ANALYZING TEACHERS' PREFERENCES FOR ORGANIZATIONAL INTEGRITY AND OBLIGATION IN PUBLIC SECTOR UNIVERSITIES OF PUNJAB, PAKISTAN

Mehmood Ul Hassan[1]

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to have comparison of organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university teachers in public universities in Pakistan. It was deductive study which used survey method for data collection. Teachers of University of Sargodha, GC University Faisalabad, University of Lahore Pakpattan campus and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan were selected as sample population for this study. In order to gauge organizational integrity and obligation among university teachers of public universities, two types of questionnaires were used, i.e. Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire having a reliability of 0.831 and 0.741 respectively. Data were analyzed by ANOVA, Post-hoc Tukey's test and independent-samples t-test. Results showed that there were well-built perceptions about organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university teachers. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation and organizational integrity entailed a significant difference between university teachers based on gender and ranks. The study suggested recommendations to enforce organizational integrity among universities and measures to boost up obligation among the university teachers.

Key Words: organizational Integrity, perceptions, measures, Obligation, Gender

Introduction

Observing integrity is one of the significant factors influencing organization's constancy and ensuring its health in the long run. Maintaining integrity is measured one of the political provisions of organizational performance, because it increases interest, loyalty and trust of the employees to the organization and adds to human and social assets of the organizations (Williams, Pitre & Zainuba, 2002). The concept of organizational integrity comes from equity theory (Adams, 1963a; 1965). Greenberg (1987a) came from the idea of organizational integrity with emphasis on the employee perceptions of organizational behavior and the consequences that come from integrity. According to Robbins and Judge (2009) organizational integrity is a general awareness of what is just and reasonable in the organizations.

Allen and Meyer (1991) categorized organizational obligation as a psychological association between the employees and the organization which reduces employee intensions to quit the job. Since there are a number of studies that investigate a relationship between organizational integrity and obligation but its comparison has not been conducted at university level, so to fill up this gap research was conducted at the university level comparing the organizational integrity and obligation in Public Universities in Pakistan

---

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of South Asia Raiwind Campus Lahore, Pakistan

.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The research set its objectives as under:

1.   To investigate the level of organizational integrity in public universities in Pakistan.

2.   To investigate the level of organizational obligation in public universities in Pakistan.

3.   To compare the level of organizational integrity and organizational obligation in public universities in Pakistan.

2. Review of Literature

Blau (1964) is the pioneer of organizational integrity by putting forward social exchange theory.   Adams (1965) equity theory was also thought as an originator of organizational integrity. Adams said that staff members pamper themselves in a comparative attitude to other colleagues in respect of the gains they take from the organization. The way in which employees look integrity in the organization forms the direction of just and fair decisions in the organization. Thus in a broad meaning, we can claim that organizational integrity was the thinking of the employees about what is happening in the organization (Greenberg, 1996). Organizational integrity creates a sense of belongingness among the employees as it is depicted by Konovsky and Pugh (1994), that the sagacity of confidence and dependence on the organization is linked with the just decisions of the organizations. According to Cole, Bernerth, Walter and Hold (2010), the employee's views of integrity inside the organization influence the output and behavior of the employees. Konovsky (2000) describes integrity as a value that assumes pivotal importance in the organization.

Brockner and Siegel (1996) explored three dimensions of veracity for the last thirty years. Procedural veracity is connected to the procedures which establish rewards and the treatment given to them by their seniors. (Brockner & Siegel, 1996).

Interactional integrity came to be known later on. This aspect demonstrates whether employees receive an honor and responsive treatment from the organization and the extent to which their opinions are respected. When we have a look at organizational integrity literature, we see that researchers focused only three facets of organizational integrity, i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional integrity (Young, 2010; Greenberg, 2004).

Distributive integrity is an outcome of social action integrity which is obtained from various theories like distributive integrity theory, Homans (1961); equity theory, Adams(1965). Amongst above theories, equity theory greatly supported distributive integrity. According to Greenberg (1987b) distributive integrity was the dimension of organizational integrity which is connected with the benefits that an employee obtained from the organization. All kinds of monetary benefits which an employee gets from the organization are also incorporated in distributive integrity (Greenberg, 2006; Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002).

Procedural integrity is the dimension of organizational integrity which establishes a course of action to evaluate organizational benefits for the employees in a just and fair way (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Procedural integrity gets a diversion from distributive integrity in such a way that it gets into consideration the allocations procedures as compared to distributive integrity where the concern is merely output (Leventhal, 1980;

Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Thibaut and Walker (1975) are pioneer to introduce procedural integrity by presenting their control theory.

Second theory was propounded by Lind and Tyler (1988) as Group-Value Model. According to this model human beings think that they are incomparable members of the society and they like fair trials because it gave them significance Procedural integrity evaluates an employee's significance in an organization (Lind &Tyler, 1988). In the beginning procedural integrity was thought to be concerned with worker's reactions to procedures which were adopted in legal trials as it was manifested in the work of Thibaut and Walker (1975). This approach of procedural integrity continued till Leventhal (1980) who asserts that organizations should regard the social milieu of the employees to recognize the importance of procedural integrity with their work atmosphere.

It was observed that employee's mind-set and behavior is much influenced by procedural fairness when it was employed to implement distributive decisions (Lind & Tyler, 1988). In the same way research proved that employee's views about procedural unfairness causes discontentment, frustration and a stagnant atmosphere (Cobb, Wooten & Folger, 1995).

Bies and Moag (1986) came from a unique approach of studying interactional integrity as a separate part of organizational integrity. It was defined as the extent of respectful dealing with employees anticipated by the organization and other employees in the process of managerial decisions and actions. It also highlights the importance of honesty, reverence and rationalization as a basis of mutual relationships (Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies,1990).

Greenberg (1993b) has demonstrated two facets of interactional integrity, i.e. "informational integrity" which is connected to the provision of information which saves employee's rights and privileges and "interpersonal integrity" which demonstrates the employee's concerns connected to the distribution of rewards and benefits. Previous researchers considered interactional integrity as an element of procedural integrity but now it is given a specific and unique recognition (Bies & Moag, 1986).

It has also been observed that existence of integrity or fairness perceptions in an organization inspire the employees to play an extra-role for the organization (Skarlicki & Latham 1996, 1997) and it reduces the concerns of the employees (Greenberg, 2006). Researchers advise managers to be fair with the employees in order to get best out of human as well as organizational resources. Dye (1990), has given fairness top priority in the process of human resource management.

Organizational obligation was defined as a degree of identification and contribution towards the organization (Simone, 2003). Johns (2005) has described organizational obligation as the degree to which an employee recognizes, adopts and performs his or her functions according to organizational principles and requirements.

Porter, Steers and Mowday (2005) observed that organizational obligation is a construct which mobilizes organizational employees to utilize their maximum abilities for the reinforcement of the institution and their inherent desire to remain a member of that particular organization. They further said that the employees who are highly determined to the

organization were valuable for the organization as they perform better, avoid wasting of time and there are fewer chances of withdrawal. Meyer and Allen (1987) opine that organizational obligation is a mental condition that creates specific opinion about the organization and culminates in employee's choice to work for the organization. Kwok-tung, Tsan-wing, Yuet-sai, Hon-tung and Wah-sun, (1996) stated that teacher's organizational obligation increases the academic achievements and consistency. Teacher's organizational obligation keeps a direct relationship with the age, experience and duration of the job in the institution (Eisenberg, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001; Swailes, 2001).

A large number of researchers opine that employee's beliefs about organizational integrity have immense consequences on individual's feelings about the organization (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Konovsky , Folger & Cropanzano, 1987),   and extra-role performance (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff,1998).

Absence of just and fair procedures in the organization makes them lazy and shirkers (Swailes, 2001). Due to the relationship between the two main variables of the study, the researcher were   interested to see a comparison between organizational integrity and organizational obligation so as to analyze the present stage of organizational integrity and organizational obligation among the faculty members of public universities in Pakistan.

2.1   Procedure

The population of the study were all male and female teaching faculty members of public universities in Pakistan. Sample was taken by applying multistage sampling. Four Public Sector Universities were selected through cluster sampling technique. Universities include University of Education Lahore, University of Sargodha, GC University Faisalabad and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan. All teaching faculty of University of Education Lahore, Bank Road Lahore Campus and Okara Campus, University of Sargodha, GC University Faisalabad and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan were selected as a sample. The distribution of the sample is shown below.

University-wise Distribution of Respondents

University Name	No. of Respondents
University of Education	60
University of Sargodha	44
GC University Faisalabad	56
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan	60
Total	**220**

2.3 Research Instruments

In order to measure organizational integrity and obligation among university teachers of public universities, two types of questionnaires were used.
  a.   Organizational Integrity Questionnaire
  b.   Organizational Obligation Questionnaire

2.4 Organizational Integrity Questionnaire

Organizational Integrity Questionnaire used in this study was developed by Crow, Lee and Joo (2012). Proper permission from the developer was obtained via email. This instrument used five

point Likert scale for all fifteen items. Response categories ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

2.5 Organizational Obligation Questionnaire (OCQ)

Organizational Obligation Questionnaire (OCQ) utilized by the researcher was developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) which was used by a number of researchers. The OCQ was published by Sage Publications. Proper permission from the publisher was obtained via email. This instrument also used five point Likert scale for all fifteen items. Response categories ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).Six items were found negative in their responses, hence were upturned for the purpose of data analysis.

Both the questionnaires were distributed in English language as the respondents were highly qualified. Demographic variables like name, position held, gender, age, university name and department were included in the scale for personal information.

2.6 Validation of Research Instrument

A pilot study was conducted to look into the reliability of Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire (OCQ). Questionnaires were administered to 50 university teachers that were not included in the main study. Reliability of the scale was measured by Chronbach alpha. Its values were found 0.833 and 0.751 for Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire respectively which confirms the standards described by Law (2004) that it is measured excellent if coefficient was greater than 0.80 and sufficient if it is within the range of 0.60 to 0.79.

Factor wise reliability and description of Organizational Integrity Scale

S/No.	Factor	No of items	Item No's included	Chronbah alpha
1	Procedural Integrity	5	1, 2,3,4,5	0.754
2	Interactional Integrity	5	6,7,8,9,10	0.725
3	Distributive Integrity	5	11,12,13,14,15	0.578

Factor wise reliability and description of Organizational Obligation Scale

S/No.	Factor	No of items	Item No's included	Chronbach alpha
1	Proud to be the part of organization	5	1, 2, 6, 10, 14	0.625
2	Loyal to the organization	5	3,4,7,11,13	0 .50
3	Satisfied to be associated with the organization	5	5,8,9,12,15	0.50

The researcher personally visited all the four universities to collect data. Total numbers of questionnaires administered were 260. The researcher received 220 responses. In this way the researcher got 84% responses which are highly acceptable according to the guide lines given by Iarossi (2006) who says that 80-85% return rate in self administered questionnaires or interview approach is highly acceptable.

2.7 Data Analysis

SPSS for Windows, Version 16.0 was used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics methods were used for evaluating organizational integrity and obligation level in Public Universities in Pakistan. ANOVA was used to measure the dimensions of organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university teachers in Public Universities in Pakistan. Post-hoc Tukey's test and independent sample t-test were applied to measure the difference on the dimensions of organizational integrity and obligation among university teachers in Public Universities in Pakistan.

Research Question No.1What are university teacher's perceptions about organizational integrity?

Table 4.1 University Teacher's Perceptions about Organizational Integrity

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Procedural	220	1.41	4.61	3.57	0.6129
Interactional	220	1.01	5.11	3.65	0.5846
Distributive	220	1.21	4.81	3.46	0.5407

According to Table 4.1, the faculty members demonstrated highest mean score on interactional integrity (M=3.65, S.D.= 0.5846), followed by procedural integrity (M=3.59, S.D.=0.6129) and distributive integrity (M=3.46, S.D.=0.5408). The results showed that majority of the faculty members agreed that their universities have been exercising interactional integrity, procedural integrity, and distributive integrity respectively.

Research Question No.2 What do university teachers perceive about organizational obligation in public universities?

Table 4.2 University Teacher's Perceptions about Organizational obligation

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Proud	220	2.40	5.00	3.70	0.456
Loyal	220	2.20	4.80	3.66	0.493
Satisfied	220	1.80	5.00	3.62	0.493

Table 4.2 shows that faculty members demonstrated highest mean score on proud factor (M=3.70, S.D=.456); followed by loyal factor (M=3.66, S.D=.493) and satisfied factor (M=3.62, S.D=.493). These results showed that faculty members agreed that they felt proud on being part of their university, they were loyal with their university, and they were satisfied with their job.

Research Question No. 3. To what extent university teachers in Pakistani Public Universities differ on the dimensions of organizational integrity and organizational obligation?

Table 4.3 Comparison of University Teachers on the Dimensions of Organizational Integrity

	Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig**
Between Groups	64.010	3	21.337	0.418	0.740
Within Groups	11027.099	216	51.051		
Total	11091.109	219			

p>0.05

The researcher was interested in comparing organizational integrity among university teachers across four selected universities. The overall results showed that no significant differences were found between university teachers on organizational integrity, F(3, 216)=.418, *p*>0.05. It meant that all the selected faculty members across four selected universities agreed that they had same kind of organizational integrity within their respective university.

Table 4.4 Comparison of University Teachers on the Dimensions of Organizational Obligation

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	340.491	3	1134.97	3.545	0.015
Within Groups	6915.668	216	32.017		
Total	7256.159	219			

p<0.05

The researcher was interested in comparing organizational obligation among university teachers across four selected universities. The overall results showed that a significant differences was found between university teachers perceptions on organizational obligation, F(3,216)= 3.545, *p*<0.05. It meant that all the selected faculty members across four selected universities are not agreed that they had same kind of organizational obligation within their respective university. It also meant that university teachers significantly differed on their perceptions on at least one of the three factors of organizational obligation construct. Further analyses were conducted to see on which factors of the organizational obligation construct the university teachers significantly differed.

Table 4.5 Comparison of University Teachers on Proud factor of Organizational Obligation

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	105.245	3	35.11	7.36	0.000
Within Groups	1029.864	216	4.79		
Total	1135.109	219			

p<0.05

Initially, university teachers perceptions based on proud factor were compared. The overall results showed that significant differences were found between university teachers on proud factor of organizational obligation, F(3,216)= 7.358, *p*<0.05. It meant that all the selected faculty members across four selected universities agreed that they had felt proud differently within their respective university.

A further Post-hoc Tukey's test showed that faculty members in University of Sargodha statistically significantly showed higher level of proud (M=19.52, SD=2.38) than Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan (M=18.73, SD=2.25). Samely, the faculty members in University of Education statistically significantly showed higher level of proud factor of organizational obligation (M=19.20, SD=1.77) than Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan (M=17.73, SD=2.25). It shows that faculty members of University of Sargodha and University of Education are more proud than faculty members of Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.

Table 4.6 Comparison of University Teachers on Loyal factor of Organizational Obligation

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	94.65	3	31.547	5.52	0.001
Within Groups	1235.52	216	5.720		
Total	1330.16	219			

p<0.05

The researcher was interested in comparing level of loyalty among university teachers across four selected universities. The overall results showed that significant differences were found between university teachers on loyal factor of organizational obligation construct, F(3,216)= 5.52, *p*<0.05. It

meant that all the selected faculty members across four selected universities agreed that they differed in their loyalty with their respective university. A further Post-hoc Tukey's test showed that faculty members in University of Education statistically significantly showed higher level of loyalty (M=19.38, SD=2.17) than GC University, Faisalabad (M=17.64, SD=2.45) and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan (M=18.13, SD=2.46) . It shows that faculty members of University of Education are more loyal than faculty members of GC University, Faisalabad and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.

Table 4.7 Comparison of University Teachers on Satisfied factor of Organizational Obligation

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	5.33	3	1.79	0.290	0.823
Within Groups	1323.768	216	6.13		
Total	1329.109	219			

p>0.05

The researcher was also interested in comparing level of satisfaction among university teachers across four selected universities. The overall results showed that a significant differences was not found between university teachers on satisfied factor of organizational obligation, F(3,216)= .290, *p>0.05*. It means that all the selected faculty members across four selected universities agreed that they had same level of satisfaction across their universities.

Research Question No. 4. Is there any significant difference between male and female teachers' perceptions on organizational obligation factors?

Table 4.8 Comparison of male and female teachers on organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	p
Male	101	53.74	6.22	-.880	218	0.380
Female	119	54.42	5.34			

p>0.05

Table 4.8 shows that male (M=53.74, SD=6.22) and female (M=54.42, SD=5.34) university teachers demonstrated slight difference on their perceptions regarding organizational obligation. However the t-test for independent samples showed that university faculty did not significantly differed on their perceptions of their obligation with their university, *t*(218)= -.880 *p>0.05*.

Table 4.9 Comparison of male and female teachers on Proud Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	p
Male	101	19.62	2.49	-.239	218	0.811
Female	119	19.69	2.10			

p>0.05

Table 4.9 shows a slight difference between male and female teachers' perceptions. Female teachers showed slightly higher mean score ((M=19.69, SD=2.10) than male teachers (M=19.62, SD=2.49). The t-test for independent samples showed that no significant differences were found between male and female teachers perceptions regarding their level of pride in the university, *t*(218)= -.239, *p>0.05*.

Table 4.10 Comparison of male and female teachers on Loyal Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
Male	101	16.30	2.55	-.440	218	.661
Female	119	16.45	2.41			

p>0.05

Table 4.10 shows female teachers showed a slightly higher level of mean score ((M=16.45, SD=2.41)) on loyalty factor than male teachers ((M=16.30, SD=2.55). However, the t-test for independent samples showed no significant difference between male and female teachers perceptions of their loyalty with their universities $t(218)=-.440$), $p>0.05$.

Table 4.11 Comparison of male and female teachers on Satisfied Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	p
Male	101	16.81	2.48	-1.399	218	0.163
Female	119	17.27	2.442			

p>0.05

Table 4.11 showed female teachers showed higher level of satisfaction with their university ((M=17.27, SD=2.45) than male teachers (M=16.81, SD=2.48). However, the t-test for independent samples showed that no statistically significantly differences were found between male and female teachers perceptions regarding their satisfaction in the universities, $t(218)= -1.399$, $p>0.05$.

Research Question. No.5. Is there any significant difference between male and female teachers' perceptions on organizational integrity factors?

Table 4.12 Comparison of male and female teachers on organizational integrity

	N	Mean	SD	T	df	P	Effect size
Male	101	50.23	7.41	-2.127	218	0.035	0.29
Female	119	51.26	6.76				

p<0.05

Table 4.12 shows that male (M=50.23, SD=7.41) and female (M=51.26, SD=6.76) university teachers demonstrated a difference on their perceptions regarding organizational integrity. The t-test for independent samples showed that university faculty significantly differed on their perceptions of their integrity with their university, $t(218)= -2.127$, $p<0.05$ with effect size 0.29.

Table 4.13 Comparison of male and female teachers on Procedural Factor of organizational integrity

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P	Effect size
Male	101	18.34	3.44	-2.713	184.811	0.006	0.38
Female	119	19.48	2.67				

p<0.05

Table 4.13 shows a difference between male and female teachers' perceptions. Female teachers showed higher mean score (M=19.48, SD=2.67) than male teachers (M=18.34, SD=3.44). The t-test for independent samples showed that a significant differences was found between male and female teachers perceptions regarding their level of procedural integrity in the university, $t(184.811)=-2.713$, $p<0.05$ with effect size 0.38 which is very large.

Table 4.14 Comparison of male and female teachers on Interactional Factor of organizational integrity

	N	Mean	SD	T	df	p
Male	101	17.89	1.88	-1.190	218	0.235
Female	119	19.36	1.94			

p>0.05

Table 4.14 shows a difference between male and female teachers' perceptions. Female teachers showed higher mean score (M=18.89, SD=1.88) than male teachers (M=19.36, SD=1.94). The t-test for independent samples showed that no significant differences was found between male and female teachers perceptions regarding their level of interactional integrity in the university, $t(218)=-1.190$, $p>0.05$.

Table 4.15 Comparison of male and female teachers on Distributive Factor of organizational integrity

	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Male	101	18.00	2.67	-1.18	218	0.24
Female	119	18.42	2.74			

p>0.05

Table 4.15 shows a slight difference between male and female teachers' perceptions. Female teachers showed higher mean score (M=18.00, SD=2.67) than male teachers (M=18.42, SD=2.74). However The t-test for independent samples showed that no significant differences was found between male and female teachers perceptions regarding their level of distributive integrity in the university, $t(218)=- 1.173$, $p>0.05$.

Research Question No. 6. Is there any significant difference between university teachers perception on organizational obligation factors based on their position?

Table 4.16 Comparison of assistant professors and lecturers on organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Assistant professors	65	57.00	5.42	-1.483	217	0.139
Lecturers	155	55.74	5.88			

p>0.05

Table 4.16 shows that assistant professors (M=57.00, SD=5.42) and lecturers (M=55.74, SD=5.88) demonstrated difference on their perceptions regarding organizational obligation. However the t-test for independent samples showed that university faculty did not significantly differed on their perceptions of their obligation with their university, $t(217)= -1.483$, $p>0.05$.

Table 4.17 Comparison of assistant professors and lecturers on Proud Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	p	Effect size
Assistant professors	65	17.32	1.94	-2.82	217	0.005	0.44
Lecturers	155	16.38	2.36				

p<0.05

Table 4.17 shows a difference between assistant professors and lecturer's perceptions regarding organizational obligation. Assistant professors showed higher mean score (M=17.32, SD=1.94) than lecturers (M=16.38, SD=2.36). However the t-test for independent samples showed that a significant differences was found between assistant professors and lecturer's perceptions regarding their level of pride in the university, t(218)=-2.82, p<0.05 with effect size 0.44 which is very large.

Table 4.18 Comparison of assistant professors and lecturers on Loyal Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	P
Assistant professors	65	17.41	2.46	-.113	218	0.910
Lecturers	155	17.37	2.48			

p>0.05

Table 4.18 shows a slight difference between assistant professors and lecturer's perceptions. Assistant professors showed higher mean score (M=17.41, SD=2.46) than lecturers (M=17.37, SD=2.48). However the t-test for independent samples showed that no significant difference was found between assistant professor's and lecturer's perceptions regarding their loyalty to the university, t (218) =- .113, p>0.05.

Table 4.19 Comparison of assistant professors and lecturers on Satisfied Factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	P
Assistant professors	65	19.25	2.39	-.771	218	0.442
Lecturers	155	18.96	2.50			

p>0.05

Table 4.19 shows a difference between assistant professors and lecturer's perceptions. Assistant professors showed higher mean score (M=19.25, SD=2.39) than lecturers (M=18.96, SD=2.50). However the t-test for independent samples showed that no significant differences was found between assistant professors and lecturer's perceptions regarding satisfaction to the university, t(218) =- .771, p>0.05.

1. Conclusions

a. Mean scores of organizational integrity with standard deviations reveal that there are strong perceptions about organizational integrity among university teachers in Public universities in Pakistan.

b. Mean scores of organizational obligation with standard deviations reveal that there are strong perceptions about organizational obligation among university teachers in Public universities in Pakistan.

c. ANOVA was calculated and overall results showed that no significant difference was found between university teachers perceptions on organizational integrity. It also means that university teachers did not significantly differ on their perceptions on organizational integrity construct.

d. ANOVA was calculated and overall results showed that a significant difference was found between university teachers perceptions on organizational obligation. It also means that university teachers significantly differed on their perceptions on at least one of the three factors of organizational obligation construct.

e.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational obligation showed that a significant difference was found between university teachers on proud factor of organizational obligation. A further Post-hoc Tukey's test showed that faculty members of University of Sargodha and University of Education are more proud than faculty members of Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.

f.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational obligation showed that a significant difference was found between university teachers on loyal factor of organizational obligation A further Post-hoc Tukey's test showed that faculty members of University of Education are more loyal than faculty members of GC University, Faisalabad and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.

g.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational obligation showed that a significant difference was not found between university teachers on satisfied factor of organizational obligation.

h.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational obligation by application of Independent Samples Test was conducted among male and female teachers of the four universities. It was found that all the three factors of organizational obligation i.e. proud, loyal, and satisfied were not statistically significant different on scores between male and female teachers.

i.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational integrity by application of Independent Samples Test was conducted among male and female teachers of the four universities. It was found that male and female teachers significantly differed on an overall model of organizational integrity. It was also found that two of the three factors of organizational integrity i.e. interactional factor and distributive factor were not statistically significant different on scores between male and female teachers while procedural factor was found significantly different. As the female teachers showed higher mean score than male teachers, it is evident that female teachers experienced more integrity than male teachers.

j.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational obligation by application of Independent Samples Test was conducted among assistant professors and lecturers of the four universities. It was found that only proud factor of organizational obligation was statistically significant different on scores between assistant professors and lecturers. As the assistant professors showed higher mean score than lecturers, it is evident that assistant professors experienced more proud factor than lecturers.

k.   A factor- wise comparison of organizational integrity by application of Independent Samples Test was conducted among assistant professors and lecturers of the four universities. It was found that all the three factors of organizational integrity, i.e. procedural, interactional, and distributive were not statistically significant different on scores between assistant professors and lecturers.

3.1 Limitations

Although the current study provides an interesting comparison and useful information regarding organizational integrity and obligation, the present study has also some limitations which need to be addressed in a future study on the same variables.

First, all the respondents belonged to the province of Punjab, which might limit the generalization of the results. The generalization of the results might also be limited by the fact that the respondents only included assistant professors and lecturers and it did not include associate professors and full professors. Associate professors and full professors being the senior teachers of the university might have different opinions.

The second limitation of the study is that the comparisons were not made based on teacher's departments. Even though they all were university teachers, were not classified in terms of their departments. Teachers of different departments might have different opinions due to the difference of their specific cultures. This factor might affect the generalization of the results.

3.4 Discussion

This study is unique as it compares organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university teachers of public universities in Pakistan. Demographic variables like position held, gender and institution names were also evaluated. The factor wise analysis was conducted to support the findings.

The study showed that there are strong perceptions about organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university teachers in Public universities in Pakistan. It was found that all the four selected universities differed significantly on the perceptions on organizational obligation. It was also found that level of organizational obligation in University of Sargodha and University of Education was more than Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan at the same time the level of organizational obligation in University of Education was more than of GC University, Faisalabad and Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan. The possible reason behind this may be that the university teachers of one institution enjoy better work place, physical conditions and working facilities than the other. Cheng (1990); Hoy and Miskel (1991), and Owens (2004) state that workplace environment escalates the level of organizational obligation.

This study also showed that there is no significant difference on the perceptions of organizational obligation between male and female teachers. This conforms the results of She (2007) and Ma (2006) who found that gender does not significantly influence teacher's organizational obligation. It was found that female teachers experienced more integrity than male teachers. The possible reason behind this fact might be that females are more sensitive to integrity than males. This does not conform the results of Xiao (2007), who found that male scores are higher than females in the perceptions of organizational integrity. Research shows that lack of integrity in each organization creates non-obligation and dissatisfaction among employees (Abu Elanian ,2010; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Administrators should implement organizational integrity before they are going to take a decision in order to avert a possible retaliation from the employees. The use of fair formal procedures and treatments by university administration while treating the employees show that organization respect the rights, privileges, and self respect of university teachers.

Study showed that assistant professors experienced more obligation than lecturers. The possible reasons behind this might be the long period of service, higher salaries, job security and confidence over management's decisions. Sergiovanni (1991) is of the view that higher salaries and job security contribute to the obligation of employees.

In a realistic point of view, findings of this research suggest that administrators dealing and controlling the faculty of the universities must consider organizational integrity in true spirit. Administrators, who are fair towards their subordinates, can enhance organizational obligation in a better way. Dealing employees in a fair manner and using fair procedures does not cost much. Additionally universities may need to actively examine their prevailing policies and procedures in order to promote fairness in the organization.

3.5 Recommendations

i.   The analysis of data shows that the level of organizational obligation was highest in University of Sargodha. It is therefore recommended that qualitative research may be conducted in Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, University of Education and GC University Faisalabad to probe the reasons behind the low level of organizational obligation.

ii.   The analysis of data demonstrated that female teachers enjoyed greater organizational integrity than male teachers. It is therefore recommended that universities must adopt just and fair procedures irrespective of gender.

iii.   The analysis of data demonstrated that assistant professors enjoyed greater organizational obligation than lecturers. It is therefore recommended that measures promoting organizational obligation must be used for lecturers.

iv.   Just and fair procedures must be used in case of promotions as it ensures higher levels of obligation among the teachers.

v.   This study was conducted in Punjab, and other parts of the country could not be included in the study due to time and financial constraints. It is recommended that study may be conducted on a broader scale so that it thoroughly probes the possible reasons behind the variations of organizational integrity and obligation among universities, both sexes and different positions held by the teachers.

References

Abu Elanain, H. M. (2010). Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational integrity and work outcomes in a non-Western context of the UAE. *Journal of Management Development*, *29*(1), 5-27.

Adams,J .S.(1963a). Wage in equities, productivity, and work quality. *Industrial Relations, 3*(3), 9-16.

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berekowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2(2), 267-299.

Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P (1991). The measurement and antecedents of affective continuance & normative obligation to the organization. *Journal occupational Psychology, 63*(2), 1-18.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the   relationship between organizational integrity and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(3), 267–285.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley &   Sons.

Bies, R. J. & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional integrity: communication criteria of fairness. In RJ Lewicki, BH Sheppard and MH Bazerman (Eds), *Research on Negotiation on Organization, 1*(2), 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brockner, J., & Siegel, P. (1996). Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive integrity. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. 30*(1), 229-249. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cobb, A.T., Wooten, K.C., & Folger, R. (1995). Integrity in the making: Towards understanding the theory and practice of integrity in organizational change and development. In W.A. Prasmore & R.W. Woodman (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 8*(3), 243-295. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F. & Hold, D.T. (2010). Organizational integrity and individuals' withdrawal: unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management Studies, 47*(4), 367- 390.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Judge, T. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2006). Integrity and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of integrity effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 100*(3), 110-127.

Dye, C.F. (1990). Ten rules define HR's role. *The Personnel Journal, 69*(5), 82-86.

Eisenberg, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch P. D., & Rhoades, L., (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86* (2). PP. 42-51.

Folger, R. & Greenberg, J. (1985) Procedural integrity: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K.M. Rowland & G.R. Ferris (Eds.).*Research In Personnel And Human Resource* Management, *3*(5), 141-183. Greenwich, CT:JAI Press.

Greenberg, J. (1987b). Reactions to procedural integrity in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72* (1), 55-61.

Greenberg, J. (1996). The Quest for Integrity on the Job: Essays and Experiments. Thousand Oaks. CA: *Sage   Publications*.

Greenberg, J. (2004). Stress fairness to fare no stress: managing workplace stress by promoting organizational integrity. *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(7), 352-365.

Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational inintegrity: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional integrity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(1), 58–69.

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Johns, R. (2005). *Determinants of organizational obligation among U.S. workers.* Masters Abstracts International, *43*(6), 20-39.

Konovsky, M. A, Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1987). Relative effects of procedural and distributive integrity on employee attitudes, *Representative Research in Social Psychology 17*(3), 15–24.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 656- 669.

Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding procedural integrity and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 489- 511.

Kwok-tung, T., Tsan-wing, L., Yuet-sai, C., Hon-tung., & Wah-sun, H., (1996). The relationship of teacher's organizational obligation to their perceived organizational health and personal characteristics in primary schools. *Journal of Primary Education, 4*(5), 27-41.

Law, M. (2004). Outcome measures rating from guidelines. *Canadian Journal of Occupational therapy.54*(4)*,* 133-138. Hamilton Canada: Institute of Applied Health Sciences, McMaster University.

Lind, E. A, & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Integrity* .New York: Plenum Publishers.

Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationship. *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research. 7*(3), 27-55. New York: Plenum.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural integrity as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal , 35*(6), 626-637.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1987). Organizational obligation: towards a three- component model. *Research   Bulletin No.660*. Ontario, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario.

Mowday, R. T, Steers, R. M, & Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of organizational obligation. *Journal of vocational behavior, 14*(3), 224-247.

Moorman, R. H, Blakely, G. L, & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural integrity and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal 41*(5), 351-357.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (2005). *Do employee attitudes towards organizations matter? The study of employee obligation to organizations*. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hill (Eds.), Great minds in management (171-189). New York: Oxford.

Robbins, S.P & Judge, T.A. (2009). *Organizational Behavior* 13th Edition Prentice Hall Publishers .

Sergiovanni, T. J, (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd Edition). M.A Allyn & Bacon.

Simone, A. (2003). The effects of gender and marital status on simulated hiring decisions. *Masters Abstract International, 42*(3), 33-54.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational integrity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2)*,* 161-169.

Swailes, S. (2001). Goals, creativity and achievement: Obligation in contemporary organizations. *Creativity & Innovative Management, 9*(3), 185-194.

Thibaut, J, & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural integrity: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler, T. R, & Bies, R. J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural integrity. In J .S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology in business settings*: *2*(2), 77-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Young, L. D. (2010). Is organizational integrity enough to promote citizenship behavior at work? A retest in Korea, *European Journal of Scientific Research, 45*(1), 637-648.

Williams, S., Pitre, R., & Zainuba, M. (2002). Integrity and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: fair rewards versus fair treatment, *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(1), 33-44.

Xiao, X. (2007). Research on job burnout and organizationalintegrity of P. E. teachers in College and university (Master's thesis, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China).