PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

CORRELATION BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF THE EMPLOYEES IN A COMPANY

Lorinda Adelina Seva¹, Cholichul Hadi²

^{1.2}Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology,

Universitas Airlangga, Jl. Airlangga No. 4, Surabaya-60286, East Java. Indonesia

Corresponding Author: ²cholichul.hadi@psikologi.unair.ac.id

Lorinda Adelina Seva, Cholichul Hadi. Correlation Between Organizational Justice And Organizational Commitment Of The Employees In A Company-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(3), 12-24. Issn 1567-214x

Keyword: Company, Correlation, Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Every company must have employees who are committed to their works. The organizational commitment of the employees, however, tends to fluctuate, depending on certain conditions, for example, company conflict or organizational justice of the company. These circumstances, in consequence, can cause the worse performance of the employees.

Aim: This study aims to pore over whether there is a correlation between organizational justice and organizational commitment of the employees in a company.

METHOD: This study applies the correlational quantitative research design. The participants are all 30 employees of the support and monitoring center division of a company in Indonesia. The independent variable is the organizational justice, while the dependent variable is the organizational commitment. The data are collected through a survey and questionnaire. The collected data regarding organizational justice are measured by the Organizational Justice Survey (OJS). Meanwhile, the organizational commitment is regulated by the favorable and unfavorable items. Spearman's Rho correlation test completes the statistical analysis.

RESULTS: It is obtained that the correlation value between two variables is 0.513, with the *p*-value of 0.004, which implies that there is a significant correlation between the variables, particularly the procedural justice and the normative commitment.

CONCLUSION: This study concludes that there is a correlation between organizational justice and organizational commitment of the employees in a company.

INTRODUCTION

A company consists of a group of people who are structured, where these people have the desire to achieve the same goal. The most crucial element in a company is the human resources (hereafter, HR) involved. HR, which includes the employees, is a significant contributor that makes a company grow and develop. Employees in a company are required to establish cooperation and commitment or a binding agreement that is also known as organizational commitment. To be further described, organizational commitment is one of the essential aspects of a company (Yuki and Schug, 2019). Also, loyalty is an unbinding commitment but is required to have (Hartini *et al.*, 2017).

Spanuth (2017) argued that even though organizational commitment is an old concept, the effect of the idea is still to be made as a research topic regarding organizational behaviors. Fu (2013) added that organizational commitment has a significant influence on employee performance. Amarneh and Abualrub (2010) further claimed that the employees with excellent performance could carry out their job under the standard settled by the company. In contrast, the employees whose performance is not impressive are considered a loss for the company, since they are seen not to be able to solve any problems at work. Gallup (2012) disclosed that 52% of the employees in America do not have an emotional relationship with their job (Crabtree, 2017). In 2015, Adkins further carried out research that concluded if more than 68% of the workers in America are not engaged with their company (Bonds, 2017). According to Ponnu and Chuah (2010), commitment brings a significant effect on employees' behaviors. Based on the interview with the employees of the support and monitoring center division, besides the issues on the organizational commitment, organizational justice also brings its problems, such as the employees feel unfairly treated because they often get a reprimand from the operational manager. However, they have done their works per the standard.

Other than commitment, employees also demand to be fairly treated by the company. Johnson (2006) argued that organizational justice is highlighted due to many important aspects of the company that is related to the employees' perception of the judgment they receive in an organization (Moghimi, S. M., Kazemi, M., & Samiie, 2013). Colquitt (2001) added that employees would have those kinds of perceptions based on four dimensions: the distributive justice dimension, the procedural justice dimension, the interpersonal justice dimension, and the informational justice dimension. The distributive justice dimension is the employee's perception of the results he/she receives from the company for what he/she has done. Furthermore, this justice refers to the suitability between the business and achievement the employee has sacrificed for the company. Meanwhile, the procedural justice dimension points out to the perception of justice that encompasses the policy rules and procedures behind the decision-making.

Referring to Greenberg (1990), the interpersonal justice dimension is a degree of treatment received by employees, which includes the employee's thoughts of whether he/she has been treated with courtesy, respect, and dignity. Within the context of the organization, interpersonal justice is related to the perception shaped during the communication process between a superordinate and the

subordinates or among the employees. The informational justice dimension, additionally, is the perception of whether the decision-maker, which in this case, the company, has given a thorough explanation regarding the rules and policies that impact the employees. Furthermore, the employee who receives a decision, be it good or bad, is rightful to know the background behind the decision (Colquitt, 2001). The elucidation implies that there is a specific correlation between one dimension and other dimensions. Therefore, through this study, the writer aims to prove the correlation between the organizational justice of a company, particularly in the support and monitoring center division that has the lowest employee turnover, and the organizational commitment of the employees.

RESEARCH METHOD

Place

The study was carried out to the employees of the support and monitoring center division in a company in Tangerang, Indonesia. Based on the preliminary research, the company is suitable as the location of the study because of the problems arouse regarding the organizational commitment in the beforementioned division.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is a correlational study, which aim is to identify the correlation strength between the variations of a variable and the variations of the other variable, based on the correlation coefficient (Azwar, 2011). From the correlation test, the information regarding the correlation level is obtained.

Variable

The independent variable is the organizational justice, while the dependent variable is the organizational commitment.

Sampling technique

The sample of this study was chosen by using the saturation sampling, which belongs to the non-probability sampling technique. This technique is used to determine samples by taking all populations as the subject of a study. Furthermore, the subjects were the permanent employees of PT. X in the support and monitoring center division. From the questionnaire, the writer managed to collect 30 subjects who are following the criteria of this study. The number is following Kerlinger's (1995) theory, which argued that the minimum sample for quantitative research is 30 subjects.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The Organizational Justice Survey developed by Colquitt (2001) was employed to measure organizational justice. The scale consists of 20 items of five Likert scale points. The 20 questions are divided into seven elements to measure the procedural justice dimension; five things to measure the distributive justice dimension, four items to measure the interpersonal justice dimension, and four questions to measure the informational justice dimension. After that, the writer

also employed the measuring instrument formulated by Puspita (2014) to measure organizational commitment. The questionnaire comprises 16 aspects that are divided into favorable and unfavorable elements. The higher the score an employee obtained, the stronger the commitment to the organization. For the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to draw a cross (X) in the scoring column next to every item. The assessment was based on the strongly agree to strongly disagree scales.

Data collection

The data were collected through the survey and questionnaire.

Data analysis

The analysis regarding the correlation strength was carried out by using the Spearman's Rho correlation test for the non-parametric statistic.

RESULTS

Subject Description

Below is the subject description of the data regarding organizational justice and organizational commitment.

Table 1. Group of data on the organizational justice based on sex, age, and years of service

Se	Organizati	Low	%	Mod	%	High	%	Tota	%
X	onal		'	erate	, -	8	'	1	, ,
	Justice								
Ma	Distributiv	7	30.43	7	30.43	9	39.	23	100
le	e						13		
	Procedural	3	13.04	6	26.09	14	60.	23	100
							87		
	Interperso	4	17.39	18	78.21	1	4.3	23	100
	nal						5		
	Informatio	5	21.74	18	78.21	0	0	23	100
	n								
							,		
Fe	Distributiv	0	0	2	28.57	7	71.	7	100
ma	e						43		
le									
	Procedural	3	42.85	0	0	4	57.	7	100
		_	_				14		
	Interperso	0	0	5	71.43	2	28.	7	100
	nal						57		
				_					
	Informatio	0	0	5	71.43	2	28.	7	100
	n					_	57		
Ag	Organizat	Low	%	Mod	%	Hig	%	Tota	%
e	ional			erat		h		1	
	Justice			e					

Distributiv e 10.52 6 31.58 11 57, 19 100 100 100 11 57, 19 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10										
Procedural 21.05				10.52	6	31.58	11		19	100
Interperso O O 16 84.21 3 15. 19 100				21.05	1	21.05	1.1		10	100
Old Interperso O O 16 84.21 3 15. 19 100	_	Fiocedulai		21.03	4	21.03	11		19	100
Informatio 2 10.52 15 78.95 2 10. 19 100		Interperso	0	0	16	8/1/21	3		10	100
Informatio 2 10.52 15 78.95 2 10. 19 100	Old	-		0	10	04.21	3		19	100
National National			2	10.52	15	78 95	2		19	100
Distributiv 4			2	10.32		70.75				100
Solid Procedural 1	27-		4	44.44	4	44 44	1		9	100
Procedural 1 11.11 1 11.11 7 77. 9 100			-				1			100
Ars old Interperso 3 33.33 6 66.66 0 0 9 100			1	11.11	1	11.11	7		9	100
nal	_									
nal	old	Interperso	3	33.33	6	66.66	0	0	9	100
Name		-								
Sociate Soci		Informatio	3	33.33	6	66.66	0	0	9	100
O		n								
Procedural 1 50 1 50 0 0 2 100	>3	Distributiv	0	0	1	50	1	50	2	100
Interperso old Interperso old Informatio 2 100 0 0 0 0 0 2 100	0	e								
Old Informatio 2 100 0 0 0 0 0 2 100	ye	Procedural	1	50	1	50	0	0		100
Informatio 2 100 0 0 0 0 2 100		-	1	50	1	50	0	0	2	100
Name	old									
Ye ars ional of Justice Low ional of Ser vice e Procedural O O O S Tota Tot		Informatio	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	100
ars of Ser vice e Distributiv 0 0 6 85.71 1 14. 7 100 <1 ye ar										
of Ser vice Justice e e service servic			Low	%		%	_	%		%
Ser vic e										
vic e Image: contraction of the contraction of th							n		1	
Color Colo	of						n		1	
Classification Clas	of Ser						n		1	
ye ar e 29 29 Procedural or Procedural or Procedural or Procedural or part of the part o	of Ser vic						n		I	
ar Procedural 0 0 1 14.29 6 85. 7 100 Interperso nal 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio nal 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 57 1 11.11 2 22.22 6 66. 9 100 9 1 11.11 2 22.22 5 55. 9 100 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 1 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 1 1 11.11 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	of Ser vic e	Justice	0	0	e	95 71		14		100
Interperso 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 1 11.11 2 22.22 6 66. 9 100 ye e 67 ars Procedural 2 22.22 2 22.22 5 55. 9 100 Interperso 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 Informatio 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100 >2 Distributiv 6 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100 ye e 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100 ye e 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100	of Ser vic e <1	Justice Distributiv	0	0	e	85.71				100
Interperso 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100 Informatio 1 11.11 2 22.22 6 66. 9 100 ye e	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e			e 6		1	29	7	
nal	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e			e 6		1	29 85.	7	
Informatio 0 0 5 71.43 2 28. 7 100	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e Procedural	0	0	6 1	14.29	1 6	29 85. 71	7	100
n	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e Procedural Interperso	0	0	6 1	14.29	1 6	29 85. 71 28.	7	100
1-2 ye e ars Distributiv e ars 1 11.11 2 22.22 6 66. 9 100 67 67 67 67 67 67 67	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e Procedural Interperso nal	0	0	6 1 5	14.29 71.43	1 6 2	29 85. 71 28. 57	7 7 7	100
ye ars Procedural 2 22.22 2 22.22 5 55. 9 100 Interperso nal 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 Informatio nal 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100 >2 Distributiv nal 6 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100 ye e 86 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1<	of Ser vic e <1 ye	Justice Distributiv e Procedural Interperso nal Informatio	0	0	6 1 5	14.29 71.43	1 6 2	29 85. 71 28. 57 28.	7 7 7	100
ars Procedural 2 22.22 2 22.22 5 55. 9 100 Interperso nal 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 Informatio nal 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100 >2 Distributiv e 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100 ye e 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributiv e Procedural Interperso nal Informatio n	0 0	0 0	6 1 5	14.29 71.43 71.43	1 6 2 2	29 85. 71 28. 57 28.	7 7 7	100 100 100
Interperso 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 Informatio 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributiv e Procedural Interperso nal Informatio n Distributiv	0 0	0 0	6 1 5	14.29 71.43 71.43	1 6 2 2	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66.	7 7 7	100 100 100
Interperso 1 11.11 8 88.88 0 0 9 100 Informatio 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 11.11	6 1 5 2	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22	1 6 2 2 6	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66.	7 7 7 7 9	100 100 100 100
nal 2 22.22 7 77.77 0 0 9 100 >2 Distributiv 6 42.86 2 14.28 6 42. 14 100 ye e 86 86 14 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 <t< td=""><td>of Ser vic e <1 ye ar</td><td>Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive</td><td>0 0 0 1</td><td>0 0 0 11.11</td><td>6 1 5 2</td><td>14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22</td><td>1 6 2 2 6</td><td>29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67</td><td>7 7 7 7 9</td><td>100 100 100 100</td></t<>	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 11.11	6 1 5 2	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22	1 6 2 2 6	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67	7 7 7 7 9	100 100 100 100
n	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural	0 0 1 2	0 0 0 11.11 22.22	6 1 5 2 2	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22	1 6 2 2 6 5	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55.	7 7 7 7 9	100 100 100 100
n	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural Interperso	0 0 1 2	0 0 0 11.11 22.22	6 1 5 2 2	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22	1 6 2 2 6 5	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55.	7 7 7 7 9	100 100 100 100
ye e 86	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural Interpersonal	0 0 0 1 2	0 0 0 11.11 22.22 11.11	6 1 5 2 2 8	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22 88.88	1 6 2 2 6 5	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55. 56	7 7 7 9 9	100 100 100 100 100
	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Interpersonal Informatio	0 0 0 1 2	0 0 0 11.11 22.22 11.11	6 1 5 2 2 8	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22 88.88	1 6 2 2 6 5	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55. 56	7 7 7 9 9	100 100 100 100 100
ars Procedural 4 28.57 3 21.42 7 50 14 100	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Interpersonal Information	0 0 0 1 2 1 2	0 0 11.11 22.22 11.11 22.22	6 1 5 2 2 8 7	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22 88.88 77.77	1 6 2 2 6 5 0 0	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55. 56 0	7 7 7 9 9	100 100 100 100 100 100
	of Ser vic e <1 ye ar	Justice Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Information Distributive Procedural Interpersonal Interpersonal Information Distributiv	0 0 0 1 2 1 2	0 0 11.11 22.22 11.11 22.22	6 1 5 2 2 8 7 2	14.29 71.43 71.43 22.22 22.22 88.88 77.77	1 6 2 2 6 5 0 0 6	29 85. 71 28. 57 28. 57 66. 67 55. 56 0	7 7 7 9 9	100 100 100 100 100 100

Interperso	3	21.43	10	71.42	1	7.1	14	100
nal						4		
Informatio	3	21.42	10	71.42	1	7.1	14	100
n						4		

Based on **Table 1**, it can be perceived that seen from sex, the male subjects have a high perception of procedural justice, as much as 60.87%. The female subjects, however, have a higher percentage on the same dimension, as much as 71.43%. Seen from the age, moreover, the subjects aged from 23 to 26 years old have the same percentage (57.89%) on the distributive justice and procedural dimensions. Meanwhile, for the subjects whose ages are 27-30 years old, the perception of procedural justice is considered high, as much as 77.77%. Also, the subjects who are above 30 years old have a strong impression of distributive justice.

Seen from the years of service, the subjects who have served for less than one year tend to have a high procedural justice, which is 85.71%. For the group of one until two years of service, on the other hand, distributive justice is the highest one, as much as 66.67%. Furthermore, the subjects who have served for more than two years also have a high perception of procedural justice.

Table 2. Group of data on the organizational commitment based on sex, age, and years of service

Se	Organizationa	Lo	%	Modera	%	High	%	Total	%
X	1 Commitment	W		te					
Ma	Affective	2	9	19	83	2	9	23	100
le	Normative	4	17	14	61	4	17	23	100
	Continuance	0	0	18	78	5	22	23	100
Fe	Affective	3	43	0	0	4	57	7	100
ma	Normative	0	0	5	71	2	29	7	100
le	Continuance	0	0	7	10	0	0	7	100
					0				
Ag	Organization	Lo	%	Moder	%	Hig	%	Total	%
e	al	W		ate		h			
	Commitment								
23-	Affective	5	26	8	42	6	32	19	100
26	Normative	2	11	12	63	5	26	19	100
ye	Continuance	0	0	16	84	3	16	19	100
ars									
old									
27-	Affective	0	0	9	10	0	0	9	100
30					0				
ye	Normative	3	33	6	67	0	0	9	100
ars	Continuance	0	0	8	89	1	11	9	100
old				_			_	_	
>3	Affective	0	0	2	10	0	0	2	100
0					0				
ye	Normative	0	0	1	50	1	50	2	100

ars	Continuance	0	0	1	50	1	50	2	100
old									
Ye	Organization	Lo	%	Moder	%	Hig	%	Total	%
ars	al	w		ate		h			
of	Commitment								
Ser									
vic									
e									
<1	Affective	0	0	5	71	2	29	7	100
ye	Normative	0	0	6	86	1	14	7	100
ar	Continuance	0	0	5	71	2	29	7	100
1-2	Affective	2	22	4	44	3	33	9	100
ye	Normative	2	22	4	44	3	33	9	100
ars	Continuance	0	0	9	10	0	0	9	100
					0				
>2	Affective	3	21	11	79	0	0	14	100
ye	Normative	3	21	9	64	2	14	14	100
ars	Continuance	3	21	10	71	1	7	14	100

Table 2 shows that, if seen from sex, the male subjects have a high continuance commitment, while the female subjects have a high affective commitment. From the characteristic of the age, those whose ages are 23-26 years old have a high affective commitment. Meanwhile, the subjects with the age of 27-30 years old have a high continuance commitment. For the age group of more than 30 years old, both the normative and continuance commitments are equally high. Furthermore, seen from the years of service, the subjects who have been working for less than one year tend to have a high affective and continuance commitments, different from those who have served for 1-2 years, which high commitments are the affective and normative commitments. The ones with more than two years of service, on the other hand, only have a high normative commitment.

Based on the correlation test between organizational justice and organizational commitment, the significance level (p) obtained is 0.004. Therefore, the hypothesis that stated if there is a correlation between the two variables is accepted. Besides, the correlation coefficient (r) as much as 0.513 indicates if the relationship is considered strong. From the correlation test, furthermore, the result concludes that there is a significant positive correlation between the two variables. In other words, the increase in organizational justice will influence the increase in organizational commitment. In contrast, if the organizational justice is decreased, then so is the organizational commitment.

DISCUSSION

According to the data analysis, the hypothesis proven is the say that there is a significant correlation between organizational justice and organizational commitment of the employees in the support and monitoring center division in the company. This result is similar to the research carried out by Demirel and Yucel (2013), which mentioned that organizational justice has a significant relationship with organizational commitment. In general, it can be assumed that

the low level of organizational justice experienced by employees will eventually influence their organizational commitment. In other words, the more the employees feel unfairly treated by the company, the less they commit to the company. Thus, it can be stated that organizational justice holds an essential role and influence on the quality of the behavior and commitment of the employees.

Likewise, this study also tests the relationship between the two variables in every dimension. Table 3 shows the correlation test results in the presence of a correlation between procedural justice and normative commitment. The argument is supported by the analysis performed by the Spearman's Rho correlation test, which significance level (p) is 0.031, p < 0.05. The results of this study are in line with the prior research regarding the procedural justice and organizational commitment with the focus on the commitment in general (Colquitt, 2001), different from this study that analyzed all three aspects of commitment. Moreover, the previous research used the employees of a health school as the subjects. Thus, it can be argued that even though the subjects are from a different group of workers, the results do not influence the relationship between procedural justice and the normative commitment of the employees. Colquitt (2001) further mentioned that procedural justice would have a stronger influence on the organization's outcome prediction. In other words, an employee will use his/her perception of procedural justice when about to react to the system (Colquitt, 2001). In brief, the procedural justice covers the capacity of an organization in treating the employees fairly; thus, the employees' behavior towards the organization, including the organizational commitment, is also taken into account.

The concept of procedural justice explains that an individual does not only evaluate the allocation nor distribution of the results but also evaluate the procedural justice to determine the allocation itself. However, someone might try to maximize his/her profit and assess the procedure according to his/her effort to obtain a determined benefit. In this case, an employee's judgment about justice is not only influenced by the result he/she gets but also by the process of how the decision is made (Colquitt, 2001). This concept points out that a procedure is considered fair if it can accommodate an individual's interest. The assessment of procedural justice further describes the employees' reactions to the organization through their behaviors, values, and attitudes.

The normative commitment is also known as the moral commitment, due to the reason that employees stay in an organization is that sometimes they feel indebted to the company for what they have been received. According to Wiener (1982, in Meyer and Allen, 1991), normative commitment is a result of the internalization process to the regulations in a company, which is influenced by procedural justice. This matter indicates that the employees' perception of justice in the salary determination or other rewards will lead to the impression that they will be lost if they leave the company. In other words, the clearer the procedure in the decision-making, the more the employees feel at lost to leave the company. This argument is further supported by Meyer and Allen (1991), which argued that normative commitment would develop along with the change of reward given by the company to the employees.

The other hypothesis tested in this study is whether there is also a correlation between each dimension of every variable. The results, however, show that there is no relationship between dimensions and, at the same time, prove that the hypothesis is unaccepted. In further elucidation, the results disclose that the distributive justice does not correlate with affective and continuance commitments, with the significance level (p) = 0.639, p > 0.05 for the distributive justice and affective commitment and (p) = 0.421, p > 0.05 for the organizational justice and continuance commitment. No correlation is further discovered between procedural justice and the continuance commitment, with a significance level (p) = 0.477, p > 0.05. Furthermore, there is also no correlation between interpersonal justice and the affective, normative, and continuance commitments, with the significance levels of 0.920, 453, and 0.400, respectively.

Besides the results as mentioned earlier, this study also discovered that the information justice does not have any correlation with the affective, normative, and continuance commitments. The significance tests of those elements result in the p of 0.239, 0.312, and 0.402, respectively. These results are following the research carried out by Fatholahi (2011) in Teheran, which concluded that there is no relationship between organizational justice and commitment (Khalej, Hamidi, 2013). However, to be further noted, the difference in results can be caused by the difference in research subjects, along with the policies and regulations made by a company.

Every dimension of organizational justice and organizational commitment were tested as separated variables. Hence, it can be argued that each of the organizational justice dimensions has a different influence on every component of organizational commitment. From a total of 12 hypotheses, only three are proven correct: correlations between the distributive justice and normative commitment, procedural justice, and affective commitment, and procedural justice and normative commitment. However, despite the results, all variables needed to be tested to identify the effect of each variable on every dimension of the organizational commitment.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study supported the results of the prior research and concluded that there is a significant correlation between organizational justice and organizational commitment of the employees in the support and monitoring center division in a company in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Amarneh, B., Abualrub, R.F., A. A. R. (2010) 'Co Workers' Support and Job Performance among Nurse in Jordania', *Journal of Research in Nursing*. Azwar, S. (2011) *Penyusunan skala psikologi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bonds, A. (2017) Employees' Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. Walden Disertation and Doctoral Studies. Walden University, Business Administration Faculty.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001) 'On The Dimentionality Of Organizational Justice: A Construct Vaidation Of A Measure.', *Journal of Applied Psychology*,

- pp. 108, 93–105.
- Crabtree, S. (2017) 'Worldwide, 13% of Employee Are Engaged at Work.', *News.Gallup*. Available at: http://news.gallup.com/poll/165269/worldwide-employees-engaged-work.aspx.
- Demirel, Y. & Yucel, I. (2013) 'The Effect of Organizational Justice on rganizational Commitment. Study on Automotive Industry', *International of Social Science*, II, p. 13.
- Fu, Weihui, D. (2013) 'The Impact of Caring Climate, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Job Performance of Employess in a China's Insurance Company.', *Journal Business Ethics*, p. 124: 339–349
- Hartini, N. *et al.* (2017) 'Improving urban environment through public commitment toward the implementation of clean and healthy living behaviors', *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 10, pp. 79–84. doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S101727.
- Khalej, Hamidi, B. (2013) 'Studying the Relation Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment among The Librarians of Khouzestan Province Ministry of Science Academic Libraries.', *Online Journal of Natural and Social Science*.
- Moghimi, S. M., Kazemi, M., & Samiie, S. (2013) 'Studying the relationship between organizational justice and employees' quality of work life in public organizations: A case study of Qom province', *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 6(1), p. 119.
- Ponnu & Chuah (2010) 'Organizational Commitment, Organizational Justice and Employee Turnover in Malaysia', *African Journal of Businees Management*.
- Puspita, C. (2014) Hubungan antara Makna Kerja dengan Komitmen Organisasi pada Anggota Ludruk Irama Budaya Surabaya. Surabaya: Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Airlangga.
- Spanuth, T. Wald, A. (2017) 'Understanding the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment in the context of Temporary Organizations: An Empirical Study.', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, pp. 33 (3), 129–138.
- Yuki, M. and Schug, J. (2020) 'ScienceDirect Psychological consequences of relational mobility', *Current Opinion in Psychology*. Elsevier Ltd, 32, pp. 129–132. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.029.