

## Justice or Just-Us? The Drama of Fairness and the Spirit of Service in Modern Academia

Dr. Saifullah Shaikh<sup>1</sup>, Saifuddin Qureshi<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Hussain Amar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor of Commerce, Institute of Commerce and Management, Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur. Email: [saifullah.shaikh@salu.edu.pk](mailto:saifullah.shaikh@salu.edu.pk)

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer in Commerce, Govt: Islamia Arts and Commerce College Sukkur. Email: [Saifqureshi.edu@gmail.com](mailto:Saifqureshi.edu@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor of Commerce, Govt: Islamia Arts and Commerce College Sukkur. Email: [amarjumani88@gmail.com](mailto:amarjumani88@gmail.com)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v3i4.1316>

### Abstract

The aim of this research was to investigate the influence of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior amid Private sector and public sector Universities Faculty in Karachi, Sindh. The sample size consists of 300 faculty members, in which 156 respondents were from private sector universities and 144 respondents were from public sector universities. To measure organizational Justice Scale (Colquitt's (2001) was used and Organizational Citizenship Behavior was assessed by using the Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) five factor model of OCB. The data was analyzed by using Linear Regression model. The findings of the study suggest that Organizational Justice influence on organizational citizenship behavior amid private and public universities faculty. The findings of the study will be helpful for universities, policy makers, psychologist, scholars and researchers in making better strategies to develop for faculty in creating citizenship behavior by providing fair and equitable working environment.

**Keywords:** Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Faculty

### Introduction

It is fact that employees of any organization are considered to be the asset and backbone of any organization. If the environment of the organization is fair and rights are observed among employees in equitable manner than it is obvious that organization will get successful growth and targets can be achieved easily.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the essential force behind the evolution of organization is justice, not knowledge, technology or competition (Florida, 2002). In the information- based economy of today, there is a growing need to increase the productivity within their workers but also their justifiable environment. Therefore, today's perspective growth of organization is highly dependent on their informative workers as these knowledgeable employees can fabricate the information, create solutions, address multifarious problems and extort information (Davenport, 2005; Borgohini, 2005). Consequently, from an employers' perspective it is essential to comprehend the aspects that effect the performance of knowledge workers. Organizational Justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness within an organization, particularly in relation to decision-making processes, distribution of resources, and interpersonal treatment. It is a central concept in organizational behavior because perceptions of fairness strongly influence employee attitudes, motivation, and workplace behavior.

In modern organizations, employees do not only evaluate outcomes such as salaries or promotions, but also assess how those outcomes are determined and how they are treated during interactions. When employees perceive fairness, they are more likely to develop trust in management, demonstrate positive work attitudes, and engage in behaviors that go beyond their formal job requirements. Conversely, perceptions of injustice can lead to dissatisfaction, reduced commitment, and negative workplace behaviors.

Organizational justice is commonly divided into three key dimensions. The first is Distributive Justice, which focuses on the perceived fairness of outcomes such as pay, rewards, and workload distribution. The second is Procedural Justice, referring to the fairness of the procedures and policies used to make decisions. The third dimension, Interactional Justice, emphasizes the quality of interpersonal treatment employees receive, including respect, dignity, and transparency in communication.

To function well, organizations are contingent on the extra- role behavior of employees, consequently these types of employees are required by managers who do extra work beyond their job description. Explicitly they are looking for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as stated by Katz and Kahn (1966). Organizational Citizenship Behavior is the “discretionary behavior which is not acknowledged by the approved compensation system and that it cumulative promotes the efficient functioning of the organization”, this discretionary behavior that is not defined by role specification is very important and vital for attaining organizational objectives (Organ, 1988). Organizations’ that exclusively depends on the blueprints of approved behavior is extremely an insubstantial societal system (Katz, 1964, p .132) as it’s not probable for an organization to antedate all contingencies with in operations and foresee environmental change specifically.

Therefore, for organizational effectiveness and survival those employees are needed who go beyond their job description by voluntarily helping new or existing coworker with their work load, enthusiastically attending and participating in meetings, focusing on self-development, being versatile and not complaining on petty issues. Comprehensively organization citizenship behavior has become important as it facilitates in accomplishing organizations enhanced performance and goals (Allen & Rush, 1998).

There is a dismal condition of education in Pakistan, the system is assaulted from different angles and higher education is not excluded from this generalization as the education system of the country is not delivering well. In short, the insufficiency of the system can be partially credited to the teachers, as they are the pillars, it is said no improvement can be brought into the education system without the involvement of teachers. This forces us to a point to understand the causes that is leading to this catastrophe (Hamid & John,2006).

Throughout the world it has been acknowledged that ‘education’ is the main force for the socio-economic, cultural and moral advancement of any nation. The development of a nation is significantly reliant on the educational structure of the nation. It also develops an individual’s goals which further enhances person’s skill then transform him to be an important advantage to the nation by spreading information, understanding, appreciation and knowledge. Education system efficiency is partially depended on responsible teachers and their efficiency is depended on the nature and extent of their professionalism, it is not adequate to only have degrees and certificates, it is essential for them to have desirable level of mastery, creativity and enthusiasm for the work they are doing (Govt. of Pakistan, 1998). Progress on the way to knowledge-based economy and society will require that universities to design hub of knowledge creation and their partners in society give creativity their full attention. Universities either private or public are providing training in all kinds of disciplines and are students training grounds, translating theory into practice.

Teachers are the most important group of professionals for every nation's future; without them the education system will be crippled. Their creativity can create dynamics at university level by building emotional and creative competitive individuals, which is much needed in the country for survival and growth. University faculties are presently facing many challenges, like lack of supportive research culture, in adequate infrastructure, discrepancy in salary, allowances, and inconsistent policies which affect their performance. This raises concern about the behavior and attitudes of educators towards their work performance. The culture of universities differs from one another, it serves the measure of faculty perception and feeling towards the organization (Medley & Shannon, 1994).

Therefore, it is of utmost importance to analyze how organizational justice affect the organizational citizenship behavior of Faculty in private and public universities. On the base of literature review following hypothesis was developed:

**Hypothesis:** There will be an impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior amid private and public universities faculty.

### **Problem Statement**

Higher education institutions in Karachi are currently navigating a highly competitive and volatile landscape, where the voluntary contributions of faculty—known as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)—are vital for institutional excellence. However, there is a growing perception of inequity regarding how faculty are treated across the public and private sectors. While public universities often struggle with bureaucratic delays and promotional stagnation, private institutions are frequently characterized by high-pressure environments and contract-based insecurities. Despite the critical role of fairness in motivating "extra-role" behaviors, there is a significant lack of comparative empirical evidence exploring how different dimensions of organizational justice influence OCB among faculty in Karachi. Without addressing this gap, universities risk a decline in faculty morale, reduced mentoring for students, and a breakdown in institutional efficiency. Currently, institutional policies often focus on rigid performance metrics while ignoring the psychological impact of fairness on voluntary work effort. This research seeks to investigate the extent to which organizational justice acts as a predictor of OCB, comparing the public and private sectors to identify which justice dimensions are most critical in fostering a culture of voluntary contribution among Karachi's academic community.

### **Literature Review**

#### **Organizational Justice (The Independent Variable)**

In an article assessing the past, present, and future states of research on organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990) suggested that organizational justice research may potentially explain many organizational behavior outcome variables. Organizational justice is the term used to describe the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace. Specifically, organizational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those determinations influence other work-related variables (Moorman, 1991). Organizational justice can help explain why employees retaliate against inequitable outcomes or inappropriate processes and interactions (Alsalem and Alhaiani, 2007). Employee's perceptions relate to three dimensions of organizational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.

#### **Distributive Justice**

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an individual receives from organization. Outcomes may be distributed on the basis of equality, need or contribution and

individuals determine the fairness of distribution through comparison with others (Alsalem and Alhaiani, 2007). Perceptions of an unfair distribution of work rewards relative to work inputs create tension within an individual and the individual is motivated to resolve the tension (Adams, 1963). However, with the finding that the procedures used to determine outcomes can be more influential than the outcomes itself, the emphasis has gradually shifted from distributive to procedural justice.

### **Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice refers to participants' perceptions about the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process (Nabatchi, et al., 2007). Whereas distributive justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of outcome, procedural justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of process. Among the traditional principles of procedural justice are impartiality, voice or opportunity to be heard, and grounds for decisions (Bayles, 1990). Procedural issues such as neutrality of the process (Tyler and Lind, 1992), treatment of the participants (Bies and Moag, 1986; Lind and Tyler, 1988), and the trustworthiness of the decision-making authority (Tyler & Bies, 1990) are important to enhancing perceptions of procedural justice. Extensive literature supports procedural justice theories of satisfaction. In general, research suggests that if organizational processes and procedures are perceived to be fair, then participants will be more satisfied, more willing to accept the resolution of that procedure, and more likely to form positive attitudes about the organization (Bingham 1997; Tyler and Lind, 1992).

### **Interactional Justice**

Organizational justice researchers developed the notion of interactional justice, defined as the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of organizational procedures (Bies and Moag, 1986). In general, interactional justice reflects concerns about the fairness of the non-procedurally dictated aspects of interaction; however, research has identified two subcategories of interactional justice: informational justice and interpersonal justice (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998). These two subcategories of informational and interpersonal justice overlap considerably; however, research suggests that they should be considered separately, as each has differential effects on justice perceptions (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Interactional justice includes various actions displaying social sensitivity, such as when supervisors treat employees with respect and dignity. Mikula et al. (1990) reported that a considerable proportion of perceived injustices did not concern distributional or procedural issues in the narrow sense, but instead referred to the manner in which people were treated interpersonally during interactions and encounters.

### **Organizational Justice**

Organizational Justice (OJ) refers to the individual's perception of fairness regarding treatment received from an organization. In the academic halls of Karachi, this perception often dictates whether a professor feels like a valued scholar or a mere employee.

The Four Pillars (Colquitt's Framework): Literature consistently categorizes OJ into four types: Distributive Justice: The perceived fairness of outcomes (salary, office space, teaching load). In Karachi's private sector, this is often linked to market-competitive salaries, whereas in the public sector, it relates to BPS (Basic Pay Scale) increments.

Procedural Justice: The fairness of the processes used to reach those outcomes. Research suggests that when faculty feel the tenure or promotion process is transparent, they are more likely to accept even "unfavorable" outcomes.

Interactional Justice: Divided into Interpersonal (dignity and respect) and Informational (transparency of communication). Studies in Pakistani higher education often find that the "HOD-Faculty" relationship is a massive predictor of job satisfaction.

**Theoretical Foundation:** The primary theory here is Equity Theory (Adams, 1965), which suggests that faculty compare their "inputs" (effort, PhD, research) and "outputs" (salary, status) with their peers. If the ratio feels off, perceived injustice occurs.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior (The Dependent Variable):** Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is the "discretionary" effort—the work that isn't in the job description but keeps the university running.

**The Five Dimensions (Organ, 1988):** Altruism: Helping a colleague with a heavy grading load or a new lecturer with their syllabus.

**Conscientiousness:** Going far beyond the minimum required attendance or effort.

**Sportsmanship:** Tolerating the inevitable administrative "hiccups" (like a broken AC in a Karachi summer) without constant complaining.

**Courtesy:** Preventing problems by keeping others informed.

**Civic Virtue:** Participating in university governance, even when it's unpaid or time-consuming.

**Theoretical Foundation:** The Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) is the backbone of OCB literature. It argues that when a university treats a faculty member well (Justice), the faculty member feels a "psychological debt" to return the favor through extra effort (OCB).

## Methodology

### Sample

The sample size of the study comprised of 300 respondents, 48% that is 144 respondents were from public sector universities and 52% that is 156 respondents were from private sector universities. Where age is concerning 40.4% respondents ranged from age 23-33 years, 36 % were from the age bracket of 34 years to 43 years, 12.3% were between 44 years to 53 years, 7.3% respondents were from the age bracket ranging from 54-63 years and 4% of the respondents belong to 64years to 73 years.

The female respondents in the study were 37% and male were 63%. In education criteria 68.3% were Master's degree holders, 16.6 % were MS/ MPhil degree holders and 15.1% were PhD. 60% of the respondents of the study were married, 39 % were unmarried and 1% were divorced. 61.1% respondents had a tenure of more than 6 years, 11.3 % respondents' tenure was from 5-6 years and same percentage goes for 3-4 years' tenure. Respondents with 1-2 years' tenure were 10.3% and 6 % respondents had less than a year tenure. Where income level is concerned 18.4% respondents earned 20,000-30,000 PKR, 6.6 % between 31,000-40,000 PKR, 7 % from 41,000-50,000 PKR, 10.3% from 51,000-60,000 PKR and 57.7% respondents' income level was above 61,000 PKR. The population of the research study encompass of diversify population. The convenience sampling method was used to select respondents of the study.

## Measures

### Organizational Justice

To measure organizational Justice Scale, Colquitt's (2001), have been used having 21 questions scale with computed sub variables of Organizational Justice, like Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice. Responses have been reported on seven-point Likert scale format ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. In this study the Cronbach alpha is =.79

### Organizational Citizenship Behavior

To assess organizational Citizenship Behavior, Podsakoff et al.'s (1990), 24 questions scale was used, it has reliably shown a five-factor model, that includes conscientiousness, sportsmanship,

altruism, courtesy and civic virtue responses are reported on seven-point Likert scale format ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7= strongly agree. In this study the Cronbach alpha is  $\alpha = .78$

### Procedure

To conduct the study following procedures were followed for the assortment of the data from the university faculty. The researcher approached the university's authorities, explained them about the scope of the study and took consent to conduct the research in their premises. After seeking the approval, the information about the survey was provided to the respondents, prior to the survey, consent form was provided to the respondents. After seeking the consent of the respondents, the survey was explained and time of three to four days was provided for the completion of the questionnaire.

### Statistical Analysis

Quantitative technique was applied to analyze the data on Statistical Packaging for Social Science (SPSS) version 20. Linear regression model was applied to test the hypothesis that there will be an impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior between private and public sector universities faculty.

### Results

According to the hypothesis i.e. there will be an impact of organizational justice on citizenship behavior amid public and private universities faculty. Table 1 specifies that the regression model predicts the outcome variable significantly well. This specifies the statistical significance of the regression model that was applied. Here,  $P < 0.0005$  which is less than 0.05 and specifies that, overall, the model applied is significantly good enough in predicting the outcome variable. Table 3 provides the R and R<sup>2</sup> value. The R value is 0.770, which represents the simple correlation and, therefore, specifies a high degree of correlation. The R<sup>2</sup> value specifies how much of the dependent variable, organizational citizenship behavior, can be explained by the independent variable, organizational justice. In this case, 59.4% can be explained, which is large.

**Table 1**

Analysis of Variance for Linear Regression with Organizational Justice as Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior amid Private Sector Business Universities Faculties

| Model                                                      |            | SS         | Df  | MS        | F       | Sig   |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----|-----------|---------|-------|
| 1                                                          | Regression | 76673.609  | 1   | 76673.609 | 435.146 | .000a |
|                                                            | Residual   | 52508.188  | 298 | 176.202   |         |       |
|                                                            | Total      | 129181.797 | 299 |           |         |       |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice          |            |            |     |           |         |       |
| b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior |            |            |     |           |         |       |

This table specifies that the regression model predicts the outcome variable significantly well. This specifies the statistical significance of the regression model that was applied. Here,  $P < 0.0005$  which is less than 0.05 and specifies that, overall, the model applied is significantly good enough in predicting the outcome variable.

**Table 2**

Coefficients for Linear Regression with Organizational Justice as Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior amid Private Sector Business Universities Faculties

| Model                  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|                        | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant)           | 28.472                      | 4.215      |                           | 6.755  | .000 |
| Organizational Justice | .240                        | .012       | .770                      | 20.860 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The above table indicated that Organizational Justice ( $\beta = 0.770$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) is significant predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

**Table 3**

Summary of Linear Regression with Organizational Justice as predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior amid Private Sector Business Universities Faculties

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| 1     | .770a | .594     | .592              |

This table provides the  $R = 0.594$  and Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.592$ . The  $R$  value is 0.770, which represents the simple correlation and, therefore, specifies strong correlation amid the variables. The  $R^2$  value specifies how much of the dependent variable, organizational citizenship behavior, can be explained by the independent variable, organizational justice. In this case, 59.4% can be explained, which is significant.

## Discussion

This section comprises, the summary of the study findings and strategic references for the stakeholders and policy makers to support the necessity and importance of organizational justice, new standards should be codified for universities to be responsible for the upcoming challenges and provide an environment to the faculty that can aid in nurturing the future of our education system in accordance to the requirement of the knowledge based economy and work beyond their formal duties and display organizational citizenship behavior.

The progress of quality education in this knowledge-based economy can only be achieved through faculty. As stated by Miller (1980) the effect of education is, “the man behind the system”. The key factor that decides the power of education is human. In reality, education is a service industry and the front line determines the quality of service delivered (Sallis, 2002). The best performance of these faculty can endow good benefits for the students and community will be comprehend if the faculty carry out their duties in fair and equitable environment which can only be possible when conducive environment can be provided to the faculty results mechanistic approach, thus building organizational citizenship behavior.

In order to be market driven, it is very much imperative for the university to provide the learned faculty with an environment that not only enhances their learning but also their wellbeing, by giving them freedom, challenging work, managerial and organizational encouragement, realistic work pressure, sufficient resources, supportive work group that enables them to carry out their

duties effectively and building trusting relationship with their organization, and going beyond their call of duties with full enthusiasm through organizational citizenship behavior.

As mentioned in the research by (Choi, 2007) a strong and inspiring vision specified by the top management and encouragement provided by them in the form of organizational justice is an important predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. One possible explanation that can be given for the Choi's (2007) inconsistent findings is that the study only involved one company employees and was deliberated for an extensive period of time, whereas the present research study measured employees from both the public and private sector faculty at one point of time.

### Limitations

In spite of the strengths in the research study there are several limitations that might have influenced the study. There was lack of pertinent literature on organizational justice, barely research studies are published in journals that target the difference amid public and private universities where organizational fairness is considered. The data was collected through self-report measures that might have directed towards the common method of variance and thus inflated the reported relationship amid independent and dependent variable. The participant might misrepresent the result to show consistency amid their responses or present themselves in positive way, despite of their exact feelings (Podsakoff, MacKenize, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As the research study was conducted in an underdeveloped country, there might have been cultural values that influenced the hypothesized variables. The research study only studied some of the universities in Karachi, where the demographics are different from the rest of the cities. All universities were not taken into study due to time limitation. There is a possibility that the respondents who had a short tenure might have not been able to perceive whether or not creative organizational climate exists.

### Conclusion

The main conclusions from this study may be applicable to a wider group of people. This research theoretically provide provision that when employees are given appropriate amount of challenging work load with essential resources to accomplish their work are more motivated to go further than their job description to work for the organization. Organizations should promote organizational justice as research suggests fair and equitable environment in order to foster positive attitude amid workers, as technology and work processes can be purchased and copied, the only sustainable viable advantage an organization has is its work force. Organization should not adhere to the rigid rules and procedures as it hinders creative ideas, policies should be design in such a way that leads to the enhancement of the creative potential, they should be treated as a valuable asset of the organization by providing them with honest and open communication, autonomy, challenging task, freedom, ample resources, voice in the decision, tolerance for non-conformity.

### References

- Alge, B. J., Ballinger, G. A., Tangirala, S., & Oakley, J. L. (2006). Information privacy in organizations: Empowering creative and extra-role performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 221.
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A fi eld study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 247-260.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity and innovation in organizations.
- Amabile, T. M. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. *California management review*, 40(1), 39-58.

- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of management journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Barrett, A. M. (2011). An education Millennium Development Goal for quality: complexity and democracy. *Compare*, 41(1), 145-148.
- Borghini, S. (2005) "Organizational creativity: breaking equilibrium and order to innovate", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9 Issue: 4, pp.19 – 33.
- Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 28(4), 467-484.
- Davenport TH (2005) *Thinking for a living: how to get better performance and results from knowledge workers*. Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston.
- Duff, G. C., & Galyean, M. L. (2007). Board-invited review: recent advances in management of highly stressed, newly received feedlot cattle. *Journal of Animal Science*, 85(3), 823-840.
- Florida, R. (2002). The economic geography of talent. *Annals of the Association of American geographers*, 92(4), 743-755.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1998 a) "*The Ninth Five Year Plan (1998-2003)*" Ministry of Education, Islamabad.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59-68.
- Grigorenko, E. L. (2019). Creativity: a challenge for contemporary education. *Comparative Education*, 55(1), 116-132.
- Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1996). Biographical and climate predictors of job satisfaction and pride in organization. *The Journal of psychology*, 130(2), 193-208.
- Hackman, J. R. (1977). Work design. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work: Behavioral science approaches to organizational change* (pp. 96-162). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Katz D, Kahn RL (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organization*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Katz, D. 1964. Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9: 131–146.
- Kylen, F.S. & Shani, A.B. (2002). *Tigering Creativity in Teams: An Exploratory Investigation*, Creativity and Innovation Management, 11(1), pp.17-30.
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California management review*, 40(3), 112-132
- McLean, L. D. (2005). Organizational culture's influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(2), 226-246.
- Medley, D. M., & Shanon, D. M. (1994). Teacher Evaluation in T. Husen and TN Postlethwaite (eds), the international Encyclopedia of Education, 2nd ed, Vol X.
- Michael J. (2011) *Long-term effects of the demographic transition on family and kinship networks in Britain*. Population and Development Review, 37 (S1). pp. 55-80. ISSN 1728-4457.
- Mishra, P., & Mehta, R. (2017). What we educators get wrong about 21st-century learning: Results of a survey. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 33(1), 6-19.
- Niazi, H. K., & Mace, J. (2006). The contribution of the private sector to higher education in Pakistan with particular reference to efficiency and equity. *Bulletin of Education & Research*, 28(2), 17-42
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human performance*, 10(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & 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.
- Sallis, E. (2002). *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Angle, H. L. (1989). An introduction to the Minnesota innovation research program. *Research on the management of innovation*, 3-30.