

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AFFECTING COMMITMENT: MEDIATION OF JOB SATISFACTION

Praveen Kumar Mishra*
Dr. Avinash D. Pathardikar**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze the effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment through the mediating influence of job satisfaction. In addition, the study wants to look at two types of organizational justice (procedural and distributive) to see how the model works in a developing country. The study addressed executives at the middle and lower levels of management working for cement organizations in the central part of the Indian subcontinent. A total of 305 questionnaires were analyzed. The hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis. Job satisfaction acted as a mediator in the link between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Furthermore, job satisfaction fully mediated the association between procedural justice and organizational commitment and partially mediated the relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment. The study addressed the mediation effect of job satisfaction, which went beyond the simple linear models commonly employed in the existing literature. Furthermore, this study extended their model to a developing country context.

KEYWORDS: *Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, India.*

Introduction

Organizations are social systems in which employees are the most valued assets (Mayo, 2016). In the age of globalization, an organization cannot thrive without the dedication and hard work of its employees (Jang, Lee, & Kwon, 2021). Each member of the organization has a critical role to play in achieving the organization's goals and objectives, giving its people a sense of accomplishment and motivating them to work harder (Pang & Lu, 2018). As a consequence, they perform better (Swalhi, Zgoulli, & Hofaidhllaoui, 2017) and work hard to fulfill the organization's goals, which are implicitly dependent on the solid and strong foundational pillar of organizational justice (Diehl, Richter, & Sarnecki, 2018).

According to the personal outcomes model, organizational justice is the most important factor in determining workplace attitudes (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). It is a good moral for improving people's lives (Graso, Camps, Strah, & Brebels, 2020), organizational growth, development, and satisfaction (López-Cabarcos, Pinho, & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2015), and human wisdom (Imamoglu, Ince, Turkcan, & Atakay, 2019). Employees perform better and are more pleased when they are treated equitably in the workplace (Yu, Lee, Han, & Kim, 2020). On the other hand, unfairly treated employees are dissatisfied

* Research Scholar, Department of HRD, Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal University Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh India.
** Dean, Faculty of Management Studies, Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal University, Jaunpur, India.

(Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018). Scholars have proved that fairness and job satisfaction are essential for organizational efficiency (Zeffane & Melhem, 2017). According to Imamoglu, Ince, Turk, Atakay, and Imamoglu (2019), unfair work procedures, interactions, or outcomes negatively affect employee attitudes, resulting in poor performance and the company's success.

Equity theory examines whether resource allocation is equitable to both relationship partners (Adams, 1965). The ratio of contributions (costs) to benefits is used to assess equity (rewards). Organizational justice (Adams, 1965) is concerned with employees' views of workplace equity and outlines how individuals are treated in an organization. It is divided into two dimensions: distributive and procedural justice. The former refers to fairness in the distribution of organizational results to members (Moorman, 1991) and describes how substantial incentives (such as remuneration) from structured organizational activities are dispersed evenly across personnel (Hu & Han, 2021). Procedural justice, on the other hand, concentrates on the steps that lead to a certain result (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). It denotes the adequacy of the methodologies used by the company to determine employee outcomes. The procedures and tactics used to make choices regarding outcomes are the focus of this type of justice (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

Organizational justice is critical for employee satisfaction (Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018) and improved performance (Yu, Lee, Han, & Kim, 2020). Many studies have found a relationship between organizational justice and work satisfaction (Kim, 2017), however, in the context of Indian cement companies, there are just a few research papers accessible in the literature. The vast majority of studies in the literature are based on data collected in western countries other than India. The focus of this research, which is based on social exchange theory (Homans, 1961), offers a clear understanding of the relationship between organizational justice and commitment among executives of the Indian cement industry. Furthermore, the significance of job satisfaction as a mediator between organizational justice dimensions and commitment was investigated.

This study's findings will contribute in a number of ways. First, a better understanding of the relationship between organizational justice, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction would add to the existing literature on how organizational justice affects organizational commitment in the Indian context, both directly and indirectly (through job satisfaction). Second, is the applicability of a Western theoretical framework to non-Western cultures.

Theoretical Background and Hypotheses

- **Organizational Justice**

Greenberg (1987) defined organizational justice as an employee's opinion of whether they are treated fairly by their employer. Organizational justice is divided into two categories: distributive and procedural justice (Colquitt, 2001). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of an organization's resource allocation. Organizational justice has been the subject of a significant amount of research (Safdar & Liu, 2019; Jang, Lee, & Kwon, 2021). Employees make judgments on whether the outcomes (e.g., income, promotions) supplied by the business are fair in relation to the amount of effort they have put in (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Procedural justice, on the other hand, relates to the perceived fairness of the procedure used to make allocation decisions (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987).

- **Job Satisfaction**

The degree to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs is referred to as job satisfaction (Spector, 1994). It is shown "as a consequence of one's perception of the relationship between what one desires from one's employment and what one sees it to offer" (Locke, 1969). A person with a high level of satisfaction has a positive attitude about their employment. On the other hand, someone dissatisfied with his or her job has a negative attitude toward it. Satisfaction is attained when work qualities and employee wants are aligned. It is now widely acknowledged that it has a significant impact on job-related behaviors like organizational commitment (Mwesigwa, Tusiime, & Ssekiziyivu, 2020), productivity (Garmendia, Elorza, Aritzeta, & Madinabeitia-Olabarria, 2021), performance (Roberts & David, 2020), absenteeism (Mayfield, Mayfield, & Ma, 2020), and turn over (Li, Zhang, Xiao, Chen, & Lu, 2019).

- **Organizational Commitment**

It is defined as an individual's psychological attachment to an organization, which may be demonstrated by several characteristics such as loyalty to the organization, internalizing the organization's goals, and devoting oneself to the organization's goals (Cook & Wall, 1980). Meyer and

Allen (1991) observed three aspects of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment shows an emotional tie to, identification with, and engagement in the organization; continuance commitment denotes the perceived costs associated with quitting the organization, and normative commitment, as a perceived obligation to remain in the organization. Previous research has shown that organizational commitment is positively related to job performance (Sungu, Weng, & Xu, 2019), organizational citizenship behavior (Aguilar-Quintana, Araujo-Cabrera, & Park, 2020), and negatively related to employee turnover (Guzeller&Celiker, 2019).

- **Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction**

Distributive and procedural justice (Bayarçelik&Findikli, 2016), have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Previous research has shown that a strong sense of justice in an organization increases employee job satisfaction (López-Cabarcos, Pinho, & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2015; Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018). When an organization's level of justice is greater, it boosts performance (Yu, Lee, Han, & Kim, 2020), organizational citizenship behavior (Jnaneswar& Ranjit, 2021), and commitment (Jang, Lee, & Kwon, 2021), indicating that workers are more motivated to accomplish the organization's goals. Contrary to what it might seem, job satisfaction levels are low when there is a lower level of fairness in the organization in terms of the distribution of outcomes and procedures. As a result of this research, and in accordance with Lambert, Keena, Leone, May, and Haynes (2020), it is hypothesized that organizational justice perceptions are a strong predictor of job satisfaction.

H₁: An employee's perceptions of distributive and procedural justice will influence job satisfaction.

- **Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment**

According to previous research, organizational fairness is a major predictor of organizational commitment (Jang, Lee, & Kwon, 2021). Employees that are emotionally tied to the organization are less likely to quit the organization (Guzelle&Celiker, 2019) and they identify themselves with the purposes and goals of the organization (Albishri, Sundarakani, & Gomisek, 2020). When employee commitment is high, the organization's performance is high. Employees who are subjected to unfair practices, on the other hand, are more likely to exhibit low dedication and maladaptive behavior. Recent research has also shown that justice has a positive influence on organizational commitment (Appaw-Agbola, Mensah, Azila-Gbettor, & Abiemo, 2021; Nazir, Shafi, Atif, Qun, & Abdullah, 2019; Charbonneau & Wood, 2018). Therefore, the researcher hypothesized

H₂: Organizational justice positively influences organizational commitment.

- **Job Satisfaction as a Mediator**

Previous research on job satisfaction demonstrated that it functions as a mediator between several predictors and outcome variables (Mashi, 2018). Studies have shown that organizational commitment arises from organizational justice (Jang, Lee, & Kwon, 2021) in any organization as the result of a well-thought-out decision. In addition, earlier research studies have also established that organizational justice affects the job satisfaction (Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018) of employees, which in turn affects the commitment of employees working in the organization. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that job satisfaction plays a mediating role in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Therefore, we hypothesize that

H₃: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

Methodology

The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of organizational justice in affecting organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction in this relationship. In addition, to determine whether there is a direct link between organizational justice and job satisfaction, as well as organizational justice and commitment.

Sample and data Collection

The data was collected from executives in the middle and lower management levels of cement-producing organizations in the central Indian subcontinent. Pen and paper surveys were used for data collection. A total of 325 questionnaires were issued to the executives, and 305 were returned, resulting in a 93.84 percent response rate. The participants in the study varied in age from 37 to 50 years, with 266 (87.2%) males and 39 (12.8%) females. There were 151 graduates (49.51 %) and 154 postgraduates (50.49 %) among the participants. In terms of marital status, 268 (87.9%) were married,

while 37 (12.1%) were single. 249 (81.6%) of the executives were middle-level executives, while 56 (18.4%) were lower-level executives. Respondents from the technical departments accounted for 112, while the non-technical department accounted for 193 personnel. (See table 1.)

Table I: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Item	Category	Frequency	Percent
Department	Technical	112	36.7
	Non-technical	193	63.3
Experience	up to 10	166	54.4
	11-20	87	28.5
	above 21	52	17.0
Gender	Male	266	87.2
	Female	39	12.8
Marital status	Married	268	87.9
	Unmarried	37	12.1
Qualification	Graduate	151	49.51
	Post Graduate	154	50.49
Designation	MLM	249	81.6
	LLM	56	18.4
	Total	305	100.0

Notes: n=305 Source: Prepared by authors

Notes: MLM: Middle-level management; LLM: Lower level management

Measures

A four-section questionnaire was distributed, with the assurance that the responses would be kept anonymous. Part I was looking for demographic information (department, experience, age, gender, marital status, designation, and educational qualifications). Part two used a 24-item scale to assess organizational justice (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). The sub-variable of procedural justice was measured with 13 items, with an alpha of .776. The following eight questions measured distributive justice and had an alpha value of .722. Three items on the distributive justice scale were removed for improving the alpha reliability score. A six-item scale (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992) with an alpha value of .801 was used to assess job satisfaction. Additionally, the Meyer & Allen (1991) scale was used to assess organizational commitment, which consists of 12 items, six of which are related to affective commitment and the other six measuring normative commitment. Affective and normative commitment were found to have alpha values of .679 and .736, respectively.

Analyses and Results

Table 2: Mean Standard Deviation and Correlations

Sl.	Variable	Mean	SD	CR	1	2	3	4	5
1	Procedural justice	50.89	6.99	.784	(.776)				
2	Distributive justice	23.73	3.70	.734	.606**	(.722)			
3	Affective Commitment	32.20	6.27	.684	.455**	.322**	(.679)		
4	Normative Commitment	27.43	5.06	.741	.436**	.475**	.482**	(.736)	
5	Job satisfaction	20.81	3.02	.807	.483**	.430**	.394**	.600**	(.801)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlations among the study variables hold in anticipated directions, and none of them surpasses the maximum limit of 0.70, which is a good indicator of the absence of multicollinearity among the variables. Moreover, Pearson's correlation indicated a positive association among all the variables in our model, i.e., procedural justice is significantly related to distributive justice ($r = .606$, $p < 0.01$), affective commitment ($r = .455$, $p < 0.01$), normative commitment ($r = .436$, $p < 0.01$), and job satisfaction ($r = .483$, $p < 0.01$). Distributive justice is related to affective commitment ($r = .322$, $p < 0.01$), normative commitment ($r = .475$, $p < 0.01$) and job satisfaction ($r = .430$, $p < 0.01$). Affective commitment is related to normative commitment ($r = .482$, $p < 0.01$) and job satisfaction ($r = .394$, $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, job satisfaction is linked to normative commitment ($r = .600$, $p < 0.01$). The study's suggested model (see figure 1) is evaluated using Baron and Kenny's mediation criteria (1986). As a result, we conducted hierarchical regression analyses for mediation studies to test the hypotheses. The results of the mediation analysis are shown in Table 4.

Figure 1: Proposed Model of Study



Table 3: Mediation Regression Analysis

Independent variable	Regression Model 1 Job Satisfaction		Regression Model 2 Organizational Commitment		Regression Model 3 Organizational Commitment	
	B	t	B	t	B	t
Constant	8.854	7.631***	47.569	11.891***	35.839	8.870***
Procedural Justice	.352	5.677***	.174	2.562**	.026	.392
Distributive Justice	.216	3.487***	.217	3.197***	.126	1.969*
Job satisfaction	-	-	-	-	.419	7.221***
F	53.977		21.092		33.823	
Model(p)	.000		.000		.000	
R ²	.263		.123		.252	

***p<.001; ** p<.01; p<.05

A three-step hierarchical regression analysis was employed for testing hypotheses. Procedural justice (β = .352) and distributive justice (β = .216) have a significant effect on job satisfaction (see table 4). Therefore, the hypothesis (H1) that distributive and procedural justice influence job satisfaction is supported. Procedural justice (β = .174; p = .011) and distributive justice (β = .217; p = .002) have a significant positive influence on organizational commitment in model 2. The hypothesis (H2) that procedural and distributive justice would positively influence commitment is also supported. Procedural justice, distributive justice, and job satisfaction were entered into the model to find out the mediation effect of job satisfaction between organizational justice and organizational commitment. The results found job satisfaction mediates between procedural justice (β = .026; p = .695) and organizational commitment completely as after the inclusion of job satisfaction the relationship becomes insignificant. On the other hand, the relationship between distributive justice and commitment (β = .126; p = .050) is significant, exhibiting partial mediation. Therefore, regression analysis results showed that job satisfaction mediates (OJ→JS→OC) relationships. Therefore, H3 is supported.

Discussion

Though the importance of justice in organizations has been debated for decades (Greenberg, 1987). However, comprehensive research of its impact in developing countries, particularly India, is required. Many studies have been conducted on organizational justice, but this study fills in some gaps and adds scientifically to the field. It shows how justice affects organizational justice, commitment, and job satisfaction in the Indian setting. As per the findings of this study, justice in the distribution of outcomes and procedures might influence commitment. Additionally, job satisfaction mediates the association between justice and commitment. Job satisfaction has been influenced by both distributive and procedural justice. Regression analysis is used to study the link between distributive and procedural

justice and organizational commitment. The findings support hypothesis 2 and are consistent with the previous study of Jang, Lee, and Kwon's research (2021), which revealed that justice in outcome distribution and procedures eventually increases commitment. This study also investigates the role of job satisfaction in mediating the relationship between justice and commitment. Previous research has shown that justice in outcome distribution and processes leads to increased employee job satisfaction (López-Cabarcos, Pinho, & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2015; Ozel & Bayraktar, 2018), which increases employee commitment (Nazir, Shafi, Atif, Qun, and Abdullah 2019). In line with these findings, the current study supports the mediation of job satisfaction in the link between distributive justice and procedural justice components of organizational justice and commitment, proving hypothesis 3. Third, the impact of organizational justice dimensions on job satisfaction is explored in this research. According to the findings, both procedural and distributive justice have a considerable impact on job satisfaction, which is similar to Lambert, Keena, Leone, May, and Haynes's (2020) study. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is also proved.

Research Implications

This study presents a theoretical model to explain the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment, as well as organizational justice and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is also identified as a mediator in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. It expands the field of previous studies by providing a few unique perspectives. Firstly, it covers both the dimensions of organizational justice. It is necessary to expand the literature because most of the earlier studies have included only one dimension (distributive or procedural) of organizational justice as a variable. Second, the study proposes a more complex model that tests the mediating effect of job satisfaction in the literature. Therefore, it attempts to establish a link between two important concepts, which include organizational justice on the one hand and commitment on the other, with job satisfaction as the mediating variable. Finally, this study looks at the concept of organizational justice in a way that few other studies have been conducted.

It adds to the relevant theoretical literature and has significant managerial and academic implications. Producers spend a lot of money on employee orientation, training, and retention. As a result, authorities, particularly the HR manager, must not underestimate the value of organizational commitment. They go to considerable lengths to optimize it. Our findings reveal key attitude indicators that may be used as soft management tools to boost employee commitment to their company. According to our findings, cement firm leaders must ensure that everyone in their organizations is treated fairly. This makes employees more satisfied with their jobs and more productive.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The current study's findings are distinctive in their own right, demonstrating their uniqueness. Despite the research's numerous useful findings, there are a few limitations that need to be addressed. First, we put our integrated model to the test in a South Asian setting. Therefore, as a result, future research may focus on cultural differences in hypothetical relationships to broaden the scope of this study's findings and analyze cultural parallels and variances. Similarly, the proposed integrated model could be tested on a more homogeneous group of people from different places and jobs.

References

1. Adams, J. (1965). Towards an understanding of inequality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
2. Aguiar-Quintana, T., Araujo-Cabrera, Y., & Park, S. (2020). The sequential relationships of hotel employees' perceived justice, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in a high unemployment context. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35, 100676.
3. Albishri, D. Y., Sundarakani, B., & Gomisek, B. (2020). An empirical study of relationships between goal alignment, centralized decision-making, commitment to networking, and supply chain effectiveness using structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 23 (4), 390-415.
4. Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social justice research*, 1 (2), 177-198.

5. Appaw-Agbola, E. T., Mensah, C., Azila-Gbettor, E. M., & Abiemo, M. K. (2021). Justice perceptions and job outcomes among family-owned hotel workers in Accra, Ghana. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 22 (1), 82- 108.
6. Bayarçelik, E. B., & Findikli, M. A. (2016). The mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relation between organizational justice perception and intention to leave. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 403- 411.
7. Charbonneau, D., & Wood, V. M. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of unit cohesion and affective commitment to the Army. *Military Psychology*, 30 (1), 43-53.
8. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: a Construct. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 386.
9. Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 53 (1), 39-52.
10. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of management perspectives*, 21 (4), 34-48.
11. Diehl, M. R., Richter, A., & Sarnecki, A. (2018). Variations in employee performance in response to organizational justice: The sensitizing effect of socioeconomic conditions. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2375-2404.
12. Fang, D., Su, S., Yang, Y., J.Xia, & Su, Y. (2017). Job satisfaction mediates subjective social status and turnover intention among Chinese nurses. *Nursing & health sciences*, 19 (3), 388-392.
13. Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 31 (1), 141-183.
14. Garmendia, A., Elorza, U., Aritzeta, A., & Madinabeitia-Olabarria, D. (2021). High-involvement HRM, job satisfaction and productivity: A two-wave longitudinal study of a Spanish retail company. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 31 (1), 341-357.
15. Graso, M., Camps, J., Strah, N., & Brebels, L. (2020). Organizational justice enactment: An agent-focused review and path forward. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 103296, 116.
16. Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
17. Guzelle, C. O., & Celiker, N. (2019). Examining the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention via a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14 (1), 102-120.
18. Guzeller, C. O., & Celiker, N. (2019). Examining the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention via a meta-analysis. *Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14 (1), 102-120.
19. Hu, B., & Han, S. (2021). Distributive justice: Investigating the impact of resource focus and resource valence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36 (2), 225-252.
20. Huang, W. R., & Su, C. H. (2016). The mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between job training satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Industrial and Commercial Training*.
21. Imamoglu, S. Z., Ince, H., Turkcan, H., & Atakay, B. (2019). The effect of organizational justice and organizational commitment on knowledge sharing and firm performance. *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 899-906.
22. Jang, J., Lee, D. W., & Kwon, G. (2021). An analysis of the Influence of organizational justice on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44 (2), 146-154.
23. Jang, J., Lee, D. W., & Kwon, G. (2021). An analysis of the Influence of organizational justice on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44 (2), 146-154.
24. Jnaneswar, K., & Ranjit, G. (2021). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of psychological ownership. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*.

- 164 Inspira- Journal of Modern Management & Entrepreneurship (JMME), Volume 12, No. 01, Jan.-March. 2022
25. Kim, S. (2017). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between distributive justice and sports referees' job satisfaction and career commitment. *Annals of Leisure Research, 20* (2), 169-187.
 26. Lambert, E. G., Keena, L. D., Leone, M., May, D., & Haynes, S. H. (2020). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of correctional staff. *The Social Science Journal, 57* (4), 405-416.
 27. Li, N., Zhang, L., Xiao, G., Chen, J., & Lu, Q. (2019). The relationship between workplace violence, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in emergency nurses. *International Emergency Nursing, 45*, 50-55.
 28. Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational behavior and human performance, 4* (4), 309-336.
 29. López-Cabarcos, M. A., Pinho, A. I.-L.-S.-d., & Vázquez-Rodríguez, P. (2015). The influence of organizational justice and job satisfaction on organizational commitment in Portugal's hotel industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 56* (3), 258-272.
 30. Mashi, M. S. (2018). The mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between organizational justice and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Public Administration, 41* (16), 1351-1360.
 31. Mayfield, M., Mayfield, J., & Ma, K. Q. (2020). Innovation matters: creative environment, absenteeism, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 33* (5), 715-735.
 32. Mayo, A. (2016). *Human resources or human capital?: Managing people as assets*. Routledge.
 33. 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.
 34. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review, 1* (1), 61-89.
 35. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousands of Oaks, C.A.
 36. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of applied psychology, 76* (6), 845.
 37. Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I., & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Leadership styles, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among academic staff in public universities. *Journal of Management Development, 39* (2), 253-268.
 38. Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Atif, M. M., Qun, W., & Abdullah, S. M. (2019). How organization justice and perceived organizational support facilitate employees' innovative behavior at work. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*.
 39. Ozel, A., & Bayraktar, C. A. (2018). Effect of organizational justice on job satisfaction; In *Industrial Engineering in the Industry*. Springer.
 40. Pang, K., & Lu, C.-S. (2018). Organizational motivation, employee job satisfaction and organizational performance: An empirical study of container shipping companies in Taiwan. *Maritime Business Review, 3* (1), 36-52.
 41. Pimentel, D., Pires, J. S., & Almeida, P. L. (2020). Perceptions of organizational justice and commitment of non-family employees in family and non-family firms. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior, 23* (2), 141-154.
 42. Roberts, J. A., & David, M. E. (2020). Boss phubbing, trust, job satisfaction, and employee performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 109702*, 155- 157.
 43. Safdar, S., & Liu, S. (2019). The Influence of Justice on Commitment of Pakistani Bankers: Job Satisfaction as Mediator. *International Journal of Public Administration, 43* (14), 1183-1193.
 44. Safdar, S., & Liu, S. (2020). The influence of justice on the commitment of Pakistani bankers: Job satisfaction as mediator. *International Journal of Public Administration, 43* (14), 1183-1193.
 45. Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey*.

46. Sungu, L. J., Weng, Q., & Xu, X. (2019). Organizational commitment and job performance: Examining the moderating roles of occupational commitment and transformational leadership. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 27 (3), 280-290.
47. Swalhi, A., Zgoulli, S., & Hofaidhllaoui, M. (2017). The influence of organizational justice on job performance: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Journal of management development*, 36 (4), 542-559.
48. Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative science quarterly*, 37 (4), 549-579.
49. Yu, J., Lee, A., Han, H., & Kim, H. R. (2020). Organizational justice and performance of hotel enterprises: Impact of job embeddedness. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21 (3), 337-360.
50. Yu, J., Lee, A., Han, H., & Kim, H.-R. (2020). Organizational justice and performance of hotel enterprises: Impact of job embeddedness. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21 (3), 337-360.
51. Zeffane, R., & Melhem, S. J. (2017). Trust, job satisfaction, perceived organizational performance and turnover intention: A public-private sector comparison in the United Arab Emirates. *Employee Relations*, 39 (7), 1148-1167.

