



Studying the relationship between Organizational Justice and organizational commitment (case study: employees of Mellat Bank supervisory branch in Tehran)

Alinaghi Amiri¹, Mahdi Esmaili² and Nasrin Safari²

¹University of Tehran, Qom College, Faculty of Management, Iran.

²Public Administration, University of Tehran, Qom campus, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 3 August 2013;

Received in revised form:

22 January 2014;

Accepted: 3 February 2014;

Keywords

Organizational Justice,
Organizational commitment,
Mellat Bank.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is analysis of the correlation between organizational justice and organizational commitment. This study also analyzes the correlation between organizational justice components as encompassed by three specific forms of justice perceptions; distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice with organizational commitment. Statistical population includes employees of Mellat Bank supervisory branch in Tehran borough 5 with B. A. and M. A. degrees. The quantity of statistical population is 112. Data collection tool is questionnaire. Collected data were analyzed by and Pearson correlation test and Friedman test by SPSS software. Findings indicated significant relationships between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Correlation analysis for the three components of organizational justice showed that three components of organizational justice had relations with organizational commitment.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

Introduction

In the last decade of 20th century, most of the attention of researchers and scholars has been gathered around the organizational justice as an important concept and the main subject of research in organizational and industrial psychology. Equity in organization expresses the equality from ethical behavioral point of view in an organization (Kolkowhite, 2001, p 386). Research findings in the organizational justice literature show that organizational justice is a significant predictor of work attitudes and behaviors (Wang et al, 2010, p661) such as: organizational commitment, job satisfaction (Kolkowhite, 2001, p 386). In terms of social exchange theory, employee perceptions of fairness lead to organizational commitment (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Employees nowadays look for organisations that offer fair/just work places where everyone feels accepted, respected and valued. Fairness should be adopted not only because accuracy is not achievable but because justice is an important societal value and feelings of justice have important consequences for society and the workplace (Suliman & Al Kathairi, 2012, p1). When individuals feel a benefit from an organization, such as fair treatment, they feel the need to reciprocate. The more they believe that their organization is treating employees fairly, the more they are likely to be committed to their organization in return (Jeon, 2009, p12). Fair behavior is demanded by all the employees who spend their time and energy in an organization. These demands and expectations would cause the organization to have more inclination toward emphasizing on being fair. The question is this, what happens when the organization doesn't pay attention to this. Greenberg concludes that managers, who violate these norms with unfair behavior, would cause a negative reaction from their employees toward this unfair behavior (Greenberg, 2004, p 322). The

purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between Organizational Justice and organizational commitment.

Literature review

Organizational Justice

Justice is a key issue for understanding organizational behavior (Bos, 2002, p866). During the past 25 years, the study of fairness has received major research attention from a variety of disciplines, including economics, psychology, law, and organizational science (Dulebohn et al, 2009, p141). Cremer (2005, p. 4) described organizational justice as “a dominating theme in organizational life” (Elanain, 2010, p6). Much of this attention to justice is because of the important work-related consequences that have been linked to employees’ perceptions of fairness within organizational contexts (Johnson et al, 2006, p175), such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational-citizenship behaviors (Olkkonen & lipponen, 2006, p204). There has also been considerable interest in examining the antecedents of justice perceptions in the hopes of promoting fairness in organizations. It is generally agreed that work-related outcomes, the procedures that determine those outcomes, the provision of voice and explanations, and the respect and dignity that is received from others all have a significant impact on the content and magnitude of fairness perceptions (Johnson et al, 2006, p175). Explaining the special significance that the concept of justice has taken in organizations, Greenberg (1996) coined the term organizational justice, which refers to individuals’ perceptions of fairness in organizations (Hoy & Tarter, 2004, p250). As indicated by Schminke et al. (1997), the fundamental concept underpinning both ethics and organizational justice is fairness, which influences people’s judgment about right and wrong (McCain et al, 2010, p995). Fair treatment is something that employees who

invest their time and energies in an organization “expect” (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005, p1041)

In fact, organizational justice scholars use the terms fairness and justice interchangeably. For these scholars, fairness is an important yardstick that employees use to assess outcomes distribution, formal procedures, or interpersonal treatment in organizations (Beugre, 2009, p129).

The dimensions of organizational justice

Early studies of justice in organizations were focused on equity theory and outcome justice. As the study of organizational justice began to expand, the focus shifted from outcome justice (was the end result fair) to social justice (were the procedures fair and were people treated with respect). Some studies now suggest that social justice is as important as outcome justice, and there is a relationship between social justice and both managerial performance (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005, p1042)

In general, organizational justice can be categorized into two broad areas called “structural justice” and “social justice”. Structural justice refers to the structural elements of the organization that allow for employee involvement in decision making and provide for the fair distribution of outcomes. Social justice, by contrast, refers to the employee’s perceptions that the organization openly shares information with them and cares about their well-being. Some readers may be familiar with the distinction between procedural and distributive justice. The structural/social justice categories used in this exercise include both distributive and procedural justice, but also add the important element of interpersonal interaction – how people are treated on an interpersonal level when an organization institutes its policies and procedures (Tatum & Eberlin, 2006, p67).

There have been many classifications offered for organizational justice, but the taxonomy presented by Greenberg (1993), has received strong empirical support (Eberlin & Tatum, 2008, p311), according to Greenberg, organizational justice has generally been postulated to encompass three different components: Distributive justice, Procedural justice, Interactional justice (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004, p10)

Greenberg (1993) classified the components of organizational justice under two dimensions. The first dimension is the classical differentiation of justice focusing either on procedures or outcomes. The second dimension refers to the focal determinant (either structural or interpersonal). Greenberg argued that traditionally procedural and distributive justice dealt with structural aspects. The focus is on the environmental context within which the interaction occurs, e.g. the procedures used to determine an outcome and the perceived fairness of the final outcome. Interpersonal justice deals with the treatment of individuals, and therefore the emphasis is on social determinants (Hassan & Hashim, 2011, p84).

Organizational justice has developed over the past 40 years to include distributive, procedural, and interactional theories. From these theories, researchers have come to accept a four-factor model of organizational justice, which includes distributive justice, procedural justice, and two classes of interactional justice, specifically, informational and interpersonal justice. Research suggests that these factors are distinct constructs that can, and should, be empirically distinguished from one another (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p149).

Distributive justice

Distributive justice is related to the perceived fairness outcomes (Jafari et al, 2011, p1696) such as payment and

promotion (Wang, 2010, p661). Distributive justice focuses on the extent to which rewards and punishments are related to job performance (Nirmala & Akhilesh, 2006, p138). Approaches to distributive justice are primarily related to structural determinants. Structural determinants are rules and environmental contexts in the decision making process (Yilmaz & Tasdan, 2006, p113).

Distributive justice stems from equity theory (Elanain, 2010, p7). According to equity theorists, individuals compare a ratio of their perceived inputs into and outcomes derived from a relationship with that of a referent other. If the ratios are equal, the individual perceives distributive justice. If the ratios are unequal, the individual will perceive inequity (Jawahar, 2002, p813). Referring to the equity theory, employees will modify the quality or quantity of their work to restore justice. When employees perceive justice in the organization, they are less likely to seek opportunities to balance things out by increasing their own benefits at the company’s expense. Additionally, when employees are treated fairly, they are “more willing to subordinate their own short-term individual interests to the interests of a group or organization” (McCain et al, 2010, p997). The logic of distributive justice is straightforward – participant satisfaction is increased when one believes that the resolution of the dispute is fair and favorable (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p150). Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) argued that distributive justice leads to organizational effectiveness (Elanain, 2010, p7).

Procedural justice

Procedural justice is concerned with one’s perception of the process that determines fair pay (Till & Karren, 2011, p45). Theory and research has established that procedures are judged as fair if they are implemented consistently, without self-interest, on the basis of accurate information, with opportunities to correct the decision, with the interests of all concerned parties represented, and following moral and ethical standards (Jawahar, 2002, p813). Procedural justice towards employees is a basis for employee commitment. Procedural justice influences individuals’ perceptions of fairness in regard with pay raises and promotions as well as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Jafari et al, 2011, p1697).

Whereas distributive justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of outcome (the content of the decision or resolution), procedural justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of process (the steps taken to reach that decision) (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p150).

Operating within a structural framework, Leventhal and his associates (1980) identified six procedural rules against which fairness of procedures may be evaluated. These rules are (a) consistency rule— allocation procedures should be consistent across persons and over time; (b) bias suppression rule— personal self-interest in the allocation process should be prevented; (c) accuracy rule—decisions must be based on accurate information; (d) correctability rule—opportunities must exist to enable decisions to be modified; (e) representativeness rule—the allocation process must represent the concerns of all recipients, and (f) ethicality rule—allocations must be based on prevailing moral and ethical standards.

Procedural justice is, therefore, concerned primarily with the extent to which structural features of decision making (allocation process) facilitate employee voice, appropriateness of criteria, and the accuracy of the information used to arrive at a decisional outcome (Aryee et al, 2004, p3).

A vast amount of research has indeed shown that the direct effect of distributive justice on people's reactions at the workplace is influenced by procedural justice. In fact, there is converging evidence that the effects of procedural justice are most strongly observed when outcomes are unfavorable. Whereas favorable outcomes may generally satisfy people, unfavorable outcomes elicit a greater need for explanation and thus focus people's attention more strongly on the procedures used to arrive at the outcome. Accordingly, with unfavorable outcomes, procedural justice will have a greater impact on people's responses to the decision (Cremer, 2005, p5)

Interactional justice

Perceived interactional justice depends on employees' reaction to the manner in which their direct supervisors carry out formal procedures (McCain et al, 2010, p995). Interactional justice is defined as the quality of interaction that an individual receives during the enactment of organizational procedures (Jafari et al, 2011, p1696) and concerns the human aspect of organizational practices (Yilmaz & Tasdan, 2006, p114). Greenberg (1993) has argued that interactional justice should be divided into two distinct components, informational justice and interpersonal justice (Till & Karren, 2011, p46). These two subcategories of informational and interpersonal justice overlap considerably; however, research suggests that they should be considered separately, as each has differential effects on justice perceptions.

Informational justice focuses on the enactment and explanation of decision making procedures. Research suggests that explanations about the procedures used to determine outcomes enhance perceptions of informational justice. Explanations provide the information needed to evaluate the structural aspects of the process and how it is enacted; however, for explanations to be perceived as fair they must be recognized as sincere and communicated without ulterior motives, based on sound reasoning with logically relevant information, and determined by legitimate rather than arbitrary factors (Nabatchi et al, 2007, p151).

Interpersonal justice reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities. The experience of interpersonal justice can alter reactions to decision outcomes, because sensitivity can make people feel better about an unfavorable outcome. Interpersonal treatment includes interpersonal communication, truthfulness, respect, propriety of questions, and justification, and honesty, courtesy, timely feedback, and respect for rights (Colquitt et al, 2006, p110).

Although related (even highly so in some cases), procedural justice and interactional justice are often viewed as distinct constructs. Whereas procedural justice involves the fairness of the organization's formal structures and procedures, the enactment of those procedures is covered by interactional justice. Thus, it is conceivable that, although the formal procedures of one's organization are judged as fair, interactional justice is deemed low because an unscrupulous boss is charged with executing them (Johnson et al, 2006, p178).

Organizational commitment

Research on organizational commitment dates back to the 1960s (Wasti, 2005, p291). Organizational commitment has captured the hearts and minds of scholarly researchers for many years. Practitioners have been similarly enamored because of the desirable consequences attributed to high levels of organizational commitment such as increased effort expenditure,

higher job satisfaction, decreased absenteeism, and more retention (Morrow, 2011, p19).

According to the attitudinal approach, commitment is a positive feeling toward the organization which depends on what employees experience on the job and how they perceive the organization (Neininger et al, 2010, p568).

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979) defined organizational commitment as a strong belief in the organization's goals and values and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization (Yucel & Bektas, 2012, p1600).

Organizational commitment has been conceptualized in terms of the strength of an employee's involvement in and identification with an organization (Neininger et al, 2010, p567). Indeed, Organizational commitment is regularly conceptualized as an affective attachment to an organization as a consequence of an individual sharing the organization's values, their desire to remain in the organization, and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization. Previous examinations of commitment reveal that it deals with the individual's identification and involvement with an organization. When thought of this way, commitment is beyond passive loyalty, it involves an active relationship wherein individuals are willing to give of themselves to contribute to organization's well being. The most commonly accepted thoughts on commitment are that it is an indicator of employees who are strongly committed to an organization and are least likely to leave; hence it is a psychological state that binds an individual to an organization (Yucel & Bektas, 2012, p1600)

Due to its significance in management, researchers have examined a number of factors, both individual and organizational, related to the level of organizational commitment. Mowday et al. (1982), for example, identified four dimensions of influencing factors for organization commitment: personal characteristics (i.e. age, gender, education level), role characteristics (i.e. tenure, rank/position, role conflict, promotion opportunities), structural characteristics (i.e. organization size, span of control, existence of union, centralized authority), and work experience (i.e. group attitude, recognition, support from peers).

In spite of difficulties in defining the construct because of its complexity, organization commitment is influential in that it may change the behaviors of employees. Previous studies found that a high level of organizational commitment was correlated with positive work-related behaviors and attitudes, including improved job performance, openness to innovation, worker productivity, job satisfaction, and positive social responsibility while a low level of commitment to an organization was linked to negative work-related attitudes and behaviors such as turnover intentions, occupational deviance, and absenteeism (Crow et al, 2012, p405).

The aspects of organizational commitment

The early conceptualizations of the construct were unidimensional, and commitment was defined as a consistent line of activity due to recognition of costs associated with quitting or more popularly, as an emotional attachment to the organization. Of these multidimensional conceptualizations, the model by Meyer and Allen (1991) has gained substantial popularity (Wasti, 2005, p291). According to this model, organizational commitment is composed of three components.

The affective component refers to employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Morrow et al, 2012, p101).

The continuance component refers to commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization (Wang et al,2010,p664).

Finally, the normative component refers to employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization. While each commitment component reflects a psychological state that has implications to continue or discontinue membership in the organization, the nature of these states differs (Cater & Zabkar, 2009, p786).

Employees with strong affective commitment remain in the organization because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they need to, those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so. Further, each of the three components of commitment is proposed to develop as a function of different antecedents and to have different implications for work relevant behavior. Nevertheless, affective, continuance, and normative commitment are best viewed as distinguishable components or forms, rather than types of commitment as employees can simultaneously experience each of these psychological states to varying degrees.

The three components have been shown to be related yet distinguishable from each other. The meta-analysis by Meyer et al. (2002) indicates that affective commitment develops primarily from positive work-related experiences, whereas lack of job alternatives and investments in the organization are predictive of continuance commitment. Although there is insufficient research to substantiate the proposition, normative commitment is arguably determined by early socialization experiences or the organization's investment in the employee. In terms of job-related outcomes, all three forms of commitment relate negatively to withdrawal cognitions and turnover behavior, with affective commitment showing the strongest correlations, followed by normative commitment and then continuance commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). The implications for other job-related behaviors differ across the three forms. While affective commitment has the strongest relations with desirable work-related outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviors, attendance and performance, continuance commitment is either negatively related or unrelated to these behaviors. Normative commitment also appears to predict positive job outcomes, albeit less strongly than affective commitment (Wasti, 2005, p291).

Study Hypotheses

In terms of social exchange theory, employee perceptions of fairness lead to organizational commitment. When individuals feel a benefit from an organization, such as fair treatment, they feel the need to reciprocate. As antecedents of organizational commitment, fair treatment of employees is one of the major themes, along with supportive from the organization and the supervisor (Jeon, 2009, p52). The main aim of this study is to explore the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational justice. In order to attain this aim, different hypotheses have been developed. These hypotheses will help in identifying the significance, direction and strength of the relationships between these two main constructs. As the discussed literature indicates most scholars reported significant links between organizational justice and organizational commitment as well as between the facets of these variables. Given this fact the hypotheses of the current research can be stated as follow:

Main hypothesis

There is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

Minor hypotheses

H₁: there is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

H₂: there is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

H₃: there is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.



Research method

In terms of purpose, this is an applied study and in terms of data gathering method, it is descriptive – type survey. Statistical population includes employees of Mellat Ban supervisory branch in Tehran borough 5 with B. A. and M. A. degrees. The supervisory branch of borough 5 was selected through cluster sampling method among 7 supervisory branches in Tehran. Since the statistical population quantity was clear and branches had identical chances to be selected, simple random sampling method was used. The total quantity of employees in statistical population was 362 of whom 112 were selected by simple random sampling method. To measure justice in workplace, the standard questioner devised by Chester Spell and Todd Arnold was used and organizational commitment was measured with Meyer and Allen (1997) consisting of the five factors: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Chronbach's alpha is used to measure the reliability of questionnaires. It is 0/841 for organizational justice questionnaire and 0/872 for organizational commitment questionnaire. Since acquired Chronbach's alpha ratio is greater than 0.7 for both questionnaires, one can say that the reliability of questionnaires is confirmed. To analyze collected data and to study research hypotheses by SPSS software, Pearson's coefficient correlation Test is utilized. Friedman test is used to rate justice variables and organizational commitment.

Research findings

Pearson correlation test

In present study, Pearson correlation test is used to test hypotheses. As mentioned in research conceptual model, research findings are set in one major and three minor hypotheses. H₀ test and contrary test are used as follow:

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \rho = 0 \\ H_1 : \rho \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Below, the findings of testing major and minor hypotheses are provided:

Main hypothesis test

H₀: there is no relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

H₁: there is a relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

Since obtained significance level (0.000) is less than considered significance level (0.01), H₀ is refused and H₁ is supported. Put it differently, by 99% confidence level one can say that research major hypothesis is supported and there is a

relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Pearson correlation ratio is 0.440. (See table 1).

Minor hypotheses test

1st minor hypothesis

- H₀: there is no relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.
- H₁: there is a relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.

As seen in table 1, significance level in the first hypothesis is less than 0.01, so one can say that with 99% confidence level, there is a relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment. Obtained correlation ratio is 0.251.

2nd minor hypothesis

- H₀: there is no relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.
- H₁: there is a relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

The results of testing the 2nd hypothesis in table 1 show that H₀ is refused and H₁ is supported. Therefore, with 99% confidence level, one can say that there is a relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment. Obtained correlation ratio is 0.490.

3rd minor hypothesis

- H₀: there is no relationship between interactional justice and organizational commitment.
- H₁: there is a relationship between interactional justice and organizational commitment.

Concerning SPSS outputs, the obtained significance figure is 0.000 which less than standard significance level (0.01). Therefore, with 99% confidence level, H₀ is refused and H₁ is supported. It means that there is a relationship between interactional justice and organizational commitment.

Table 1: the results of Pearson correlation test

		organizational justice	Distributive justice	Procedural justice	interactional justice
organizational commitment	Pearson correlation	0.440	0.251	0.221	0.157
	Sig	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	112	112	112	112

Based on table 2, the relationship between various aspects of organizational justice and three variables of organizational commitment are outlined.

Table 2: the results of Pearson correlation test between the dimensions of organizational justice and organizational commitment aspects

		organizational justice	Distributive justice	Procedural justice	interactional justice
Organizational commitment	Pearson correlation	0.284	0.264	0.194	0.331
	Sig	0.003	0.005	0.043	0.000
Affective commitment	Pearson correlation	0.206	0.227	0.164	0.411
	Sig	0.031	0.017	0.088	0.000
Continuance commitment	Pearson correlation	0.150	0.226	0.072	0.455
	Sig	0.120	0.018	0.457	0.000
Normative commitment	Pearson correlation	0.215	0.176	0.188	0.435
	Sig	0.025	0.067	0.051	0.000

Ranking the dimensions of organizational justice and organizational commitment

To rate the dimensions of organizational justice and organizational commitment, Friedman test is used.

- H₀: there is no significant difference in status quo of organizational justice dimensions.
- H₁: there is a significant difference in status quo of organizational justice dimensions.

The results of testing show that obtained significance level is less than 0.05 so H₀ is refused and H₁ is supported. Therefore, one can say that there is a significant difference between in status quo of organizational justice dimensions. Relevant constituents are outlined in table 3 and 4.

Table 3: Friedman test significance of organizational justice dimensions

Statistical indicators	Computed sums
N	112
Chi-Square	104/513
df	4
Sig	0.000

Table 4: Ranks of organizational justice dimensions

The dimensions of organizational justice	Mean Rank	Aspects priority
Interactional justice	2.14	1
Distributive justice	1.95	2
Procedural justice	1.91	3

- H₀: there is no significant difference in status quo of organizational commitment aspects.
- H₁: there is a significant difference in status quo of organizational commitment aspects.

The results of testing show that obtained significance level is less than 0.05 so H₀ is refused and H₁ is supported. Therefore, one can say that there is a significant difference between in status quo of organizational commitment aspects. Relevant constituents are outlined in table 5 and 6.

Table 5: Friedman test significance of organizational commitment aspects

Statistical indicators	Computed sums
N	112
Chi-Square	19/672
df	4
Sig	0.001

Table 6: Ranks of organizational commitment aspects

The aspects of organizational commitment	Mean Rank	Aspects priority
Continuance commitment	2.56	1
Normative commitment	1.54	2
Affective commitment	1.34	3

Discussion and conclusion

Employees nowadays look for organisations that offer fair/just work places where everyone feels accepted, respected and valued. Fairness should be adopted not only because accuracy is not achievable but because justice is an important societal value and feelings of justice have important consequences for society and the workplace (Sabbagh, et al 1990). On the other hand, over the years practitioners and researchers believed that a loyal committed worker is likely to be a productive employee. Therefore, it is possible that organizations which have more committed and loyal employees are more productive, thus more profitable than organizations with employees known for less commitment and loyalty. However, the exploration of such relationships is regarded more important today than four decades ago, on the grounds that as

Dubois, P. Associates (1997) put it, the level of organizational commitment is the driving force behind an organization's performance. This supports Lawrence's study (1958) that provoked the necessity and rationale for research in this area by asserting those perceptions of organizational justice (i.e. fairness perceptions in the workplace) within supervisor-subordinate, and recently organization employee relationship, influence individuals' attitudes and behaviors (Suliman & Al Kathairi, 2012, p1).

This paper set out to look at the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. All the hypotheses received some support. There is a relationship between organizational commitment of employee and perceptions of justice and between perceived levels of justice which is in line with previous studies. For example, Foster (2007) supported the general relationship between organizational justice and commitment. In his dissertation, results showed that the perceptions of organizational justice had a positive and sizable influence on both affective and normative commitment. In addition, the results demonstrated that the strongest relationship exists between procedural justice and affective commitment to change, among other relationships (Jeon, 2009, p52). In a review of organizational commitment, Allen and Meyer (1996) assessed the relation between organizational commitment and organizational justice and found strong relationships among the three dimensions of organizational justice and affective commitment. Meanwhile, in a later meta-analytic study by Colquitt et al. (2001), there is a correlation of 0.57 between organizational commitment and procedural justice. Shalhoop (2003) further pointed out that distributive and procedural justice affect organizational commitment via the mediation of organizational support perception. Masterson et al. (2000), however, argue that procedural justice is a stronger predictor of organizational commitment than interactional justice. Thus, the three dimensions of organizational justice are supposed to be related to organizational commitment (Wang et al, 2010, p664). Therefore, the key is thus to find ways of triggering discretionary behaviour in employees and management in order to stimulate organizational commitment. Particularly for the organization involved in this study, our findings suggest that increased focus on improving perceptions of justice, through ensuring line management are capable of carrying out HCPM practices, may help improve commitment to the organization.

Despite the interesting findings emerging from this study, it is important to note that the research is based on self-report data on levels of commitment: future studies could try to measure this also from management perspective, for example, to help minimize possible problems of common-method variance.

References

1. Aryee, Samuel & Chen, Zhen Xiong & Budhwar, Pawan S. (2004). Exchange fairness and employee performance: An examination of the relationship between organizational politics and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94, 1–14.
2. Beugre, Constant D. (2009). Exploring the neural basis of fairness: A model of neuro-organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110, 129–139.
3. Bos, Kees van den (2001). Fundamental Research by Means of Laboratory Experiments Is Essential for a Better

Understanding of Organizational Justice. *Vocational Behavior*, 58, 254-259.

4. Bos, Kees van den (2002). Assimilation and contrast in organizational justice: The role of primed mindsets in the psychology of the fair process effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 866–880.
5. Cater, Barbara & Zabkar, Vesna (2009). Antecedents and consequences of commitment in marketing research services: The client's perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38, 785–797
6. Chang, Huo-Tsan & Chi, Nai-Wen & Miao, Min-Chih(2007). Testing the relationship between three-component organizational/occupational commitment and organizational/occupational turnover intention using a non-recursive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 352–368
7. Colquitt, Jason A. & Scott, Brent A. & Judge, Timothy A. & Shaw, John C.(2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 110–127.
8. Cremer, David De (2005).Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20 (1), 4-13.
9. Crow, Matthew S. & Lee, Chang-Bae & Joo, Jae-Jin(2012). Organizational justice and organizational commitment among South Korean police officers: An investigation of job satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 35 Iss: 2 pp. 402 - 423
10. Dulebohn, James H. & Conlon, Donald E. & Sarinopoulos, Issidoros & Davison, Robert B. & McNamara, Gerry(2009). The biological bases of unfairness: Neuroimaging evidence for the distinctiveness of procedural and distributive justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110, 140–151.
11. Eberlin, Richard J & Tatum, B Charles (2005). Organizational justice and decision making: When good intentions are not enough. *Management Decision*, 43 (7/8), 1040-1048.
12. Eberlin, Richard J & Tatum, B Charles (2008). Making just decisions: organizational justice , decision making , and leadership. *Management Decision*, 46 (2), 310-329.
13. Elanain, Hossam M Abu (2010). Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes in a non-Western context of the UAE. *Journal of Management Development*, 29 (1), 5-27.
14. Hassan, Arif and Hashim, Junaidah(2011).Role of organizational justice in determining work outcomes of national and expatriate academic staff in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21 (1), 82-93.
15. Hoy, Wayne K. & Tarter, C. John (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18 (4), 250-259.
16. Jafari, Parivash & Shafiepour motlagh, Farhad & Yarmohammadian, Mohammad Hossein (2011). Designing an adjusted model of organizational justice for educational system in Esfahan City (Iran). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1696–1704.
17. Jawahar, I.M.(2002). A Model of Organizational Justice and Workplace Aggression. *Journal of Management*, 28(6) 811–834.
18. Jeon, Jeong-Ho(2009). The Impact of Organizational Justice and Job Security on Organizational Commitment Exploring the Mediating Effect of Trust in Top Management. A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

19. Johnson, Russell E. & Selenta, Christopher & Lord, Robert G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet: Consequences for the organization and its members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 175–201.
20. McCain, Shiang-Lih Chen & Tsai, Henry & Bellino, Nicholas (2010). Organizational justice, employees' ethical behavior, and job satisfaction in the casino industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22 (7), 992-1009
21. McDowall, A. & Fletcher, C. (2004). Employee development : an organizational justice perspective. *Personnel Review*, 33 (1), 8-29.
22. Morrow, Paula C. & McElroy, James C. & Scheibe, Kevin P.(2012). Influencing organizational commitment through office redesign. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81 , 99–111
23. Morrow, Paula C.(2011). Managing organizational commitment: Insights from longitudinal research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79,18–35
24. Nabatchi,Tina & Blomgren Bingham, Lisa & Good, David H. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: a six-factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18 (2), 148-174.
25. Neinger, Alexandra & Lehmann-Willenbrock, Nale & Kauffeld, Simone & Henschel, Angela(2010). Effects of team and organizational commitment – A longitudinal study.
26. Nirmala, Maria Christine & Akhilesh, K.B. (2006). An attempt to redefine organizational justice: in the rightsizing environment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19 (2), 136-153.
27. Olkkonen, Maria-Elena & Lipponen, Jukka (2006). Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 202–215.
28. Suliman, Abubakr & Al Kathairi, Majid (2012). Organizational Justice, Commitment and Job Performance in Developing Countries: The Case of the UAE. *Employee Relations*, Vol. 35 Iss: 1
29. Tatum B. Charles & Eberlin, Richard J. (2006). Organizational justice and conflict management styles: Teaching notes, role playing instructions, and scenarios. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 17 (1), 66-81
30. Till, Robert E. & Karren, Ronald (2011).Organizational justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26 (1), 42-57.
31. Wang, Xinyan & Liao, Jianqiao & Xia, Degen & Chang, Tao (2010). The impact of organizational justice on work performance: Mediating effects of organizational commitment and leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31 (6), 660-677.
32. Wang, Xinyan & Liao, Jianqiao & Xia, Degen & Chang, Tao (2010). The impact of organizational justice on work performance Mediating effects of organizational commitment and leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 31 Iss: 6 pp. 660 - 677
33. Wasti, S. Arzu (2005). Commitment profiles: Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 290–308
34. Yilmaz, K. & Tasdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Educational Administration*, 47 (1), 108-126
35. Yucel, Ilhami & Bektas, Cetin(2012). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and demographic characteristics among teachers in Turkey: Younger is better? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46 , 1598 – 1608