

The Impact of Justice on Teachers' Commitment in Jaffna Education Division

Mr.logendran Mayuran

BBA(hons) HRM special, Advanced Diploma in Management Accounting(CIMA), Department Of Human Resource Management, University Of Jaffna.

Abstract- The study was designed to investigate the impact of the justice on employee commitment in Jaffna education division's schools. The design of the study was descriptive survey design. By application of simple cluster sampling method, the total of 32 schools was drawn from Jaffna education division. Accordingly the population (teachers) was divided into cluster (schools) and some of these clusters were randomly selected. Finally, it was possible to the researcher to collect 143 responses from the population. In an attempt to focus the study, one reach question was posed and nine hypotheses were formulated and tested. The instrument for the study was a five point likert type questionnaire. Answers to these questions were analyzed using mean, coefficients and regression. The results revealed that, if the teachers' perception of organizational justice is positive, this will increase their commitment to their organization. It is believed that studying other variables that affect organizational commitment in teachers may be useful. In particular, determining other variables that influence teachers' affective commitment to the organization, which means identifying themselves with the organization, and undertaking the necessary work in this regard may increase teachers' job performance.

Index Terms- distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment

I. INTRODUCTION

In this study, researcher has to identify the impact of justice on employee commitment. Organizational justice refers to people's perception of fairness in organizations, consisting of perceptions of how decisions are made regarding the distribution of outcome and the perceived fairness of those outcomes themselves (Greenberg and Baron 2003). Organizational justice comprises the sub-dimensions of 'distributive justice', 'procedural justice' and 'interactive justice'.

In the organizational context, procedural justice is considered an important resource in social exchange, where else, distributive justice considered to be more closely related to economic exchange (Loi et.al. 2006). Another form of justice that focus on employees' perceptions of the quality of the interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of organizational procedures labeled as interactional justice (Skarlicki and Folger 1997). An immediate implication of inequity can arise in one of three ways:(1) own inequity (the persons' input-outcome ratio is unbalance); (2) comparison inequity (the persons' input-outcome is balance but it is

unbalance when compared with that of another person in similar circumstances); (3) own-comparison inequity (the persons' input-outcome ratio is unbalance it is also unbalance with respect to the comparison person) (Weick dan Nettet 1968).

According to the results of a study conducted by Folger and Konovsky (1989), individuals with a high-level perception of organizational justice also have a high level of commitment to the organization. Some studies indicate that the level of perceived organizational justice has a positive influence on the motivation, attitude and behavior of the employees towards the organization (Austin and Walster, 1974; Greenberg, 1990). In contrast, a negative perception of organizational justice leads to some negative consequences. According to the results of the study conducted by Meyer et al. (2002), if the perceptions of organizational justice are positive, then that has a higher level of influence on the organizational commitment of employees than their influence individually.

Distributive justice is a perception of justice that encompasses the perceptions of the members of the organization regarding fair distribution of resources among the members of the organization. It is based on 'Equity Theory' developed by Adams (1965) and 'a theory of justice' by Rawls (1999). Both of these theories concern distribution of resources. Distributive justice in organizations is a concept that explains the distribution of all kinds of acquisitions such as duties, goods, services, opportunities, punishments/rewards, roles, status, wages and promotion among individuals, on the basis of their similarities and differences (Walster et al., 1978; Greenberg, 1990; Foley et al., 2002).

Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine the amount of benefits (Folger and Konovsky 1989). Past research demonstrates that procedural justice often is more predictive of a variety of work attitudes, including organizational commitment (Warner et.al. 2005). The fairness of the decision making process itself seems to be more important than the actual amount of compensation that is received by individual (Tepstra and Honoree 2003).

Interactive justice is a concept that concerns perceptions of employees about the treatment they have received during the application of organization. According to Folger and Bies (1989), indicators of the existence of interactive justice are demonstrating due respect to employees, introducing consistent criteria, giving feedback on time and behaving appropriately and sincerely. According to the results of a study conducted by Wasti (2001), the perception of organizational justice increases the positive commitment that employees feel towards the organization

Organizational commitment has been identified as a critical factor in understanding and explaining the work-related behavior of employees in organizations. Mowday et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment as an effective response which moves beyond passive loyalty to an organization.

Grouping the causes of organizational commitment in three dimensions, Meyer and Allen (1997) defined affective, continuance and normative commitment in the following way:

- i. **Affective commitment** is defined as the affective desire on the part of individuals employed in an organization to continue to work in the organization as a result of identifying themselves with the organization.
- ii. **Continuance commitment** can be defined as the state where employees continue to stay in the organization with the thought that if they leave the job, they will suffer financially and their job opportunities will be limited.
- iii. **Normative commitment** can be explained as the situation where employees do not leave the job as a result of a moral obligation of duty.

The most widely discussed form of psychological attachment to an organization is affective commitment. Although Meyer and Allen's (1991) 3-component model includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment, affective commitment is considered to be the more effective measurement of organizational commitment. Affective commitment takes its root from the work of Kanter (1968) who described cohesion commitment as the attachment of an individual's fund of affectivity to the group. Although the core of this component is an affective tendency, it has been described in a broad way (Gonzalez & Guillen, 2008). More recently, Mowday et al. (1982) viewed affective commitment as the relative strength of an employee's identification with and involvement in a particular organization.

The literature indicates that continuance commitment is a well-developed component of organizational commitment with a well-founded and strong chain of causality (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to some scholars, however, whether continuance commitment is really a commitment is questionable (Gonzalez & Guillen, 2008). In addition, McGee and Ford (1987) reported that the two dimensions of continuance commitment, high sacrifice and low alternatives, are significantly and differentially related to affective commitment. More specifically, high sacrifice indicates a positive relationship and low alternatives show a negative relationship to affective commitment.

As a result, a third component of commitment was identified as the obligation dimension and labeled normative commitment, also referred to as moral commitment in the literature (Jaros et al., 1993). Meyer and Allen's (1997) discussion of normative commitment begins with an outline of earlier (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Wiener, 1982) and more recent (Rousseau, 1995) theorizing of relevance to the development of normative commitment.

II. RESEARCH QUESTION

Here the research question is stated as "To what extent the organizational justice components influence the development of organizational commitment of an employee?"

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study attempts to explore the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organization commitment. Theoretically, the current results suggest that an organization justice perception plays a significant role in the development of organizational commitment. Perceived organizational justice was expected to correlate significantly with organization commitment. The people perceive justice in organizations are more likely to feel satisfied with employment and feel less likely to leave and feel more committed to job. Hence the main objective of this research is to find how strongly the organization justice dimensions contribute to the development of organization commitment. The researcher wishes to analyze the following sub objectives also,

IV. HYPOTHESES

After the review of the relevant literature researcher found out the research problem and developed some assumptions to solve the problem. Based on assumed causal relationship given in the conceptual model, the following hypotheses were developed by the researcher to carry out the research.

H1: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment

H2: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment

H3: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment

H4: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment

H5: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment

H6: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment

H7: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment

H8: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment

H9: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment

V. METHODOLOGY

The research was a descriptive survey aimed at investigating the impact of justice on employee commitment. The instrument used for the study was questionnaire developed through extensive literature and based on three research question. There were 947 teachers worked in 32 schools at Jaffna education division. Due to excessive costs and time involved, it was difficult to the researcher to pick a random sample or stratified

sample from the total population. To overcome this problem the researcher used simple cluster sampling method. Accordingly the population (teachers) was divided in to clusters (schools) and some of these clusters were randomly selected. Finally it was possible to the researcher to collect 143 responses from the population.

A questionnaire consists of three parts were used to measure variables. The part one of the questionnaire deals with demographic data, part two deals with organizational justice and the final part deals with employee commitment.

To collect the data related to organizational justice perceptions and organizational commitment, five point likert type scale were used in the questionnaire (where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =

disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree).

Data collected was analyzed using mean values, correlation and regression analysis

VI. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The level of justice perception among employees

Even though the respondents worked at a same organizational climate, the perception of justice differs among them. Hence it is essential to assess the respondents' perceived organizational justice in organizations. The respondents level of justice perceptions are furnished below,

Table 1: The level of organizational justice perception

Organizational Justice	Total	Percentage
Low	9	6.3%
Moderate	45	31.5%
High	89	62.2%
Total	143	100.0%

The level of organizational justice perception varies to employees to employees. Here the most of the respondents showed high level (62.2%) of perceived organizational justice and other rest showed moderate & low level (31.5% & 6.3%) of justice perception.

The level of organizational commitment

The level of commitment respondent shows o an organization differs from individuals to individuals, here the commitment differences of respondent of furnished below,

Table 2: The level of Organizational Commitment

Employee Commitment	Total	Percentage
Moderate	87	60.8%
High	56	39.2%
Total	143	100.0%

According to the above table, only the moderate and high level of commitment was identified but none of respondents found with low level of commitment. In that 39.2% of employees show high level of commitment and other 60.8% of employees show the moderate level of commitment.

The main objective of the research is to identify that to what extent the organizational justice perceptions contribute to the development of organization commitment. To assess the achievement of this objective, several hypothesis were formulated and tested here by using statistical analysis techniques such as regression analysis, correlation and mean.

The distributive justice and affective commitment

To test how the distributive justice perception contributes to the development of affective commitment the following hypothesis was developed.

H1: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 3 The regressions result for distributive justice and affective commitment

Model Summary ^b									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.459 ^a	.210	.205	.64447	.210	37.565	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Distributive Justice

b. Dependent Variable: Avg Affective Commitment

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.124	.262		8.110	.000
	Avg Distributive Justice	.430	.070	.459	6.129	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Affective Commitment

In the above model summary, r^2 is 0.210. It indicates that 21% of affective commitment is caused by the distributive justice perception. The remaining 79% of development affective commitment is determined by other factors.

According to the above coefficients table the constant value is 2.124 and beta value is .459 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that distributive justice has positive significant impact of affective commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when distributive justice perception increases the affective commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The distributive justice and normative commitment

To test how the distributive justice perception contributes to the development of normative commitment the following hypothesis was developed,

H2: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below,

Table 4 The regression results for distributive justice and normative commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.352 ^a	.124	.118	.56232	.124	19.928	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Distributive Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.533	.229		11.086	.000
	Avg Distributive Justice	.273	.061	.352	4.464	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Normative Commitment

As shown in the above model summary, r^2 is 0.124. It describes that 12.4% of normative commitment is caused by the distributive justice perception. The remaining 87.6% of development normative commitment is determined by other factors.

Based on the above coefficients table the constant value is 2.533 and beta value is .352 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that distributive justice has positive significant impact of normative commitment. Thus it can be

concluded that when distributive justice perception increases the normative commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The distributive justice and continuance commitment

To test how the distributive justice perception contributes to the development of continuance commitment the following hypothesis was developed.

H3: The distributive justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 5 The regression results for distributive justice and continuance commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.261 ^a	.068	.061	.56355	.068	10.282	1	141	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Distributive Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.518	.229		10.997	.000
	Avg Distributive Justice	.197	.061	.261	3.206	.002

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Continuance Commitment

In the above model summary, r^2 is 0.068. It illustrates that 6.8% of continuance commitment is caused by the distributive justice perception. The remaining 93.2% of development continuance commitment is determined by other factors.

The above coefficients table indicates that the constant value is 2.518 and beta value is .261 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that distributive justice has positive significant impact of continuance commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when procedural justice perception increases the continuance commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The procedural justice and affective commitment

To test how the procedural justice perception contributes to the development of affective commitment the following hypothesis was developed.

H4: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 6 The regression results for procedural justice and affective commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.444 ^a	.197	.191	.65002	.197	34.532	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Procedural Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.181	.263		8.282	.000
	Avg Procedural Justice	.419	.071	.444	5.876	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Affective Commitment

Based on the above model summary, r^2 is 0.197. It describes that 19.7% of affective commitment is caused by the procedural justice perception. The remaining 80.3% of development affective commitment is determined by other factors.

According to the above coefficients table the constant value is 2.181 and beta value is .444 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that procedural justice has positive significant impact of affective commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when procedural justice perception increases the

affective commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The procedural justice and normative commitment,

To test how the procedural justice perception contributes to the development of normative commitment the following hypothesis was developed,

H5: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment
 The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 7 The regression results for procedural justice and normative commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.477 ^a	.227	.222	.52801	.227	41.519	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Procedural Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.183	.214		10.206	.000
	Avg Procedural Justice	.373	.058	.477	6.444	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Normative Commitment

Here in the model summary, the r^2 indicates that 22.7% of normative commitment is accountable for their procedural justice perceptions and the other 77.3% of development of normative commitment is determined by other factors.

Based on the above coefficients table the constant value is 2.183 and beta value is .477 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that procedural justice has positive significant impact of normative commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when procedural justice perception increases the normative commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The procedural justice and continuance commitment

To test how the procedural justice perception contributes to the development of continuance commitment the following hypothesis was developed.

H6: The procedural justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment.
 The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below

Table 8 The regression results for procedural justice and continuance commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.344 ^a	.119	.112	.54802	.119	18.977	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Procedural Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.291	.222		10.318	.000
	Avg Procedural Justice	.262	.060	.344	4.356	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Continuance Commitment

It is clear from the model summary, that r^2 is 0.119. It denotes that 11.9% of continuance commitment is influenced by the procedural justice perception. The remaining 88.1% of

development continuance commitment is determined by other factors.

The above coefficients table indicates that the constant value is 2.291 and beta value is .344 which is significant at 0.05

significance level. It implies that procedural justice has positive significant impact of continuance commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when procedural justice perception increases the continuance commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The interactional justice and affective commitment,

To find how the interactional justice perception contributes to the development of affective commitment the following hypothesis was developed,

H7: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of affective commitment.

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 9 The regression results for interactional justice and affective commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.484 ^a	.235	.229	.63452	.235	43.209	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Interactional Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.993	.264		7.539	.000
	Avg Interactional Justice	.436	.066	.484	6.573	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Affective Commitment

Here in the model summary, r^2 indicates that 23.5% of affective commitment is accountable for their interactional justice perceptions and the other 76.5% of development of affective commitment is determined by other factors.

The above coefficients table describes that the constant value is 1.993 and beta value is .484 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that interactional justice has positive significant impact of affective commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when interactional justice perception increases the affective commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The interactional justice and normative commitment

To conclude how the interactional justice perception contributes to the development of normative commitment the following hypothesis was developed,

H8: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of normative commitment.

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below.

Table 10 The regression results for interactional justice and normative commitment

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.471 ^a	.222	.217	.52985	.222	40.256	1	141	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Interactional Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.160	.221		9.785	.000
	Avg Interactional Justice	.351	.055	.471	6.345	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Normative Commitment

It is clear from the above model summary that, $r^2 = 22.2\%$. It denotes that 22.2% of normative commitment is influenced by the interactional justice perception. The remaining 77.8% of development normative commitment is determined by other factors.

According to the above coefficients table the constant value is 2.160 and beta value is .471 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that interactional justice has positive significant impact of normative commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when interactional justice perception increases the normative commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

The interactional justice and continuance commitment

To measure how the interactional justice perception contributes to the development of continuance commitment the following hypothesis was developed,

H9: The interactional justice perception influences on the development of continuance commitment,

The above hypothesis was tested using regression analysis technique. The results are furnished below,

Table 11 The regression results for interactional justice and continuance commitment

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.276 ^a	.076	.070	.56108	.076	11.618	1	141	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Avg Interactional Justice

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.456	.234		10.510	.000
	Avg Interactional Justice	.200	.059	.276	3.408	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Avg Continuance Commitment

It is precise that, r^2 is 0.076. It describes that 7.6% of continuance commitment is influenced by the interactional justice perception. The remaining 92.4% of development continuance commitment is caused by other factors.

The above coefficients table illustrates that the constant value is 2.456 and beta value is .276 which is significant at 0.05 significance level. It implies that interactional justice has positive significant impact of continuance commitment. Thus it can be concluded that when interactional justice perception increases the continuance commitment of employees also will increase in these organizations. So the above hypothesis is accepted.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is revealed that procedural justice is more important in developing the continuance commitment and normative commitment while the interactional justices strongly influence the affective commitment. In this study, the distributive justice has no significant effect to any dimension of organizational commitment. This probably due to the samples concern more towards the procedural justice compared to distributive justice.

It was observed that most of the respondents had moderate level of commitment in the organization.

It was revealed that most of the respondents perceived high level of organizational justice and all others perceived moderate level of organizational justice.

VIII. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is believed that taking measures that will increase teachers' organizational commitment, especially reinforcing organizational justice in schools, will be useful. If teachers' perception of organizational justice is positive, this will increase their commitment to their organization. Therefore, it may be useful to revise practices of distributive, interactive and procedural justice in schools.

It is believed that studying other variables that affect organizational commitment in teachers may be useful. In particular, determining other variables that influence teachers' affective commitment to the organization, which means identifying themselves with the organization, and undertaking the necessary work in this regard may increase teachers' job performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, JS. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol. 2: 267-299.

- [2] Ambrose, M.L., Seabright, M.A. dan Schminke, M. (2002). *Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process. **89**:947-965.
- [3] Cohen-Charash Y, Spector PE (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process **86**(2): 278-321.
- [4] Colquitt JA (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. J. Appl. Psychol. **86**: 386-400.
- [5] Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E. and Gilliland, S.W. (2007). *The management of Organizational Justice*. Academy of Management Perspectives. November:34-48.
- [6] Goodman P. dan Friedman, A. (1968). *An examination of the effect of wage inequity in the hourly condition*. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. **3**:340-352.
- [7] Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. J. Manage. **16**(2): 399-432.
- [8] Jamaludin, Z., (2008). Perceived organizational justice and its impact to the development of commitment: A regression analysis, International Islamic University College
- [9] Konovsky MA (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. J. Manage. **26**: 489-511.
- [10] Meyer JP, Allen NJ (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication
- [11] Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. dan Steers, R.M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. San Diego, CA:
- [12] Academic Press.
- [13] Price, L.L. and Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman
- [14] Robbins, S.P. (1992). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. Ed. ke-3. London: rentice Hall.
- [15] Terpstra, D. E. dan Honoree, A. L. (2003). The relative importance of external, internal, individual and procedural equity to Pay Satisfaction, Compensation and Benefits Review **35**(6): 67-74.
- [16] Thompson M, Heron P (2005). The difference a manager can make: organizational justice and knowledge worker commitment Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manage. **16**(3): 1029-1048.
- [17] Yuvuz, M., (2010) African Journal of business management vol. **4**(5). PP. 695-701

AUTHORS

First Author – Mr.logendran Mayuran , BBA(hons) HRM special, Advanced Diploma in Management Accounting(CIMA), Department Of Human Resource Management, University Of Jaffna, Email: logenmayuran@gmail.com