Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention:
Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors?

Gauri S. Rai[1]

Abstract

This study investigated the impact of organizational justice on specific attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. The data were collected from 511 staff members from ten health and rehabilitation centers in a southern state in the United States. Pearson Correlations and Hierarchical Regression were used to analyze data. The findings revealed that distributive justice influenced job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Procedural justice is only associated with organizational commitment. Informational justice affected only job satisfaction. Interpersonal justice was not related to any attitude or behavior included in this study. These findings suggest that if organizations want to improve job satisfaction and organizational commitment while reducing turnover intention, they need to pay more attention to developing programs and policies as well as leadership styles that encourage fairness.

Keywords: Organizational Justice; Job Satisfaction; Organizational Commitment; Turnover Intention; Health and Rehabilitation Centers; United States

1.0 Introduction

The terms fairness and justice have been used interchangeably in the context of organizations (Miller et.al. 2012). In the last four decades, numerous studies have been conducted on organizational justice, and several reviews (Greenberg 1990; Cropanzano and Greenberg 1997; Colquitt et.al. 2001; Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001; Chang and Dubinsky 2005) and a review of reviews (Nowakowski and Conlon, 2006) have appeared in academic literature. The main reason for continued interest in organizational justice is that it is a key factor in understanding attitudes and behaviors of employees in organizations (Cropanzano et.al. 2001). In recent years, scholars from

[1] Ph.D., Associate Professor of Social Work, Mary Baldwin College, U.S.A, grai@mbc.edu

many countries around the globe have shown interest in the organizational justice issues. Most of these studies have been carried out in business and industrial organizations. This study makes its contribution by (a) using all four of the dimensions of organizational justice-distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice, (b) including three attitudes and behaviors-job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention, (c) investigating in a set of human service organizations, and (d) applying social exchange theory and multifocal perspective.

2.0 Literature Review

In this section, the independent variables are types of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational) and the dependent variables are job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention, which will be defined, and the findings from previous studies in relation to these variables will be examined.

2.1 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to the perceived fairness of social and economic exchanges among employees and their work organizations (Beugre, 1998). It consists of four main dimensions, which are distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Distributive justice is concerned with the perception of fairness on the ratio of ones contribution to ones outcomes and comparison of that ratio with other members of the organization (Adams, 1965). This may involve comparisons of pay, benefits, promotions, power, prestige, rewards, satisfaction, outcomes of dispute resolutions and the distribution of other social and economic resources. Procedural justice is concerned with the perception of fairness in the use of processes, procedures and methods in making outcome decisions (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). These mechanisms are considered fair to the extent that they are consistent, unbiased, accurate, correct, representative and ethical (Leventhal, 1980). Since organizations use procedures in allocating resources, procedural justice is associated with organization focused reactions rather than outcome-focused reactions (Cropanzano, Preher & Chan, 2002). Interactional justice is defined as the quality of interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are applied and outcomes are distributed (Bies and Moag, 1980). According to Moorman (1991), interactional justice is the interaction between the source of allocation and the people who will be affected by the allocation decision. Greenberg (1993) suggested that interactional justice can be divided into two separate parts-interpersonal and informational justices. Interpersonal justice is the peoples' perception of fairness of the manners such as politeness, dignity and respect used by authorities in using procedures and determining

outcomes. Informational justice focuses on candid, adequate and detailed explanations of the application of procedures and the distribution of outcomes in a timely fashion.

2.2 Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most researched concepts in organizational behavior in general and organizational justice in particular. Job satisfaction is viewed as an effective response that an organizational member has toward his or her particular job, and results from the employee's comparison of actual outcomes with those that are expected (Spector, 1985). Reviews of organizational justice and satisfaction studies in general (Colquitt et. al., 2001) and a review of justice studies in the sales force only (Chang and Dubinsky, 2005) concluded that all justice types (distributive, procedural, and interactional) are positively related to job satisfaction. In the investigation conducted after these reviews, a majority of the studies found that distributive justice and procedural justice are related to job satisfaction (Begley et. al., 2002; Lambert 2003; Samad, 2006; Jespen and Rodlwell, 2007; Suliman 2007; Nadiri and Tanova 2009; Abu Elanain, 2009; Mamerzadeh and Mahmoudi, 2010; Elamin and Alomain, 2011; Choi, 2011; Promket, et. al., 2012). In terms of their importance, more studies claim that distributive justice has a stronger influence on satisfaction than procedural justice; two of them (Lambert, 2003; Mamarzadeh and Mohmoudi, 2010) assert that procedural justice has a stronger influence on satisfaction than distributive justice. Other studies (Suliman 2007; Elamin and Alomain, 2011) have observed that interactional justice has more influence on satisfaction than distributive justice or procedural justice. In addition, some studies have found that interpersonal justice (Simons and Roberson, 2003; Chan and Jespen, 2011; Choi, 2011) and informational justice (Lambert, et. al., 2007; Chan and Jespen, 2011) are related to satisfaction. Shah, Waqas and Saleem (2012) found that distributive and informational justice influence job satisfaction in Pakistani public sector organizations. Thus, there is sufficient evidence that distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices are related to satisfaction.

2.3 Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

Modway, Steers and Porter (1979) defined organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (pp. 228). Organizational commitment also reflects the emotional attachment of the worker with the values, goals, and missions of the employing organization (Landsman 2008; Jaskyte and Lee 2009). All of the reviews of organizational justice studies have considered commitment as an outcome variable. For example, in their review of sales force studies, Chang and Dubinsky (2005) advanced propositions that all the types of justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional) are positively

related to organizational commitment. Colquitt, et. al. (2001) concluded that a few studies argue that procedural justice has a stronger relationship with support for institutions than distributive justice and interactional justice, while other studies found a stronger relationship for distributive justice and organizational commitment than for procedural justice. Similarly, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) noted in their review that whereas procedural justice predicted cognitive reactions toward the organization, distributive justice predicted effective reactions toward outcomes and interactional justice is predicted to influence attitudinal reactions towards managers and their decisions. In recent investigations, it was observed that only procedural justice is related to organizational commitment (Simons and Roberson, 2003; Hung et. al., 2004; Lambert, 2003; Tremblay et. al., 2010; Memarzadeh and Mahmoudi, 2010). In the studies reporting more than one type of justice, in their order of importance, researchers have found that procedural justice has a stronger influence than distributive justice (Loi et. al., 2001; Lambert et. al., 2007), and more influence than interactional justice (Rezaiean et. al., 2010) on organizational commitment. Yet, some studies (Phromket et. al., 2012; Samad., 2006) claim that distributive justice exerts a stronger influence than procedural justice on employee commitment. Jespen and Rowell (2007) noted that distributive justice predicted commitment at time one and procedural justice predicted commitment at time two. Also, informational justice predicted commitment at times one and times two for females only. Patrick (2012) found that distributive and procedural justice were related to the commitment of I.T. personnel and interactions. Nili, et. al. (2012) observed that distributive, procedural, informational and interpersonal justice influence commitment among municipality employees in Iran. Despite fairly extensive work done in this field, the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment has not been clarified and it is still inconclusive (Samad, 2006).

2.4 Organizational Justice and Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is defined as the relative strength of an individual's intent to leave the organization (Lee, et. al., 2011). In this process, an employee actively considers quitting and begins searching for alternative employment. It is the immediate precursor to actual turnover behavior (Daly and Dee, 2006). Turnover can occur as the result of well thought-out-decisions or as a reaction to unsatisfactory outcomes or poor interpersonal treatment by an authority. One of the reviews of organizational justice and turnover studies (Colquitt et. al., 2001) concluded that the findings on their relationship is "somewhat muddled" with some studies showing that distributive justice influences turnover, while other studies revealing the effects of procedural justice and even some studies claiming that procedural justice has more of an impact on turnover than interactional

justice. The second review (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001) showed that procedural justice and distributive justice equally predict turnover intentions, and that interactional justice is the least potent predictor of turnover intention. It should be noted that both reviews occurred at the same time and are based on almost the same studies. A review of studies in sales force (Chang and Dubinsky 2005) proposed that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are inversely related to the likelihood of intentions to leave the organization. In the studies conducted after these reviews, some of them (Jespen and Rodwell, 2007; Nadiri and Tanova, 2009; Choi, 2011) found that all three types of justice are negatively related to turnover intention and others found that only two of them, i.e. distributive justice and procedural justice (Begley et. al., 2002; Loi, 2006; Elanain, 2009) and distributive and interactional (Memarzedeh and Mahmounds, 2010) are related. Chan and Jespen (2011) found that only procedural justice is related to turnover intention in only one type of club that they studied. In addition, Lee et.al. (2010) in their study of the frontline non-supervisory personnel of two hotel properties in the United States found that distributive justice is negatively related to turnover intention, but contrary to their expectations, procedural justice is positively related to turnover intention. They explained that this positive influence between procedural justice and turnover intention may be partially due to sample specific attributes and relationships. Employees who perceive that their low pay (for physically challenging work or long undesirable hours of work) were determined through fair procedures may conclude that the only way to improve their situation is to quit. Furthermore, it is likely that most hourly employees in hotel organizations need better pay or more rewards, whether the procedures the organization uses are fair or not.

Table 1

Summary of reviewed studies relating organizational justice to satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention

Independent Variables

Types of Justice

Dependent Variable	Author (year)	Type of Organization Country	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Interpersonal Justice	Informational Justice
Job Satisfaction	Cropazano et. al. (2002)	A large state university Rocky Mountain region U.S		Positive			
	Begley et. al. (2002)	State runs firms which produced machine tools Beijing China	Positive	Positive			
	Simons and Roberson (2003)	Different hotel properties in the U.S. and Canada run by single large hotel management				Positive	

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

Dependent Variable	Author (year)	Type of Organization Country	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Interpersonal Justice	Informational Justice
	Lambert (2003)	State correctional Facilities Michigan U.S.	Positive	Positive			
	Samad (2006)	Electronic manufacturing industry Malaysia	Positive	Positive			
	Japsen and Rowell (2007)	Local government council Australia		Positive			
	Suliman (2007)	Public and private sector organizations UAE	Positive	Positive	Positive		
	Nadiri and Tanova (2009)	Hotel employees Morth Cyprus Turkey	Positive	Positive			
	Abu,Elanain (2009)	Hotel employees Morth Cyprus Turkey Dubai UAE	Positive	Positive			
	Memerzadeh and Mahmoudi (2010)	Employees of public organizations Tehran Iran	Positive	Positive			
	Elamin and Alomain (2011)	Saudi and foreign workers from different organizations Saudi Arabia	Positive	Positive			
	Chen and Jepsen (2011)	Employees of registered clubs Australia	Positive	Positive	Positive		
	Choi (2011)	employees from U.S. federal agencies	Positive			Positive	Positive
	Phromket et. al.(2012)	108 University employees, Thailand	Positive	Positive		Positive	
	Shah, et. al. (2012)	Public Service organizations, Pakistan	Positive				Positive
	Patrick, (2012)	I.T. employees, India	Positive	Positive			
Organizational Commitment	Simons Robertson (2003)	Different hotel properties in U.S. and Canada run by a single hotel company		Positive		Positive	
	Lambert (2003)	State correctional facilities Michigan U.S		Positive			

Dependent Variable	Author (year)	Type of Organization Country	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Interpersonal Justice	Informational Justice
	Hung et. al. (2004)	Nine diverse multinational manufacturing corporations Northern Malaysia		Positive			
	Loi et. al. (2006)	Practicing solicitors working in law firms Hong Kong	Positive	Positive			
	Samad (2006)	Electronic and electrical manufacturing industries Malaysia	Positive	Positive			
	Jespen and Rodwell (2007)	Local government council Australia	Positive	Positive			Positive
	Lambert et. al. (2007)	State Correctional Facilities Michigan U.S.	Positive	Positive			
	Abu,Elanain (2009)	National Employees from 5 different service and industrial product organizations Dubai UAE	Positive	Positive			
	Memarzadeh and Mohmoudi (2010)	public organizations Tehran Iran		Positive			
	Rezaiean et. al. (2010)	Hospitals in Tehran Iran		Positive	Positive		
	Yavuz (2010)	Teachers Kouya Turkey	Positive				
	Tremblay et. al. (2010)	Hospital employees Montreal Canada		Positive			
	Wang et. al. (2010)	Industry employees China	Positive	Positive			
	Promket et. al. (2012)	Employees of University Thailand	Positive	Positive			
	Nili, et., al., (2012)	Municipality employees, Iran	Positive	Positive		Positive	Positive
Turnover Intention	Begley et al. (2002)	State owned firms which produced machine tools China	Negative	Negative			
	Loi et. al. (2006)	Practicing solicitors working in law firm Hong Kong	Negative	Negative			

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

	Jespen and Rodwell (2007)	Local government council Australia	Negative	Negative	Negative		
	Nadiri and Tanova (2009)	5 star hotels North Cyprus Turkey	Negative	Negative	Negative		
	Abu,Elanain (2009)	Service and industrial product organization Dubai, UAE	Negative	Negative			
	Lee et. el. (2010)	Two hotel properties operated by an indecent hotel company	Negative	Positive			
	Memarzadeh and Mohmoudi (2010)	35 public organizations Techran Iran	Negative		Negative		
	Chan and Jepsen(2011)	Registered clubs Australia		Negative			
	Choi (2011)	federal agencies U.S.	Negative	Negative		Negative	

3.0 Theory and Hypotheses

Social exchange theory has been widely used in organizational justice research for formulating hypotheses and explaining findings. It is considered a synthesis theory that has potential to integrate various related theories and models (Bryant and Napier, 1981; Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler and Schminke, 2001; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). In the context of organizations, workers can form exchange relationships with coworkers, supervisors, organizations, governing boards, communities and clients they serve. These relationships develop over a period of time and are based on the norm of reciprocity. Benefits that are often exchanged in social relations include money, social approval, respect from others, self-esteem, compliance with one's wishes and avoidance of more-costly alternatives. The norm of reciprocity obliges recipients of benefits to comparatively reward the other person or persons participating in the exchange (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960; Homans, 1961; Emerson, 1976). The direct exchange relationships can be further distinguished by whether transactions are negotiated or reciprocal.

Recent development in exchange theory reports that social exchange can be either direct or indirect. The negotiated exchange involves an explicit trade of goods, services or other benefits based on a negotiated or contractual arrangement-an employee contract, for example. The behaviors of giving and receiving are highly connected and well-defined. The reciprocal exchange entails a pattern of reciprocal assistance or advice across time. The behaviors of giving and receiving are loosely connected and not well-defined, such as with co-workers and supervisors

who exchange favors and obligations (Lawler, Thye and Yoon, 2009). These exchanges can occur sequentially or consecutively in any organization at any given time. In many relationships, participants engage in both forms of exchange throughout their association. Often, one form of exchange provides the dominant overarching context for the relationship with opportunity for the other form embedded in the larger context. When the two forms of exchange are combined, the positive effects of each form of exchange, the greater structural cooperativeness of negotiated exchange, and the positive relational climate of trust and perceived partnership created by reciprocated exchange,will work together to produce stronger behavioral commitments than either of these forms alone (Molm, Whitham, and Melamed, 2012; Molm, Melamed, and Whitham, 2013).

Structure and process of exchange affects integrative bonds such as trust, commitment, effective regard and solidarity. Reciprocity is structural; it is not just a norm, not just a process, and it is variable across different forms of exchange. The structure of reciprocity describes how participants exchange behavior and how exchange benefits are connected to each other. There are two dimensions to it: **(a)** Whether benefits can flow unilaterally or only bilaterally between participants; and **(b)** Whether benefits are reciprocated directly or indirectly (Molm, 2010). There are three aspects of reciprocity: positive reciprocity; negative reciprocity; and belief in reciprocity (Perugini, Gallucci, Presaghi and Ercalani, 2003). There are two distinct dimensions of the value of reciprocity: **(a)** Instrumental or utilitarian values of reciprocity is value for the recipient of the good, service or social outcome that is obtained from exchange; and **(b)** The symbolic or communicative value is the value congregated by the act of reciprocity itself over and above the instrumental value of the benefit provided (Molm, Schaefer, and Collett, 2007).

While all forms of exchange involve reciprocity (Molm, 2007) and justice perceptions can be thought of as one indicator of reciprocity inherent in exchange relationships (Gouldner, 1960), the degree to which people and cultures apply reciprocity principle varies (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Reciprocity is not the only principle, norm, or motivation that governs exchange transactions. In fact, Meeker (1971) proposed reciprocity as one alternative to rationality if it does not aid to explain behavior. He also proposed altruism or social responsibility, group gain, status consistency and competition or rivalry as four other alternatives. Several principles or motivations could speak at once in any exchange (Meeker, 1970; Molm, 2007), but little attention has been given to the possibility that multiple rules can be applied simultaneously (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). As a result, this study asserts that in organizations both negotiated and reciprocated exchange occurs, and that they are governed by both rationality and reciprocity.

Their dominance and supplementary role in the combined exchange process is determined by the situation and variables involved.

In addition, research suggests that justice perceptions could be formed about many targets within the organization and social exchange relationships can be useful in understanding multifoci justice (Rupp and Cropanzano, 2002). According to the multifoci perspective, differential treatment by sources within a organization leads to the formation of distinct justice perceptions about each source (Frazier, Johnson, Gavin and Snow, 2010). Therefore, justice research should include multiple exchange forms, multiple exchange rules, multiple benefits, multiple values and multiple foci in future investigations.

This study conceptualizes that distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices are important resources in social exchange transactions (Loi, Hang-Yue, and Foley, 2006). Distribution and procedural justice correspond to organization as a target because distribution and allocation of resources such as pay and promotion, policies and procedures involved in these decisions comes strictly under the perview of administrative control of the organization. Interpersonal and informational justice correspond to supervisors because they are concerned with one-to-one treatment with politeness, trust, respect and providing adequate timely information (Rupp, and Cropanzano, 2002). These transactions involve negotiated as well as reciprocal exchange. The exchange between employee and organization is dominated by rationality with opportunity for reciprocity and the exchange between supervisor and employee is dominated by reciprocity with opportunity for rationality. Therefore, it is expected that differential sources and type of justice followed by combined forms of exchange will affect job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention differently.

Since job satisfaction can be induced through organization and supervisor by using rationability and/or reciprocity manifested in justice decisions, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1a. Distributive Justice will be positively related to job satisfaction.

H1b. Procedural Justice will be positively related to job satisfaction.

H1c. Interpersonal Justice will be positively related to job satisfaction.

H1d. Informational Justice will be positively related to job satisfaction.

As organizational commitment among employees is developed through concrete rewards, trust, fair procedures and considerations, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

H2a. Distributive Justice will be positively related to organizational commitment.

H2b. Procedural Justice will be positively related to organizational commitment.

H2c. Interpersonal Justice will be positively related to organizational commitment.

H2d. Informational Justice will be positively related to organizational commitment

Turnover intention is found to be highly related to actual turnover. Because it may be influenced by organizational policy and administrative decisions and supervisory behavior, the following hypotheses are forecasted:

H3a. Distributive Justice will be negatively related to turnover intentions.

H3b. Procedural Justice will be negatively related to turnover intentions.

H3c. Interpersonal Justice will be negatively related to turnover intentions.

H3d. Informational Justice will be negatively related to turnover intentions.

4.0 Methodology

4.1 Data and Sample

The data for this paper were collected as part of a larger study. The organizations studied were ten health and rehabilitation centers privately owned by a health care corporation in the southern United States. There were a total of 1,732 employees, out of which 511 staff members completed the questionnaire. Thus, the completion rate was 29.08%. Their predominant function is "people sustaining," (Hasenfeld, 1983) as they offer around-the-clock health care to their patients.

4.2 Measurement

4.2.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice was measured by choosing five items included in the distributive justice index (DJI) developed by Kim et. al. (1996). An item example of distributive justice is the question, "How fair has the nursing home been in rewarding you when you consider how much effort you put forth?" Respondents rated these questions on a five-point scale ranging from "Not At All Fairly (1)" to "Very Fairly (5)." The reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha is .96 for distributive justice.

4.2.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice was measured by choosing six items from the scale developed by Colquitt (2001). An item example of procedural justice is the statement "These procedures have been applied consistently." Respondents rated these items on a five-point Likert type scale ranging

from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha is .91 for procedural justice.

4.2.3 Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal justice was measured by four items from the scale developed by Colquitt (2001). An item example for interpersonal justice is the statement "My supervisor has treated me with dignity." Respondents rated these statements on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha is .94 for interpersonal justice.

4.2.4 Informational Justice

Informational justice was measured by a four item scale developed by Colquitt (2001). An item example for informational justice is the statement "My supervisor offers adequate justification for the decisions made about my job performance". Respondents rated these statements on a five-point likert type scale from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha is .93 for informational justice.

4.2.5 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured by only one item, "I am satisfied with my job," chosen from a three-item scale developed by Spector (1985). Respondents rated this statement on a five-point likert type scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The use of a single item scale for measuring behavioral intent has been found appropriate to capture the construct (Wanous, Reichers and Hudy 1997).

4.2.6 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured by the nine items used by Redfern, Shirma, Ina and Finber (2000) in a nursing home study, chosen from Modway, Steers and Porter's (1979) organization commitment scale. An item example is the statement "I feel loyalty to this nursing home." Items were rated on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha is .67 for these nine items.

4.2.7 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention was measured using a single-item developed by Spector (1985): "How often have you seriously considered quitting your present job?" It was rated on a five-point likert type scale ranging from "Rarely (1)" to "Very Often (5)" (Wanous, Reichers and Hudy 1887).

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

4.2.8 Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The socio-demographic characteristics measured in this study include age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, education and tenure. Age was measured as actual age at last birthday. Gender was measured as 0=Male and 1=Female. Marital status was expressed by using one item reporting respondent's marital status: 1=Single, 2=Married, 3=Separated, 4=Widowed and 5=Divorced. This was recoded as a dichotomous variable with two categories: married (1) and unmarried (0). Ethnicity was measured as 1=Caucasian, 2=African American, 3=Hispanic, 4=Asian, 5=Native American, and 6=Other. Ethnicity was recoded as a dichotomous variable with two categories: Non-white (0) and White (1). Education was measured as 1=Grade school, 2=High school, 3=Some college, 4=Bachelor's degree, and 5=Graduate degree. Tenure was measured as actual length of service in the organization.

Table 2

Description of Measures of Study Variables				
Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Items	Alpha
Gender				
Marital Status				
Ethnicity				
Education	3.1	2.97		
Age	40.62	13.14		
Tenure	5.73	6.65		
Organizational Commitment	3.55	.64	9	.67
Distributive Justice	3.27	1.06	5	.96
Procedural Justice	3.38	.87	6	.91
Interpersonal Justice	3.72	1.20	4	.94
Informational Justice	3.67	1.12	4	.93
Job Satisfaction	3.87	1.11	1	
Turnover Intention	2.14	1.31	1	

4.3 Data Analysis

Data were examined using descriptive statistics, i.e. mean and standard deviation. Reliability coefficient Chronbach Alpha was calculated for scales measuring distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice and organizational commitment (Table 2). Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed for each pair of variables. Hierarchical

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

Regression analysis was performed to determine the relative and overall contribution of types of organizational justice on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention.

5.0 Results

5.1 Social Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Data were obtained from 511 staff members of ten different long term care facilities (Table 3). The majority of participants, 84% were female and a minority of 15% were male. A slight majority of them, 50.7% were married, 30.1% were single, 3.3% were separated, 3.9% were widowed, and 11.5% were divorced. The participants were 69% Caucasian, 23.7% African American, .8% Hispanic, 2.5% Native American, 4.8% Asian, and 2% were other. The mean age of the respondents was 40 years. In terms of education, 1.6% had completed only grade school, 25.8% had graduated from high school, 45% had some college, 14.3% had a bachelor's degree and 12.7% had a graduate degree. The mean for organizational tenure (i.e. length of service at the facility) was 5.7 years.

Table 3

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Sample		
	Number	Percentage
Gender		
Male	78	15.30
Female	429	84
Marital Status		
Married	259	50.70
Non-Married	250	48.90
Age		
30 and Below	140	27.40
31-40 Years	98	19.20
41-50 Years	122	23.90
51 Years and Above	151	29.50
Ethnic Group		
Caucasian	353	69.10
Non-Caucasian	158	30.90
Education		
Grade School	8	1.60
High School	132	25.80
Some College	230	45
Bachelor Degree	73	14.30
Graduate School	65	12.70
Length of Service		
Up to 1 Year	143	28
2-5 Years	174	34.10
6-10 Years	103	20.20
More than 10 Years	91	17.80
Because of missing Values total does not add up to 100%		

5.2 Correlational Analysis

Table 4 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlations for each pair of variables. The results of the correlational analysis revealed that all the proposed hypotheses were supported by this data. When the correlation coefficient matrix between constructs is examined, no correlation coefficient is above 0.90. This means that all the constructs are different/distinct (Amick and Walberg, 1975). Prior research has also successfully shown that these scales predict different dependent measures and suggest that they are distinct variables representing different constructs (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992).

Table 4

		1	2	3	4	5	6
	Pearson's Correlations For All Study Variables						
1	Distributive Justice						
2	Procedural Justice	.642**					
3	Interpersonal	.310**	.322**				
4	Informational	.398**	.422**	.851**			
5	Commitment	.513**	.470**	.183**	.268**		
6	Satisfaction	.538**	.432**	.421**	.536**	.477**	
7	Turnover Intention	-.426**	-.319**	-.265**	-.312**	-.471**	** .465
**P Value: < .01 (2-tailed)							

5.3 Regression Analysis

Table 5 presents the regression analysis for the influence of organizational justice dimensions on predicting job satisfaction. In step 1, all of the demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, education and tenure) were entered into the equation and they contributed to a very small variation (Rsquare=.03) in job satisfaction. In step 2, distributive justice was entered in the equation and it explained 30.0% variance in job satisfaction. In step 3, procedural justice was entered into the equation and it did not contribute to any amount of variance. In step 4, interpersonal justice was entered into the equation, where it contributed to 5.0% variance. Finally, informational justice was entered to the equation and it contributed to another 4.0% in variance. Together, all of the justice dimensions contributed to 39.0% variance in the levels of job satisfaction. In terms of specific types of justice, only distributive justice and informational justice were significantly related to job

satisfaction. They both have the same strength (Beta=.39, p<.00) and thus, they are of equal importance in predicting job satisfaction. This suggests that fair distribution of resources and candid, adequate, detailed and timely explanation of these decisions produces satisfied workers.

Table 5

Hierarchal Regression Analysis Predicting Job Satisfaction after Controlling for Demographic Variables							
Step	Variable Entered	R square	R square Change	F	Beta	t-Value	SIG
1	Demographic Variables	.03	.03	2.17			
2	Distributive Justice	.33	.30	30.43	.39	8.11	.00
3	Procedural Justice	.33	.00	27.70	.04	.81	.42
4	Interpersonal Justice	.38	.05	30.04	.07	-1.06	.29
5	Informational Justice	.42	.04	31.71	.39	5.42	.00

Table 6

Hierarchal Regression Analysis Predicting Organizational Commitment after Controlling for Demographic Variables							
Step	Variable Entered	R square	R square Change	F	Beta	t-Value	SIG
1	Demographic Variables	.03	.03	2.43			
2	Distributive Justice	.28	.25	23.57	.34	6.29	.00
3	Procedural Justice	.31	.03	24.62	.24	4.53	.00
4	Interpersonal Justice	.31	.01	21.84	-.21	-1.40	.16
5	Informational Justice	.32	.01	19.90	.22	1.42	.16

Table 7

Hierarchal Regression Analysis Predicting Turnover Intention after Controlling for Demographic Variables							
Step	Variable Entered	R square	R square Change	F	Beta	t-Value	SIG
1	Demographic Variables	.03	.03	2.17			
2	Distributive Justice	.21	.18	16.24	-.37	-6.62	.00
3	Procedural Justice	.21	.00	14.21	.01	.08	.93
4	Interpersonal Justice	.22	.01	13.76	-.07	-.87	.38
5	Informational Justice	.22	.00	12.47	-.08	-.94	.35

Table 6 presents the hierarchical regression analysis in discerning justice dimensions as independent variables and organizational commitment as the dependent variable. In step 1, all the demographic variables were entered in the equation, and they contributed to a very small variance in the level of commitment. In step 2, distributive justice was entered into the equation and it explained 25.0% variance in organizational commitment. In step 3, procedural justice was added to the equation, where it contributed to an additional 3.0% of variance. In step 4 and step 5, interpersonal and informational justices were added to the equation, but they did not contribute any significant amount of variance. In terms of their strength, distributive justice (Beta=.34, p<.01) has a stronger influence on commitment than procedural justice (Beta=.24, p<.01). Interpersonal and informational were not significantly related to organizational commitment. Thus, fairness in reward allocation and consistent, unbiased use of policies and procedures in determination of outcomes enhances commitment among workers towards their organizations. It is clear that actual rewards play a more important role than the methods used in building commitment among workers. Further, table 7 reveals that distributive justice is negatively related to turnover intention (Rsquare=.18, Beta=-.37, p<.08). Thus, it is evident that outcomes such as pay, promotion, physically challenging work and scheduling of activities play an important role in employees making decisions to quit. This emphasis on outcome issues may also be due to the type of human service organization studied and lack of resources is a major issue that is considered to be important in the functioning of these organization.

Overall, these findings reveal that distributive justice influences job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Procedural justice only affected organizational commitment and informational justice also only made a difference in job satisfaction only. It is obvious that hard core decisions made by the organization authorities affect workers more strongly than their social behavior.

6.0 Discussion

The objective of this study was to investigate the impact or organizational justice on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. The findings reveal that distributive justice and informational justice are equally important in determining job satisfaction among staff members of these organizations. This supports the hypothesis derived from exchange theory and multifocal perspective that employees seek satisfaction from exchange with organizations manifested through distributive justice as well as from supervisiors through informational justice. These findings make a very important contribution, which is that supervisors

and the organization are equally important and it is not that one is more important than the other. However, this finding is not in line with previous studies that claimed only distributive justice (Lambert, 2003; Marmarzedeh, 2010) or procedural justice has stronger influence (Suliman, 2007; Elawn and Alomain, 2011) or even informational justice has stronger influence (Shaw, Waqas, and Saleem, 2012) than other types of justice on satisfaction.

Table 8

Summary of Hypotheses Tested from Hierarchical Regression Analysis		
Hypotheses		**Result**
H1a	Distributive justice will be positively related to job satisfaction	Supported
H1b	Procedural justice will be positively related to job satisfaction	Not Supported
H1c	Interpersonal justice will be positively related to job satisfaction	Not Supported
H1d	Informational justice will be positively related to job satisfaction	Supported
H2a	Distributive justice will be positively related to organizational commitment	Supported Table 7
H2b	Procedural justice will be positively related to organizational commitment	Supported
H2c	Interpersonal justice will be positively related to organizational commitment	Not Supported
H2d	Informational justice will be positively related to organizational commitment.	Not Supported
H3a	Distributive justice will be negatively related to turnover intention	Supported
H2b	Procedural justice will be negatively related to turnover intention	Not Supported
H3c	Interpersonal justice will be negatively related to turnover intention	Not Supported
H3d	Informational justice will be negatively related to turnover intention	Not Supported

Organizational commitment is influenced by distributive and procedural justice and not by interpersonal or informational justice. It is an organizational concern and not an individual or supervisory concern. Organization is more important than an individual. People develop and maintain loyalty and commitment to an organization and in some cases it is even a life-long commitment. The findings support the hypothesis that organizational resources and policy or procedures engender commitment among staff members. Among organizational resources, concrete rewards play more important roles than their method of delivering outcomes. This is consistent with earlier findings (Samad, 2006; Promket, Thanyaphirak and Promket, 2012), which argue that distributive justice has stronger influence on commitment than procedural justice.

Finding related to turnover intention is more interesting. It assumes that there is a high probability that turnover intention will result in actual turnover. Much empirical evidence is available to support this. This study found that only distributive justice affects turnover intention negatively and not any other types of justice. This means that employees in these organizations consider changing and finding alternate jobs a serious matter. It is mainly affected by hard, concrete and objective concerns and decisions and not by staff interactions or procedural methods. It asserts the importance of employee exchange relationship with the organization and also organization as a focal point.

However, these findings are interpreted slightly differently than previous studies. So far, all the justice studies using exchange theory claim that organizations and/or their supervisors provide considerations and do favors to their employees, and thus employees feel obligated to return it by their cooperation, loyalty and performance and their behavior is governed by the norm of reciprocity. This is also the fundamental principle of "human relations" that "organizations will take care of employees and employees will take care of the organization." This premise may be partially true. Organizations are rational systems; rationality does not provide much room for "favor and obligation." Rational systems may consider these behaviors as unfair, unjust, even inappropriate and unreal. Organizations are not always wonderful and supervisors are not always kind. There is no place for "therapy in a bureaucracy." Even the Surgeon General said that organizations are "dangerous to your health." Therefore, this study contends that rationality and reciprocity complement each other, and they operate simultaneously. In case of organization, rationality dominates, and reciprocity dominates in the case of the supervisor. They work their best when they are combined. Therefore, distributive justice dominated by rationality and informational justice dominated by reciprocity provide satisfaction to employees. Distributive and procedural justice both dominated by organizational rationality promotes commitment. Organizational distribution and allocation of resources based on rational choices supplemented by reciprocal considerations reduce turnover intentions among employees in these organizations.

7.0 Theoretical Implications

Several studies have been conducted on the relationship between justice perception and job satisfaction, commitment and turnover intentions but only rare studies (Loi, Hang-Yue and Foley, 2006) have offered any theoretical explanations. Probably none of them have considered using a multifoci perspective. Their explanation has been based on only reciprocal change. This study contends that in organizations not only reciprocal change occurs but also negotiated exchange. It is

their combined exchange that makes the differences. So far, only theoretical and experimental evidence are available about combined forms of exchange, structure and value of reciprocity, and their consequences for organizational society. This study provides evidence from a cross-sectional design and updated social exchange theory.

8.0 Practical Implications

This study suggests important implications for long-term care facilities. If these organizations want to improve commitment and satisfaction and reduce turnover intentions, they need to pay more attention to developing programs and policies that encourage fairness. Leaders and authority figures need to examine organizational justice from the employees' point of view and not to merely rely on their own observations and assessments. This can be done through meetings, surveys, management by wandering around, a suggestion/complaint box and an open-door policy. Management strategies such as these are likely to help in bridging the perceived gap between supervisors and their subordinates (Suliman, 2007). Leadership training that emphasizes the important of fairness, interpersonal skills, mentoring and joint development of goals may increase employees' knowledge, skills and self-confidence on the job. Leaders should be trained to make decisions based on merit and performance. In addition, more emphasis should be placed on the necessity to be explicit in thoroughly explaining whatever decisions are made in order to mitigate perceptions of injustice (Wan, 2011). Members of the administration should be able to address problems pertaining to fairness in the outcomes employees receive, the decision making process of determining the outcomes, and the amount and the quality of information shared with the employees. The outcomes that are offered to the employees should be equitable in comparison to others (Samad, 2006).

9.0 Future Research

Future studies should include not only reciprocal exchange but also the impact of negotiated exchange and indirect exchange. Studies need to continue to investigate the implication of organizational ethics and employees rights and responsibilities in the exchange process. Also, the multifoci perspective should extend itself beyond supervisors and organizations, and include person centered perspectives (Marvin, Morizot, Boundrias and Madore, 2011). The organizations studied were a set of private "people sustaining organizations." Future research should also include "people changing" and "people processing" organizations to cover all types of human service organizations (Hasenfeld, 1983), both public and private. The research on organizational justice has mainly considered it as the independent variable and has examined its consequences. Justice research

should include other classical independent variables from organizational behavior such as organization size, technology and environment, and examine their relative contributions. Surprisingly, only a few investigations (Schminke, 2000;Wan, 2011; Ince and Gull, 2011) have examined the antecedents of organizational justice. Therefore, possible antecedents should be further identified and investigated. At the present time, many studies of organizational justice have been conducted in different countries throughout the world. However, there are only a few examples of cross-national samples (Rahim et. al., 2001; Lam et. al., 2002) and longitudinal study (Jespen and Rodwell, 2009). It is strongly recommended that research using cross-national samples and longitudinal design be encouraged.

10.0 Limitations

There are a few limitations to this study. The first potential concern to construct validity is the common method of variance. Since all of the variables were measured by asking questions to a single respondent, some association among them may be expected as a result of response style (Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp, 2002). The second concern is that because the study measures the perceptions of fairness, satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention, the participants responses to scale items may represent the perceived social desirability of the items rather than their actual predispositions (Nicotera, 1996). The third concern is that the study used a cross-sectional design and samples were not randomly selected, therefore, no causal relations among variables can be established.

11.0 Conclusion

This study concludes that organizational justice definitely influences staff attitudes and behaviors related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. Fair treatment in distribution of rewards, use of procedures and providing adequate, detailed and timely information to employees has a tremendous impact on the operation of the organization. Although a four-factor model of justice (Colquitt, 2001) was used in this study, only three dimensions (distributive, procedural, and informational) made any significant difference. The fourth dimension, interpersonal justice, has no relationship with any of the dependent variables. Therefore, a three-factor model (Moorman, 1991) may indeed be a better choice as recommended by Miller, et. al. (2012) in a comparative study of Colquitt's (2001) and Moorman's (1991) scales of organizational justice.

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

References

[1]   Adams, S. J. 1965. "Inequity in Social Exchange." 269-297. in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Edited by Leonard Berkowitz. New York, Academic Press.

[2]   Ambrose, M. L, & Schminke M. 2003. "Organizational Structure as a Moderator of the Relationships between Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Perceived Organizational support, and supervisory trust." *Journal of Applied Psychology 88*(2): 295-305.

[3]   Amick, D. J. & Walberg, H. J. 1975. Introductory Multivariate Analysis. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

[4]   Beugre, C. D. 1998. "Managing Fairness in Organizations." Westport, CT: Quroum Books.

[5]   Beau, P.M. 1964. "Exchange and Power in Social Life." New York: John Wiley

[6]   Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S.1986." Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness." 43-55 *in Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, edited by Roi, J. Lewicki, Blaire, H. Sheppard and Max, H. Bazerman. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

[7]   Chan, S., & Jespen, D. M. 2011. "Workplace Relationships, Attitudes, and Organizational Justice: A Hospitality Shift Worker Contextual Perspective." *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism* 10: 150-160.

[8]   Chang, C. & Dubinsky, A. J. 2005. "Organizational Justice in Sales Force: A Literature Review with Propositions." *Journal of Business to Business Marketing 12*(1): 35-71.

[9]   Choi, S. 2011. Organizational Justice and Employee Work Attitude: The Federal Case. *The American Review of Public Administration 41*(2) 185-204.

[10]   Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. 2001. "The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 26*, 278-321.

[11]   Colquitt, J. A. 2001. "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86:286-400.

[12]   Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L.H., & Keya Yee Ng. 2001. "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology 36*(3): 425-445.

[13]   Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A.,& Chen, P. Y. 2002. "Using Social Exchange Theory to Distinguish Procedural from Interactional Justice." *Group and Organization Management* (27): 324-351.

[14]   Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S. 2005. "Social Exchange Theory: An Interdiciplinary Review." Journal of Management, 31, 6. 874-900.

[15]   Daley, C., & Dee, J. R. 2006. "Greener Pastures: Faculty Turnover Intent in Urban Public Universities." *Journal of Higher Education 77*(5): 776-203.

[16]   Elamin, A. M., & Alomain, N. 2011. "Does Organizational Justice Influence Job Satisfaction and Self-Perceived Performance in Saudi Arabia Work Environment." *International Management Review 7*(1): 38-49.

[17]   Emerson, R.M. 1976. "Social Exchange Theory" Annual Review of Sociology, 2, 335-362.

[18]   Frazir, M.L, Johnson, P.D, Garn, M. Cooty, J. & Snauss, D.B. 2010. "Organizational Justice, Trustworthiness, and Trust: A Multifocal Examination." Group and Organization Management, 25, 1, 39-76.

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

[19]   Greenberg, J. 1993. "The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and informational Classes of Organizational Justice in the Workplace." 79-103. in *Justice in Workplace: Approaching fairness in human resources management*. edited by Russell Cropanzano. Hillsdale, NJ: Eribaum.

[20]   Gouldner, A.W. 1960. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement" American Sociological Review, 25,161-178.

[21]   Gurbuz, S. 2009. "Some Possible Antecedents of Military Personal Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Military Psychology 21*:202-215.

[22]   Hasenfeld, Y. 1983. "*Human service organizations.*" Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[23]   Hepomiemi, T., Elovalnio, M., Laine, J., Pekkarinen, I., Ecctes, M., Noro, A. S., Nervo, T. 2007. "Productivity and Employees' Organizational Justice Perceptions in Long Term Care for the Elderly." *Review in Nursing and Health,* 30, 498-507.

[24]   Homans, G.C. 1961. "Social Behavior: It's Elementary Forms." New York: Hescrust Press.

[25]   Huang, C., You, C. & Tsai, M. 2012. "A Multidimensional Eithic Climate, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Nursing Ethics, 19, 4,* 513-529.

[26]   Jaskyte, K., & Lee, M. 2009. "Organizational Commitment of Social Workers: An Exploratory Study." *Administration in Social Work 33*(1): 227-241.

[27]   Jespen, D. M., & Rodwell, J. 2007. "Gender Differences in Organizational Justice: Predicting the Key Employee Outcomes of Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention." *Deakin Research*. Retrieved from http://www.deakin.edu.au/olro/veiw/DU:30016763

[28]   Kim, S., Price, J. J., Muller, C. W., & Watson, T. 1996. "The Determinant of Career Intent Among Physicians at U.S. Air Force Hospital." *Human Relations 49*(7): 947-976.

[29]   Lam, S., Scharbrocek J., & Aryee, S. 2002. "Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcome: A Cross-National Study." *Journal of Occupational Reform* (23): 1-10.

[30]   Lambert, E. 2003. "The Impact of Organizational Justice on Correctional Staff." *Journal of Criminal Justice* (31): 155-168.

[31]   Lambert, E. E., Hogan, N., & Griffin, M. 2007. The Impact of Distributive and Procedural Justice on Correctional Staff Job Stress, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice 33*: 644-656.

[32]   Lawler, E. J., Thye, S.R., Yoon, J. 2009. "Social Commitments in a Depersonalized World." New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

[33]   Lee, H., Murrman, S. K., Murrman, K. F. & Kim, K. 2012. "Organizational Justice as a Mediator of the Relationships between Leader-Member Exchange and Employee's Turnover Intention." *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management 19*: 97-114.

[34]   Leventhal, G. S.1980. "What Should be Done with Equality Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships." 167-218 *Social exchanges: Advances in theory and research* Edited by Kenneth Gergen, Martin Greenberg, and Richard Willis. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

[35]   Liao, H., & Rupp, D.E. 2005. "The Impact of Justice Climate and Justice Orientation on Work Outcomes: A Cross-Level Multifoci Framework." *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 2.* 242-256.

[36]   Loi, R., Ngo H., & Foley, S. 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*: 101-120.

[37]   McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. 1992. "Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes." *Academy of Management Journal* 35 (3): 626-637.

[38]   Meeker, B. F. 1971. "Decisions and Exchange." *American Sociological Review, 36, 3.* 185-195.

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(2), 260-284.

[39] Memarzadeh, G., & Mahmoudi, R. K. 2010. "Applying Organizational Concepts in the Iran Public Sector: A Preliminary Empirical Work on Justice." *European Journal of Social Sciences* *14*(4): 594-605.

[40] Miller, B. K., Konopaske, R., & Byrne, Z. S. 2012. "Dominance Analysis of Two Measures of Organizational Justice." *Journal of Managerial Psychology 27*(3): 264-282.

[41] Modway, R. T., Steers, R. M, & Porter, L.W. 1979. "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14: 224-247.

[42] Moorman, R. H. 1991. "Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76: 845-855.

[43] Morvin, A.I., S. Morizot, J. Bondries, J. & Medore, I. 2011. "A multifoci person-centered Perspective on workplace affective commitment: A latent profile/factor mixture analysis. *Organizational Research Methods. 14, 1*, 58-90.

[44] Molm, L. D., Peterson, G., & Takahashi, N., 2003. In the Eye of the Beholder: Procedure Justice In Social Exchange. *American Sociological Review, 68, 1*, 128-132.

[45] Molm, L. D., 2003.Theoretical Comparisons of Forms of Exchange. *Sociological Theory, 21, 1*, 1-17.

[46] Molm, L. D., Schaeffer, D. A., & Collett, J. A., 2007. The Value of Reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 70, 2*, 199-217.

[47] Molm, L. D., 2010. The Structure of Reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 73, 2*, 119-131.

[48] Molm, L.D., Whitham, M.M., & Melamed, D., 2012. Forms of Exchange and Integrative Bonds: Effects of History and Embeddedness. *American Sociological Review, 77, 1*, 141-165.

[49] Molm, L.D., & Whitman, M.M., 2013. Behavioral Consequences of Embeddedness: Effects of Underlying Forms of Exchange. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 20, 10*, 1-25.

[50] Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. 2009. "An Investigation of the Role of Justice in Turnover Intention, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Hospitality Industry." *International Journal of Hospitality Management 29*: 33-41.

[51] Napier, T. L. 1981. "The application of social exchange theory to the study of satisfaction With outdoor recreational facilities." In *Ted. L. Napier, Outdoor Recreational, Planning Perspectives and Results*. 83-98. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendell/Hunt Publishing Company.

[52] Nili, M, Hendijani, M. and Shekarchizadeh, A., 2012. "Measuring the Impact of Perceived Justice on Organizational Construct in Isfahan Municipality." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Behavior, 4, 5*, 857-869.

[53] Nowakowsky, J. M. and Conlon, D. E. 2006. "Organizational Justice: Looking Back and Looking Forward." *The International Journal of Conflict Management 16*(1): 4-24.

[54] Patrick, H.A., 2012. "Commitment of Information Technology Employees in Relation to Perceived Organizational Justice." *The I. U. P. Journal of Organizational Behavior,20, 3*, 23-40.

[55] Perugini. M., Gallucci, M., Presaghi, F. & Ercolam, A. R. 2003. "The personal norm of Reciprocity." *European Journal of Personality. 17, 251-283.*

[56] Promket, C., Thanyaphirak, V., & Promket. 2012. "An Empirical Study of Organizational Justice as a Mediator of the Relationships Among Organizational Culture, Employee Satisfaction, and Employee Commitment in Rafamangala University of Technology, Isan Sakm Nakhon Campus, Thailand." *Review of Business Research 12*(2): 47-58.

[57] Rahaim, A. M., Magner, N. R., Antonioni, D., & Raham, S. 2001. "Do Justice Relationships with Organization Directed Reactions Differ Across U.S and Bangladash Employees." *The International Journal of Conflict Management 12*(4): 333-349.

[58] Redfern, S., Hannan, S., Norman, I., & Finber, M. 2002. "Work Satisfaction, Stress, Quality of Care and Morale of Older People in a Nursing Home." *Health and Social Care in the Community 10*(6): 512-617.

Rai, G. S. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention: Can fair treatment by organizations make a difference in their workers' attitudes and behaviors? *International Journal of Human Sciences, 10*(2), 260-284.

[59] Razaiean, A., Givi, M. E., Givi,H. E. & Nasrabadi, M. B. 2010. "The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment, Satisfaction, and Trust." *Research Journal of Business 4*(2): 112-120.

[60] Rupp, D.E. & Cropanzano, R. 2002. "The mediating effect of social exchange relationship in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 29. 925-946.*

[61] Samad, S. 2006. "Procedural and Distributive Justice: Differential Effects on Employees Work Outcomes." *The Business Review 3*(2): 212-218.

[62] Schminke, M., Ambrose,M. L. & Cropanzano, R. S. 2000. "The Effect of Organizational Structure on Perceptions of Procedural Justice." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85 (2): 294-304.

[63] Shah, S.A., Waqas, M. and Saleem, R., 2012. "Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Trust in Supervisor." *International Journal of Human Sciences,* 9, 1, 672-721.

[64] Simons, T. & Roberson, Q. 2003. "Why Managers Should Care about Fairness: The Effects of Aggregate Perception on Organizational Outcomes." *Journal of Applied Psychology 88*(3): 432-443.

[65] Spector, P. E. 1985. "Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of Job Satisfaction Survey." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 13: 693-713.

[66] Suliman, A., & Tahir, M. 2007. "Links between Justice, Satisfaction and Performance in the Workplace: A Survey in the UAE and Arabic Countries" *Journal of Management Development 26*(4): 294-310.

[67] Thibaut, J. W. & Walker, L. 1975. *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawerence Eribaus Associates.

[68] Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E. & Hudy, M. J. 1997. "Overall Job Satisfaction: How Good are Single Item Measures." *Journal of Applied Psychology 82*(2): 247-252.

[69] Yavuz, M. 2010. "The Effects of Teachers Perception of Organizational Justice and Culture on Organizational Commitment." *African Journal of Business Management 4*(5): 695-701.