

The Role of Organizational Justice and Social Capital on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: Notes and Review

Agus Maliana

Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

Abstract

Organizational justice is a very important aspect in human resource management and is also a topic that is widely discussed in various management literature. One of the interesting studies related to organizational justice is the research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) regarding the role of organizational justice which consists of distributive justice and procedural justice in increasing organizational satisfaction and commitment as well as the moderating effect of social capital on higher education institutions. This study aims to review and provide notes on the research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) which is uploaded to Int. J. Business Excellence, 17(3), 336-360. This study is qualitative research with a literature review method. The results show that there are several notes related to the research of Tjahjono et al (2019) which are grouped into three aspects, namely conceptual, method and development of research results. Future studies are important to conduct a more in-depth and broader review related to organizational justice and social capital both in the education industry and other industries.

Keywords

Organizational justice;
distributive justice; procedural
justice; social capital;
satisfaction; organizational
commitment



I. Introduction

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) divides organizational justice into two types, namely distributive justice and procedural justice. Tjahjono et al. (2019) analyzes the moderating role of social capital in the relationship between distributive justice and procedural justice on satisfaction and commitment. From the results of this study, it was found that distributive justice and procedural justice have an important role in elaborating organizational satisfaction and commitment. The results also show that social capital is able to significantly moderate the relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment and satisfaction. The results also state that social capital is able to significantly moderate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment, but the relationship between procedural justice and satisfaction is not significantly moderated by social capital.

The concept used in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) focuses on distributive justice and procedural justice which are also widely carried out by other studies such as Raja et al. (2018; Tjahjono, 2011; Surianti & Soejoto, 2018; Lucas et al. 2018; Bagis, 2018). Whereas research related to organizational justice has grown to three types by adding interactional justice (Ashraf et al. 2018; Dong & Phuong, 2018; Bahri & Bilgihan, 2017) and four types by adding informational justice (Badawi et al. 2021; Pandita, 2017). ; Scheller & Harrison, 2018). Even Akram et al. (2016) use five types of organizational

justice including distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice and spatial justice.

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) using an experimental method involving 247 respondents. The interesting thing about this research is that it categorizes research subjects into two groups, namely low social capital and high social capital. Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) tested four hypotheses, namely social capital moderates the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction, social capital moderates the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment, social capital moderates the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction and social capital moderates the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment. The hypothesis in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) was analyzed using the ANOVA test as suggested by Kuehl (2000).

Tjahjono et al. (2019) provides an update in his research regarding the moderating role of social capital and the division of social capital into two groups, namely low social capital and high social capital. Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) has also been reviewed by Utomo (2022) which states that contextual aspects, such as distributive justice, procedural justice, and social capital, play a major role in elaborating organizational satisfaction and commitment. This study will provide a review of different aspects, namely conceptual, method and development of research results.

II. Research Method

2.1 Organisational Justice

Organizational justice is one of the main factors in creating employee happiness. Organizational justice creates a balance between work and personal life because they have the support of the organization. Research related to organizational justice has developed into three types by adding interactional justice (Ashraf et al. 2018; Dong & Phuong, 2018; Bahri & Bilgihan, 2017) and four types by adding informational justice (Badawi et al. 2021; Pandita, 2017; Scheller & Harrison, 2018; Palupi & Tjahjono, 2016). Even Akram et al. (2016) uses five types of organizational justice including distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice and spatial justice. Organization must have a goal to be achieved by the organizational members (Niati et al., 2021). The success of leadership is partly determined by the ability of leaders to develop their organizational culture. (Arif, 2019).

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) divides organizational justice into two types, namely distributive justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice is justice in terms of the process of distributing the results of activities (outcomes) and rewards (rewards) to members of the organization (Tjahjono et al. 2019). Distributive justice refers to the perception that outstanding organizational outcomes (for example, salaries, benefits, shift assignments, job evaluations, position assignments, promotions, and work discipline) are fair and equitable (Lambert et al. 2019).

Procedural justice is justice that is judged based on rules or policies and procedures in decision making in organizations (Saima, 2013). Procedural justice focuses more on the company's operational policies, the level of fairness in the organizational policy process will affect the level of member satisfaction (Tjahjono et al. 2019). Another opinion states that procedural justice refers to the perception that the processes and procedures used by organizations to achieve outstanding results are fair and equitable (Lambert et al. 2019).

Tjahjono et al. (2019) emphasizes the relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice and social capital. It is emphasized that from the point of view of distributive justice, people with low social capitalization are more focused on their short-term needs, namely financial. They will get angry easily if the immediate results are not as good as they expected. Thus, changes in the perception of distributive justice will get a more sensitive response in the form of changes in satisfaction.

Likewise in procedural justice, people with low social capital will try to protect their interests by the procedures of a policy, such as a performance appraisal policy. This phenomenon is described in the self-interest model that people will be more concerned with procedural justice because the procedure accommodates their interests. If the procedure is considered unfair, people with low social capital will be more sensitive in terms of changes in satisfaction levels because they focus on the financial aspect.

Research related to organizational justice that can be used as a comparison for research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) is a study by Palupi & Tjahjono (2016) which also analyzes organizational justice but combines it with religiosity and dysfunctional behavior. Palupi & Tjahjono (2016) emphasized that religiosity is a good predictor of organizational justice and commitment. On the other hand, in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) puts more emphasis on the social capital aspect.

2.2 Social Capital

Tjahjono et al. (2019) includes several definitions related to social capital, including the definition by Akdere (2005) which states that social capital is an individual's ability to mobilize potential through a network of friends, groups or organizations. In this definition, individual abilities are determined for a long period of time, so that social capital is a private property that is determined by a person and not on social interaction. Another definition cited states that social capital is the ability of individuals to mobilize their potential through a network of groups or organizations (Kostova & Roth, 2003).

Recent studies related to social capital provide different definitions such as McCann et al. (2021) which states that social capital is an organizational feature in social and economic life that has the potential to generate benefits for organizations that come from collective associations. The organizational features referred to in the definition are trust, norms and reciprocal networks.

The findings of various literatures emphasize that social capital is an ability that is able to make a major contribution in overcoming several economic problems in organizations (Saukani & Ismail, 2019). Levdokimov et al. (2020) states that social capital is a collective asset in the form of norms, values, beliefs, trust, networks, social relations and shared institutions that foster cooperation and collective action for mutual benefit.

Social capital has several forms, namely bonding social capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital (Ansari et al. 2012; McCann et al. 2021; Kyne & Aldrich, 2020). Bonding social capital refers to shared beliefs and norms that enable social cohesion within a generally homogeneous group of individuals, or those with similar backgrounds in the same community. Bridging social capital enables relationships between diverse social groups: these groups are often formed in horizontal networks, based on relationships between groups with similar characteristics such as life experience and social status. Furthermore, linking social capital refers to vertical relationships in which people develop alliances with sympathetic individuals in positions of power to take advantage of resources, ideas and information from formal institutions.

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction or employee satisfaction (also called morale) is one of the most widely used variables in organizational behavior. This is a response or reaction to the attitudes of workers in the organization (Tjahjono et al. 2019). Job satisfaction can also be interpreted as a feeling of pleasure and love for his work which is reflected in work enthusiasm, discipline and work performance (Aziri, 2011).

Several other definitions of job satisfaction theory state that job satisfaction is an individual's emotional relationship with the work environment (Vroom, 1964). Specifically, Locke suggests that job satisfaction is a happy or positive emotional state resulting from job evaluation or work experience" (Locke, 1976). Gupta & Singh (2020) define job satisfaction as a person's feelings about the rewards they receive in their work.

Tjahjono et al. (2019) states that distributive justice has a greater influence on employee satisfaction than procedural justice. Conceptually, it is due to distributive justice, which is related to the outcomes that employees get from the organization (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Several researchers support the positive influence of organizational justice and its dimensions on employee satisfaction (Ozel & Bayraktar, 2017; Christie et al. 2015). Other studies that support the effect of organizational justice on employee satisfaction are Gupta & Singh (2020; Lambert et al. 2019; Tran, 2020).

2.4 Organisational Commitment

Tjahjono et al. (2019) cites several definitions related to organizational commitment including Steers & Spencer (1977) defining organizational commitment as an individual's relative strength towards identification and involvement in a particular organization. Mowday et al. (1979) defines organizational commitment as an affective response indicated by the level of loyalty of a person in the organization.

Commitment is one of the identification systems for employee conditions that help certain organizations and their goals and objectives in maintaining organizational membership (Novitasari et al. 2020). Organizational commitment has implications for accepting the organization's direction and goals, including a strong desire to be part of the organization (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2014).

In social exchange theory, the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment is one of the most studied relationships in the management literature. Referring to social exchange theory, reciprocal rules predict that workers can reciprocate good or fair treatment with the organization or its managers by committing to the organization (Jameel et al, 2020).

Porter et al. (1974) suggested three factors related to organizational commitment, namely a strong belief in the goals and values of the organization, a willingness to exert considerable effort for the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Several studies support the role of organizational justice on organizational commitment such as Novitasari et al. (2020; Jameel et al. 2020; Suhardi et al. 2020).

III. Research Method

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) using an experimental method involving 247 respondents. The interesting thing about this research is that it categorizes research subjects into two groups, namely low social capital and high social capital. Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) tested four hypotheses, namely social capital moderates the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction, social capital moderates the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment, social capital

moderates the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction and social capital moderates the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment. The hypothesis in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) was analyzed using the ANOVA test as suggested by Kuehl (2000).

Regarding the measurement of variables, research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) uses several references, namely on the distributive justice variable, the measurement is carried out by modifying the four items developed by Lavensthal (1980) which are also used (Colquitt, 2001) after exploring it. For procedural justice variables, the measurement is carried out using seven items developed by (Colquitt, 2001). The measurement of social capital is based on Chua (2002) who developed a measurement of social capital at the individual level. Measurement of satisfaction is carried out using eight items developed by Robert and Reed (1996) and measurement of organizational commitment developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) and then modified by Al-Kilani Hani (2017). This measurement consists of six items.

IV. Result and Discussion

Conceptually, research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) has provided a good schematic analysis. However, if you refer to the literature more broadly, the concept of organizational justice can be developed further with broader dimensions such as research by Akram et al. (2016) use five types of organizational justice including distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice and spatial justice.

The literature review used by Tjahjono et al. (2019) is also quite in-depth and has elaborated various literatures from 1974 to 2019. This study provides several additions in order to update the literature review so that it can be studied more broadly. As for the research method, the research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) provides a good contribution, especially in the aspect of social capital where this analysis classifies the results into two groups, namely low social capital and high social capital.

Furthermore, related to the results of the analysis, research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) analyzes the relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice and social capital on organizational satisfaction and commitment. The study analyzed four hypotheses and found three supported and one unsupported hypothesis. The first hypothesis states that social capital significantly moderates the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction.

The average satisfaction of individuals with high social capital ($M = 7.71$) was higher than the average of individuals with low social capital (5.50). The regression line shows that individuals with low social capital tend to be more sensitive and more influenced by distributive justice, so it can be said that the impact of distributive justice on individual satisfaction is stronger in individuals with low social capital.

The second hypothesis in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) which states that social capital significantly moderates the relationship between procedural justice and satisfaction. The results of the analysis show that the second hypothesis in this study is not supported so that there is no significant moderating effect by social capital on the relationship between procedural justice and satisfaction.

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) has provided a fairly clear picture regarding the role of social capital in strengthening or weakening the relationship between distributive justice and procedural justice on individual satisfaction. The effect of distributive justice on satisfaction is proven to be stronger and more sensitive to employees who have low social capital. So that companies that have employees with low social capital should pay

more attention to distributive justice in order to achieve maximum satisfaction. Meanwhile, in the case of procedural justice, social capital does not have a significant effect.

The third and fourth hypotheses in the research of Tjahjono et al. (2019) is empirically supported so that it is proven that social capital moderates significantly the relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment and the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment. The results also show that respondents with low social capital have a higher sensitivity in responding to the influence of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational commitment.

Research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) provides an illustration that employees with low social capital are empirically proven to have higher sensitivity in responding to the influence of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational commitment. So that when employees have high distributive justice and procedural justice, employees with low social capital will have lower organizational commitment than employees with high social capital.

What needs to be underlined in this study is the social capital of employees. Social capital is an individual's ability to mobilize potential through a network of friends, groups or organizations. Companies or institutions should encourage employees to increase social capital. This will be very helpful in creating organizational satisfaction and commitment.

The results of this study have provided a satisfactory answer, but what needs to be added is a detailed classification related to low social capital and high social capital. It is necessary to add in further research the detailed measurement and criteria of employees with low social capital and high social capital. On the other hand, this research also needs to add a deeper analysis related to the results of the second hypothesis which is not supported, so that it is clear why social capital has an impact on the effect of distributive justice on satisfaction but does not have an impact on the effect of procedural justice on satisfaction.

V. Conclusion

This study provides several reviews and notes related to the research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) in three main aspects, namely conceptual, analytical methods and research results development. First in conceptual, research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) has provided a good schematic analysis. However, if you refer to the literature more broadly, the concept of organizational justice can be developed further with broader dimensions such as research by Akram et al. (2016) use five types of organizational justice including distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice and spatial justice.

Furthermore, in terms of research methods, research by Tjahjono et al. (2019) provides a good contribution, especially in the aspect of social capital where this analysis classifies the results into two groups, namely low social capital and high social capital. As for the research results, this research has provided a satisfactory answer, but what needs to be added is a detailed classification of low social capital and high social capital. It is necessary to add in further research the detailed measurement and criteria of employees with low social capital and high social capital. On the other hand, this study also needs to add a deeper analysis related to the results of the second hypothesis which is not supported.

References

- Akdere, M. (2005). Social capital theory and implications for human resource development, *Singapore Management Review*, 27(2), 1-24.
- Akram, T., Haider, M. J., & Feng, Y. X. (2016). The effects of organizational justice on the innovative work behavior of employees: an empirical study from China. *Innovation*, 2(1), 114-126.
- Ansari, S., Munir, K., & Gregg, T. (2012). Impact at the 'bottom of the pyramid': The role of social capital in capability development and community empowerment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 813-842.
- Arif, S. (2019). Influence of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction of Performance Principles of Senior High School in Medan City. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. P. 239-254
- Ashraf, M., Vveinhardt, J., Ahmed, R. R., Streimikiene, D., & Mangi, R. A. (2018). Exploring intervening influence of interactional justice between procedural justice and job performance: evidence from south asian countries. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 20(47), 169-184.
- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: a literature review, *Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.
- BADAWI, B., HARTATI, W., & MUSLICHAH, I. (2021). Service recovery process: The effects of distributive and informational justice on satisfaction over complaint handling. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 8(1), 375-383.
- Bagis, F. (2018, July). Does Job Satisfaction Mediate the Effect of Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice on Organizational Commitment?: Case Study of Education Institution. In *5th International Conference on Community Development (AMCA 2018)*.
- Bahri-Ammari, N., & Bilgihan, A. (2017). The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on customer retention: An empirical investigation in the mobile telecom industry in Tunisia. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 37, 89-100.
- Gupta, A., & Singh, V. (2020). Incorporating organisational justice, job satisfaction and organisational commitment in a model of turnover intentions for software professionals. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 21(4), 544-562.
- Ievdokymov, V., Lehenchuk, S., Zakharov, D., Andrusiv, U., Usatenko, O., & Kovalenko, L. (2020). Social capital measurement based on "The value explorer" method. *Management Science Letters*, 10(6), 1161-1168.
- Jameel, A. S., Mahmood, Y. N., & J Jwmaa, S. (2020). Organizational justice and organizational commitment among secondary school teachers. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-6.
- Kostova, T. & Roth, K. (2003). Social capital in multinational corporation and micro-macro model of its formation, *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 297-317.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2014). *Perilaku Organisasi* (9th ed.). Salemba Empat
- Kuehl, R.O. (2000). *Design of Experiments: Statistical Principles of Research Design and Analysis*, 2nd ed., Cengage Learning, Inc.
- Kyne, D., & Aldrich, D. P. (2020). Capturing bonding, bridging, and linking social capital through publicly available data. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 11(1), 61-86.

- Lambert, E. G., Keena, L. D., Leone, M., May, D., & Haynes, S. H. (2020). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of correctional staff. *The Social Science Journal*, 57(4), 405-416.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*
- Lucas, T., Strelan, P., Karremans, J. C., Sutton, R. M., Najmi, E., & Malik, Z. (2018). When does priming justice promote forgiveness? On the importance of distributive and procedural justice for self and others. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 13(5), 471-484.
- McCann, C., Prest Talbot, A. L., & Westaway, A. (2021). Social Capital for Social Change: Nine Tenths Mentoring Programme, a Solution for Education (In) Justice in South Africa?. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 16(1), 45-59.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The Effect of Training on Work Performance and Career Development: The Role of Motivation as Intervening Variable. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(2), 2385–2393. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1940>
- Novitasari, D., Asbari, M., Wijaya, M. R., & Yuwono, T. (2020). Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 3(3), 96-112.
- Palupi, M. & Tjahjono, H.K. (2016). A model of religiosity and organizational justice: the impact on commitment and dysfunctional behavior. *Ibima Proceedings*. 1781-1790. Milan Italy
- Pandita, D. (2017). An Analysis of Organizational Justice on Employee Engagement in Selected Healthcare NGOs in India. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 8(4).
- Raja, U., Sheikh, R. A., Abbas, M., & Bouckenooghe, D. (2018). Do procedures really matter when rewards are more important? A Pakistani perspective on the effects of distributive and procedural justice on employee behaviors. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 68(2), 79-88.
- Saima, B. (2013). Developing organizational commitment and organizational justice to amplify organizational citizenship behavior in banking sector of Pakistan, *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 646-655.
- Saukani, N., & Ismail, N. A. (2019). Identifying the components of social capital by categorical principal component analysis (CATPCA). *Social Indicators Research*, 141(2), 631-655.
- Scheller, E. M., & Harrison, W. (2018). Ignorance is bliss, or is it? The effects of pay transparency, informational justice and distributive justice on pay satisfaction and affective commitment. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 50(2), 65-81.
- Steers, R. M., & Spencer, D. G. (1977). The role of achievement motivation in job design. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(4), 472.
- Suhardi, M., Huda, S. A., Mulyadi, D., & Nazopah, N. (2020). The effect of organizational culture, leader behaviors, job satisfaction, and justice on organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Science, Engineering, Technology, and Education*, 2(1), 37-42.

- Surjanti, J., & Soejoto, A. (2018). The Impact Of Procedural Justice (Pj), Distributive Justice (Dj) And Ethical Climate (Ec) On Continuous Professional Development (Cpd): The Role Of Work Related Stress (Wrs) Mediation. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(1), 1-9.
- Tjahjono, H.K. (2011). The configuration among social capital, distributive and procedural justice and its consequences to individual satisfaction. *International Journal of Information and Management Sciences*, 22 (1): 87-103.
- Tjahjono, H.K., Fachrunnisa, O. & Palupi, M. (2019), 'Configuration of organisational justice and social capital: their impact on satisfaction and commitment,' *International Journal of Business Excellence*, 17(3): 336-360.
- Tran, Q. H. (2020). The Relationship between Organisational Justice, Employee Satisfaction, and Employee Performance: A case study in Vietnam. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(7), 1182-1194.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Sage Publications.