



RESEARCH PAPER**Comparing EFL Teachers' Organizational Integrity and Obligation at Pakistani Universities**

Dr. Mehmood Ul Hassan¹ Asma Abdul Aziz*² Asfa Naheed³

1. Associate Professor, Department of English Mir Chakar Khan Rind University Sibi-Balochistan, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of English, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University Sibi-Balochistan, Pakistan
3. Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, GC University Faisalabad, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author asma.eng@mckru.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This study was made to have comparison of organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university English teachers in Government Universities of Pakistan. It was deductive study which used survey method for data collection. English teachers of University of Lahore Pakpattan campus, University of Education Vehari, Khwaja Fareed UEIT Rahim Yar Khan, and Bahauddin Zakariya University (henceforth BZU) Multan were selected as sample population for this study. In order to find organizational integrity and obligation among university English teachers of Government Universities, two types of questionnaires were applied, i.e. Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire with a reliability of 0.833 and 0.751 respectively. Data were analyzed by ANOVA, Post-hoc Tukey's test and independent-samples t-test. Results tell that there was well-built observation about organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university English teachers. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation and organizational integrity entailed a valuable difference between university English 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 English teachers.

KEYWORDS Gender, Measures, Obligation, Observation, Organizational Integrity

Introduction

Observing integrity is one of the valuable 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, faithfulness 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 observation 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.

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 being 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.

Literature Review

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 observation 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).

Numerous researchers are of the view that employee's beliefs about organizational integrity have great impacts 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 researchers were involved to find a comparison between organizational integrity and organizational obligation so as to analyze the present stage of organizational integrity and organizational obligation among the University English teachers of Government Universities of Pakistan.

Material and Methods

The population of the study, were all male and female teaching University English teachers of Government Universities of Pakistan. Sample was taken by applying multistage sampling. Four Public Sector Universities were selected through cluster sampling technique. Universities include University of Lahore Pakpattan campus, University of Education Vehari, Khwaja Fareed UEIT Rahim Yar Khan and BZU Multan. All teaching faculty of University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus, University of Education Vehari, Khwaja Fareed UEIT Rahim Yar Khan and BZU Multan were selected as a sample. The distribution of the sample is shown below.

Table 1
University-wise Distribution of Respondents

University Name	No. of Respondents
University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus	60
University of Education Vehari	44
Khwaja Fareed UEIT Rahimyar Khan	56
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan	60
Total	220

Research Instruments

In order to measure organizational integrity and obligation among university English teachers of Government Universities, two types of questionnaires were used.

Organizational Integrity Questionnaire applied in this study was composed by Crow, Lee and Joo (2012). Proper permission from the developer was sought through email. This tool used five point Likert scale for all fifteen items ranging response categories from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Organizational Obligation Questionnaire (OCQ) utilized by the researcher was composed 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 seen negative in their responses, hence were upturned for the purpose of data analysis.

Both the questionnaires were composed in English language as the respondents were highly educated. Demographic variables like position held, name, university name, gender, age, and department were incorporated in the scale to get personal information.

Validation of Research Instrument

A pilot study was made to look into the reliability of Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to 50 university English teachers that were not included in the main study. Reliability of the scale was calculated by Chronbach alpha. Its values were seen 0.833 and 0.751 for Organizational Integrity Questionnaire and Organizational Obligation Questionnaire respectively which confirms the standards described by.

Table 2
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	0.751

2	Interactional Integrity	5	6,7,8,9,10	0.723
3	Distributive Integrity	5	11,12,13,14,15	0.577

Table 3
Factor wise reliability and description of Organizational Obligation Scale

S/No.	Factor	No of items	Item No's included	Chronbach alpha
1	Feel pride to be the part of organization	5	1, 2, 6, 10, 14	0.635
2	Faithful to the organization	5	3,4,7,11,13	0.50
3	Contented to be related with an organization	5	5,8,9,12,15	0.51

The researchers personally travelled to four universities for data collection. Total numbers of questionnaires administered were 260. The researcher obtained 220 responses. In this way the researchers got 84% responses which are highly appropriate according to the instructions made by Iarossi (2006) who said that 80-85% response rate in self-administered questionnaires or interview is highly commendable.

Data Analysis

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

Research Question No.1 What are observation of university English teachers about organizational integrity?

Table 4
University English teachers' Observation about Organizational Integrity

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Procedural	220	1.42	4.63	3.58	0.6127
Interactional		1.02	5.13	3.68	0.5745
Distributive		1.22	4.83	3.45	0.5404

According to table 4 the University English teachers revealed highest mean score on interactional integrity (M=3.68, S.D.= 0.5745), followed by procedural integrity (M=3.58, S.D.=0.6127) and distributive integrity (M=3.45, S.D.=0.5404). The results tell that majority of the University English teachers agreed that their universities have been exercising procedural integrity, distributive integrity and interactional integrity.

Research Question No.2 What do English teachers in Universities value about organizational obligation in Government Universities?

Table 5
University Teacher's observation about Organizational obligation

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
self-righteous	220	2.41	5.02	3.80	0.446
Faithful		2.22	4.79	3.76	0.483

Contentment	1.81	5.01	3.72	0.473
-------------	------	------	------	-------

Table 5 shows that University English teachers revealed highest mean score on self-righteous factor ($M=3.80$, $S. D=.446$); for faithful factor ($M=3.76$, $SD=.483$) and contentment factor ($M=3.72$, $SD=.473$). These results revealed that University English teachers agreed that they felt proud on being part of their university, they were faithful with their university, and they were contented with their job.

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

Table 6
Comparison of University English teachers on 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			

$p>0.05$

Table 6 reveals that researchers were interested in comparing organizational integrity among university English teachers in four selected universities. The aggregate results described that no valuable differences were seen between university English teachers on organizational integrity, $F(3, 216) = .418$, $p>0.05$. It shows that all the selected University English teachers in four selected universities agreed that they had same kind of organizational integrity within their universities.

Table 7
Comparison of University English teachers on 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			

$p<0.05$

Table 7 shows that the researchers were interested in finding out comparison of organizational obligation among university English teachers in four selected universities. The aggregate results informed that a valuable difference was observed between university English teachers' observation on organizational obligation, $F(3,216) = 3.545$, $p<0.05$. It informed that all the selected University English teachers in four selected universities are not agreed upon organizational obligation within their respective universities. It also informed that university English teachers disagreed on their observation on one of the three factors of organizational obligation. Further analyses were made to see on which factors of the organizational obligation the university English teachers disagreed.

Table 8
Comparison of University English teachers on Self-righteous 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			

$p<0.05$

At the very outset, university English teachers' observation based on self-righteous were compared. The aggregate results informed that notable differences were seen between university English teachers on self-righteous of organizational obligation, $F(3,216) = 7.358, p < 0.05$. It reveals that all the selected University English teachers in four selected universities agreed that they had felt proud within their university.

A further Post-hoc Tukey's test informed that University English teachers in University of Education Vehari valuable tell higher level of pride ($M=19.52, SD=2.38$) than BZU University Multan ($M=18.73, SD=2.25$). In the same way, the University English teachers in University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus statistically reveal higher level of self-righteous of organizational obligation ($M=19.20, SD=1.77$) than BZU Multan ($M=17.73, SD=2.25$). It shows that University English teachers of University of Education Vehari and University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus are more proud than University English teachers of BZU Multan.

Table 9
Comparison of University English teachers on Faithful factor on 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 researchers were interested in comparing level of faithfulness among university English teachers in four selected universities. The aggregate results informed that valuable differences were seen between university English teachers on Faithful factor of organizational obligation construct, $F(3,216) = 5.52, p < 0.05$. It reveals that all the selected University English teachers in four selected universities agreed that they disagreed in their faithfulness with their respective university. A further Post-hoc Tukey's test informed that University English teachers in University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus statistically shows higher level of faithfulness ($M=19.38, SD=2.17$) than Khwaja Fareed UEIT, Rahim YarKhan ($M=17.64, SD=2.45$) and BZU Multan ($M=18.13, SD=2.46$). It shows that University English teachers of University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus are more faithful than University English teachers of Khwaja Fareed UEIT, Rahim Yar Khan and BZU Multan.

Table 10
Comparison of University English teachers on Contented factor on 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 researchers were also concerned in comparing level of contentment among university English teachers in four selected universities. The aggregate of results informed that a valuable distinction was not seen between university English teachers on contented factor of organizational obligation, $F(3,216) = .290, p > 0.05$. It means that all the selected

University English teachers in four selected universities agreed that they had same level of contentment in their universities.

Research Question No. 4. Is there any valuable distinction between male and female English teachers' observation on organizational obligation?

Table 11
Comparison of male and female English 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 4.7 shows that male ($M=53.74$, $SD=6.22$) and female ($M=54.42$, $SD=5.34$) university English teachers demonstrated slight difference on their observation about organizational obligation. However, the t-test for independent samples informed that university English teachers were not disagreed on their observation of their obligation with their university, $t(218) = -.880$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 12
Comparison of male and female English teachers on Self-righteous 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 12 shows a slight difference between male and female English teachers' observation. Female English teachers informed slightly higher mean score ($M=19.69$, $SD=2.10$) than male English teachers ($M=19.62$, $SD=2.49$). The t-test for independent samples informed that no valuable differences were seen between male and female English teachers' observation about their level of pride in the university, $t(218) = -.239$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 13
Comparison of male and female English teachers on Faithful 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 13 shows female English teachers informed a bit higher level of mean score ($M=16.45$, $SD=2.41$) on faithful factor than male English teachers ($M=16.30$, $SD=2.55$). However, the t-test for independent samples informed no valuable difference between male and female English teachers' observation of their faithfulness with their universities $t(218) = -.440$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 14
Comparison of male and female English teachers on Contented 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 14 informed female English teachers informed higher level of contentment with their university ((M=17.27, SD=2.45) than male English teachers (M=16.81, SD=2.48). However, the t-test for independent samples informed that no statistically valuable differences were seen between male and female English teachers' observation about their contentment in the universities, $t(218) = -1.399, p > 0.05$. Research Question. No.5. Is there any valuable difference between male and female English teachers' observation on organizational integrity?

Table 15
Comparison of male and female English 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 15 shows that male (M=50.23, SD=7.41) and female (M=51.26, SD=6.76) university English teachers demonstrated a difference on their observation about organizational integrity. The t-test for independent samples informed that university English teachers disagreed on their observation of their integrity with their university, $t(218) = -2.127, p < 0.05$ with effect size 0.29.

Table 16
Comparison of male and female English 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 16 shows a difference between male and female English teachers' observation. Female English teachers informed higher mean score (M=19.48, SD=2.67) than male English teachers (M=18.34, SD=3.44). The t-test for independent samples informed that a valuable differences was seen between male and female English teachers observation about 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 17
Comparison of male and female English 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 17 shows a difference between male and female English teachers' observation. Female English teachers informed higher mean score (M=18.89, SD=1.88) than male English teachers (M=19.36, SD=1.94). The t-test for independent samples informed that no valuable differences was seen between male and female English teachers' observation about their interactional integrity in the university, $t(218) = 1.190, p > 0.05$.

Table 18
Comparison of male and female English 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 18 shows a slight difference between male and female English teachers' observation. Female English teachers informed higher mean score ($M=18.00$, $SD=2.67$) than male English teachers ($M=18.42$, $SD=2.74$). However, the t-test for independent samples informed that no valuable differences was seen between male and female English teachers' observation about distributive integrity in the university, $t(218) = 1.173$, $p > 0.05$. Research Question No. 6. Is there any valuable difference between university English teachers' attitude on organizational obligation based on their position held?

Table 19
Comparison of assistant professors and English lecturers on organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	p
Assistant professors	65	57.00	5.42	-1.483	217	0.139
English lecturers	155	55.74	5.88			

$p > 0.05$

Table 19 shows that English assistant professors ($M=57.00$, $SD=5.42$) and English lecturers ($M=55.74$, $SD=5.88$) demonstrated difference on their observation about organizational obligation. However, the t-test for independent samples informed that university English teachers were agreed on their observation of their obligation with their university, $t(217) = -1.483$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 20
Comparison of English assistant professors and English lecturers on Self-righteous 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
English lecturers	155	16.38	2.36				

$p < 0.05$

Table 20 shows a difference between English assistant professors and lecturer's observation about organizational obligation. English assistant professors tell higher mean score ($M=17.32$, $SD=1.94$) than English lecturers ($M=16.38$, $SD=2.36$). However, the t-test for independent samples informed that a valuable difference was seen between English assistant professors and lecturer's observation about their Self-righteous in the university, $t(218) = 2.82$, $p < 0.05$ with effect size 0.44 which is very large.

Table 21
Comparison of English assistant professors and English lecturers on Faithful factor of organizational obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
--	---	------	----	---	----	---

Assistant professors	65	17.41	2.46	-0.113	218	0.910
English lecturers	155	17.37	2.48			

$p > 0.05$

Table 21 shows a slight difference between English assistant professors and lecturer's observation. English assistant professors informed higher mean score ($M=17.41$, $SD=2.46$) than English lecturers ($M=17.37$, $SD=2.48$). However, the t-test for independent samples informed that no valuable difference was seen between assistant professor and lecturer's observation about their faithfulness to the university, $t(218) = -0.113$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 22
Comparison of assistant professors and lecturers on Contentment to organization obligation

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
Assistant professors	65	19.25	2.39	-0.771	218	0.442
English lecturers	155	18.96	2.50			

$p > 0.05$

Table 22 shows a difference between English assistant professors and lecturer's observation. Mean score about English assistant professors is ($M=19.25$, $SD=2.39$) than English lecturers ($M=18.96$, $SD=2.50$). However, the t-test for independent samples informed that no valuable differences was seen between English assistant professors and lecturer's observation about their contentment to the university, $t(218) = -0.771$, $p > 0.05$.

Discussion

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

The study explores that there are strong observations about organizational integrity and organizational obligation among university English teachers in Government Universities of Pakistan. It was seen that all the four selected universities disagreed on the observation on organizational obligation. It was also seen that level of organizational obligation in University of Education Vehari and University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus was higher than BZU Multan at the same time the level of organizational obligation in University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus was higher than of Khwaja Fareed UEIT, Rahim Yar Khan and BZU Multan. The possible reason behind this may be that the university English teachers of one institution have the benefit of better work place, substantial conditions and working amenities than the other. Cheng (1990); Hoy and Miskel (1991), and Owens (2004) describe that workplace environment increases the level of organizational obligation.

Present study also informed that there is no valuable distinction on the observation of organizational obligation between male and female English teachers. This supports the results of She (2007) and Ma (2006) who observe that gender does not influence teacher's organizational obligation. It was seen that female English teachers exercised more integrity than male English teachers. The reason is that females are more responsive to integrity than males. This does not rectify the results of Xiao (2007), who examines that male scores are higher than females in the observation of organizational integrity. Findings of the study inform that dearth of integrity in each organization creates non-obligation and

discontentment among jobbers (Abu Elanian ,2010; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Administrators should exercise organizational integrity before they take a decision in order to turn away retaliation from the jobbers. The application of fair treatments and procedures by university administration while behaving the teachers satisfies the rights, privileges, and self-respect of university English teachers.

Study informed that English assistant professors exercised more obligation than English lecturers. The reasons behind this may be the long standing experience of service, sufficient salaries, job security and trust over management's decisions. Sergiovanni (1991) says that good salaries and job security set minds to the obligation of jobbers.

Findings of this study reveal that administrators' handling and controlling the universities teachers must perceive organizational integrity in true sense. Administrators, who are fair dealers, can reinforce organizational obligation quite well and promote a true sense of organizational integrity and obligation among university employees.

Conclusions

- a. Mean scores of organizational integrity with standard deviations make it clear that there are strong observations about organizational integrity among university English teachers in Government Universities of Pakistan.
- b. Mean scores of organizational obligation with standard deviations informs that there are strong observations about organizational obligation among university English teachers in Government Universities of Pakistan.
- c. Aggregate results tell that no valuable difference was seen between university English teachers' observation on organizational integrity. It also says that university English teachers did not agree on their observation towards organizational integrity.
- d. Aggregate results describe that a valuable difference was seen between university English teachers' observation on organizational obligation which also reveals that university English teachers disagreed on their observation on at least one of the three factors of organizational obligation.
- e. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation informed that a notable difference was seen among university English teachers on self-righteous of organizational obligation. A further Post-hoc Tukey's test informed that University English teachers of University of Education Vehari and University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus are more proud of than University English teachers of BZU Multan.
- f. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation informed that a valuable difference was seen among university English teachers on Faithful factor of organizational obligation. A further Post-hoc Tukey's test shows that University English teachers of University of Lahore Pakpattan Campus are more faithful than University English teachers of G.C University, Rahim Yar Khan and BZU Multan.
- g. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation informed that a valuable distinction was not seen between university English teachers on contentment factor of organizational obligation.
- h. A factor-wise comparison of organizational obligation by application of Independent Samples Test was made for male and female English teachers of the four universities. It was seen that all the three factors of organizational obligation i.e. self-righteous,

faithful, and contentment were not different on scores between male and female English teachers.

- i. A factor-wise comparison of organizational integrity by Independent Samples Test was made for male and female English teachers of the four selected universities. It was seen that male and female English teachers disagreed on an aggregate model of organizational integrity. It was also seen that two of the three factors of organizational integrity i.e. interactional factor and distributive factor were similar on scores between male and female English teachers while procedural factor was seen different. As the female English teachers tell higher mean score than male English teachers, it reveals that female English teachers exercised more integrity than male English teachers.
- j. Comparison of organizational obligation by Independent Samples Test was made among English assistant professors and English lecturers of the four universities. It was seen that only self-righteous of organizational obligation was different on scores between English assistant professors and English lecturers. As the English assistant professors tell higher mean score than English lecturers, it is reveals that English assistant professors exercised more self-righteousness than English lecturers.
- k. Comparison of organizational integrity by Independent Samples Test was made for English assistant professors and English lecturers of the four universities. It was seen that all the three factors of organizational integrity, i.e. interactional, distributive and procedural were similar on scores between English assistant professors and English lecturers.

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 of 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 R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard and M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation on Organization*, 1(2), 43-55.
- 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 Processes*, 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), 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 integrity: 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.
- 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 contentment 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 employees' attitudes towards organizations matter? The study of employees' 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 principal-ship: 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.
- Swales, 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 organizational integrity of P. E. English teachers in College and university* (Master's thesis, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China).