

Yavuz Demirel, İlhami Yücel

Aksaray University, Turkey

**The Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment:
A Study on Automotive Industry**

Abstract:

This study aims to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. For this purpose, the research was conducted base on 261 employees from two the industry and the manufacturing firms. Moreover, organizational justice is defined as: perception or the objective distribution of gains obtained by employees from the organization in exchange for their contributions to the organization. In the other words, organizational justice is the combination of employee's attitudes to their organizations as a result of comparison of gains obtained by employees in exchange for their contributions to their own organization with gains obtained by the employees of other organizations. Furthermore, the study examines organizational justice as three basic dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. On the other hand, organizational commitment is internalization of organizations' objectives and goals, beliefs and values by employees and the desire of being loyal, staying for the organization, and keeping of organizations membership. Additionally, organizational commitment was examined as three main dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. In this context, the study determines the direction of the relationship between the dimensions of the organizational justice and those of the organizational commitment and widely presents some arguments and recommendations about the title.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment, Automotive Industry and Turkey.

1. Introduction

Research findings in the organizational justice literature exhibit that organizational justice is an important determinant of employee behaviors or attitudes at the workplace, and specifically the commitment of employees toward organizations (McFarlinand and Sweeney, 1992). As business firms increasingly rely on their human capital to give them a sustainable competitive edge (Woolridge, 2000), organizational commitment is one of the most important issues in today's highly competitive business environment. Organizational justice refers to individuals' assessment of whether their organization treats its members fairly or unfairly so it means employee perceptions of fairness. In the past two decades, there has been increase in the field of research of organizational justice perceptions. Various studies conducted in different countries and cultures have already documented a positive relationship between organizational justice perceptions and organizational commitment (Aryee et al., 2002 and Lambert et al., 2007). However, it is not still clear, which component of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice or interactional justice) is most central to the prediction of organizational commitment. It is very important to find out for organizations and researchers the unique effects of organizational justice on organizational commitment. They will be more likely to reciprocate by holding positive attitudes about their work,

their work outcomes and their supervisor if employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by their supervisor (Wat and Shaffer, 2005). This work outcome and work attitude related to what being called as organizational commitment. Thus, this study tries to look at the impact of organizational justice towards the development of commitment among employees from the industry and the manufacturing firms.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Organizational justice was defined by Greenberg (1990) as a concept that refers to people's perception of fairness in organizations, consisting of perceptions of how decisions are made regarding the distribution of outcome and the perceived fairness of those outcomes themselves (Greenberg, 1990). Organizational justice concerns employees' perception of fair treatment by an organization and its agents (Shalhoop, 2003). The equity theory (Adams, 1965), which is one major approach to organizational justice, proposes that individuals are motivated to maintain fair or equitable relationships among themselves and to avoid those relationships that are unfair or inequitable. The theory holds that people compare their outcomes and inputs with those of others and then judge the equitableness of these relationships in the form of a ratio. The referent comparison may be someone in the work group/organization or those working in other organizations. The former is known as perception of internal equity and the latter as external equity. Equity has generally been conceptualized as a three-dimensional construct: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (McDowall and Fletcher, 2004). *Distributive justice* relates to the preoccupations expressed by employees considering the distribution of outcomes and resources (Cropanzano and Folger, 1989). Organ (1988) stated that distributive justice is arguments on status, seniority, production, effort, needs and determination of payment. Employees perceive and form perceptions on how they are treated in an organization. Another element derived from organizational justice is the element of trust gained by employees when they perceive that they are treated fairly by their supervisor (Williams, Pitre and Zainuba, 2002) which further improves their relationship with their supervisor and encourage them to display citizenship behavior. Even though numerous journals has indicated that procedural justice tend to take a more active role in terms of perceiving fairness but in this study interactional justice influenced an employee's intention to perform citizenship behavior and it brought in a new perspective that fair treatment predicts citizenship behavior compared to fair rewards (Williams, Pitre and Zainuba, 2002). *Procedural justice* refers to the fairness of procedures used to define the outcome of decisions. Those procedures should be coherent, unprejudiced and morally acceptable (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). If people see a discrepancy between the rewards they are receiving for their efforts when compared to those of others, they will be motivated to do more (or less) work.

Distributive justice. The concept of distributive justice has its roots in Adams' (1965) equity theory and Leventhal's (1976) justice judgment model. Adams (1965) proposes inequality arising from an imbalance between inputs and outputs. According to Adams, in a social exchange process, employees bring certain inputs to organization (e.g., education, effort, experience), and in return expect certain outcomes such as pay, promotion and intrinsic satisfaction. Equity exists (people are satisfied) when the perceived inputs match outcomes. Conversely, if the outcomes received are perceived unfair in relation to the inputs, then the individual is likely to experience distributive injustice (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). The second source of distributive justice is found in Leventhal's (1976) justice judgment model. Leventhal expanded the Adams' (1965) equity theory by incorporating two other distributive justice rules besides equity (contribution) rule. According to

Leventhal (1976), people perceive fairness by evaluating outcomes based on equity, equality (everyone should receive similar outcomes regardless of needs or contribution) and, need (individuals with greater need should receive higher outcomes regardless of equity or equality).

Procedural justice means most generally that how an allocation decision is made (Ding and Lin, 2006). It has been defined as the degree to which those affected by allocation decisions perceive them to have been made according to fair methods and guidelines (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993). Therefore, it refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to distribute compensation and rewards (Beugre, 1996; Williams et al., 2002). Procedural justice theorists have argued that fair procedures serve two purposes. The first is to protect individuals' interests so that, in the long run, individuals will receive what they are due. Research on fairness shifted to an emphasis on procedural justice in the 1980s (Schminke et al. 1997). In the organizational context, procedural justice is considered an important resource in social exchange (Loi et al., 2006).

Interactional justice is introduced by Bies and Moag (1986) the most recent advance in the justice literature by focusing attention on the importance of the quality of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented. Bies and Moag (1986) referred to these aspects of justice as "interactional justice". A subset of procedural justice, called interactional justice, has emerged in the literature on organizational justice and refers to the interpersonal side of decision-making, specifically to the fairness of decision makers' behavior in the process of decision-making. Decision makers behave in an interactionally fair manner when they treat those affected by the decision properly and enact decision policy or procedures fairly (Folger and Bies, 1989). Proper interpersonal treatment entails being truthful in communication and treating people with courtesy and respect. The proper enactment of procedures is defined by five behaviors: adequate consideration of the employee's input, suppression of personal biases, consistent application of decision-making criteria, timely feedback, and justification for a decision. These factors play an important role in affecting employees' perceptions of fairness, acceptance of decisions, and attitudes toward the organization (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Korsgaard et al., 1995). Bies and Shapiro (1987) identified interactional justice as being closely related to social exchange theory, describing the quality of social interactions between the individual and others in the organization, as well as the interpersonal treatment employees receive during the enactment of procedures. Interactional justice theory during the allocative decision process of organizational resources has evolved to include the decision maker's provision for adequate explanation of the allocation decision and treating employees with respect when implementing the decision (Staley, Dastoor, Magner, and Stolp, 2003).

3. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

The concept of organizational commitment has attracted more attention in the literature of industrial/organization psychology and organizational behavior over the last two decades (Chung, 2001). The interest being organizational commitment is rooted in the belief that a relationship exists between the commitment of employees and their job performance (Brown, 1969). Organizational commitment has also an important place in the study of organizational behaviors since the studies have found relationships between organizational commitment and attitudes and behaviors in the workplace (Porter et al., 1974, 1976; Koch and Steers, 1978; Angle and Perry, 1981; Yucel, McMillan and Richard, 2013). Organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment of employees to their organization (Chen et al., 2002), loyalty to their organization and identification with their organization (Mowday et al., 1979). Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed a

three-dimension organizational commitment that consists of affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization. Normative commitment refers to a feeling of obligation to continue employment, while continuance commitment reflects an awareness of the costs of leaving the organization (Yucel et al., 2013). Therefore, employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so, while those with a strong normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization, and those with a high continuance commitment feel they need to stay in the organization.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE RELATIONSHIP TO ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational justice has received substantial attention from scientists (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990). Emphasizing justice could lead to a positive outcome for the organization, such as increased employee satisfaction (Folger and Konovsky, 1989), organizational commitment (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993), group cohesion, cooperation, and the productive resolution of disputes within and between groups (Cobb, Folger, and Wooten, 1995). Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that when employees perceive that the organization is supportive and treating them in a fair matter, they will tend to develop affective commitment. Many of the studies included in the analysis were based on social exchange theory (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001) in which employees reciprocate fair and just treatment by the organization with feelings of affective commitment. Researchers in organizational behavior field have established that distributive and procedural justice have different predictive roles with regard to different work attitudes. Procedural justice has been shown to predict organizational commitment (Konovsky, et al., 1987), whereas distributive justice has been linked to job satisfaction (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). Tyler and Lind (1992) assert that procedural fairness is used as the basis by which people establish longer relationships with their employers or organizations. When employees feel that organization follows fair procedures in allocation of resources, they feel more loyal to their organizations and hence are more committed to their organization. On the other hand, distributive justice has been hypothesized to predict variables that may derive from both extrinsic (i.e., organization and rewards) and intrinsic sources such as satisfaction (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). Viswesvaran and Ones (2002) found relatively stronger correlation between procedural justice and organizational commitment than between distributive justice and organizational commitment. In another study, conducted on correctional staff officers, Lambert et al. (2007) found that staff perceptions of procedural justice exerted a relatively larger effect than did distributive justice on organizational commitment. 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 (2004) further pointed out that distributive and procedural justice affect organizational commitment via the mediation of organizational support perception. Past research has demonstrated that organizational justice correlated more strongly with affective commitment than the other two components of commitment (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Meyer et al., 2002). Cropanzano, Prehar and Chen (2002) used social exchange theory to predict relations between perceived procedural fairness and work outcomes. From the perspective of social exchange theory, organizations are arenas for social transactions between the organizational members and organization (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano, Prehar, and Chen, 2002; Greenberg and Scott, 1996; Wayne, Shore, and Liden, 1997). Steers (1977) also found that work experiences, along with personal characteristics and job characteristics, predict organizational

commitment. It makes intuitive sense that the social exchanges or transactions serve as an important basis for organizational commitment. Since procedural justice and interactional justice should be influential to social transactions experiences of employees, they should also have effects on employees' affective commitment.

Studying the justice in budget decision making to federal managers, Staley et al. (2003) was able to use 1,358 surveys that were received from a sample of 9,643 managers employed by the Federal government. Controlling for procedural and interactional justice it was found that distributive justice did not lead to higher levels of commitment to the federal government as an employing organization. Controlling for distributive and interactional justice, Staley et al. (2003) was able to determine that procedural justice allowed for higher levels of commitment to the Federal government the employing organization. The effect procedural justice had on organizational commitment was enhanced by a study conducted by Jahangir, Akbar, and Begum (2006), who posited unjust perceptions of procedural justice with 204 middle level telecommunication employees in Bangladesh lowered organizational commitment, which in turn raised the intent to leave their employing organization. Procedural justice has been found to have a significant and positive relationship with organizational commitment. Loi, Hang-Yue, and Foley (2006) studied the linkage between justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intent to leave. The study used perceived organizational support as a mediating role. The study used a sample of 514 outside sales persons and determined that both procedural justice and distributive justice increased perceived organizational support which in turn increased organizational commitment and lowered intent to leave. Not all studies have concluded a support for procedural justice with components of organizational commitment. Pare' and Tremblay (2007) investigated the influence procedural justice and organizational commitment on Information Technology professionals. A total of 394 surveys were completed from Quebec members of the Canadian Information Processing Society which was used because members represented a wide variety of information technology jobs and settings. It was posited that perceptions of procedural justice would be positively related to affective commitment. This hypothesis could not be supported (Pare' and Tremblay, 2007). One study of great interest investigated the salespersons perceptions of equity and justice on their impact of organizational commitment and intent to leave (Roberts, Coulson, and Chonko, 1999).

5. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study, its hypotheses, scope and limitations; the process of sampling and data collection methods and the findings of the research are summarized as following:

The Scope of the Study and its Limitations

The universe of this study consists of employees of two organizations in the area of manufacturing industry. The most important limitation of the study is the fact that the employees of only two organizations were involved in the study. However, it is thought that the findings of the study will provide important clues in order to understand the relationship between the employees' and employers' perceptions about organizational justice and their organizational commitment.

Sampling Process and Data Collection Method

Convenience sampling method was preferred in the study. All the employees of the related organizations were involved in the sample. Questionnaire technique was used in order to collect data. Questionnaires were applied to the employees by an objective interviewer who was outside the organization. The questionnaire form was composed of three parts. In the first part, there are the

socio-demographic characteristics of the employees; in the second part, there are variables related to organizational justice and in the third part, there are variables related to the organizational commitment.

The organizational justice scale used in the study was adapted from Villanueva's study (2006) and the organizational commitment scale was adapted from Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P.'s study (1990).

Findings of the Study

The findings of the research were presented through socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, reliability and validity analyses of the scale, correlation and regression analyses.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Employees

When the distribution of the socio-demographic characteristics of the employees involved in the study is considered, it was found that 52.1 % of the 261 employees worked at the A organization and 47.9 % worked at the B organization; 30.3 % was female and 69.7 % was male; their average age was 41 and their monthly income was 1700-1800 TL. In terms of the education level of the participants, 17.2 % was high school graduates, 22.2 % was vocational school graduates, 42.9 % was faculty graduates and 16.1 % had a master degree. When the participants were considered in terms of their working experience in the same sector and in the same organization, it was found out that their average working duration was 10 years or more.

Reliability and Validity Analyses of the Scales

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used for the reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis was used for the validity analysis of the scale used in the research. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the organizational commitment scale was .889 and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the organizational justice scale was .963. The results of the validity analysis of the scales are presented at Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1: Organizational Commitment- Factor Analyses

Number of Factors and Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	% of Variance	Cumulative %	K-M-O
Affective Commitment (8)	,903	26,27	56,29	,908
Continuance Commitment (6)	,801	16,01		
Normative Commitment (5)	,738	14,05		

Table 1 puts forward the results of the validity analysis on the organizational commitment scale. It is seen that organizational commitment is explained through three basic factors and 56.29 % variance in total. It was determined that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the factors were .903; .801 and .738 and the sample proficiency coefficient (KMO) was .908. Within this framework, it is understood that the reliability and validity levels of the scale were high at 0.05 significance level.

Table 2 puts forward the results of the validity analysis on the organizational justice scale. It is seen that organizational justice is explained through two basic factors and 67.59 % variance. The reliability coefficients of the factors were quite high. In addition, factor load values of the factors

were above 0.50 in general. Sample sufficiency coefficient (KMO) of the scale was calculated as .964. In short, it was determined that the scale had a high level of validity.

Table 2: Organizational Justice-Factor Analyses

Number of Factors and Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	% of Variance	Cumulative %	K-M-O
Distributive Justice (5)	,870	25,40	67,59	,964
Procedural and Interactional Justice (14)	,962	42,19		

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

The relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and the dimensions of organizational commitment was analyzed and the results are given in the table following.

Table 3: The Relationship between the Organizational Justice Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Dimensions

	Correlation	Affective Commitment (Mean: 2,10 and Std. Dev. ,809)	Continuous Commitment (Mean: 2,43 and Std. Dev. ,803)	Normative Commitment (Mean: 2,43 and Std. Dev. ,803)
Distributive Justice (Mean: 3,09 and Std. Deviation: 1,020)	Pearson Correlation	,310**	,006	-,032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,921	,610
Procedural and Interactional Justice (Mean: 2,96 and Std. Deviation: 1,006)	Pearson Correlation	,254**	-,095	-,088
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,125	,154

N:261 and ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In the Table 3, the results of the correlation between the dimensions of organizational justice and the dimensions of organizational commitment are shown. When the results of the analyses are considered, it is seen that there is a positive correlation between the distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and affective commitment; however, there isn't any correlation between the distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and continuance commitment, normative commitment. It is seen that when the perception level of the employees about the organizational justice increases their affective commitment to the organization increase, as well.

Researchers have also examined the relationship between fairness perceptions and specific organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results of these studies have been inconsistent in determining how fairness perceptions affect satisfaction and commitment. Many studies have found procedural justice to be a stronger predictor of job

satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, findings in the studies examining these relationships have been inconsistent. In a study conducted shortly after an organizational restructuring, Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) found that distributive justice predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment more strongly than procedural justice. These findings conflicted with prior studies indicating procedural justice played a stronger role in developing a sense of organizational commitment (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992). Martin and Bennett (1996) found that an individual's organizational commitment is determined by perceptions of procedural fairness, and both distributive and procedural justice was antecedents to facet-specific job satisfaction. These studies provide a good first step in understanding the relationship of organizational justice and organizational commitment outside a sport context. In summary, despite a number of studies examining the relationship between fairness perceptions and organizational outcomes, a great deal of disagreement and inconsistency is still present which limits a complete understanding of the relationship. Our findings highlight the need to consider the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment as well as implications for further exploration of antecedents of both organizational justice and organizational commitment.

The Level of Being Perceived of the Dimensions of Organizational Justice and the Dimensions of Organizational Commitment According to the Organizations

In the study, whether the level of being perceived of the dimensions of organizational justice and the dimensions of organizational commitment differs according to the organizations has been analysed and the results are given in Table 4.

Table 4: T-test Results

	Organization	N	Mean	t-value	Sig.
Distributive Justice	A	136	3,00	-1,423	,156
	B	125	3,18		
Procedural and Interactional Justice	A	136	2,71	-4,334	0,001
	B	125	3,23		
Affective Commitment	A	136	2,35	5,413	0,001
	B	125	1,83		
Continuous Commitment	A	136	2,80	8,604	0,001
	B	125	2,04		
Normative Commitment	A	136	2,81	8,596	0,001
	B	125	2,10		

When the Table 4 is taken into consideration, it is seen that the level of being perceived of the distributive justice did not differ according to the employees of the A and B organizations; however,

it is seen that the level of being perceived of procedural and interactional justice, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment differed.

6. RESULTS and SUGGESTIONS

Employees' reliance on the organization or how far the organization meets the expectations of the employees is closely related to the level of perceived organizational justice. Organizational justice is the importance that an organization gives to an individual when s/he contributes to the organization. The level of importance given to the employee influences his/her level of organizational commitment directly. If an employee feels that s/he is not given value, his/her commitment to the organization decreases. Therefore, considering the concepts of organizational commitment and organizational justice independent of each other may lead to incorrect conclusions. Organizational justice is the reason and organizational commitment is the result of that reason. The results of the study also support this conclusion. According to the findings, there is a positive correlation between distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and affective commitment. In other words, when the level of employees' belief in organizational justice increases, their affective commitment increases as well.

When the employees' perception of organizational commitment is positive, the employees' commitment to the organization is not normative but affective. The findings of the study also support this conclusion. In addition, the administrators of the organization can use the organizational justice as a basis for providing the organizational commitment.

The administrators of the organization can realize the applications to strengthen the employees' perception of justice. Such applications can be summarized as following:

- The resources of the organization and outcomes obtained from these resources should be shared objectively.
- The principle of objectivity among the employees should be taken as a basis in terms of the organizational applications.
- The channels for organizational communication should be open.
- Full participation in all the decisions should be provided.
- Feedback should be taken regarding the fact that organizational justice is provided.
- An organizational culture on the basis of justice should be built up.
- Organizational justice should be seen as the basic element in realizing the organizational commitment.

The fact that the study was conducted only in one sector and with a limited number of employees is the most important limitation of the study. Despite this limitation, the most important issue that the future studies to be conducted in line with the findings of the present study should consider is that the topic of this study should be applied on the employees working at different sectors. Within this framework, comparing the level of employees' perception of organizational justice and their organizational commitment at different sectors may lead to a conclusion covering the whole country.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). "Inequity in social exchange." *Advances in experimental social psychology* 2(267-299).
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18.
- Andrews, M. C. and K. M. Kacmar (2001). "Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22(4): 347-366.
- Angle, H. L. and J. L. Perry (1981). "An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness." *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 1-14.
- Aryee, S., et al. (2002). "Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23(3): 267-285.
- Beugré, C. D. (1996). Analyzing the effects of perceived fairness on organizational commitment and workplace aggression, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.
- Bies, R. J. and J. S. Moag (1986). "Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness." *Research on negotiation in organizations* 1(1): 43-55.
- Bies, R. J. and D. L. Shapiro (1987). "Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts." *Social Justice Research* 1(2): 199-218.
- Brown, M. E. (1969). "Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement." *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 346-355.
- Chen, Z. X., et al. (2002). "Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 75(3): 339-356.
- Chung, R.-L. (2001). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among junior high school counselors in Taipei, Taiwan, University of Toledo.
- Cobb, A. T., et al. (1995). "Justice in the making: Toward understanding the theory and practice of justice in organizational change and development." *Research in organizational change and development* 8(1): 243-295.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. and P. E. Spector (2001). "The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 86(2): 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A., et al. (2001). "Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research." *Journal of applied psychology* 86(3): 425.
- Cropanzano, R. and R. Folger (1989). "Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy: Beyond equity theory." *Journal of applied psychology* 74(2): 293.
- Cropanzano, R. and J. Greenberg (1997). "Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze." *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* 12: 317-372.
- Cropanzano, R., et al. (2002). "Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice." *Group & Organization Management* 27(3): 324-351.
- Ding, C. G. and C. P. Lin (2006). "Comparing the effects of determinants of turnover intentions between Taiwanese and US hospital employees." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 17(4): 403-421.
- Folger, R. and R. J. Bies (1989). "Managerial responsibilities and procedural justice." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 2(2): 79-90.
- Folger, R. and M. A. Konovsky (1989). "Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions." *Academy of Management Journal* 32(1): 115-130.

- Greenberg, J. (1986). "Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations." *Journal of applied psychology* 71(2): 340.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). "Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow." *Journal of management* 16(2): 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. and K. S. Scott (1996). "Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process."
- Jahangir, N., et al. (2006). "The role of social power, procedural justice, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction to engender organizational citizenship behavior." *ABAC Journal* 26(3): 21-36.
- Koch, J. L. and R. M. Steers (1978). "Job attachment, satisfaction, and turnover among public sector employees." *Journal of vocational behavior* 12(1): 119-128.
- Konovsky, M. A. and R. Cropanzano (1991). "Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance." *Journal of applied psychology* 76(5): 698.
- Konovsky, M. A., et al. (1987). "Relative effects of procedural and distributive justice on employee attitudes." *Representative research in social psychology*.
- Korsgaard, M. A., et al. (1995). "Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1): 60-84.
- Lambert, E. G., et al. (2007). "The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35(6): 644-656.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). "The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations." *Advances in experimental social psychology* 9: 91-131.
- Loi, R., et al. (2006). "Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of perceived organizational support." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 79(1): 101-120.
- Lowe, R. H. and S. J. Vodanovich (1995). "A field study of distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction and organizational commitment." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 10(1): 99-114.
- Martin, C. L. and N. Bennett (1996). "The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment." *Group & Organization Management* 21(1): 84-104.
- McDowall, A. and C. Fletcher (2004). "Employee development: an organizational justice perspective." *Personnel Review* 33(1): 8-29.
- McFarlin, D. B. and P. D. Sweeney (1992). "Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes." *Academy of Management Journal* 35(3): 626-637.
- Meyer, J. P. and N. J. Allen (1991). "A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment." *Human resource management review* 1(1): 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., et al. (2002). "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences." *Journal of vocational behavior* 61(1): 20-52.
- Mowday, R. T., et al. (1979). "The measurement of organizational commitment." *Journal of vocational behavior* 14(2): 224-247.
- Niehoff, B. P. and R. H. Moorman (1993). "Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior." *Academy of Management Journal* 36(3): 527-556.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Paré, G. and M. Tremblay (2007). "The influence of high-involvement human resources practices, procedural justice, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors on information technology professionals' turnover intentions." *Group & Organization Management* 32(3): 326-357.
- Porter, L. W., et al. (1974). "Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians." *Journal of applied psychology* 59(5): 603.
- Roberts, J. A., et al. (1999). "Salesperson perceptions of equity and justice and their impact on organizational commitment and intent to turnover." *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*: 1-16.
- Schminke, M., et al. (1997). "The effect of ethical frameworks on perceptions of organizational justice." *Academy of Management Journal* 40(5): 1190-1207.
- Shalhoop, J. H. (2004). *Social-exchange as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and workplace outcomes*, ProQuest Information & Learning.
- Staley, A. B., et al. (2003). "The contribution of organizational justice in budget decision-making to federal managers' organizational commitment." *Journal of public budgeting accounting and financial management* 15: 505-524.
- Sweeney, P. D. and D. B. McFarlin (1993). "Workers' Evaluations of the "Ends" and the "Means": An Examination of Four Models of Distributive and Procedural Justice." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 55(1): 23-40.
- Tyler, T. R. and E. A. Lind (1992). "A relational model of authority in groups." *Advances in experimental social psychology* 25: 115-191.
- Villanueva, Lytida S. (2006). *An Examination of the Role of Self-Control in the Prediction of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Does Cognition Matter?*, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Houston
- Viswesvaran, C. and D. S. Ones (2002). "Examining the construct of organizational justice: A meta-analytic evaluation of relations with work attitudes and behaviors." *Journal of Business Ethics* 38(3): 193-203.
- Wat, D. and M. A. Shaffer (2005). "Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating role of trust in the supervisor and empowerment." *Personnel Review* 34(4): 406-422.
- Wayne, S. J., et al. (1997). "Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective." *Academy of Management Journal* 40(1): 82-111.
- Williams, S., et al. (2002). "Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 142(1): 33-44.
- Wooldridge, M. J. (2000). *Reasoning about rational agents*, the MIT Press.
- Yucel, I., et al. (2013). "Does CEO transformational leadership influence top executive normative commitment?" *Journal of Business Research*.