

# Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment among Faculty Staff and their Assistants

Mona Mostafa Shazly<sup>(1)</sup>, Sanaa Hassan Mohammed<sup>(2)</sup>, Ahmed Farghaly Towfik<sup>(3)</sup>

(1) Professor of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing - Ain Shams University

(2) Lecturer of Nursing Administration, (3) B.Sc. In Nursing

Faculty of Nursing – Beni-sueif University

## Abstract

**Background:** Nowadays, human resources is the most important input for all of the organizations. From this aspect, the justice within the organization and the organizational commitment are undoubtedly the most important elements in using the human factor efficiently. **Aim of the study:** This study aimed at identifying the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment of faculty staff members and their assistants in (Beni-sueif and El-fayoum) faculties of nursing **design:** a descriptive correlational study design was utilized. **Subjects** the study was conducted on 196 faculty staff members and their assistants **setting:** the study was carried out at Beni-sueif and El-fayoum faculties of nursing. **Tools:** two tools were used to collect data. **First tool:** self-administered questionnaire sheet which was consisting of two main parts. **PartI:** sociodemographic data sheet and **partII:** organizational justice questionnaire sheet. **Second tool:** organizational commitment questionnaire sheet. **Results:** the study revealed that, faculty staff members and assistants had low organizational justice and commitment with relatively high percentages of high organizational justice and commitment among faculty staff members than assistants; 42.6% with high organizational commitment of faculty staff members in front of 29.2% of assistants, regarding organizational justice. percentage of faculty staff members with high organizational justice was 40.4% while among assistants it was 24.8% , the dimensions of organizational commitment ranged as following: continuance commitment are the highest then normative then affective commitment is the least and the highest percentage of organizational justice dimensions was interactional justice and the lowest was distributive justice. **Conclusion:** there were statistical significant positive correlation between organizational justice dimensions and organizational commitment dimensions:  $r=.635$ . **Recommendations:** conduct training courses for the faculty administrators on the importance of organizational justice perception on organizational commitment.

**Keywords:** organizational justice, organizational commitment.

## Introduction

Human resources is one of the most vital determinants of functional quality and performance of organizations. Commitment and loyalty of human resources can result in the performance of organizational duties with efficiency. Organizational commitment facilitates organizational efficiency and operations. In an active work environment, irresponsible and passive employees will be considered organizational impediments who deteriorate quantitative and qualitative characteristics of employees' performance (Saadati et al., 2016).

One of the most important factors affecting organizational commitment is the perception of organizational justice. Monitoring justice is one of important factors effecting organization continuance and protecting its health in the long run. Observing justice is considered one of the necessities of organizational behavior, because it improve interest, loyalty and trust of people to the organization and adds to human and social investment of the organizations. Perceptions of organizational justice constitute an important aspect in organizational decision-making, as research relates it to job satisfaction, turnover, leadership, organizational citizenship, organizational commitment, trust, customer satisfaction, job performance, employee theft,

role breadth, alienation, and leader-member exchange (**Bakhshi, 2009**).

Organizational justice has three dimensions namely: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. The distributive justice refers to attitudes and opinions of the staff about the suitability of what is received and obtained; distributive justice includes not only the fairness of the payments, but also involves a broad set of organizational outcomes (upgrades, rewards, punishments, business applications, advantages and evaluations). Procedural justice refers to the perceived justice from procedures and processes that through them the consequences are specified, interactional justice is defined as the perceived justice from interpersonal relationships and the fairness of the behavior of decision makers in the process of organization decision making. Organizational justice is among the important organization parameters and is associated with important organizational processes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (**Dehkordi, 2013**).

### **Aim of the study**

This study was aimed to identifying the Relationship between organizational justice and Organizational Commitment of faculty staff and their assistants in (Beni-sueif and El-fayoum)faculty of nursing through:

Assessing level of organizational justice among faculty staff and their assistants, Assessing organizational commitment among faculty staff and their assistants & Finding out the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment among faculty staff and their assistants .

### **Research question :**

Is There is a relationship between organizational justice and commitment among faculty staff and their assistants?

### **Subjects and Methods**

#### **Technical design:**

The technical design includes a description of research design, setting of the study, subjects, and tools for data collection.

### **Research design**

A descriptive correlational, design was used in carrying out this study.

### **Setting**

This study was conducted at the faculty of nursing affiliated to Beni-Sueif University & faculty of nursing affiliated to El-Fayoum University.

### **Subjects**

The total number of the study subjects are (196) divided into **two groups namely:** nursing teaching staff members (faculty staff members) and assistants of faculty staff members.

### **Data collection tools**

Collection of data of this study was achieved by using **two tools namely:** organizational justice questionnaire and organizational commitment questionnaire

#### **1. Organizational justice questionnaire:**

This tool aimed at assessing the level of organizational justice. It consisted of two parts:

**Part I:** demographic data: this part was intended to collect data related to the characteristics of the study subjects as (age, sex, years of experience)

#### **Part II: organizational justice questionnaire:**

consisted of (28) items distributed into three dimensions of organizational justice, Developed by **Rahim et al., [2001]:** distributive justice (13) items, interactional justice (8) items& procedural justice (7) items. **Scoring system:** the participant's responses were measured and graded based on a 5-degree Likert Scale. Where 1 stands for "strongly disagree" and 5 stands for "strongly agree". Scores of items were summed-up and the total divided by the number of the items, giving a mean score of the part] the subjects were considered to perceiving organizational justice if the percent score was 60% or more and not perceiving organizational justice if the score percent less than 60%.

#### **2. Organizational commitment questionnaire:**

this tool aimed at assessing the level of organizational commitment using **Meyer and**

Allen's [1991] scale. Entailed three dimensions of organizational commitment namely: Affective commitment consisted of Normative commitment & Continuance commitment each consisted of (6) items.

**Scoring system:** the participant responses are graded based on a 5-degree Likert scale. Range from strongly agree to strongly disagree these respectively scored 5-1 this is applicable to all items. The scores of items were summed-up and the total divided by the number of the items, giving a mean score of the part, the staff was considered to be committed if the percent score was 60% or more and not committed if the score percent less than 60%. This scoring system according to (Meyer & Allen 1991).

## **II. Operational design**

The operational design involves the preparatory phase, pilot study and field work

### **Preparatory phase**

The researcher reviewed current and past, local and international related literature and knowledge aspects of the study using books, articles, journals, and internet to modify tools for data collection.

**Validity of the tools:** the tools were distributed to a jury group of five experts specialized in nursing administration from three different universities [Ain Shams, Cairo, Tanta]. Two assistant professors from faculty of nursing Ain Shams University, one assistant professor and professor from faculty of nursing Cairo University and one assistant professor from faculty of nursing Tanta University. Jury group reviewed the tools to judge its clarity, comprehensiveness and accuracy. Their opinions were elicited regarding the tools format, layout, and parts. According to jury recommendations, the researcher modified items of the tools.

**Reliability of tools:** the reliability of the data collection tool was assessed using internal consistency method. The two questionnaires showed good reliability as shown by their Cronbach's alpha coefficient Organizational Commitment questionnaire (0.761) & Organizational justice questionnaire (0.943).

### **Pilot study:**

A pilot study was conducted on (19) participant of the study subjects. They represent 10% of the study sample in the study setting. The aim of pilot study was to examine the applicability and clarity of the tool and to identify obstacles and problems that may be encountered during data collection. Additionally to estimating the time needed to fill it out. The time subjects took to fill in the questionnaire sheet was 15-20 minutes. These participants were included in the main study sample since no changes were needed in the tools.

### **Field work:**

The researcher met the participants or study subjects to collect data. The aim of the study explained and invited them to participate in the study. Tools distributed to subjects individually and study subjects asked to fill it out. They were instructed in how to complete the form. Data were collected from the subjects in their work areas and the researcher was present all the time to respond to any queries then the tools collected and checked for completeness. The researcher present in the subjects work setting two times per week one day at the beginning of the week and one day at the end of the week every time the researcher presented from 09:00 am to 02:00 pm to meet the study subjects before and after clinical day and between lectures. Field work was done over five months; started at the beginning of April 2017 and completed at the beginning of October 2017.

### **Ethical consideration:**

Prior to the study conduction, ethical approval was obtained from scientific research and ethical committee of faculty of nursing – Ain Shams University. In addition, the researcher obtained official permission from dean of the target faculty of nursing. Oral informed consent obtained from every participant. The researcher explain the aim of the study to participants eligible to be included in the study and invited them to participate. They assured that confidentiality would be guaranteed, and informed that they can withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

### **III. Administrative design:**

Official approval to conduct the study was obtained from the dean of faculty of nursing (Beni-Suef and El-fayoum) universities. This was done through an official letter from the dean of the faculty of nursing- Ain Shams University explaining the purpose and procedure of the study.

### **IV. Statistical design**

Data entry and statistical analysis were done using SPSS 20.0 statistical software package. Data were presented using descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and percentages for qualitative variables, and means and standard deviations for quantitative variables. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the reliability of the tools through their internal consistency. Qualitative categorical variables were compared using chi-square test. Whenever the expected values in one or more of the cells in a 2x2 tables were less than 5, Fisher exact test was used instead. In larger than 2x2 cross-tables, no test could be applied whenever the expected value in 10% or more of the cells was less than 5. Spearman rank correlation was used for assessment of the inter-relationships among quantitative variables and ranked ones. In order to identify the independent predictors of commitment and justice scores, multiple linear regression analysis was used and analysis of variance for the full regression models done. Statistical significance was considered at  $p$ -value  $<0.05$ .

### **Results**

Table (1), illustrates statistically significant variation between faculty staff and assistants total organizational justice scores ( $p=0.04$ ) in the two universities. Regarding their job position and organizational commitment there is no statistically significant variations.

Concerning total organizational commitment relations with faculty staff members and assistants characteristics. Table (2), shows the presence of statistically significant association between faculty staff and assistants total organizational commitment and their work department ( $p=0.03$ ) & total experience years ( $p=0.005$ ). It was evident that faculty staff and assistants who work at

psychiatric department have total organizational commitment higher than others who work in other departments, faculty staff and assistants with total experience years of (10+) years had total organizational commitment higher than others who had less experience years.

Table (3), demonstrates the presence of statistically significant correlation between faculty staff and assistants' total organizational justice perception with their total experience years of ( $p=0.03$ ). It was evident that the more experienced faculty staff and assistants (10+) have higher perception of total organizational justice than less experienced.

Table (4) demonstrates the presence of statistically significant weak positive correlations between affective and normative commitment ( $r=.291$ ), normative and continuance commitment ( $r=.328$ ) and very weak positive correlation between continuance and affective commitment ( $r=0.025$ ).

Table (5) illustrates the presence of statistically significant moderate positive correlations between various dimensions of organizational justice. The strongest correlation was between interactional and procedural justice ( $r=.597$ ), while the weakest correlation was between distributive and interactional justice ( $r=.521$ ).

Table (6) indicates the presence of statistically significant weak to strong positive correlations between various dimensions of organizational commitment and faculty staff and assistants' various dimensions of organizational justice. The strongest correlation was between interactional justice and commitment score ( $r=.675$ ). Conversely, the weakest correlation was between continuance commitment and justice score ( $r=.257$ ).

Table (7) indicates that the statistically significant independent positive predictor of faculty staff and their assistants' total organizational commitment score were their procedural and interactional justice. Meanwhile, the negative predictor was their qualifications. The model explains 37% of the variation in total organizational commitment scores. None of faculty staff and their assistants other characteristics had a significant influence on this score.

**Table 1:** Organizational commitment and justice among faculty staff and assistants in the two universities no:(184)

	Job position				X <sup>2</sup> test	p-value
	Faculty assistant (n=137)		Faculty staff (n=47)			
	No.	%	No.	%		
High (60%+) commitment:						
Affective	51	37.2	13	27.7	1.41	0.23
Normative	43	31.4	22	46.8	3.64	0.06
Continuance	78	56.9	29	61.7	0.33	0.57
Total:						
High	40	29.2	20	42.6		
Low	97	70.8	27	57.4	2.84	0.09
High (60%+) justice:						
Distributive	26	19.0	11	23.4	0.43	0.51
Interactional	79	57.7	29	61.7	0.24	0.63
Procedural	46	33.6	19	40.4	0.72	0.40
Total:						
High	34	24.8	19	40.4		
Low	103	75.2	28	59.6	4.16	0.04*

(\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ **Table 2:** Relations between total commitment among faculty staff and assistants

	Total commitment				X <sup>2</sup> test	p-value
	High		Low			
	No.	%	No.	%		
Job:						
Demonstrator	26	32.5	54	67.5	--	--
Assit. Lecturer	14	24.6	43	75.4		
Lecturer	20	45.5	24	54.5		
Assit. Professor	0	0.0	3	100.0		
Department:					12.32	0.03*
Medical-surgical	7	20.6	27	79.4		
Community health	5	17.2	24	82.8		
Pediatrics	10	27.0	27	73.0		
Psychiatry	12	50.0	12	50.0		
Maternity/newborn	10	43.5	13	56.5		
Administration	16	43.2	21	56.8		
Gender:					0.01	0.94
Male	8	33.3	16	66.7		
Female	52	32.5	108	67.5		
Marital status:					0.16	0.69
Single	19	30.6	43	69.4		
Married	41	33.6	81	66.4		
Experience years (current):					0.01	0.91
<3	45	32.4	94	67.6		
3+	15	33.3	30	66.7		
Experience years (total):					7.89	0.005*
<10	35	26.5	97	73.5		
10+	25	48.1	27	51.9		
Age:					0.38	0.54
<36	45	31.5	98	68.5		
36+	15	36.6	26	63.4		
Qualification:					5.13	0.08
Bachelor	28	33.3	56	66.7		
Master	19	44.2	24	55.8		
Doctorate	13	22.8	44	77.2		

(\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ 

(--) Test result not valid

**Table 3:** Relations between organizational justice among faculty staff and assistants

	Total justice				X <sup>2</sup> test	p-value
	High		Low			
	No.	%	No.	%		
Job:						
Demonstrator	20	25.0	60	75.0	--	--
Assit. Lecturer	14	24.6	43	75.4		
Lecturer	17	38.6	27	61.4		
Assit. Professor	2	66.7	1	33.3		
Department:					8.32	0.14
Medical-surgical	5	14.7	29	85.3		
Community health	10	34.5	19	65.5		
Pediatrics	13	35.1	24	64.9		
Psychiatry	9	37.5	15	62.5		
Maternity/newborn	9	39.1	14	60.9		
Administration	7	18.9	30	81.1		
Gender:					0.86	0.36
Male	5	20.8	19	79.2		
Female	48	30.0	112	70.0		
Marital status:					2.80	0.09
Single	13	21.0	49	79.0		
Married	40	32.8	82	67.2		
Experience years (current):					0.60	0.44
<3	38	27.3	101	72.7		
3+	15	33.3	30	66.7		
Experience years (total):					4.74	0.03*
<10	32	24.2	100	75.8		
10+	21	40.4	31	59.6		
Age:					0.22	0.64
<36	40	28.0	103	72.0		
36+	13	31.7	28	68.3		
Qualification:					1.93	0.38
Bachelor	22	26.2	62	73.8		
Master	16	37.2	27	62.8		
Doctorate	15	26.3	42	73.7		

(\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ 

(--) Test result not valid

**Table 4:** Correlation matrix of commitment scale dimensions scores

Commitment	Spearman's rank correlation coefficient		
	Affective	Normative	Continuance
Affective			
Normative	.291**		
Continuance	0.025	.328**	

(\*\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$ **Table 5:** Correlation matrix of organizational justice scale dimensions scores

Organizational Justice	Spearman's rank correlation coefficient		
	Distributive	Interactional	Procedural
Distributive			
Interactional	.521**		
Procedural	.585**	.597**	

(\*\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$

**Table 6:** Correlation between commitment and organizational justice scores among faculty staff and assistants

	Spearman's rank correlation coefficient	
	Commitment score	Justice score
Commitment:		
Affective		.438**
Normative		.553**
Continuance		.257**
Justice:		
Distributive	.449**	
Interactional	.675**	
Procedural	.497**	

(\*\*) Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$

**Table 7:** Best fitting multiple linear regression model for the total commitment score

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-test	p-value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower	Upper
Constant	2.02	0.15		13.446	<0.001	1.72	2.31
Qualification	-0.09	0.03	-0.16	-2.713	0.007	-0.15	-0.02
Interactional justice	0.29	0.04	0.47	6.470	<0.001	0.20	0.37
Procedural justice	0.13	0.05	0.20	2.689	0.008	0.04	0.23

r-square=0.37

Model ANOVA:  $F=36.69$ ,  $p < 0.001$

Variables entered and excluded: gender, marital status, experience, university, distributive justice

## Discussion

Organizational justice is a key factor associated with the success of every organization. In order to keep employees satisfied, committed, and loyal to the organization, the organization needs to be fair in its system regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are inclined to show more positive attitude and behaviors like job satisfaction (Ayobami, 2013).

Overall, less than half of the faculty staff members and their assistants had high organizational commitment. Unlike this result a study conducted by Aggarwal, (2011) at Indian universities founded that faculty members are moderately committed to their organizations. This result is a potential problem that may lead to delays and not achieving of the faculty of nursing objectives and should be assessed

carefully by the faculty administration to improve work productivity.

The result of the present study showed that the highest dimensions of organizational commitment among faculty staff members and their assistants was continuance commitment. This result should be an alarm to the faculties administration as this type of organizational commitment is based on staff members & assistants own calculation of cost-benefit of leaving or staying with organization and reflect that most faculty staff members & assistants staying because they cannot leave the organization not because they want to stay. This means that most faculty staff members and assistants had low commitment to organization goals and objectives. . This result is in congruence with Paramanandam, (2014) who found that the highest dimension of organizational commitment was continuance commitment.

Moreover, this result may be explained based on the social preference of faculty staff members position or vacancy especially in

nursing field and the subjects feeling of obligation to stay because of financial or administrative ties such as retirement plan as well as the social image of them. In the same line with this, a study conducted in Canada showed that when employees work with internal or external pressure they have more continuance commitment that directly predicts positive intention to leave the organization **Aggarwal, (2011)**. This result is not consistent with **Bin Bakr& Ahmed, (2015)** who found that the highest level of commitment was reported for affective commitment among faculty staff.

The results of the present study indicated that the percentage of faculty staff members with high level of normative commitment came second in rank following the continuance commitment. This result was in the same line with study conducted in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia by **Bin Bakr& Ahmed, (2015)** who found that normative commitment came second in rank of organizational commitment dimensions among faculty staff members working in University of Dammam. This result can be explained in the light of the longer experience of faculty staff members than assistants make them feeling more ethically responsible to continue with their organization and to be more committed to its objectives, this dimension of organizational commitment to came second in rank for faculty staff members this is good result, this means that faculty staff members doesn't escape from responsibility and they put the objectives of the organization in front of their objectives.

Unlike this, the present study results showed that the faculty staff members' assistants affective commitment came second in rank after the continuance commitment. In the same line **Saadati et al., (2016)** found that affective commitment of staff working in Neyshabour University of Medical Sciences came second in rank following continuance commitment. And agreeing with **Ali, (2016)** who found that dimensions of organizational commitment ranged like normative is the highest then affective and continuance respectively. In contrast to this result a study conducted in turkey by **Aküzüm, (2014)** indicated that teachers affective commitment

came first in rank followed by normative commitment.

This result may be due to most assistants of faculty staff members are from Faculty graduates, so they are emotional attached to the faculty more than faculty staff members. They feel that this faculty is their home and they are her sons. This dimension of organizational commitment is preferred to be high because it means emotional binding between organization and employees and they will prefer to stay with their organization regardless any other opportunity. They will try their best to improve the faculty and achieve its objectives. The faculty administration should assess organizational commitment and this dimension especially and try to improve the staff and assistants affective commitment. in congruence with this, **Misra, (2013)** indicated that faculty administration must assess organizational commitment and improve it to improve effectiveness of work.

The least percentage of faculty staff members' organizational commitment dimensions is affective commitment. This is a bad indicator to the organization and the administration should take measures to improve faculty staff members' affective commitment. This may be result of the new evolutions of faculties lead to hiring staff members from outside the faculty and outside the governorate, most faculty staff members waiting an opportunity to return to their original governorate. So they aren't emotional attached to the organization. This result not agreeing with a study conducted in Iran by **Haddadi, (2010)** who found that the lowest dimension of organizational commitment among faculty staff is continuance commitment.

Assistants of faculty staff members' scores show that the lowest dimension of organizational commitment was normative commitment. This result can be referred to less experience among faculty staff members' assistants and most of them were newly hired at the organization in addition to their young age. This result is in congruence with **Saadati et al., (2016)**. Who found that the least organizational commitment among employees

in Neyshabour University of Medical Sciences was normative commitment.

The findings of the current study revealed that less than half faculty staff members and assistants perceive high organizational justice. This result explains the low level of organizational commitment in the findings of this study. Agreeing with this result, a study conducted in Jordan by **Altahayneh et al., (2014)** found that level of Perceived organizational justice by Jordanian physical education teachers was low. Low organizational justice is related to low job satisfaction, low organizational commitment and low work productivity. So the faculty administration should assess the reason that lead to low organizational justice and how to improve faculty staff members and assistants perception of organizational justice. Fortunately, the faculty administration doesn't need to improve all dimensions of organizational justice. Organizational justice dimensions interact with each other and if one dimension is achieved it can improve the perception of overall organizational justice especially interactional justice. An explanation of this result may be low payment that faculty staff members and assistants had in the form of low salary and incentives, in addition to the pressure they perceive either from the work itself or from the obligations related to the work such as continuing study, travelling & most faculty staff members and assistants are from other cities.

Regarding faculty staff members and assistants' perception of organizational justice dimensions, the present study results showed that the highest percentage of perceived high organizational justice dimension was interactional justice. Interactional justice can be fostered when decision-makers: treat individuals with dignity & provide due justifications or explanations for decision-making that affect individuals. Based on this we can understand the reason of interactional justice to be the highest perceived dimension, because faculty staff members interact with each other with respect and dignity in any circumstances. This result agreeing with **Altahayneh et al., (2014)** who found that interactional justice was the most perceived organizational justice dimension. . In the other

hand this result disagreed with **Bahrami, (2013)** who stated that the highest perceived organizational justice dimension was procedural justice. This result I see it from the good luck for the faculty administration, as they can work on it and conduct accurate assessment of the factors that could improve interactional justice because it doesn't cost the administration a lot to train the faculty administrators on how to execute interactional justice through treating their staff with dignity and presenting explanation for their decision that affect them.

Concerning procedural justice, it came second in rank according faculty staff members and assistants scores following interactional justice. In congruence with this result a study conducted by **Gayipov, (2014)** found that procedural justice came second in rank after interactional justice. The procedural justice is concerned with execution of procedures throughout the organization. Procedural justice to be achieved the procedures should: be applied consistently, free from bias, based on accurate information & ensure that opinions of affected staff members have been taken into account. From this, an explanation of this result is it was difficult to consistently applying the same procedures with various individuals and various time because of new evolution of faculty so its system is prone to frequent changes or updates. So some decision taken affected part of faculty staff members and assistants then changed in addition to opinions and preferences of faculty staff members and assistants aren't fully taken into account.

The lowest perceived organizational justice dimension was distributive justice. In the same line with the current study findings **Bahrami, (2013)** stated that the lowest perceived organizational justice dimension scores was related to distributive justice. This finding could be due to low payment that faculty staff members and assistants perceive in the form of salary and incentives in relation to the high obligations and stress they feel compared other profession with less stress and obligations.

The current study aimed at identifying the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment of faculty staff

and their assistants. The study results showed significant positive correlations between the scores of various dimensions of organizational justice from one side and those of faculty staff members and assistants various dimensions of organizational commitment on the other side. This indicates that different dimensions of organizational justice do influence the different dimensions of organizational commitment. This result was consistent with results of **Kamaluddin et al., (2013)**. Who found that organizational justice has strong positive correlation with organizational commitment. However, the multivariate analysis identified only procedural and interactional justice as positive predictors of total organizational commitment. in contrast of this result a study conducted in India by **Nakra, (2014)** revealed that the three dimensions of organizational justice were known as positive predictors of organizational commitment in multivariate analysis.

Regarding negative predictor of total organizational commitment. Multivariate analysis identified qualifications as negative predictor of organizational commitment; the higher qualification faculty staff and assistants have the low their organizational commitment. this could be explained by the higher level of stress the higher qualified faculty staff and assistants experience as a result of more obligations without the corresponding advantages they receive from their organization. in the same vein study conducted in Saudi Arabia on faculty staff by **Iqbal, (2011)** indicated a reverse correlation between qualifications and faculty staff organizational commitment.

Qualification identified as a negative predictor of total organizational commitment of faculty staff members and assistants in the current study multivariate analysis. However, univariate analysis indicated no significant correlation between organizational commitment and qualification. This result was in congruence with **Bakan et al., (2011)** whose study indicated that there was a significant correlation between qualification and organizational commitment. A study conducted by **Dogar, (2014)** disagreed with this result as it indicated that there was no significant correlation between qualification and

organizational commitment. An explanation of this finding may be highly educated staff members and assistants perceive cumulated stress through different stages of education this in turn lowering their organizational commitment.

In univariate analysis it was founded that organizational commitment has significant correlations with faculty staff members and assistants department and total experience; faculty staff members and assistants who working in psychiatry department and with high experience their organizational commitment scores higher than others. This result is in the same line with **Iqbal, (2011)** who found that positive correlation between organizational commitment and length of service and not consistent with results of **Bin Bakr & Ahmed (2015)** who found that work experience have no effect on organizational commitment.

Regarding distributive justice. Marital status identified as the positive predictor of distributive justice. Married faculty staff members and assistants have higher distributive justice scores than not married. An explanation of this finding is most married faculty staff members and assistants feel more stability and less stressful life than others do, so they perceiving distributive justice more than not married faculty staff members and assistants who are to some extent not stable and travelling a lot. This may be more obvious in this organization because of its recent evolution of it. This result opposed by **Qureshi, (2014)** who found that there is no significant relation between marital status and distributive justice.

Regarding total organizational justice. The current study results indicated that total experience years have statistically significant correlation with organizational justice; more experienced faculty staff members and assistants have higher organizational justice scores than others. However, in multivariate analysis total experience did not defined as a predictor of organizational justice. This result is in line with **(Bahrami, 2013)** whose study indicated that professional experience has a significant relationship with perceived organizational justice.

The present study showed that dimensions of organizational commitment were interdependent on each other and there are weak positive correlations between organizational commitment dimensions except between affective and continuance commitment. This finding supported by **Ali, (2016)** who found that the dimensions of organizational commitment interact with each other and that positive correlations is presented between organizational commitment dimensions. This result can be explained by that affective commitment based on emotional attachment to organization while continuance commitment is based on cognitive weighing of cost and benefits leaving organization so there was no correlation between continuance and affective commitment.

The finding of this study presented that organizational justice dimensions were interdependent on each other and there were strong positive correlations between organizational justice dimensions. This result was in congruence with **Al-Zu'bi, (2010)** who found that there are strong relationships between the three dimensions of organizational justice. This result present the possibility of the improvements in one dimension of organizational justice will help improvement of overall organizational justice.

Lastly. In general multivariate analysis showed that less than 40% of organizational commitment scores can be attributed to organizational justice perception effect. This indicate the need for more comprehensive analysis of the reasons of low organizational commitment among faculty staff members and assistants because the main target of any organization is to improve its human resources in terms of skills, qualification and commitment to the organization and its objectives.

## Conclusion

A sizeable proportion of faculty staff members and assistants has low organizational commitment and justice, it can be concluded that, the highest dimension of organizational justice perceived by study subjects is interactional justice while the lowest is distributive justice. The highest dimension of

organizational commitment among faculty staff members and assistants is continuance commitment while the lowest is affective commitment.

There were statistical significant relations between organizational justice and faculty staff members and assistants demographic characteristics regarding marital status and gender. There were statistical significant relations between organizational commitment and faculty staff members and assistants demographic characteristics regarding experience. there was statistically significant positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

## Recommendations

Based on the current study findings the following recommendations were proposed:

- The faculty administration must conduct training courses for the faculty administrators on the importance of organizational justice perception on organizational commitment.
- Explore the best methods for training administrators in the announcement and execution of organizational justice in all its dimensions.
- Take measures to monitor application of fair procedures and actions by the faculty administrators.
- Further research could examine a wider variety of antecedents of organizational commitment including previously studied variables such as conflict resolution, human resources practices and stress.
- Further studies are recommended to assess the reasons of low organizational justice and organizational commitment.

## References

**Aggarwal R., (2011):** A Study of Occupational Stress of Academic Faculty in Relation to Their Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy, Organizational Commitment and Coping Strategies, Panjab University.

- Aküzüm C., (2014):** *The Effect of Organizational Justice and Organizational Cynicism on the Organizational Commitment: An Application in Primary Education Institutions, Mevlana International Journal of Education.*
- Ali M. M., (2016):** Infeleunce of Conflict Management Strategies on Organizational Commitment Among Staff Nurses, Ain-Shams University, Mater Thesis.
- Altahayneh Z. L., Khasawneh A., & Abedalhafiz A., (2014):** Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction as Perceived by Jordanian Physical Education Teachers, *Asian Social Science* Vol. 10, No. 4
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A., (2010):** A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Business and Management* Vol. 5, No. 12
- Ayobami A. p., (2013):** Impact of Perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), special issue.
- Bahrami M. A., (2013):** Determinants of Perceived Organizational Justice among Hospital Employees, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* Copy Right © 2013 Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research NOVEMBER 2013 VOL 5, NO 7.
- Bakan I., Büyükbese T., & Ersahan B., (2011):** The Relationship between Employees' Education Level and Organizational Commitment: an Empirical Study, *International Conference on Management.*
- Bakhshi A., Kumar K. and Rani E. ( 2009):** Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 4, No. 9, Pp. 145-154.
- BinBakr B. M., & Ahmed E., (2015):** An Empirical Investigation of Faculty Members' Organizational Commitment in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, College of Arts, University of Dammam, Dammam, Saudi Arabia
- Dehkordi F. R., (2013):** Relationship of Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment of the Staff in General Directorate of Youth And Sports, Chahar Mahal Va Bakhtiari Province, *Pelagia Research Library, European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 2013, 3(3):696-700.
- Dogar N., (2014):** Relations between Organizational Commitment and Demographic Factors: A Research in Banking Sector, *Academicus - International Scientific Journal*
- Gayipov y., (2014):** The Relationship of Organizational Justice with Organizational Commitment: An Implementation in an Education Institution in City of Konya.
- Haddadi E., (2010):** Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Teaching Faculty A Case Study of Sistan and Baluchestan University Of Iran, University of Mysore.
- Iqpal A., (2011):** The Impact Assessment of Demographic Factors On Faculty Commitment in The Kingdom Of Saudi Arabian Universities, *Journal of College Teaching and Learning.*
- Kamaluddin M., Mahrani S. W., Takdir S. D., & Ansir, (2013):** Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment, *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-7064.
- Meyer J. P., & Allen N. J., (1991):** A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Misra K. C., (2013):** Nexus between Work Life Balance Practices and Employee Retention – The Mediating Effect of a

Supportive Culture, Asian Social Science; Vol. 9, No. 11, India.

**Nakra R., (2014):** Understanding the Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment and Projected Job Stay among Employees of the Business Process Outsourcing Sector in India.

**Paramanandam P., (2014):** Organisational Justice and Commitment among the Employees of An Auto Component Manufacturing Company, Grg School Of Management Studies, Peelamedu, Coimbatore.

**Qureshi F., (2014):** Factors Affecting Employees' Perception for Procedural and Distributive Justice, World Journal of *Management*.

**Rahim M. A., & Magner N. R., & Rahman S., (2001):** Do Justice Relationships with Organization-Directed Reactions Differ Across U.S. and Bangladesh Employees, The International Journal Of Conflict Management, 12(4), 333-349.

**Saadati1 M., Bidgoli A., Ghodsi A., Saadati A., Asghari A., & Golkhatmi M., (2016):** The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction Health, Spirituality and Medical Ethics, 3(1).