based Perspectives. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5993–5993.
- Mardikaningsih, R. (2024). Organizational Effectiveness and Green Human Resources Management. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(1), 6–13.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Putra, A. R. (2021). Efforts to Increase Employee Work Productivity Through Job Satisfaction and Job Training. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 51–64.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Darmawan, D., Masithoh, N., & Nuraini, R. (2022). Examining the Role of Authentic Leadership in Shaping Positive Work Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 52–59.
- Mohajan, H. K. (2018). Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 7(1), 23–48.
- Nguyen, T. V., Tadesse, E., & Mu-hua, W. (2021). Perceptions of Justice and Its Impact on Work Motivation among Lecturers at Universities in Hanoi, Vietnam. 2(1), 143–159.
- Oktarina, Y., Rafki, R., Nofriadi, N., Elfiswandi, E., Weriframayeni, A., & Yulasmi, Y. (2024). Work Loyalty and Work Discipline Increase Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) at Universitas Perintis Indonesia. *Arrus Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 14–21.
- Oluwatosin, A., Darmawan, D., & Marsal, A. P. (2021). Linkage of Employee Welfare Programs with Workforce Retention in Modern Organizational Management Policies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 171–176.
- Oluwatoyin, F., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2024). Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainability of Human Resource Development in Industry 4.0. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 9–16.
- Pham, N. T. B., Le, T. T., Nguyen, H. T. H., Phan, A. T. T., & Nguyen, H. N. (2024). The Effect of Interactional Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Vietnam: A Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *International Journal of Advances in Applied Sciences*, 11(4), 35–44.
- Rahma, A., Tjahjono, H. K., & Rahayu, M. K. P. (2024). Literature Review: Study of the Effect of Distributive Justice on Employee Performance. *Asian Journal of Management Analytics*, 3(2), 353–366.
- Rojak, J. A. (2023). Factors Affecting Lecturer Involvement in Academic Culture Development and How Academic Culture Implements Higher Education. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 29–34.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
- Yasir, M., Khan, M. N., Hamayun, M., Khan, M. A., & Ullah, A. (2023). Transformational Leadership, Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Restaurant Context. *Journal of Management Info*, 9(4), 496–509.