

RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF FAIRNESS PERCEPTIONS, JOB SATISFACTION AND INTRINSIC MOTIVATION ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Eser KAYHAN TEKİN

*Head of Recreational and Social Facilities,
Turkish Naval Academy, Tuzla, 34940, Istanbul, Turkey
ektekin@dho.edu.tr*

Alper ERTÜRK

*Head of Department of Social Sciences,
Turkish Naval Academy, Tuzla, 34940, Istanbul, Turkey
aerturk@dho.edu.tr*

Abstract

This study examines the relative effects of fairness perceptions, job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation on the organizational commitment of blue-collar workers in a highly dynamic job environment. Samples were drawn from different private manufacturing organizations in Turkey. Data from 107 participants in total were analyzed by using SPSS 19.0. The basic postulate of this research is that, under strong feelings job-insecurity, employee perceptions of managerial fairness (i.e., distributive justice and procedural justice) will surpass the effects of other attitudinal factors (i.e., job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation) as they jointly influence organizational commitment. Results of hierarchical regression analysis suggest that among all antecedent constructs, employee perception of distributive justice and job satisfaction are found to employ the strongest effect on organizational commitment of the blue-collar workers in our sampling context. Several managerial and theoretical implications of the study are also discussed.

Keywords: *Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Intrinsic Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment*

ORGANİZASYONEL ADALET ALGILARI, İŞ TATMİNİ VE İÇSEL MOTİVASYONUN, ORGANİZASYONEL BAĞLILIK ÜZERİNDEKİ GÖRECELİ ETKİLERİ

Özetçe

Bu çalışma, organizasyonel adalet algıları, iş tatmini ve içsel motivasyonun, dinamik bir iş çevresinde faaliyet gösteren firmalarda çalışan personelin organizasyonel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerindeki göreceli etkilerini incelemektedir. Örneklemi oluşturan çalışanlar, Türkiye'de faaliyet gösteren imalat odaklı firmalardan seçilmiştir. Toplamda 107 katılımcıdan toplanan veriler SPSS 19.0 programı kullanılarak analize tabi tutulmuştur. Bu çalışmanın temel önermesi, kuvvetli iş güvensizliği koşulları altında, organizasyonel adalet algılarının (prosedür ve dağıtım adaleti), organizasyonel bağlılık üzerinde, diğer işle ilgili tutumlardan (iş tatmini ve içsel motivasyon) daha kuvvetli bir etkisinin olacağı üzerine kurulmuştur. Yapılan hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri sonucunda, diğer bağımsız değişkenlerle birlikte ele alındıklarında, dağıtım adaleti ve iş tatmininin organizasyonel bağlılık üzerinde en yüksek etkiye sahip olduğu görülmüştür. Çalışmada, bu sonuca bağlı olarak çeşitli yönetsel ve teorik çıkarımlar da tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Prosedür adaleti, Dağıtım adaleti, İş tatmini, İçsel motivasyon, Organizasyonel bağlılık.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the relevance of employees' attitudes and behavior in organizations, such as the impact of employee work commitment on job performance, absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover intentions has received a great deal of attention in the literature [1,2]. Because of the changing economic climate in many countries, both academic and professional management literature have begun to dedicate considerable attention to understanding the dynamics and developing theories of employees' commitment to the job and the organization that is thought to contribute positively to overall organizational performance.

Employees, who have high levels of organizational commitment, take pride in organizational membership, believe in the goals and values of

the organization, and therefore exhibit higher levels of performance and productivity [3]. Because low productivity, absenteeism, and turnover, are costly for organizations, it is important for organizations to determine what affects organizational commitment and to nurture it.

Nonetheless, while it is evident that organizational commitment is a crucial determinant of an organization's effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, and overall performance, research about the specific factors that promote organizational commitment under differing economic and organizational contexts seems to suggest equivocal solutions for practicing managers. More importantly, a majority of the existing works on organizational commitment has been conducted in the United States or Western Europe. It is therefore very important for practicing managers to explore the effects of fairness perceptions, job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation on organizational commitment under relatively less stable macroeconomic conditions, particularly in situations characterized by high unemployment rates, substantial workforce layouts, imbalanced and unfair wage policies. For instance, according to the News Bulletin published by Turkish Government Institute of Statistics, unemployment rate is about 8.5%.

The purposes of this article are to provide a literature summary related to organizational justice, intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and to summary of recent research and studies concerning those factors, as well as to discuss the findings of an empirical study about the relevance of organizational justice, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction to organizational commitment.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Organizational Commitment

Previous research on organizational commitment has focused on the subject from various perspectives. Mowday, Porter & Steers note ten different definitions [4]. Also Morrow identifies 29 commitment related

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

concepts in the literature [5]. Research on commitment have been divided into a variety of types; according to its consequences, its antecedents, its targets, or a mix of some of those. Furthermore, organizational commitment has been defined as both behavioral and attitudinal. According to the behaviorists, organizational commitment is demonstrated by such manifestations of commitment to the organization such as extra-role behaviors that link employees to their respective institution [4]. Further, by remaining with the organization, employees accumulate “investments” or “side bets” that make leaving the organization very costly [6].

In contrast to the behavioral approach to organizational commitment, the attitudinal approach recognizes that the identification of the person linked to the organization; and thus, the person develops an emotional or psychological attachment to his or her employer [7]. In this study, organizational commitment is operationalized as a multi-dimensional construct.

Probably the most common approach to organizational commitment is the perspective suggested by Mowday, Porter and Steers, which defines organizational commitment as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization. This perspective characterizes organizational commitment by (a) “a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” [4]. Studies corresponding to this perspective have focused on individual differences as predictors of commitment. In several studies, demographic factors such as gender, age and organizational tenure have been linked to organizational commitment. Among those demographic variables, age and organizational tenure were found to be positively correlated with organizational commitment, while level of education has been found to be negatively related [8,9]. Research has also revealed that there is no significant difference in the organizational commitment according to the gender [8,9]. Research has also yielded a negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention, also a positive relationship between commitment and regular

employee attendance has been found [9]. Contrary to previous research, Mathieu and Zajac have found that organizational commitment affects actual work performance slightly [9]. In addition, many other empirical studies have also focused on the effects of demographic factors, such as job level, tenure, and longevity on employee commitment [10]. Also in some research, organizational commitment has been found to be a significant antecedent of organizational citizenship behaviors [11].

2.2. Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is the term used to describe the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace. Specifically, organizational justice focuses on the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those perceptions influence other organizational outcomes [12]. Organizational justice theory posits that employees' feelings of equity in the workplace are determined mainly by (a) how decisions affecting them are made, and (b) the outcomes of these decisions [13]. This theory also holds that employees judge whether the decisional processes and mechanisms (procedural justice) and the consequences these decisions are fair (distributive justice). Greenberg also argued that procedural and distributive justice are independent determinants of perceived fairness that are typically distinguished from each other. In practice, however, the two are usually positively associated.

Procedural justice perspective focuses on the process used to make decisions of how outcomes are determined [14]. Procedures used in determining pay raises uniquely contribute to trust in the leader and to organizational commitment. Procedural justice is multi-dimensional and consists of formal procedures (the degree to which procedures are fair) and interactional justice (the way in which the procedures are carried out), as suggested by recent research [15].

Distributive justice perspective focuses on the perceived fairness of pay and other rewards received. Since its focus is on outcome fairness, equity theory has been commonly used to operationalize the construct [12]. Equity theory emphasizes an employee's beliefs of how he or she is treated

Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic Motivation On Organizational Commitment

in relation to others. The perceived ratio of what an employee puts into his or her job helps to determine equity or inequity. When an employee is evaluating if an outcome is appropriate or fair, he or she is making a distributive justice decision.

2.3. Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation is related with the psychological rewards that one gets from his or her work. When intrinsically motivated, people look for better ways to perform their jobs and to do it well. In order to be intrinsically motivated; people must believe that the purpose is meaningful, that they are free to choose the best way to do their job; and that they are performing competently [16]. According to Thomas, following emotional indicators are the psychological vital signs of intrinsic motivation: Sense of meaningfulness, sense of choice, sense of competence and sense of progress.

Recently, several researches have focused on how to build, maintain and increase intrinsic motivation. Pullins and his colleagues suggested that intrinsic motivation would come from a human drive for autonomy or competency, representing the desire to engage in the activity itself instead of outcome of the activity [17]. Intrinsic motivation is basically related to working smarter, making better choices about the approach to use, and to creativity at work. Intrinsic motivation was found to be positively correlated with various factors including cooperation, job satisfaction and a number of performance outcomes [18]. Research emphasized that recognition of a job well-done and full appreciation for work done were often among the top motivators of employee performance.

2.4. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction may be defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. This positive feeling results from the perception of one's job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values, provided these values are compatible with one's needs [19]. Given that values refer to what one desires or seeks to attain, job satisfaction can be considered as reflecting a

person's value judgment regarding work-related rewards. Job satisfaction is also considered the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the achievement of one's job values in the work situation.

Job satisfaction has long been recognized as a component of organizational commitment. It is suggested that job satisfaction is a state of pleasure gained from applying one's values to a job. Spector believes that job satisfaction "can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job" [20]. Job satisfaction is an attitude toward work-related conditions, facets, or aspects of the job. Therefore, commitment suggests more of an attachment to the employing organization as opposed to specific tasks, environmental factors, and the location where the duties are performed. When discussed on these terms, commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time. Many studies use different facets of satisfaction to predict employee attributes such as performance, organizational commitment, and service quality [21].

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Based on the empirical work done undertaken by previous researchers, one can conclude that if the organization is perceived as failing to provide sufficient resources capable of satisfying the needs and goals of organizational members, resulting in lower job satisfaction, employees' commitment to the organization is likely to decrease. Several researches regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment have made the case that job satisfaction is a predictor of organizational commitment [9].

Since culture and values within the organization may increase employees' bond with the organization and their organizational commitment, affiliation between organizational values and organizational commitment has also received considerable attention. Similarly, organizational commitment has been found to be a significant antecedent of job satisfaction [22].

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

Research suggests that the rewards offered by an organization might have a powerful effect on employee's behaviors and attitudes toward their jobs and the organization for which they work. Several researchers also suggested that intrinsic rewards would probably be more significant antecedent for affective commitment [9, 10]. Intrinsic rewards would make significant contributions to organizational commitment. In empirical studies, researchers found strong relationship between intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment and that intrinsic motivation was relevant to both job involvement and organizational commitment [23].

Both distributive and procedural justice have been linked to organizational commitment in prior research [24]. Commitment is dependent on maintaining a relationship of consistency and good faith, which, in turn, is likely to be associated with justice perceptions. Some previous research also suggests that employees, who believe their contributions are highly regarded, are likely to be more committed to the organization [25]. Thus, positive procedural and distributive justice perceptions are associated with increased organizational commitment. Hence, researchers who support the value of organizational justice suggest if employees believe that they are treated fairly, they will be more likely to hold positive attitudes about their work, work outcomes and their supervisors.

Distributive justice ought to influence organizational commitment since an equitable distribution of pay raises strengthens the bonds of loyalty between employees and their company. Perceptions of fair procedures are likely to cause workers to have faith in the system, which may lead to higher organizational commitment, regardless of outcomes. More specifically, interpersonal treatment is also likely to be associated with one's satisfaction of need for praise and approval, which are important determinants of commitment. Additionally, interpersonal treatment ought to lead employees to feel respected by, and proud of the organization. In turn, they are more likely to identify with, and internalize the values of the organization. In general terms, research has shown that distributive justice predicts specific

personal outcomes, such as pay satisfaction, better than general organizational outcomes, such as organizational commitment and turnover [24, 25].

Research has shown that procedural justice is important in determining the degree of employees' commitment to the organization [26]. Employees perceiving that they have been treated fairly in the process of allocating rewards will be more satisfied with supervisors and display greater organizational commitment. In general, research suggests a link between procedural justice perceptions and organizational commitment. Accordingly, justice is likely to influence organizational commitment both directly and indirectly through its effects on satisfaction.

4. METHODS

4.1. Sample and Procedures

Participants in the study consisted of blue-collar workers employed by 3 manufacturing companies located in Istanbul and Kocaeli. Selection of blue-collar employees was based on the simple random sampling method.

First of all, each questionnaire was translated from English into Turkish with the assistance of professional translators, and then back translated into English. After a few minor modifications, the questionnaires were administered to randomly selected 15 blue-collar workers for a pilot survey. During pilot survey testing, the questions were proved to be easily understood by blue-collar workers, who generally gave full responses.

A total of 150 questionnaires were sent out to randomly selected blue-collar employees of those 3 companies. Included within each questionnaire packet was a cover letter and a return envelope addressed directly to the researchers to assure respondent confidentiality and anonymity. Respondents were given two weeks to answer the questionnaires. A total of 107 responses were obtained representing a response rate of about 71%.

Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic Motivation On Organizational Commitment

Data was recorded on written forms. Some demographic data was also collected, such as age, gender, tenure in the organization and education level. No personal data was collected except demographics. In terms of gender, 62.6% of respondents were males with the remaining 37.4% being females. Regarding education, majority (83.2%) of the respondents had university degrees; specifically 70.1% with bachelor's degrees, 13.1% with masters degrees and 16.8% with high school diplomas. Age of respondents varied from 22 to 51 with the mean of 31.20 ($\mu=31.20$, $sd=5.73$), and tenure ranged from 1 to 16 years ($\mu=5.07$, $sd=3.12$).

4.2. Measures

All constructs are measured using seven-point Likert scales with anchors from strongly disagree (= 1) to strongly agree (= 7).

Organizational Commitment. Based on Mowday et al., organizational commitment is conceptualized as “the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization,” and is measured using the 15-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire [27].

Job Satisfaction. 18-item scale adopted from Brayfield and Rothe' research is used to measure job satisfaction [28].

Procedural Justice. Procedural justice is measured with a 15-item scale adopted from Niehoff and Moorman [29]. This scale measures the degree of fairness in the formal and informal procedures applied by the supervisor and the upper management.

Distributive Justice. A five-item scale adopted from Niehoff and Moorman is used to measure distributive justice [29]. The questions assess the perceived fairness of work outcomes regarding pay, workload, and task responsibilities.

Intrinsic Motivation. Intrinsic motivation is measured with 22-item Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) adapted from Ryan, Mims and

Koestner [30]. IMI is a multidimensional measurement instrument to assess participants' subjective experience related to target activity. It has been used in several studies related to intrinsic motivation and self-regulation [31]. Also, McAuley, Duncan, and Tammen did a study to examine the validity of the IMI and found strong support for its validity [32].

5. ANALYSES AND RESULTS

5.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliabilities

SPSS 19.0 software was used to conduct factor analyses. Principal factors with varimax rotation were used for each variable to demonstrate the factor structure.

For organizational commitment, exploratory factor analysis revealed a one-factor structure. Negatively worded items were reverse-coded. Most of the reverse-coded items were identified as poor performers later on in the item analysis and omitted. The reverse-coded items tended to have more cross loading than most of the other items and they had lower inter-item correlation. Factor loadings of organizational commitment scale range from 0.542 to 0.886. The coefficient alpha reliability for internal consistency of the factor was 0.915.

For job satisfaction, similar to the organizational commitment scale, negatively worded reverse-coded items identified as poor performance were omitted. Then, the exploratory factor analysis revealed a one-factor solution. Factor loadings of job satisfaction scale range from 0.526 to 0.889. The coefficient alpha reliability for internal consistency of the factor was 0.886. Factor structures of organizational commitment scale and job satisfaction scale are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Factor Loadings of the Items of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
	Organizational Commitment	Job Satisfaction
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be	.542	

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

successful.	
I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.	.855
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.	.846
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	.852
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	.840
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	.822
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	.842
I really care about the fate of this organization.	.576
For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.	.886
My job is like a hobby to me.	.853
My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.	.833
It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.	.861
I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.	.889
I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.	.802
I am satisfied with my job for the time being.	.769
I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.	.571
Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	.878
I like my job better than the average worker does.	.526
I find real enjoyment in my work.	.813

For distributive justice, five-item distributive justice measure produced a one-factor solution allowing the retention of all five of its original items. Factor loadings of distributive justice scale range from 0.878 to 0.954. The coefficient alpha reliability of the scale was 0.949.

For procedural justice, fifteen items comprising the procedural justice measure produced a clean single factor structure. Factor loadings of procedural justice scale range from 0.679 to 0.923. The coefficient alpha

reliability of the scale was 0.967. Table 2 summarizes the factor structures of distributive and procedural justice.

Table 2. Factor Loadings of the Items of Organizational Justice

Items	Factor 1 Distributive Justice	Factor 2 Procedural Justice
My work schedule is fair.	.904	
I think that my level of pay is fair.	.878	
I consider my work load to be quite fair.	.954	
Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.	.939	
I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.	.907	
Job decisions are made by the general manager in an unbiased manner.		.839
My general manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.		.760
To make job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information.		.801
My general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.		.815
All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.		.766
Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the general manager.		.856
When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with kindness and consideration.		.923
When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with respect and dignity.		.906
When decisions are made about my job, the general manager is sensitive to my personal needs.		.908
When decisions are made about my job, the general manager deals with me in a truthful manner.		.679
When decisions are made about my job, the general manager shows concern for my rights as an employee.		.866
Concerning decisions made about my job, the general manager discusses the implications of the decisions with me.		.872
The general manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.		.849
When making decisions about my job, the general manager offers explanations that make sense to me.		.911

Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic Motivation On Organizational Commitment

My general manager explains very clearly any decision made about my job.	.912
--	------

For intrinsic motivation, exploratory factor analysis of the 22-item intrinsic motivation scale yielded a four-factor structure after eliminating poor performing items. This result is consistent with the scale's theoretical suggestions. Four subscales of intrinsic motivation produced by the exploratory factor analysis were interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, perceived choice, and pressure/tension. Factor loadings of four subscales range from 0.462 to 0.931. Cronbach alpha reliabilities for subscales of Intrinsic Motivation Inventory were as follows: 0.759 for interest/enjoyment, 0.713 for perceived competence, 0.850 for perceived choice, and 0.693 for pressure/tension. Factor structures of four subscales of intrinsic motivation scale are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Factor Loadings of the Items of Intrinsic Motivation Inventory

Items	Factor 1 Interest/ Enjoyment	Factor 2 Perceived Competence	Factor 3 Perceived Choice	Factor 4 Pressure/ Tension
While I was working on the task, I was thinking about how much I enjoyed it.	.696			
Doing the task was fun.	.756			
I enjoyed doing the task very much.	.762			
I would describe the task as very enjoyable.	.462			
I found the task very interesting.	.558			
I thought the task was very interesting.	.853			
I felt tense while doing the task.	.880			
I think I am pretty good at this task.		.758		
I think I did pretty well at this activity, compared to other employees.		.842		
I am satisfied with my		.554		

performance at this task.		
I felt pretty skilled at this task.	.524	
I felt that it was my choice to do the task.		.931
I felt like I was doing what I wanted to do while I was working on the task.		.460
After working for this task for a while, I felt pretty competent.	.845	
I was anxious while doing the task.		.797
I felt pressured while doing the task.		.715

These results provide patterns consistent with the scales' theoretical underpinnings. To demonstrate discriminant validity, the items to measure all scales, including four subscales of intrinsic motivation, should load separately from each other. The results indicate no inappropriate loadings and each scale is interpreted as distinct from each other. Convergent validity was established by correlating all the scale items, including four subscales of intrinsic motivation. The resulting correlations range from 0.002 to 0.845. Consistent with our expectations supporting both discriminant and convergent validity, all items loaded (1) with high-standardized coefficients onto their respective factors and (2) with substantially lower standardized coefficients on other factors. Furthermore, the coefficient alpha estimates for all the scales are greater than the recommended level of 0.70, except for the pressure/tension subscale of intrinsic motivation, which has a reliability of 0.693. I therefore decided that the measures have adequate internal consistency and computed composite scores of each scale for use in further analyses. The means, standard deviations, reliability estimates and interrelations of all variables are displayed in Table 4.

Moreover, Harman's one-factor test seems to indicate that common method variance was not a serious threat in this study [33]. It should be recalled that the factor analyses of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, procedural justice and distributive justice yielded clean one-

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

factor solutions. Also, factor analysis of intrinsic motivation resulted in four factors eigenvalues of 1 or higher reveals that the explained variance of the factors ranged from 32.7 percent (factor 1) to 8.9 percent (factor 4).

5.2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Next, a series of (hierarchical) regression analyses were performed to explore the relative portions of unique variances in organizational commitment accounted for by each factor – four subscales of intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, procedural justice, and distributive justice. This procedure provides a unique partitioning of the total variance accounted for in a dependent variable by a set of predictors [34].

Considering the organizational commitment as the dependant variable, the effects of other factors were investigated. The first regression model included the two demographic indicators of respondents, which are age and organizational tenure, as control variables. Next, each predictor variable was added to the model in a step-by-step procedure in order to assess the unique explanatory power of each. Variables were included in the model in the order of sub dimensions of intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, procedural justice, and distributive justice. Table 5 summarizes the dependant and independent variables of each step in the analysis.

Table 4. Variable means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations

	Mean	SD	Org. Com.	Int/Enj	Per.Com.	Per.Cho.	Pres/Ten	Job Sat.	Pros..Jus.	Dis.Jus.
Organizational Commitment.	3.64	1.27	(.915)							
Interest/ Enjoyment.	5.48	0.75	.228*	(.759)						
Perceived Competence.	5.51	0.63	.360***	.498***	(.713)					
Perceived Choice	4.76	1.41	.079	.050	.110	(.850)				
Pressure/ Tension	3.68	1.40	-.449***	-.196*	-.201*	-.272**	(.693)			
Job Satisfaction	4.17	1.01	.845***	.281**	.171	.077	-.627***	(.886)		
Procedural Justice	2.73	1.32	.539***	.002	-.066	.107	-.466***	.617***	(.967)	
Distributive Justice	2.53	1.57	.793***	.126	-.089	.278**	-.323***	.818***	.701***	(.949)

*** p< 0.001, ** p< 0.01, * p< 0.05

Numbers in brackets are coefficient alpha (reliability) estimates

Table 5. Dependent and Independent Variables in Hierarchical Regression Analysis Steps

Step	Dependent	Added Independent Variables
1	Organizational Commitment	Control Variables (Age and Tenure)
2	Organizational Commitment	Intrinsic Motivation Factors (Interest/Enjoyment) (Perceived Competence) (Perceived Choice) (Pressure/Tension)
3	Organizational Commitment	Job Satisfaction

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

4	Organizational Commitment	Procedural Justice
5	Organizational Commitment	Distributive Justice

The resulting parameter estimates and the incremental variance explained in organizational commitment in each step are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Test Values For Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Organizational Commitment as Dependant Variable

Independent Variables	Step 1 β (T)	Step 2 β (T)	Step 3 β (T)	Step 4 β (T)	Step 5 β (T)
Control Variable	0.262*	0.232*	0.039	0.055	0.085
Age	(2.222)	(2.059)	(0.610)	(0.863)	(1.535)
Control Variable	0.266*	0.177	0.044	0.054	0.005
Tenure	(2.258)	(1.530)	(0.668)	(0.837)	(0.086)
Interest and Enjoyment	-	0.014 (0.158)	0.152* (2.903)	0.103 (1.867)	0.061 (1.251)
Perceived Competence	-	0.144 (1.507)	0.299* (5.393)	0.309* (5.669)	0.347* (7.290)
Perceived Choice	-	0.068 (0.785)	0.071 (1.426)	0.126* (2.302)	0.065 (1.355)
Pressure and Tension	-	-0.366*** (-4.329)	-0.194* (-3.158)	-0.198* (-3.288)	-0.156* (-2.976)
Job Satisfaction	-	-	0.923*** (14.565)	0.798*** (9.620)	0.469*** (5.284)
Procedural Justice	-	-	-	0.158* (2.251)	0.122 (1.502)
Distributive Justice	-	-	-	-	0.477*** (5.846)
Model R ²	0.236	0.398	0.808	0.818	0.866
Δ R ²	-	0.162	0.410	0.010	0.048
Model F	16.117	11.024	59.701	55.016	69.258

*** p<0.001; ** p<0.01; * p<0.05

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

5.3. Results

As shown in Table 6, the first model investigated involves the two control variables only, that is, employee age and organizational tenure, as predictors of organizational commitment. Both variables are found to be insignificantly related to organizational commitment. After the inclusion of four sub dimensions of intrinsic motivation that are interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, perceived choice and pressure/tension at the second stage, however, the amount of explained variance in organizational commitment increases by 16.2 percent to an overall level of 39.8 percent. Therefore, it appeared that intrinsic motivation dimensions explained a significant variance in organizational commitment. After the addition of job satisfaction as a predictor variable in the third stage, job satisfaction is found to be significantly related to the emergence of organizational commitment, and the incremental variance explained is significantly high ($R^2 = 0.808$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.410$). Hence, it appeared that job satisfaction explained a unique variance in organizational commitment.

The inclusion of procedural justice in the fourth stage yields a negligible change in the amount of variance explained in organizational commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 0.010$). However, the inclusion of distributive justice in the fifth stage yields a significant change in the amount of variance explained in organizational commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 0.048$). However, after the addition of distributive justice as a predictor variable in the fifth stage, the standardized regression coefficient linking procedural justice to organizational commitment drops to the point of being insignificant at the traditional .05 level. Thus, while these findings can be attributed to potential effects of a possible multicollinearity (since procedural justice and distributive justice are highly correlated), the fact that the regression coefficient linking procedural justice to organizational commitment is attenuated after the inclusion of job satisfaction suggests that the two variables (procedural justice and distributive justice) explain the same portion of the observed variance in organizational commitment.

Nevertheless, both forms of employees' fairness perceptions in managerial practices appear as strong determinants of organizational commitment in the sampling context. More importantly, a closer look into the results of the final model should reveal that, after the inclusion of distributive justice in the fifth stage, most of the other predictive factors (interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, perceived choice, pressure/tension and procedural justice) drop to the point of being insignificantly related to organizational commitment at the traditional level of 0.01, with job satisfaction and distributive justice remaining as the major predictors of organizational commitment that have statistical significance (the standardized regression coefficient for job satisfaction is 0.469, $p < 0.001$ and the standardized regression coefficient for distributive justice is 0.477, $p < 0.001$). Thus, it appears that job satisfaction and distributive fairness are the most important drivers of organizational commitment in our sampling context, perhaps mediating the effects of employee perceptions of procedural fairness and intrinsic motivation.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this research was to explore the joint and relative effects of intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, procedural justice, and distributive justice upon organizational commitment of blue-collar workers in a highly volatile job environment under the strong feelings of job-insecurity. Examination of the relative effects of these determinants of employees' organizational commitment in such a specific sampling context is very important for contributing to the theoretical articulations of organizational commitment. It is very crucial to explore the relative effects of the various antecedent factors on organizational commitment under relatively less stable macroeconomic conditions, which are characterized by high unemployment rates, substantial workforce layouts, imbalanced and unfair wage policies, since most empirical research in this area has been conducted in highly stable workplace contexts.

Findings of this research reveal that, while perceived competence, pressure/tension, job satisfaction, procedural justice and distributive justice

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

are important determinants of employees' organizational commitment, distributive justice exerts the strongest effect on the organizational commitment of blue-collar workers in our sampling context. As expected, employees in unstable and volatile job environments put great emphasis on the fairness the managerial practices, particularly on the perceived equity of managerial practices in reward distribution. It is found that job satisfaction and procedural justice on organizational commitment are largely attenuated when distributive justice is added to the regression model. Hence, it is possible that job satisfaction and perceived procedural justice may have indirect effects on organizational commitment through distributive fairness perceptions.

In fact, the research about the role of managerial justice on employee attitudinal and behavioral responses suggest that promoting distributive justice influence organizational commitment since an equitable distribution of pay raises strengthens the bonds of loyalty between employees and their organizations by causing employees to have faith in the system, which may realize their aspirations and contributions and motivating and activating behaviors that lead to innovation, cooperation, and contribution. Thus, it is extremely important that the reward system and distribution be perceived as fair by employees, particularly in times of crisis.

The results of this research emphasize the need for developing contingency approaches for explaining the emergence of employee behaviors in organizations like organizational commitment. Empirical research of the predictive behavioral factors that affect such employee behaviors and attitudes in different economic infrastructures and cultures contexts are likely to contribute substantially to the understanding of the organizational commitment. This study offers a unique contribution to the current knowledge in this area by examining the effects of predictive factors upon organizational commitment in a highly unstable macroeconomic environment under the strong feelings of job-insecurity.

These findings have also some practical implications for managers. Organizational commitment and those kinds of extra-role behaviors have

been proven to have important effects on the effectiveness, efficiency and profitability of the companies. Under different cultural context and economic infrastructures, employees might have different levels of organizational commitment that may require different management styles and motivational strategies for optimum organizational effectiveness. In this regard, in order to achieve enhancing employees' commitment to the organization, managers should focus their attention on exercising fair management practices. For instance, the role of fair distribution of pay in increasing commitment should also be on the focus of managers. Especially under such unbearable economic conditions and feelings of job-insecurity, sufficient income becomes more and more crucial in satisfying employees' needs and enhancing their commitment to the organization. Moreover, under such volatile macroeconomic conditions, those behavioral factors are becoming more and more crucial for the future of organizations. Consequently, supervisors should try to find various ways to promote employees' organizational commitment that contributes overall organizational performance.

However, some limitations should also be pointed out. Due to the time and financial constraints, a random sample of employees within ten manufacturing organizations was selected. Therefore, these results may not be considered as representative of general private sector. Nevertheless, despite the small sample size in the current study, findings may prove useful for guiding future research. Also, broad studies across several private organizations are needed. Furthermore, studies about what would increase intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and fairness perceptions of blue-collar employees should be conducted in the future.

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

REFERENCES

- [1] Cohen, A. (1992). "Antecedents of Organizational Commitment Across Occupational Groups: A Meta-Analysis", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 539-558.
- [2] Whitener, E. & Walz, P. (1993). "Exchange Theory Determinants of Affective and Continuance Commitment and Turnover", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 265-281.
- [3] Steinhaus, C.S., & Perry, J.L. (1996). "Organizational commitment: Does Sector Matter?", *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 19(3), 278-288.
- [4] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). "Employee-Organizational Linkages: The Psychology Of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover", In P. Warr (Ed.), *Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, (pp. 219-229), NY: Academic Press, Inc.
- [5] Morrow, P.C. (1983). "Concept Redundancy in Organizational Research: The Case of Work Commitment", *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- [6] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). "Testing The 'Side-Bet Theory' Of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- [7] Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [8] Ceylan, A., Mutlu, M., Ertürk, A. & Palacı, M. (2001). Charismatic leadership and organizational commitment in public service organizations, *Bogazici Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies*, 15(2), 129-139.
- [9] Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. (1990). "A Review and Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organizational Commitment", *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 171-194.
- [10] Ertürk, A. & Ceylan, A. (2002). Relationship between intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment: An empirical study on private sector, *Bogazici Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies*, 16(2), 73-87.
- [11] Carson, K.D., & Carson, P.P. (1998). "Career Commitment, Competencies and Citizenship", *Journal of Career Assessment*, 6(2), 195-208.
- [12] Greenberg, J. (1990). "Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow", *Journal of Management*, 16, pp.399-432.
- [13] Greenberg, J. (1990). "Looking Fair Versus Being Fair: Managing Impressions of Organizational Justice", In B.M.Staw and L.L.Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, pp.111-157, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [14] Konovsky, M.A. (2000). "Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations", *Journal of Management*, 26: 489-511.
- [15] Tyler, T.R., and Bies, R.J. (1990). "Beyond Formal Procedures: The Interpersonal Context of Procedural Justice", In J.S.Carroll (Ed.), *Applied Social Psychology in Business Settings*, pp.77-98, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [16] Thomas, K.W. (2000). "Intrinsic Motivation and How It Works", *Training*, 37, 130-135.

- [17] Pullins, E.B., Haugtredd, C.P., Dickson, P.R., Fine, L.M., & Lewicki, R.J. (2000). "Individual Differences in Intrinsic Motivation and the Use of Cooperative Negotiation Tactics", *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 15, 466-478.
- [18] Thomas, K.W., & Velthouse, B.A. (1990). "Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: On Interpretive Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation", *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681.
- [19] Locke, E. A. (1969). "What Is Job Satisfaction?", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- [20] Spector, P.E. (1997). "Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [21] Oshagbemi, T. (2000). "Is Length Of Service Related To The Level Of Job Satisfaction?", *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27(3), 213-226.
- [22] Bateman, T. & Organ D.W. (1983). "Job Satisfaction and The Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee Citizenship", *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 586-595.
- [23] Young, B.S., & Worchel, S. (1998). "Organizational Commitment Among Public Service Employees", *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3), 339-349.
- [24] Cohen-Charash, Y. and Spector, P. (2001). "The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta Analysis", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2): 278-321.
- [25] Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C., and Ng, K.Y. (2001). "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 425-445.
- [26] Fields, D., Pong, M., and Chiu, C. (2000). "Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Employee Outcomes in Hong Kong", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp.547-562.
- [27] Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). "The Measurement Of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- [28] Brayfield, A.H. & Rothe, H.F. (1951). "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- [29] Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). "Justice as a Mediator of the Relationships Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior ", *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- [30] Ryan, R.M., Mims, V., and Koestner, R. (1983). "Relation of Reward Contingency and Interpersonal Context to Intrinsic Motivation: A review and Test Using Cognitive Evaluation Theory", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 736-750.
- [31] Ryan, R.M., Koestner, R., and Deci, E.L. (1991). "Varied Forms of Persistence: When Free-Choice Behavior Is Not Intrinsically Motivated", *Motivation and Emotion*, 15, 185-205.
- [32] McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V. V. (1987). "Psychometric properties of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis", *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 60, 48-58.

*Relative Influence Of Fairness Perceptions, Job Satisfaction And Intrinsic
Motivation On Organizational Commitment*

- [33] Podsakoff, P.M. & Organ, D.W. (1986). "Self Reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospectus", *Journal of Management*, 12, 531-544.
- [34] Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.