

12-1-2011

Traditional organizational behavior concepts viewed through new lenses

Donald E. Gibson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gibson, Donald E. (2011) "Traditional organizational behavior concepts viewed through new lenses," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 8: Iss. 4, Article 2.
Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol8/iss4/2>



Introduction to Current Empirical Research

Traditional organizational behavior concepts viewed through new lenses

Donald E Gibson

Co-Editor

Organization Management Journal
(2011) 8, 203–204. doi:10.1057/omj.2011.43



Organization
Management
Journal

The set of Current Empirical Research articles in this issue represent varied, cutting edge explorations of classic organizational behavior issues, including organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and leadership. The articles serve to poke and prod these familiar phenomena, by using new research methods (e.g., relative weights analysis), new ways of seeing (e.g., through “the lens of equity sensitivity”) and new global perspectives (Leadership in Confucian Asia).

In “The relative importance of organizational justice dimensions on employee outcomes: A critical re-analysis using relative weights analysis,” Scott Behson uses a new analytical method, relative weights analysis, to examine a well-established construct: organizational justice and its four primary dimensions, distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational. By using this novel approach, Behson is able to provide a more fine-grained measure of the relative predictive utility of the four dimensions, which have primarily been examined through hierarchical regression-based techniques. Using the new method helped to show a stronger relationship between distributive justice and important organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and commitment. This finding runs counter to much of the existing justice literature, raising intriguing questions for future research.

Allen, Evans, and White, in “Affective organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the relationship through the lens of equity sensitivity,” use the concept of equity sensitivity, derived from Adams’ equity theory, to explore relationships with affective organizational commitment (AOC) and citizenship behavior (OCB). They make the interesting discovery that there is an interaction between AOC and equity sensitivity such that individuals with an “entitled” orientation exhibit higher levels of citizenship behavior as their degree of commitment increases. People with an entitled orientation and lower levels of AOC have the lowest levels of OCB’s. This finding suggests that for some employees, working on increasing affective commitment – especially through organizational support – is an important way to overcome the possibly negative effects of employees with an entitled equity orientation.

The following two articles examine leadership in two very different cultural milieus: the Middle East (the Sultanate of Oman),



and “Confucian Asia” (Mainland China, Singapore, and Taiwan). In the first, “Leadership tactics: Enabling quality social exchange and organizational citizenship behavior,” Stuart Schmidt and Unnikammu Moideenkutty examine the relationship between leaders’ positive and negative influence tactics and their subordinates’ OCB directed toward them. Using structural equation modeling and a sample including data from actual supervisor–subordinate dyads, they find that positive leader influence tactics are positively associated with social exchange (represented by a combination of leader–member exchange and trust) and subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior directed toward supervisors. However, while negative leader influence tactics were negatively related to social exchange, they were unrelated to supervisor-directed organizational citizenship behavior. In fact, social exchange mediated the

relationship between a leader’s positive influence tactics and OCB directed toward them.

In “Leadership in ‘Confucian Asia’: A three-country study of justice, trust, and transformational leadership,” Pillai, Kohles, Bligh, Carsten, and Brodowsky found interesting differences in the way that transformational leaders built trust, depending on whether they were in Mainland China, Singapore, or Taiwan. The authors make the interesting assertion that these findings suggest that managers and leadership should be sensitive to the possibly differential impact of procedural and distributive justice, depending on cultural differences.

This issue’s articles, then, provide multiple perspectives on long-examined constructs in organizational behavior. By using new methods and perspectives, they keep these constructs alive and dynamic for future research.