International Open Acces Journal
Wesley & Eber Publishing

The Relationship between Concepts of Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: Moderating Effect of Procedural Justice

Özgür Önday [1], Dilsah Ertop [2] & Elif Yilmaz [3]

[1],[2],[3] PhD Student, Department of Business Administration, Yeditepe University.

Abstract

This paper has been prepared as part of course and the objective is to present information about the relationship of all three concepts namely organizational climate, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and moderating effect of procedural justice will be analyzed in an effort to identify and discuss their linkages to modern management implications; presents an empirical study that covers white color participants.

Keywords: Organizational climate, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment and Procedural justice.

1.0 Introduction

It is believed that the external environment has an influence on individual behaviors and attitudes that such attempts have been made by many researchers to identify these relationships. (e.g.; Daly, 2002; Schnake, 1983) It is also known that organizational climate has always been discussed as perceptions of individuals that are assumed to affect individual behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The study of procedural justice was witnessed to be trend that defined as the fairness of decision-making procedures (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Much of this work has focused on perceptions of procedural justice; usually succeed by providing employees input into decisions or by apprehending to several rules of fair treatment such as consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, and correctability (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Indeed, most of the researchers agree that employees tend to do distinct judgments about both the processes that cause to the allocation of outcome (i.e., procedural justice [PJ]) and the interpersonal treatment given to employees as these procedures are carried out (Colquitt, 2001; Greenberg, 1993).

Other researchers have tried to focus on relationships between procedural justice and important organizational outcomes. For example, procedural justice has been linked meta-analytically to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, and job performance (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).

In addition, job satisfaction was positively correlated with organizational justice such that it is believed that greater perceived injustice results in lower levels of job satisfaction and greater perceptions of justice result in higher levels of job satisfaction (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Moreover, organizational commitment was related to perceptions of procedural justice such that greater perceived injustice results in decreased commitment while greater perceived justice results in increases commitment to the organization (DeConick, 2010; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Despite these robust findings, there are many unanswered questions regarding the antecedents and consequences of organizational climate and justice perceptions, and these very questions have cause some new and exciting research areas within this field. This study examines the relationship of all three concepts; organizational climate, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and moderating effect of procedural justice.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Climate

Broadly speaking, organizational climate was found to be associated to the work atmosphere that covers ways and methods undertaken by members of organizations for appropriate functioning of organization. It has been mostly defined as the shared perceptions of the policies, practices, and procedures that an organization rewards, supports, and expects that is developed through group interaction (James, Joyce, & Slocum, 1988; Schneider & Reichers, 1983). If the concept of climate were analyzed at an individual level, it would be named "psychological climate". "When aggregated the concept is called organizational climate" (Isaksen, Lauer, Ekvall & Britz, 2000 01, p.172).

Since climate perceptions form the foundation for individual and collective responses, it represents meaning derived from the organizational context,. One of early literatures on organizational climate defined this term as a form of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the workforce (Litwin & Stringer, 1968). Lin (1999) also defines "the concept of organizational climate as the shared perceptions about organizational conditions". Lin (1999) bases his definitions on Litwin and Stringer's (1968) organizational climate questionnaire. This

Corresponding Author: Özgür Önday
PhD Student, Department of Business Administration, Yeditepe University
E-mail: ozgur.onday@msn.com

well-known questionnaire covers nine dimensions of the concept of organizational climate: structure, responsibility, reward, risk taking, support, warmth, standards, conflict and identity. Schneider, Brief and Guzzo (1996) define four dimensions of organizational climate as nature of interpersonal relationships, nature of hierarchy, nature of work and focus on support and rewards. Though there is an ongoing debate among scholars to the relevance of the dimensions regarding the concept of organizational climate, these dimensions are considered as the overall perception of organizational operations and practices shared by members of the organization. According to Taguiri and Litwin (1968) climate is the relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization (p.25).

Differently, Moran and Volkwein (1992) discussed the OCT by making four different approaches which were named as cultural, perceptual, structural and interactive are, in fact, complementary depending upon the viewpoint of researchers. In turn, Schein's definition of the climate concept is "the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers or with other outsiders" (1992, p.9).

Since then, different definitions and conceptualizations of organizational climate has been presented by different researchers. One of the most important definition offered by Churchill, Ford and Walker (1976) is that organizational climate represents the workers' perceptions of his or her objective work situation, including the characteristics of the organization he or she works for and the nature of his or her relationship with other people while doing his or her job. Similarly, Schneider (2000) described it as an experientially based description of the work environment and more specifically, employees' perceptions of the formal and informal policies, practices and procedures in the organization.

Climate is reality-based and thus is capable of being shared in the sense that observers or participants may agree upon the climate of an organization or group, although this consensus may be constrained by individual differences in perceptions. This "commonality of perceptions" is considered by some to differentiate climate from other organizational variables such as satisfaction. In short, organizational climate exists from the idiosyncratic interpretations of the work environment when individuals within a particular unit (group and/or organization) share similar perceptions of the situation (Schulte, Ostroff & Kinicki, 2006). Only when individuals agreed on their perceptions of the work environment can these individuals agree on their perceptions be meaningfully aggregated to represent unit or organizational level climate (James, 1982; Klein et al., 2000).

2.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the process or procedures used to determine organizational outcomes (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Lind & Tyler, 1988). The study of justice made a similar shift, when research in

Social Psychology shifted emphasis from purely the results of reward allocations and distributive justice, to emphasizing the process of making the allocations, i.e., procedural justice (Leventhal , 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

Studies have demonstrated that justice has a positive effect on employees' trust and social harmony with decision makers (e.g., Korsgaard, Schweiger & Sapienza,1995; Naumann & Bennett, 2000), commitment to decisions or policy execution (e.g., Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; McFarlin &Sweeney, 1992), citizenship behaviors (e.g., Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993), and contribution to organizational change and strategic planning (e.g., Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). If justice perceptions are not common to all parties, conflicts and related opportunistic behaviors may arise, since one party is likely to feel unfairly treated with respect to exchange procedures (Klein, Conn, Smith, & Sorra, 2001).

Organizational justice was no longer determined only by fair outcomes. But fair processes followed to decide the outcomes were also important, in some cases; it could be even more important adverb of perceived organizational justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Research on the formation of procedural justice judgments has drawn attention to the function of social ties in providing employees with access to justice-related information from others that they can interpret, discuss, and use as a referent standard in judging the fairness of their own organizational experiences (Lamertz, 2002; Umphress et al., 2003).

Procedural justice means that the procedures and criteria used in making and executing decisions are unbiased, representative, transparent, correctable, and ethical (Leventhal, 1980). Procedural justice concerns how decisions are made (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Procedural justice creates standards and norms of expected behavior that not only obviate the need for, but are superior to, pure authority relations in discouraging malfeasance in operations and management (Tyler, 1989). Such standards and their generalized morality can strengthen process control in production, operations, marketing, and organization (Wathne & Heide, 2000).

Two theories best explain the significance of procedural justice: First, Control Theory by Thibaut and Walker (1975) who also introduced the concept of procedural justice. According to the theory, individuals in organizations want to control what happens to them. Fair procedures are valuable because they allow individuals' control over outcomes. Second, the group-value model by Lind and Tyler (1988) proposes that individuals want to be valuable members of their groups and fair procedures are desirable because they mean that individuals are valued. The group value model asserts that employees are not only concerned about procedural fairness because of organizational outcomes which they want to maximize, but also because the procedures used to make decisions communicate how much an organization value the members (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992).

Employees utilize perception of procedural fairness to determine their worth within an organization (DeCremer, van Knippenberg, Mullenders & Stinglhamber, 2005; Lind

&Tyler, 1988). Although they introduced the concept of procedural justice, the work of Thibaut and Walker (1975) mostly focused on the individuals' reactions to procedures followed during the legal trials. This focus on legal procedures continued to be the interest of many researchers (Tyler, 1990). However, credit goes to Leventhal and colleagues for extension of procedural justice concept to other contexts (non-legal), like organizational settings (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal et al., 1980). Leventhal (1980) suggested that in order to ensure fairness in decision making, organizations should take into consideration the basic values and norms of relevant groups of people to better understand what is really need to be underlined and relevant to them in their working environment. Since different groups within various organizations have varied outlooks and values, this may be a difficult task for some managers (Blake & Mouton, 1984; Leventhal, 1980).

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs (Spector, 1997). It is an emotional response toward various facets of one's job. In Spector's words (1996, p.214) job satisfaction is "an attitudinal variable that reflects how people feel about their jobs as well as various aspects of them." It is defined as the extent to which an employee expresses a positive affective orientation toward a job (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Job satisfaction can also be defined as pleasantness or unpleasantness of employees while working (Davis, 1981).

In addition, job satisfaction has been treated as both a global concept referring to overall satisfaction and as a facet-specific concept referring to various aspects of work, such as pay, supervision, or workload (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). The literature evidences that the term job satisfaction is interrelated with the term attitude due to the difficulty of giving a proper definition widely accepted in the literature (Robinson & Head, 1983; Yukl & Wexley, 1971).

According to this approach, job satisfaction appears if expectations are met or fulfilled; otherwise dissatisfaction would be the outcome of any working experience. In addition, there are researchers who view that job satisfaction is a result of both employees' expectations and aspirations and their existing status or as multi-dimensional attitudes towards their jobs and working places (Hamermesh, 2001; Clark & Oswald, 1996).

From this argument, it seems reasonable that the level of job satisfaction changes due to the reasons namely working conditions, demographic characteristics, and expectations in the future career or the type of work being carried out. In a number of research studies completed in the 1970s, the most significant factors influencing the level of job satisfaction included gender, age, experience, well-paid salary, promotion opportunities, and context of jobs, control and education (Sousa & Poza, 2000; Clark, 1997; Clark & Oswald, 1996; Clark, Oswald & War, 1996).

As a result of various studies carried out subsequently, some new dimensions were outlined. These are security, skills and qualifications, knowledge, management policy, atmosphere, reliability of labor unions, culture, expectations, and motivations (Ferrie et al., 2005; Furnham, 2002; Heywood,

Siebert & Wei, 2002). It appears that the findings of such studies also support those of earlier studies. Based upon these factors, one could suggest that some job satisfaction-related variables appear to be objective values as some others are subjective or psychosocial values (Marsden & Cook, 1993).

In a very recent study, Lopopolo (2002) indicates that there are five dimensions (groups of variables) that account for explaining the variance in the job satisfaction construct. The first four dimensions (nature of interpersonal relationships, nature of hierarchy, nature of work and focus on support and rewards) are in exact conformance with the dimensions of organizational climate concept as developed by Schneider, Brief and Guzzo (1996), but the fifth one includes internal motivation and moral values as well. Research on job satisfaction has continued recently as an outstanding subject of investigation.

The scholars and researchers (see, Kim, 2002; Nagy, 2002) have been working on the development of new measurement devices for measuring the concept of job satisfaction by using a single, or a few items in the questionnaire.

2.4 Organizational Commitment

Organization commitment can be defined as affiliation of employees to the organization and involvement in it. It is also defined as the extent to which an employee identifies with and is involved in an organization. In general there are three dimensions of commitment which are continuance commitment, affective commitment and normative commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Karrasch, 2003; Turner and Chelladurai, 2005; Greenberg, 2005; Boehman, 2006; Canipe, 2006). All these types are independent in nature and are shown by individuals at different levels in organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). These three components can be explained as; (1) a strong belief in an organization's values and goals, (2) a willingness to expend considerable effort for it, and (3) a strong intent or desire to remain employed by the organization.

Porter et al., (1974) defined the organizational commitment as believing and accepting the goals and values of organization and possessing and showing desire to be part of the organization. Committed employees show strong intentions to serve their organizations and are low at intentions to leave (Hunt and Morgan, 1994; Robbins and Coulter, 2003; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Definitions of the concept organizational commitment include the description by O'Reilly (1989, p 17), an individual's psychological bond to the organization, including a sense of job involvement, loyalty and belief in the values of the organization. Organizational commitment from this point of view is characterized by employee's acceptance of organizational goals and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization (Miller & Lee, 2001).

Cohen (2003, p xi) states that commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets. This general description of commitment relates to the definition of organizational commitment by Arnold (2005, p 625) namely that it is the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an

organization. Miller (2003, p 73) also states that organizational commitment is a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization. Organizational commitment is therefore, the degree in which an employee is willing to maintain membership due to interest and association with the organization's goals and values. While the three dimensions of organizational commitment are important, this research focuses on affective organizational commitment since it appears to directly influence effort as well as indirectly influence the other forms of commitment.

3.0 Relationships between Key Concepts

Most of research has shown that there are direct relationships between procedural justice climate strength and various unit-level outcomes, including satisfaction with supervisor, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior (Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008).

Some organizations are perceived as being concerned with the welfare of their employees. This environment could be thought of as one characterized by organizational support (George, Reed, Ballard, Colin and Fielding, 1993; Shore and Shore, 1995; Fasolo, 1995). Supportive organizations are seen as taking pride in their employees, compensating them fairly, and looking after their needs.

Factors such as hierarchical decision making, autocratic working environment, and the lack of employee empowerment would produce negative employee commitment in the workplace (Brewer, 1994; Brewer and Lok, 1995; Mueller and Mcclosky, 1992). Field studies by Cropanzano et al. (1997) and Wayne et al. (1997) both found that perceived support is negatively correlated with turnover intentions. Similarly, Eisenberger et al. (1990) determined that absenteeism is lower when a company is perceived as supportive. Positive associations also exist with regard to support organizational commitment (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa, 1986; Nye and Witt, 1993; Settoon et al., 1996; Shore and Tetrick, 1991;Wayne et al., 1997).

Further, procedural justice is assumed to be associated with behavioral reactions towards the organization such as organizational commitment because organizational procedures represent the way the organization allocates resources (Martin & Bennett, 1996; Mossholder, Bennett, Kemery & Wesolowski, 1998).

The organizational justice literature (e.g. Alexander and Ruderman, 1987;Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; McCauley and Kuhnert, 1992) and the trust literature (e.g. Cropanzano and Folger, 1989; Geyskens and Steenkamp, 1995) suggest that trust in organization mediates the relationship between procedural justice and affective commitment. Alexander and Ruderman (1987) found that trust in management was affected substantially by procedural justice. They also noted that organizational trust was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. It is also believed that increased procedural justice causes improvement in the issues of organizational commitment and subordinate evaluation of supervisors. (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Konovsky (1989)

reported that procedural justice affected an employee's organizational commitment. Procedural justice has been shown to affect the evaluation of the organization and its authorities (Cropanzano and Folger, 1991;Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993), and thus it may exert some effects on trust in and commitment to the organization. It is reasonable to expect that employees will have a high level of trust in organization, if they are guaranteed fair procedural treatment..

Further, lack of procedural justice may cause in decrease in organizational citizenship behavior and an increase in turnover (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Social exchange in an employment relationship may be initiated by an organization's fair treatment of its employees. This favor engenders an obligation on the part of employees to reciprocate the good deeds of the organization. Whitener (1997: 393) argued that employees can develop trust in at least two different types of referents-specific individuals (e.g. supervisor) and generalized representatives. Thus, the focus on trust in supervisor provides only a limited understanding of how an organization's fair treatment of its employees is related to their work outcomes.

Trust in organization is posited to mediate the relationship between the organizational justice components and the organization-related outcomes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and OCBO. There is empirical evidence linking trust in organization to organizational commitment, intention to remain, and the civic virtue dimension of citizenship behavior (Liou, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Trust mediates the relationship between organizational justice and the employee work-related attitudes and behaviors. Geyskens and Steenkamp (1995) found a positive association between trust and affective commitment in a marketing channel setting.

Main effect approach that characterized the first wave of organizational justice research (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992) has since been complemented by research that seeks to explain the mechanisms that underpin the reported relationship between organizational justice and employee work outcomes (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998). The link between organizational justice and organizational commitment has been widely discussed in the literature. This link has recently become the subject of renewed interest thanks to studies examining the differentiation of sources of justice and of targets of commitment (Lavelle et al., 2007), the justice climate (Li & Cropanzano, 2009), and both concepts at the same time (Liao & Rupp, 2005). In particular, the notion of a justice climate has opened the way to promising multi-level studies on justice and commitment. Thus, we hypothesize that the justice climate moderates the relationship between individual justice perception and organizational commitment. For individuals who have a weak sense of justice, a weak justice climate reinforces the effects of their justice perceptions. For those who have a strong sense of justice, an elevated justice climate enhances the effects of their justice perceptions on their commitment to an organization.

One possible antecedent of commitment is organizational culture. Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982) have suggested that organizational culture could exert considerable influence on the functioning of organizations, particularly in areas such as performance and commitment.

It is also found that a positive relationship existed between commitment and certain values and beliefs of employees in the organization. According to Price and Mueller (1981); other antecedents (for example, professionalism and kinship responsibility) had a direct effect on commitment. Other variables linked to commitment include leadership style, job satisfaction and a number of employee characteristics.

Moreover, Pritchard and Karasick have seen relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. They found that organizational climate was more highly related to individual job satisfaction than it was to individual performance. Schneider and Snyder offered the following position: "Organizational climate is conceptualized as a characteristic of organizations which is reflected in the descriptions employees make of the policies, practices, and conditions which exist in the work environment". And job satisfaction is conceptualized as an affective response of individuals which is reflected in the evaluations employees make of all the individually salient aspects of their job and the organization for which they work (58, p. 326).

Employees who perceived that they were treated fairly by their company tended to develop and maintain communal relationships with the company (Kim 2009). Also, when employees felt that they were treated fairly by their company, they were likely to hold more commitment, trust, satisfaction, and control mutuality than when they perceived that they were treated vice-versa. The research on organization justice perceptions which focuses on the role of fairness in the work place have shown that organizational justice perceptions strongly effect the attitude of the workers such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organization commitment and also workplace behavior such as absenteeism and organizational citizenship behavior (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).

In addition, research has also demonstrated the linkages between perceived organizational justice and individual work performance (Colquitt et al., 2001, Earley & Lind, 1987). Many studies also ask about employees' satisfaction with their jobs in general. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) showed that distributive justice was a more affective predictor of job satisfaction than was procedural justice. Distributive justice, however, is a better predictor of personal outcomes such as pay satisfaction. However, this does not seem to fit the two-factor theory argument that procedural justice predicts system-referenced outcomes, whereas distributive justice predicts person-referenced outcomes. Further, Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor (2000) showed procedural justice to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than interactional justice, although both had significant independent effects.

A variable closely associated with commitment in the research literature is job satisfaction. Number of work related constructs have been linked to satisfaction. Some of these behaviors include work content, control of work and actual performed tasks, direct supervision, promotion opportunities, finnancial rewards, co-workers and working conditions. Some of the job satisfaction facets are customer, promotion, pay, company policy, supervisor, co-worker and the work itself. While all of these facets are important since them infuence the way a person feels about her/his job, each of the facets may affect the job satisfaction outcomes differently. Different facets of job satisfaction affect organizational commitment differently.

Consequently, there are numerous investigations that have studied the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Currivan, 1999). The nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is an issue that has not been resolved yet. The dominant view in the literature is that job satisfaction is an antecedent to organizational commitment (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Mueller, Boyer, Price, & Iverson, 1994; Williams & Hazer, 1986). There is also some support for the reverse causal ordering, organizational commitment as an antecedent to job satisfaction (Vandenberg & Lance, 1992).

Most of the research has treated job satisfaction as an independent and organizational commitment as a dependent variable (Gaertner, 1999; Jernigan et al., 2002; Lok and Crawford, 2001; Mowday et al., 1982). As Mowday et al. (1982) suggest commitment and job satisfaction may be seen in several ways. Job satisfaction is a kind of response to a specific job or job-related issues; whereas, commitment is a more global response to an organization. Therefore, commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time and takes longer after one is satisfied with his/her job (Feinstein and Vondrasek, 2001, p. 6).

Feinstein and Vondrasek (2001) analyzed the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment among the restaurant employees and the findings proved that satisfaction level would predict their commitment to the organization. Gaertner (1999, p. 491) also analyzed the determinants (pay workload, distributive justice, promotional chances, supervisory support, etc.) of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The positive relationship between job satisfaction with organizational commitment is widely recognized in sales and marketing literature.

Though there has been some disagreement over the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Sager and Johnston, 1989), most research support the aforementioned direction of the relationship - job satisfaction as an antecedent to organizational commitment (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Curry et al., 1986; Vandenberg and Lance, 1992). Demographic variables such as age (Yiing), organizational tenure (Loc and Crawford 1999) and position tenure (Gregersen and Black, 1992; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990) have been found to be positively associated with organizational commitment. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) concluded that age is considerably more strongly related to attitudinal than to behavioral commitment.

They further suggested that older workers are more satisfied with their job, receiving better positions and having ``cognitively justified'' their remaining in the organization. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) also found that the number of

years in a position is significantly positively related to attitudinal commitment, and length of service is significantly positively related to behavioral commitment. Another demographic variable that has attracted a great deal of attention is level of education. Educational level has been reported as negatively correlated with organizational commitment (DeCotiis and Summers, 1987;Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mottaz, 1988; Mowday et al., 1982). It has been argued that this inverse relationship is attributable to the fact that more highly educated individuals have higher expectations. They are therefore more likely to feel that they are not rewarded enough by their employers, and so the level of organizational commitment is diminished (De Cotiis and Summers, 1987).

Affective commitment has been positively correlated with job challenge, degree of autonomy, and variety of skills used by the employees in different samples of employees (Colarelli et al., 1987; Dunham et al., 1994). Studies indicate that men and women have different levels of organizational commitment for varied reasons. A possible explanation for this involves the varied sociological roles and societal expectations differentially affecting job and family roles for men and women in the workforce (Boles et al., 2003; Babin and Boles, 1998).

Socialization theory and social role theory suggests that gender differences exist in job attitudes and behaviors. Women tend to report higher attachment to their peers and generally women reported higher levels of organizational commitment than men. Satisfaction with the actual job and the pay associated with the job will be expected to have a greater effect on organizational commitment of men than women since the job may be more central to the male salesperson's view of his societal role as bread winner. Gender researchers suggested that women's emotions can be tied more closely to their approach-avoidance behavior and men are less expressive and react less emotionally to different situations than do women (Boles et. al., 2007).

A variety of variables (namely, age, pre-employment expectations, perceived job characteristics, and the consideration dimension of leadership style) all influence commitment indirectly via their effects on job satisfaction. (William and Hazer ;1986). Previous studies suggested that age (Lok and Crawford, 1999) has a significant and positive impact on organizational commitment. Weisman et al. (1981) found that age was a strong predictor of job satisfaction. Older and longer tenured employees would tend to ``cognitively justify'' their remaining in the organization by reporting higher levels of satisfaction and commitment

The effects of various antecedents on commitment are mediated through job satisfaction. (Iverson and Roy, 1994; Michaels, 1994; Price and Mueller, 1981; Taunton et al.,1989; Williams and Haze, 1986). Research on the determinants of commitment has consistently found a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and commitment. Satisfaction with the job is directly related to organizational commitment (Brown and Peterson, 1993). Second, job satisfaction is either directly (Netemeyer et al., 1990) or indirectly (Brown and Peterson,1994) related to a person's turnover intentions. Most researches support the

direction of the relationship - job satisfaction as an antecedent to organizational commitment (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Curry et al., 1986; Vandenberg and Lance, 1992).

A positive relationship is expected with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Trust and procedural justice positively affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction is an antecedent of organizational commitment. Turnover intentions are perhaps the best indicator of future turnover (Futrell and Parasuraman, 1984). Thus job satisfaction can in?uence a variety of important attitudes, intentions and behaviors. In most of the factors, the relation between variables and organizational commitment are same as the relations with job satisfaction. For example, age affect positively organizational commitment and also job satisfaction.

Demographic factors such as age, job tenure, position tenure, gender, educational level, organizational climate, organizational support, leadership style, affect organizational commitment through job satisfaction. We expect a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Through the evaluation of costs and benefits, individual needs and desires are satisfied and results in a positive affective state towards the organization, work and work environment. Organizational commitment results from this association.

4.0 Methodology

Research Hypotheses

There are numerous studies investigating the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, with many researchers finding evidence to support the relationship between the two constructs (Field & Abelson, 1982; Friedlander & Margulies, 1969; LaFollette & Sims, 1975; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). In summary, organisational climate and job satisfaction are distinct but related constructs (Al-Shammari, 1992; Keuter, Byrne, Voell & Larson, 2000). Organizational climate is focused on organizational/institutional attributes as perceived by organizational members, while job satisfaction addresses perceptions and attitudes that people have towards and exhibit about their work. (Hypothesis 1)

Gilmer (1966) defined climate as the attributes that set one organization apart from another and positively influence the behavior of the workers within that organization. Mowday, et al., (1979) made the connection between organizational commitment and overall effectiveness. Hoy and Tarter (1997) claimed that openness and health are strong predictors for organizational commitment. Since the OCI measures openness and health, a relationship should exist. (Hypothesis 2)

Strong positive relationships have been observed between organizational commitment and desirable work outcomes such as performance, adaptability and job satisfaction (Angle & Perry 1981; Hunt, Chonko & Wood 1985; Mowday, Porter & Dubin 1974). Research results indicate that satisfied employees tend to be committed to an organization, and

employees who are satisfied and committed are more likely to attend work, stay with an organization, arrive at work on time, perform well and engage in behaviors helpful to the organization (Aamodt 2007). (Hypothesis 4)

In terms of the relevant theoretical background, regarding the association between the concepts of organizational climate, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and moderating effect of procedural justice below stated hypotheses are formulated:

H1: There is a positive relationship between the organizational climate elements and job satisfaction under the moderating effect of procedural justice.

H2: There is a positive relationship between the organizational climate elements and organizational commitment under the moderating effect of procedural justice.

H3: The level of job satisfaction differs for each group of professionals.

H4: Job satisfaction relates significantly and positively to organizational commitment.

The Research Objective

The objective is to present information about the relationship of all three concepts namely organizational climate, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and moderating effect of procedural justice in an effort to identify and discuss their linkages to modern management implications; presents an empirical study that covers 52 white color participants working at a financial institution (bank). Sample and Procedure There were a total of 52 white color professionals at the time of data collection period in November 2013. The answers were provided out of 52 participants, reaching a response rate of 100 percent. The participants were not compensated in any way for their participation in the study. The total number of the respondents, in the author's view, covers a large enough sample to employ necessary statistical analyses in accordance with the study objective.

The Measurement Instruments

The organizational climate measurement: This questionnaire is 6-point Likert scale ranging from "totally agree" (6) to "totally disagree" (1). It comprised 13 items that relate to six dimensions of the concept of organizational climate. The reliability analyses of these studies were found as (Cronbach alpha = 0… and 0…).

Furthermore, the exploratory factor analyses indicated satisfactory construct validity at a very high significance level (i.e. $p < .001$). The procedural justice measurement: This questionnaire includes 7 items and four dimensions of organizational justice were measured with a scale developed and validated by Colquitt (2001): procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice. The scale ranged from 1 (to a very small extent) to 5 (to a very large extent). The reliability analyses of these studies should be in the range of (alpha = 0.86/0.90)

The organizational commitment measurement: This scale measures the degree to which employees are committed, or attached, to their organization. The scale is adopted from Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). Each of the questions shall be answered on a Likert Scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree). Although the original version of scale consists of 15 items; only 9 items will be asked due to the need of data gathering about only affective organizational commitment part.

The job satisfaction measurement: The Andrew and Withney Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was employed. Andrew and Withney designated the original scale. The device is 7-point Likert scale questionnaire. Seven-point Likert scale (from 1 - delighted to 7 - not at all satisfied) It contains 5 items, and assesses general job satisfaction. The study has an explanatory design, and is empiric in nature. It is a field study.

4.0 Findings

Reliability Analysis

Reliability Analysis / Organizational Climate

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,597	13

Since Cronbach's alpha $0,597 < 0,70$ we can conclude that there is medium type reliability within organizational climate as cronbach's alpha is close to 0,70.

Reliability Analysis / Procedural Justice

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,857	6

Since Cronbach's alpha $0,857 > 0,70$ we can conclude that there is high consistency and reliability within procedural justice as cronbach's alpha is greater than 0,70.

Reliability Analysis / Job Satisfaction

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,554	3

Since Cronbach's alpha $0,554 < 0,70$ we can conclude that there is medium type reliability within job satisfaction as cronbach's alpha is close to 0,70.

Reliability Analysis / Organizational Commitment

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,547	9

Since Cronbach's alpha 0,547 < 0,70 we can conclude that there is medium type reliability within organizational commitment as cronbach's alpha is close to 0,70.

Since all of the 1-tailed significance levels are less than 0,05 we can conclude that there is high correlation among variables.

Regression Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
JSCENTERED	2,1282	,90545	52
ClimateCentered	31,0296	5,74910	52
ProceduralCentered	11,6506	4,91067	52

Correlation

		JSCENTERED	Climate Centered	Procedural Centered
Pearson Correlation	JSCENTERED	1,000	,238	,422
	ClimateCentered	,238	1,000	,678
	ProceduralCentered	,422	,678	1,000
Sig. (1-tailed)	JSCENTERED	.	,044	,001
	ClimateCentered	,044	.	,000
	ProceduralCentered	,001	,000	.
N	JSCENTERED	52	52	52
	ClimateCentered	52	52	52
	ProceduralCentered	52	52	52

Model Summary(b)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change	
1	,427(a)	,182	,149	,83537	,182	5,458	2	49	,007	1,962

a Predictors: (Constant), ProceduralCentered, ClimateCentered
b Dependent Variable: JSCENTERED

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7,618	2	3,809	5,458	,007[a]
	Residual	34,194	49	,698		
	Total	41,812	51			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Prcedural Centered, Climate Centered
b. Dependent Variable: JSCENTERED

Since significance level is ,007 < 0,05 we can conclude that there is an moderating effect of procedural justice on organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Model is wholly significant since significance level is less than 0,05 and f-test value is 5,45. Organizational climate

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,525	,674		2,263	,028
	ClimateCentered	-,014	,028	-,088	-,503	,617
	ProceduralCentered	,089	,032	,482	2,741	,009

a. Dependent Variable: JSCENTERED

References

1. Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

2. Alexander, S. & Ruderman, M. 1987. The role of procedural and distributive justice in organization behavior. Social Justice Research, 1(2): 177-198.

3. Allen, Meyer, (1996), "Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity", Journal of Vocational Behavior, Vol: 49, pp: 252-276.

4. Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. International Journal of Business and Management, 5(12), 102-109.

5. Arnold, P. (2005). Effective leadership and partnerships: Making democracy work, civic traditions in modern Italy. Italy: Princeton University Press

6. Babin, B.J., Boles J.S. (1998), "Employee behaviour in a service environment: a model and test of potential differences between men and women", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 62 No 2, pp.77-91.

7. Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 299-322.

8. Boehman, (2006), "Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment among Student Affairs Professionals", Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University,Raleigh, NC (ProQuest Digital Dissertations).

9. Boles JS, Wood JA, Johnson J (2003). Interrelationships of role conflict, role ambiguity, and work-family conflict with different facets of job satisfaction and the moderating effects of gender. JPSSM, 2: 99-113.

10. Brewer, B. W. (Springfield College). Journal of Applied Sport Psychology (JASP), 6(1), 87 - 100. 1994. Remote Queues: Exposing Network Queues for Atomicity and Optimization, Eric A. Brewer, Frederic T. Chong, Lok T. Liu, John Kubiatowicz, and Shamik D. Sharma. Appeared at SPAA '95.

11. Brown, S.P., & Peterson, R.A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects.

12. Brown, S.P., & Peterson, R.A. (1994). The effect of effort on sales performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Marketing, 58 (2), 70-80.

13. Canipe, (2006), "Relationships among Trust, Organizational Commitment, Perceived Organizational Support, and Turnover Intentions", Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

14. Churchill, Gilbert,A..Jr., Neil M. Ford, and Orville C. Walker,Jr. (1976),"Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in the Salesforce." Journal of Marketing Research,13(November), 323-32

15. Clark, A.E. and A.J.Oswald. 1996. "Satisfaction and Comparison Income", Journal of Public Economics 61(3): 359-381

16. Clark, A.E., Oswald, A.J. and Warr, P.B. (1996). "Is Job Satisfaction U-Shaped in Age?", Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69, 57-81.

17. Clark, A.(1997) Why are women so happy at work? Labour Economics,4,341-72

18. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 278-321.

19. Cohen, A. (2003). Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

20. Colarelli, S. M., Dean, R. A., & Konstans, C. (1987). Comparative effects of personal and situational influences on job outcomes of new professionals. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 558-566.

21. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 386-400.

22. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 425- 445.

23. Colquitt, Jason A., Donald E. Conlon, Michael J. Wesson, Christopher O. L. H. Porter, and K. Yee Ng. 2001. "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research." Journal of Applied Psychology 86 (3): 425-445.

24. Cook JD, Hepworth SJ, Wall TD, & Warr PB (1981). Experience of work: A compendium and review of 249 measures and their use. New York: Academic Press.

25. Cropanzano, R., and Folger, R. (1991). Procedural justice and worker motivation. In R. M. S teers and L. W.Porter (Eds.), Motivation and Work Behavior. NewYork: McGraw-Hill.

26. Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., and Toth, P. (1997). "The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress." Journal of Organizational Behavior , 22: 159-80.

27. Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress inorganizational justice: tunneling through the maze, in Cooper, C. L. and Robertson, I. T. (Ed.). International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12,317-72, Wiley, New York.

28. Cropanzano, R., Byrne,Z.S., Bobocel, D.R., & Rupp, D.R.2001. Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities,and other for organizational justice. Journal of Vocational Behavior,58:164.209

29. Currivan, D. B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. Human Resource Management Review 9, 495-524.

30. Daly, J. L. (2002). Implications of organizational climate and ethical leadership on reengineering in municipal government. Public Administration Quarterly, 26, 198-217.

31. Davis, K. (1981). Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior (5th ed.). New York: McGraw

32. Deal, T. E., and A. A. Kennedy 1982 Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

33. DeConick, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. Journal of Business Research, 63, 1349-1355.

34. DeCotiis, T. and T.Summers (1987). "A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment". Human Relations, 40, 445-470

35. De Cremer, D., van Knippenberg, B., van Knippenberg, D., Mullenders, D., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). Rewarding leadership and fair procedures as determinants of self-esteem. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 3-12.

36. Dunham,R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: the utility of an integrative definition. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 730-780.

37. Earley, P. C., & Lind, E. A. (1987). Procedural justice and participation in task selection: The role of control in mediating justice judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1148-1160.

38. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,500-507.

39. Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,51-59.

40. Fasolo, P. M. (1995). `Procedural justice and perceived organizational support: Hypothesized effects on job performance'. In: Cropanzano, R. and Kacmar, K. M. (Eds) Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing the Social Climate of Work Organizations, Quorum Books, Westport, CT, pp. 185-195.

41. Feinstein A.H. and Vondrasek D. 2001.A study of relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among restaurant employees. Journal of Hospitality, Tourism, and Leisure Science

42. Ferrie, J. E., Shipley, M. J., Newman, K., Stansfeld S. A., & Marmot, M. (2005). Self-Reported Job Insecurity and Health in the Whitehall II Study: Potential Explanations of the Relationship. Social Science and Medicine, 60 (7), 1593-1602.

43. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational justice and human resource managemen t. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

44. Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An intexpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. Rowland & G. Fen-is (Eds.), Research in personnel and human resources management (Vol. 3, pp. 141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

45. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reaction to pay raise decisions. Academy of Management Journal, 32(1), 115 - 30.

46. Furnham, A., Petrides K. V., Jackson C. J., & Cotter T. (2002). Do Personality Factors Predict Job Satisfaction? Personality and Individual Differences, 33 (8), 1325-1342.

47. Futrell, Charles M; A Parasuraman (1984), "The Relationship of Satisfaction and Performance to Salesforce Turnover," Journal of Marketing, 48(Fall), 4, 33-40.

48. Gaertner, S. (1999), "Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models", Human Resource Management Review, Vol.9 No.4, pp. 479-93.

49. Gary A. Kenneth N. Wexley Oxford University Press, 1971

50. Geyskens, I., & Steenkamp, J.-B.E.M. (1995). An investigation into the joint effects of trust and interdependence on relationship commitment. Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy, Cergy (France) (pp. 351-371).

51. George, J. M., Reed, T. F., Ballard, K. A., Colin, J. and Fielding, J. (1993). `Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: E€ects of organizational and social support', Academy of Management Journal, 36, 157-171.

52. Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

53. Greenberg, J. 2001 b. The seven loose can(n)on of organizational justice. In Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), Advances in organizational justice:245.271. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

54. Greenberg, J. (2005). Managing Behavior in Organizations 4th ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood.

55. Gregersen, H.B., & Black, J.S. (1992). Antecedents to commitment to a parent company and a foreign operation. Academy of Management Journal, 35(1), 61-81.

56. Hamermesh, D. 2001. "The Changing Distribution of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Human Resources, 36(1): 1-30

57. Heywood, J. S., Siebert, W, S., & Wei, X. (2002). Job Satisfaction and Worker Sorting: The Case of Union and Government Jobs. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 55 (2), 595 -609.

58. Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 555-573.

59. Hunt and Morgan, (1994), "Organizational Commitment: One of Many Commitments or Key Mediating Construct", The Academy of Management Journal, Vol: 37, No: 6, pp: 1568-1587.

60. Isaksen, S.G.; Lauer, K.J.; Ekwall, G. & Britz, A., (2000-01), Perception of the worst and best climates for creativity: Preliminary validation evidence for the situational outlook questionnaire, Creativity Research Journal,13, 171-184.

61. Iverson, R.D. & Roy, P. (1994). A causal model of behavioral commitment: Evidence from a Study of Australian bluecollar employees. Journal of Management, 20(1), 15-41

62. James Boles, Ramana Madupalli, Brian Rutherford, John Andy Wood, "The relationship of facets of salesperson job satisfaction with affective organizational commitment", Emerald 22, (2007)

63. James, L. A. Joyce, and W. F., Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1988), "Comment: Organizations do not cognize", Academy of Management Review,Vol. 13(1), pp. 129-132.

64. James, L. J., & Williams, L. (2000). The cross-level operator in regression, ANCOVA, and contextual analysis. In K.J. Klein & S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.),Multilevel Theory, Research, andMethods in Organizations(pp. 382-424). San Francisco: Jossey Bass

65. Jernigan, I.E., Beggs, J.M. and Kohut, G.F. (2002), "Dimensions of work satisfaction as predictors of commitment type", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 17 No.7, pp. 564-79.

66. Karrasch, (2003), "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment", Military Psychology, Vol: 15, No: 3, pp: 225-36. 67-) Kim, H. (2009). "Integrating Organizational Justice into the Relationship Management Theory".

67. Klein, Katherine J.; Conn, Amy Buhl; Smith, D. Brent; Sorra, Joann Speer Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 86(1), Feb 2001, 3-16.

68. Konovsky, M.A. & Pugh, S.D. (1994). Citizenship behaviour andsocial exchange. Academy of Management Journal, 37(3), 656-669.

69. Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior.Journal of Organizational Behavior,16,215-224.

70. Korsgaard, M.A., Schweiger, D.M., & Sapienza, H.J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 60-84.

71. Lee Huey Yiing, Kamarul Zaman Bin Ahmad, "The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance", Emerald 30, (2009)

72. Leventhal, G. S. 1980. What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K.Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange:Advances in theory and research, pp. 27-55. New York: Plenum.

73. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? InK. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research. New York: Plenum

74. Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. 1980. Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), Justice and social interaction, pp. 167-218. New York: Springer-Verlag.

75. Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Fairness at the group level: Justice climate and intraunit justice climate. Journal of Management, 35, 564-599.

76. Lin, C., The Association between organizational climate and quality management Practices. Total Quality Management, 10, (1999) 863-869.

77. Lincoln, J. R., & Kalleberg, A. L. (1990).Culture, control and commitment: A study of workorganization and work orientations in the United States and Japan. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

78. Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. N.Y.: Plenum.Translated into Japanese. Tokyo: Tuttle-Mori Publishing.

79. Liou, K.T., 1995. Professional orientation and organizational commitment among public employees: An empirical study of detention workers. J. Public Admin. Res. Theory, 5: 231-246.

80. Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A., Jr. (1968). Motivation and organizational climate. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Harvard Business School, Harvard University.

81. Lok, P. and Crawford, J. (2001), "Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 16 No, 8, pp. 594-613.

82. Lopopolo, R.B., The relationship of role-related variables to job satisfaction and commitment to the organization in a restructured hospital environment. Physical Therapy, 82,(2002) 984-999.

83. Marsden, P. V., Kalleberg, A. L., & Cook, C. (1993). Gender differences in organizational commitment: Influences of work positions and family roles. Work and Occupations, 20, 368-390.

84. Martin, C. L., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organization commitment. Group & Organization Management, 21, 84-104.

85. Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M., & Taylor, M.S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 43(4),738-748

86. Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108(2), 171-194.

87. McCauley, D.P. and Kuhnert, K.W. (1992), "A theoretical review and empirical investigation of employee trust in management", Public Administration Quarterly, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 265-85.

88. McFarlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992).Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 35(3),626-637.

89. Meyer J and Allen N (1997), "Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application ", Sage Publications.

90. Michaels, P. (1994). An expanded conceptual framework on organizational commitment and job satisfaction for sales force management. Journal of Business and Society, 7(1), 42-67.

91. Miller, D. & Lee, J. 2001. 'The people make the process: commitment to employees, decision- making and performance', Journal of Management, 27: 163-189.

92. Miller, K. 2003. 'Values, attitudes and job satisfaction' In Robbins, S.P., Odendaal A. & Roodt, G. (eds), Organisational Behaviour: Global and Southern African Perspectives. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa

93. Mishra,A.,Spreitzer,G.(1998).Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust empowerment, justice ,and work redesign. Academy of Management Review,23.567-589.

94. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. 1998. Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? Academy of Management Journal , 41: 351-357

95. Moran, E. T. & Volkwein, J. F. (1992). The cultural approach to the formation of organizational climate. Human Relations,45(1), 19-46

96. Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., Kemery, E. R., & Wesolowski, M. A. (1998). Relationships between bases of power and work reactions: The mediational role of procedural justice. Journal of Management, 24, 533-552.

97. Mowday, Steers and Porter, (1982), "Employee-Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Turnover, and Absenteeism", New York: Academic Press.

98. Mueller, C. W., Boyer, E. M., Price, J. L., & Iverson, R. D. (1994). Employee attachment and noncoercive conditions of work: The case of dental hygenists.Work and Occupations,21, 179-212

99. Mueller, C. W., & McCloskey, J. C., (1992). Nurses job satisfaction: A proposed measure. Nursing Research, 39(2), 113-117.

100. Naumann, S. E & Bennett, N. 2000. A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. Academy of Management Journal, 43: 881-889.

101. Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. Journal of Marketing, 61, 85-98.

102. Niehoff, B., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior.Academy of Management Journal, 36(3),527-56.

103. Nye, L. G. and Witt, L. A. (1993). `Dimensionality and construct validity of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS)', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53, 821-829.

104. O'Reilly, A.C. (1989). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit.The Academy of Management Journal, 34 (3), 487-516.

105. Peter Lok, John Crawford, "The relationship between commitment and organizational culture, subculture, leadership style and job satisfaction in organizational change and development", Emerald 20, (1999)

106. Peters, T., and R.H. Waterman 1982 In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

107. Porter, L.W.; Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; & Boulian, P.V. (1974) Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 603-609.

108. Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1981). Professional turnover: The case of nurses. New York: SP Medical Scientific Books.

109. Pritchard, R. D., & Karasick, B. W. (1973). The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction', Organizational Behavior and human decision processes, 9(1),126-146.

110. Robbins and Coulter, (2003), "Management", 7th ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

111. Robinson, A., and Head, K.(1983). Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Michigan: Survey Research Centre.

112. Robinson SL. 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. Administrative Science Quarterly 41: 574-599.

113. Robinson SL, Morrison EW. 1995. Organizational citizenship behavior: a psychological contract perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior 16: 289-298.

114. Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K., & Liao, H. (in press). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.

115. Russell Cropanzano and Folger, R. (1989). Significance tests and the duplicity of binary decisions. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 155-160.

116. Sager, J.K. and Johnston, M.W. (1989). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment: A study of salespeople. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 9 (Spring): 30-41.

117. Schein, E.H. (1992), Organizational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View, 2nd ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

118. Schnake, M. E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. Personnel Psychology, 36, 791-807.

119. Schneider, B., & Snyder, R.A. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3), 318?328.

120. Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. (1983). On the etiology of climates. PersonnelPsychology, 36, 19-39.

121. Schneider, B., A. P. Brief and R.A. Guzzo. 1996. "Creating a climate and culture for sustainable organizational change." Organizational Dynamics, Spring: 7-18.

122. Schneider, B. (2000). The psychological life of organizations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, & M. F. Peterson, Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate(pp. 17-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

123. Schulte, M., Ostroff, C., & Kinicki, A. J. (2006). Organizational climate systems and psychological climate perceptions: A

cross-level study of climate-satisfaction relationships.Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79, 645-671.

124. Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N. and Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader±member exchange, and employee reciprocity', Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 219-227.

125. Shore, L. M. and Shore, T. H. (1995). `Perceived organizational support and organizational justice'. In: Cropanzano, R. and Kacmar, K. M. (Eds) Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing the Social Climate of Work Organizations, Quorum Books, Westport, CT, pp. 149-164.

126. Smith, P.C., L.M. Kendall,and C.L. Hulin (1969). The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

127. Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.(2000) Taking another look at the gender/job satisfaction paradox,KYKLOS,53,135-52

128. Spector, L. 1996. Simultaneous Evolution of Programs and their Control Structures. In Advances in Genetic Programming 2, edited by P. Angeline and K. Kinnear, pp. 214. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

129. Spector, P. 1997. Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences. California: Sage.

130. Sweeney, P.D., and McFarlin, D. B.(1993). Workers'evaluations of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55, 23-40

131. Tagiuri, R., & Litwin, G. (Eds.). (1968). Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept. Boston: Harvard Business School.

132. Taunton, R., Krampitz, S. & Woods, C. (1989). Manager impact on retention of hospitality staff. Journal of Nursing Administration, 19(3), 14-19.

133. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. 1975. Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

134. Turner, Chelladurai, (2005), "Organizational and Occupational Commitment, Intention to Leave, and Perceived Performance of Intercollegiate Coaches", Journal of Sport Management, Vol: 19, pp: 193-211.

135. Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology ,57,830-838

136. Tyler,T.R.. &Lind. E.A. (1992).A relational model of authority in groups. In M.Zanna(Ed.). Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 25, pp.115-191).New York: Academic Press.

137. Umphress, E. E., Labianca, G., Brass, D. J., Kass, E. & Scholten, L. 2003. The role of instrumental and expressive social ties in employees' perceptions of organizational justice. Organization Science, 14 (6): 738-753.

138. Vandenberg R, Lance C (1992), 'Satisfaction and organisational commitment,' Journal of Management, Vol. 18, pp. 153-167

139. Walumbwa, F.O.,Wu, C., & Orwa, B. (2008). Contingent Reward Transactional Leadership, Work Attitudes, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Role of Procedural Justice Climate Perceptions and Strength. Leadership Quarterly, 19(3), 251-265

140. Wathne, Kenneth H. and Jan B. Heide (2000), "Opportunism in Interfirm Relationships: Forms, Outcomes, and Solutions," Journal of Marketing, 64 (October), 36-51.

141. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. and Liden, R. C. (1997). `Perceived organizational support and leader-memberexchange: A social exchange perspective', Academy of Management Journal, 40, 82-111.

142. Weisman, C., Alexander, C. and Chase, G. (1981), "Evaluating reasons for nursing turnover", Evaluation and the Health Professionals, Vol. 4, pp. 107-27

143. Whitener E. M. 1997. The impact of human resource activities on employee trust. Human Resource Management Review 7: 389-404.

144. Williams, L.J. & Hazer, J.T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(2), 219-231.

145. Yahyagil, M.Y. (2003). "The Employee Perceptions of Organizational Climate and Its Relationship with Job Satisfaction in A Private Healthcare Organization", The Proceedings of International Conference On Challenging The Frontiers In Global Business and Technology, (Eds. N.Delener & C.Chao), (pp.1339-1349), A Publication Of Global Business and Technology Association.

146. Yahyagil, M. Y.(2004).The Interdependence between the Concepts of Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate: An Empirical Investigation, Istanbul University, Journal of Business Administration, Istanbul, Vol. 33(1), 69-98.

6.0 APPENDICES

6.1. Questionnaire

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, iş hayatınızla ilgili bazı eğilimleri ölçmek amacı ile hazırlanmıştır. Araştırma sonuçları Yeditepe Üniversitesi Yönetim ve Organizasyon Doktora araştırma çalışmasında eğitim amaçlı kullanılacak olup, esasen kimlik ya da işletme bilgileri de istenmemektedir. Sizden istediğimiz, sorular iş yaşamınız çerçevesinde kendi düşünce ve yaklaşımlarınızı dikkate alarak doldurmanızdır.
………………………………………………………………………………………….
Sadece 10-12 dakikanızı alacak bu çalışmaya yapacağınız katkı için teşekkürlerimizi sunuyoruz.

● *Lütfen öncelikle aşağıdaki genel bilgileri veriniz:*

A) Cinsiyetiniz   ☐ Kadın   ☐ Erkek

B) Yaşınız (lütfen yazınız) ………………

C) Eğitim durumunuz   ☐ İlköğretim   ☐ Lise   ☐ Lisans   ☐Lisansüstü

3D) Toplam iş deneyiminiz ☐ 1-4 yıl   ☐ 5-8 yıl   ☐ 8-11 yıl   ☐12-15 yıl

3E) Şu an çalışmakta olduğunuz işyerindeki toplam iş deneyiminizi işaret ediniz.

      ☐ 1-4 yıl   ☐ 5-8 yıl   ☐ 8-11 yıl   ☐12-15 yıl
………………………………………………………………………………………….

● *Şimdi de çalışmakta olduğunuz iş yerini ve sizin kendi algı ve düşüncelerinizi esas alarak, aşağıdaki maddeleri yanıtlayınız.*

1) Çalışanlar kendi işlerini yaparken gerektiğinde, bir şekilde destek alabilmektedir.
   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

2) Bürokratik formaliteler mümkün olan en az düzeydedir.
   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

3) Üst-yönetim, tüm çalışanların yaptıkları işle ilgili olarak karar-alma sürecine katılmalarını istemektedir.
   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

4) Çalıştığım kurum genelde, iş stratejilerini belirlerken risk almaktan kaçınmaktadır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

5) Çalışanlar, iş-akışına ilişkin olarak istedikleri bilgiye kolaylıkla ulaşabilmektedir.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

6) Çalışanlarımız arasında karşılıklı güvene dayalı, ılımlı bir ilişki vardır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

7) Genel olarak, tüm iş faaliyetleri yeknesak, rutin bir nitelik taşımaktadır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

8) İşlerin yürütülmesinde, çalışanlar arasında bir takım ruhu olduğu söylenemez.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

9) İş faaliyetlerinin yürütülmesinde kurallar ve standartlara mutlaka uyulması beklenir.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

10) Ödüllendirme mekanizmasında, çalışanların performansı temel kriter olarak alınıp, değerlendirilmektedir.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

11) Çalıştığım kurum genelde, yenilikçi olan düşünce, teknoloji ve uygulamalara açıktır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

12) Çalışanlar kendi işlerini planlamada ve yürütmekte belli bir serbestiye sahiptir.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

13) İşletmenin tüm bölümleri ve çalışanlar arasında açık ve olumlu bir iletişim vardır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

14) Yöneticim tarafından işle ilgili verilen kararlar yansız bir şekilde alınmaktadır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

15) Yöneticim, işle ilgili kararlar verilmeden önce tüm çalışanların fikirlerinin alındığından emin olur.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

16) İşle ilgili kararları vermeden önce, yöneticim tam anlamıyla doğru ve eksiksiz bilgi toplar.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

17) Çalışanlar tarafından talep edildiğinde, yöneticiler tarafından alınan kararlar hakkında açıklama yapılır ve ilave bilgi verilir.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

18) İşle ilgili alınan tüm kararlar, etkilenen tüm çalışanlar üzerinde tutarlı şekilde uygulanır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

19) Çalışanların, yöneticiler tarafından alınan kararlar üzerinde veya fikir yürütme veya itiraz etme hakkı vardır.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

20) Genel olarak, bu iş yerinde çalışmaktan hoşlanmıyorum. (T)

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

21) Bütün faktörler dikkate alındığında, işimi seviyorum.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

22) Yaptığım işten tatmin oluyorum.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Çok kat.( )   Oldukça Kat.( )   Az Kat.( )   Çok Az Kat.( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

23) Kurumuma karşı güçlü bir aidiyet duygum yok. ®

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

24) Bu kuruma duygusal açıdan bir bağlılık hissetmiyorum. ®

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

25) Bu kurumun benim için çok özel bir anlamı var.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

26) İstesem de şu anda kurumumdan ayrılmak benim için çok zor olurdu.

   Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

27) Şu anda kurumumdan ayrılmak istediğime karar versem, hayatımın çoğu alt üst olur.

Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

28) Eğer bu kuruma kendimden bu kadar çok vermiş olmasaydım, başka yerde çalışmayı düşünebilirdim.

Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

29) Buradaki insanlara karşı yükümlülük hissettiğim için, şu an için kurumumdan ayrılmak istemiyorum.

Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

30) Benim için çok avantajlı olsa da, kurumumdan şu anda ayrılmanın doğru olmadığına inanıyorum.

Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

31) Kurumumdan şimdi ayrılırsam, kendimi suçlu hissederim.

Tamamen Katılıyorum.( )   Katılıyorum ( )   Fikrim yok ( )   Katılmıyorum ( )   Hiç Katılmıyorum( )

Katkınız ve bize zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür ediyoruz.