➔ *Regular Research Paper – SS*

# The Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

**Ahmet Karaca**
*Pamukkale University*
*Civril Atasay Kamer Vocational School,*
*Dept. of Foreign Trade, Turkey*
*akaraca@pau.edu.tr*

## Abstract

In today's competitive environment, the most important strategic factor for businesses is a trained human resource. Organizations need to retain trained employees so that they can reach their goals and compete. Organizational justice is one of the most important factors affecting the organizational commitment of employees. In an organization, the organizational commitment of people is diminishing without organizational justice. The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. For this purpose, a questionnaire was applied to 123 people selected from 3 holding employees in Denizli and entered into SPSS program and analyzed. As a result of the research, positive meaningful relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment was found.

*Keywords: organizational justice, organizational commitment, relationship, employee*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. The Concept of Organizational Commitment

When we look at the implications of the concept of commitment, TDK (2017) defines as individuals as a group, a member of a community, or a congregation. Organizational commitment is the psychological commitment that workers feel. Commitment is a strong belief in the interest, loyalty, and organizational values of the individual (Riketta, 2002). When the literature is examined, it can be seen that there are many definitions related to the concept of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is explained as a sided and effective commitment of workers to their organization's goals and aims. An individual can believe in the goals and the values of the organization and conforms to the behaviors that organization expects from him or her (Hallberg, 2006).

Organizational commitment is that the employers adopt and accept the processes within the organization. Individual behaviors such as communication, trust, respect, participation in the organization, sharing, continuity of work, adherence to politics and adopting strategies, desire to work together, participation in organizational processes and adopting organizational structure reveal the associative commitment of individuals. In other words, commitment depends on the cohesion of organization-employee (Spence, 2002). Schwepker, (2001) explains organizational commitment as "a formal and normative expectation that an organization is expected from an individual. Kirkman, (2001) explains that" the employer is not merely loyal, but that it is a

process that explains and tries to explain the thoughts of those involved in the organization and its success. Beyond expectations, the individual is behaving towards these goals and values. "A concept and understanding from the other side of organizational commitment, which is shaped, can be everywhere that there is social sensibility. It is the obligation we have to obey and have to fulfill. It is a commitment to humanity's strongest emotions, a personality, a thought, an institution, or a phenomenon we see larger than ourselves.

Although organizational commitment, one of the attitudes of business people to work, is a subject that has been intensively studied since 1970's, a clear consensus has not been reached by researchers in this regard. For this reason, researchers from different fields, such as psychology, sociology, social psychology and organizational behavior, must address the issue in terms of their area of expertise. Therefore, when literature related to organizational commitment is examined, many definitions about organizational commitment are emerging (Riketta, 2002). On the other hand, organizational commitment is one of the fundamental goals of organizations in protecting their assets. Individuals with organizational commitment are created by individuals who work with more cohesion, more productive and higher responsibility and loyalty. This situation causes the cost to decrease in the organizations (Hooff, 2004). When we look at the history of organizational commitment, many researchers, from the 1950s to the present day, have examined different dimensions of organizational commitment. These studies have gained importance. We can list some of the reasons for this (Avolio, 2004).

1. Relationship between commitment and desired working behavior,
2. The fact that commitment is more effective than job satisfaction as a reason for leaving work,
3. Individuals with high organizational commitment should perform better than those who have low organizational commitment,
4. Organizational commitment is a useful indicator of organizational effectiveness,
5. Organizational commitment is expressed as an expression of organizational citizenship behaviors such as self-sacrifice and honesty (Feather, 2004).

### 1.1.1. The dimensions of organizational commitment

Allen and Meyer (1996) described organizational commitment in three groups. These are affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Allen and Meyer 1996).

*1- Affective commitment:* Emotional attachment emphasizes the emotional attachment of the individual within the organization. On the other hand, the reasons for the employees' staying in the emotional attachment are identified with their emotional attachment and organizational goals. The individual should adopt the organization and the organization should be an important place in his life (Peterson, 2004).

*2 - Continuance Commitment:* refers to observing situations that may arise as a result of separation from the organization. If the person working in the organization keeps the intra-organizational investments, the cost of separation from the organization very high, the working individual is connected to that organization. To be more honest, seeing more rewards than financial means more organizational commitment (Currivan, 2000).

*3- Normative Commitment:* It reflects the obligations of working individuals to remain in the organization. It is not for personal interests that individuals should be affiliated, but they believe that what they do is right and moral (Finegan, 2000).

### 1.2. Organizational Justice

The concept of organizational justice has become increasingly important in the rapidly developing business world. The notion of organizational justice, both for employees and for

employers, is considered to be an important factor affecting the organizational commitment of employees (Riketta, 2002).

The concept of organizational justice is defined as the perception of how fairly employees are treated in the working environment. However, the concept of organizational justice carries the characteristic of being a subjective perception interacting with other components in the organizational structure. Job loyalty, job satisfaction and the tendency to leave work are considered as factors that are shaped by the sense of justice in the workplace (Bogler, 2004).

Employees' perceptions of the work environment are shaped by the context they are in, and the organization's concept of organizational justice constitutes the organization's justness (Brammer, 2007). In other words, organizational justice is defined as the subjective perception that depends on the factors such as working hours, wages, duties and responsibilities related to the job description of the persons. In this context, the concept of organizational justice is an example of how the organizational structure is assessed by the employee.

The shaping of the concept of organizational justice occurs at the point of comparison with other employees in the same organization (Brammer, 2007). It includes comparisons such as fairness of fees within an organization, equal treatment of employees, and equal use of opportunities within the organization. However, organizational justice is a process that encompasses the rules in the working environment, the application of rules and the effects of rules on individuals (Solinger, 2008).

### 1.2.1. The dimensions of organizational justice

The concept of organizational justice is basically examined in three main dimensions:

- Distributive justice, including the fairness of the results obtained in an organizational sense,
- Procedural justice for the procedures in question for the results obtained,
- Interactional justice that interacts with the results and contains the interactions of employees within the organization is examined in three dimensions (Elovainio, 2002).

### *1.2.1.1. Distributive justice*

Distributive justice is defined as the justice that people perceive about the outcome. Whether or not the person has earned what he deserves is mentioned as the focal point of justice. In general terms, it is defined as the perception of whether fairness is distributed fairly in terms of business resources (Aryee, 2002).

The concept of distributed justice derives its roots from the "Equality Theory" (Adams, 1965). According to this approach, employees decide whether the results or awards they receive are fair or not in the framework of the "Equity Rule". The equality of the compensation received by employees after their entrants within their own duties and responsibilities is taken as basis. If it is thought that there is an inequality at this point, people may think that distribution is unfair.

Executives who work in accordance with the Distributive Justice shall distribute rewards and punishments within the framework of equality to their employees. Rewarding and punishment are the norms based on the performance of the employees here. If there is inequality in the case, it is necessary for the staff of the manager to explain the reasons for this. The justice element assessed under the "Equality Theory" is based on the "Justice Theory". According to the theory of equality, employee inputs, awards, and the inputs of another employee and the awards they receive are compared. Distribution is considered to be fair if these ratios are accepted as equality. The experiences, position, physical and psychological competencies, which are

considered as investment of employees in the Equation Theory, are characterized as variables such as sex and age. The elements that are defined as a prize and the rights, privileges, awards, and progress that the person has given depend on the investment (Colquitt, 2001).

### 1.2.1.2. Procedural justice

Procedural justice is defined as the participation of people in decision making in the process and justice and objectivity in the decision-making process. Regarding decision-making processes, employees' performance-related premiums are defined as the sense of justice that they perceive about the monitoring strategies of the workplace, not limited to salaries and hikes they receive. Procedural justice can be described as what organizational meaning of the responses that employees receive as a result of performance and justice that they perceive. The procedure is justified as a concept of justice for practicing justice in another sense. It is shaped by the decisions taken regarding the working environment and the strategies applied to them in the working environment, whether it is fair from the point of view of the individual or not, especially giving importance to the recognition of the right to speak and the ideas without giving importance to the employees. If employees' opinions are taken on decisions to be taken in a working environment, this can be considered as a situation that increases the procedural perception of employees (Allen and Meyer, 1996).

It is foreseen that procedural justice is the function of justness in organizational commitment and behavior within the organization, rather than justice in the organizational sense, where organizational justice components are required to create procedural justice for employees in three basic steps. Factors related to the formation of procedural justice of employees are related to the determination of the decisions taken by the principle of impartiality. The second factor is the confidence that employees feel towards the decision-maker or authority. The third factor is that the climate of the organization is to be in respect, trust and cooperation. Procedural justice is decisive in terms of attitudes and behaviors that employees identify according to their place and importance in the decision-making process. The next step, the element of interaction justice, is shaped by observing how employees are treated and by developing attitudes accordingly. If the procedure is not satisfactory in justice, it is suggested that organizational commitment may not be the case and the intention to leave the work may be higher (Allen and Meyer, 1996).

### 1.2.1.3. Interactional justice

The third dimension of organizational justice, referred to as interactional justice, is the nature of employees' overall social interaction within other employees and the organization in general. And the procedural justice does not fully meet the definition of organizational justice, but it is also an indication of whether or not employees are at fair level of interaction with other employees and their managers. It is considered that processes such as efficient communication with the managers and employees, provision of respect and confidence environment and provision of the necessary information to the employees are positively affect the perceived interactional justice (Colquitt, 2001).

## 2. METHOLODY OF THE SURVEY

### 2.1. Aims of the Survey

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

### 2.2. Test Subjects

Employees in the three holding companies in Denizli constitute the universe of research. 123 people selected from these constitute the sample of the researcher.

### 2.3. Collection of Data.

The data used in the research were obtained from the researcher himself by applying a one-way survey. The data collection tools used in the research are as follows:

- **Organizational Justice Scale:** "Organizational Justice Scale" was used as one of the data collection tools. There are 20 items on the five-point Likert scale for the 1 to 5 scoring of the items on the organizational justice scale of the sample group, "1: Absolutely Disagree" and "5: Absolutely Agree". In the second part of the questionnaire, there is the Organizational Justice Questionnaire composed of 20 questions developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The first five questions of the organizational justice scale measure the distributional justice dimension, and the procedural justice dimension between 6 and 11 measures the extent of the interactive justice 12-19.
- **Organizational Commitment Scale:** "Organizational Commitment Scale" was used as one of the data collection tools. There are 18 items on the five-point Likert scale that are scored from 1 to 5, with the items related to the factors affecting the organizational commitment of the employees in the sample group as "1: Absolutely Disagree" and "5: Absolutely Agree". The scale was developed by Meyer, Allen and Smith to measure the organizational commitment of staff working in companies X and Y. This scale measures organizational commitment in the sub-dimensions of "Affective Commitment", "Continuance Commitment" and "Normative Commitment". Expressions about affective commitment; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are examples. Expressions of continuance commitment are 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. Expressions measuring normative commitment are 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18.

### 2.4. Analysis of the Results

Scale data in the study were entered into the SPSS program and coded. Descriptive statistics of socio demographic variables and scale questions were made. Independent sample t test and ANOVA analysis were used because of the normal distribution of the scales in order to investigate the difference between scale sub-dimensions and socio-demographic variables. The Pearson Correlation technique was used to examine the correlation between the scales.

### 3. FINDINGS

Obtained findings are provided under the following tables.

**Table 1.** The frequency of gender.

|        | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| male   | 74        | 60,2    |
| female | 49        | 39,8    |
| Total  | 123       | 100,0   |

39.8% of the participants are male and 60.2% are female.

**Table 2.** The frequency of marital status.

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Evli | 88 | 71,5 |
| Bekar | 35 | 28,5 |
| Total | 123 | 100,0 |

71.5% of the participants are married and 28.5% are bachelor.


**Table 3.** The frequency of age.

|  | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 20-25 age | 17 | 13,8 |
| 26-31 age | 25 | 20,3 |
| 32-37 age | 37 | 30,1 |
| 38-43 age | 24 | 19,5 |
| 44 age and above | 20 | 16,3 |
| Total | 123 | 100,0 |

13.8% of the participants in the study are in the age range of 20-25, 20.3% in 26-31, 30.1% in 32-37, 19.5% in 38-43 and 16.3% in the age range of 44 and above.

**Table 4.** The analysis of correlation between the sub-dimensions organizational commitment and organizational justice.

| | | Distributive Justice | Prosedural Justice | Interactional justice | Affective commitment | Continuance Commitment | Normative Commitment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Distributive Justice** | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,478** | ,429** | ,968** | ,434** | ,447** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| **Procedural Justice** | Pearson Correlation | ,478** | 1 | ,823** | ,591** | ,980** | ,816** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| **Interactional justice** | Pearson Correlation | ,429** | ,823** | 1 | ,515** | ,854** | ,989** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | ,000 | | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| **Affective commitment** | Pearson Correlation | ,968** | ,591** | ,515** | 1 | ,532** | ,533** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | | ,000 | ,000 |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| **Continuance Commitment** | Pearson Correlation | ,434** | ,980** | ,854** | ,532** | 1 | ,839** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | | ,000 |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| **Normative Commitment** | Pearson Correlation | ,447** | ,816** | ,989** | ,533** | ,839** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | |
| | N | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |

There is a positive meaningful correlation between the distributive justice and procedural justice, interactional justice, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment. There is a positive meaningful correlation between the procedural justice and interactional justice, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment. There is a positive meaningful correlation between the interactional justice and affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment. There is a positive meaningful correlation between the affective commitment and continuance commitment, normative commitment. There is a positive meaningful correlation between the continuance commitment and normative commitment.

**4. CONCLUSION**

Organizational justice is an issue that should be emphasized in order to employees to use their individual efforts in the context of organizational goals, even though personal trials are relatively open. Given the recreational advantages of transferring the knowledge, skills and abilities of employees to business processes, the importance of this is increasing. The organizational justice examined in terms of distributive, normative and interactional dimensions influences the satisfaction of the work, the deepening of the commitment and its identification with organizations, depending on the employees' perceptions.

The high level of sense of justice in the company affects the level of organizational commitment of employees who are positively affected by organizational commitment will do their part well. Employees who play well in their natural role will have a high performance. Employees with a high level of organizational commitment will have lower turnover rates, so continuity in the quality of the services offered will be maintained.

In this study, the employees in three holding companies in Denizli were evaluated by applying organizational commitment and organizational justice scales. As a result of this analysis, positive meaningful relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment was found.

The increase in perception of organizational justice also affects many factors and organizational commitment. Administrators should pay attention to the fair distribution of the awards and to ensure that the transactions utilized in the presentation of the data are fair. In addition, it is also possible for managers to communicate with their employees in a respectful and good manner, to clearly express the decisions to be taken and to participate in the decisions, and also to have positive influence in increasing the organizational commitment. If employees believe that there is a fair environment in their organizations, it is thought that they will be connected more to their organizations and they will spend more effort to develop their organizations.

Finally, the measurement of employees' perceptions of organizational justice and organizational commitment from time to time can give guidance to managers and guide them about the actions to be taken.

**REFERENCES**

Adams, J.S., (1965), Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York Academic Press.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. Journal of vocational behavior, 49(3), 252-276.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (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.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. Journal of organizational behavior, 25(8), 951-968.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. Teaching and teacher education, 20(3), 277-289.

Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(10), 1701-1719.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research.

Currivan, D. B. (2000). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. Human resource management review, 9(4), 495-524.

Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. American journal of public health, 92(1), 105-108.

Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 77(1), 81-94.

Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(2), 149-169.

Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?. European psychologist, 11(2), 119-127.

Hooff, B., & De Ridder, J. A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing. Journal of knowledge management, 8(6), 117-130.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. Academy of Management journal, 44(3), 557-569.

Peterson, D. K. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. Business & Society, 43(3), 296-319.

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. Journal of organizational behavior, 23(3), 257-266.

Schwepker, C. H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce. Journal of business research, 54(1), 39-52.

Solinger, O. N., Van Olffen, W., & Roe, R. A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. Journal of applied psychology, 93(1), 70.

Spence Laschinger, H. K., Finegan, J., & Shamian, J. (2002). The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment. In Advances in Health Care Management (pp. 59-85). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

TDK. (2017). Büyük Türkçe Sözlük.
http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_bts&arama=kelime&guid=TDK.GTS.590329b0aa
5be8.71319884, accessed date: 01.04.2017.

**JOMUDE**
**http://www.jomude.com**