IMPACT OF PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT ON ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

-Dr. Luxmi
Sr. Lecturer
UBS, Panjab University, Chandigarh

Abstract

This research paper aims to study perceived organizational support (POS) and organizational Justice (OJ) in IT organizations, to find out the correlation between perceived organizational support and organizational Justice, to examine the impact of organizational Justice on perceived organizational support and to compare organizational Justice vis-à-vis different psycho-demographic factors of employees. The scope of the study was IT organizations belonging to Chandigarh, Pune, Mumbai, Bangaluru and Noida. The sample comprised of 122 respondents drawn from IT organizations (Infosys, TCS, Accenture and Tech Mahindra). Comparisons made on the basis of psycho-demographic factors make the study comprehensive. The results revealed a very significant positive correlation between perceived organizational support and organizational Justice. The positive correlation here signifies that fairer is the organizational justice (procedural justice, interactive justice and distributed justice) higher will be the perceived organizational support. The study further revealed that organizational Justice has a very significant impact on perceived organizational support amongst the employees of IT organidations.

Introduction

For employees, the organization serves as an important source of socio-emotional resources, such as respect and caring, tangible benefits, wages and medical benefits. Being regarded highly by the organization helps to meet employees' needs for approval, esteem, and affiliation. Positive valuation by the organization also provides an indication that increased effort will be noted and rewarded. Employees therefore take an active interest in the regard with which they are held by their employer.

Perceived organizational support is defined as "the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by their organization and that the firm cares about their well-being" (**Eisenberger et al., 1986**).

Eisenberger and colleagues developed the concept of perceived organizational support is an attempt to represent the employment relationship described by social exchange theory (**Blau, 1964**). Social exchange suggests that positive perceptions about the employment relationship will lead to beneficial work behaviors through the process of obligatory reciprocation.

The term **organizational justice** was coined by **Greenberg (1987)** and is defined as an individual's perception of and reactions to fairness in an organization. Fairness is often of central interest to organizations and managers and can range from perceptions of fair pay, equal opportunities for promotion, to personnel selection. The idea of organizational justice stems from Equity Theory **(Adams, 1965)**, which posits that judgments of equity and inequity are derived from comparisons between one's self and others based on inputs and outcomes. Inputs refer to what a person perceives to contribute (e.g., knowledge and effort) while outcomes are what an individual perceives to get out of an exchange relationship (e.g., pay and recognition).

Niehoff and Moorman, (1993) held that organizational justice is a multidimensional construct comprising three components: **Distributive, Procedural and Interactive justice.**

Distributive justice describes the extent to which an employee believes that his or her work outcomes, such as rewards and recognition, are fair. The outcomes or resources distributed may be tangible (e.g., pay) or intangible (e.g., praise). Perceptions of distributive justice can be fostered when outcomes are perceived to be equally applied (Adams, 1965).

Procedural justice describes the extent to which formal procedures exist and whether these procedures are implemented in a way that takes employees' needs into consideration.

Interactive justice covers the extent to which employees perceive that their needs are taken into account in making job decisions and that employees are provided with adequate explanations when decisions are finalized.

Literature Review

According to organizational support theory, the development of perceived organizational support (POS) is based on the employees' tendency to view their favourable or unfavourable treatment as an indication that the organization favours or disfavours them (**Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002**). Employees are said to develop global beliefs regarding the extent to which their organization values their contributions and genuinely cares about their wellbeing (**Eisenberger et al., 1997**).

Both employee and employer can benefit from high levels of perceived organizational support. Employees experience positive outcomes - such as a decrease in job-related stress, an increase in positive job-related affect, high levels of job involvement, reduced withdrawal behaviour, increased organizational commitment and a desire to remain with the organization **(Eisenberger et al., 1986).** This results in positive organizational outcomes such as reduced turnover, increased affective commitment and higher productivity and performance **(Eisenberger et al., 2001).**

Wayne et al., (1997) suggested that the quality of leader-member exchange appears to have a stronger effect on perceived organizational support, indicating that LMX plays a key role in affecting employees' perceptions of organizational support. **Eisenberger et. al., (2002)** found that the relationship between perceived supervisor's support and perceived organizational support was greater for employees who perceived their supervisors to have high informal status within the organization. Organizations generally have a high regard for members who are reputed to embody favored characteristics. **Gakovic, (2003)** suggested that, regardless of work status, employees who perceive their organization as caring also have a socio-emotional relationship with that organization. **Stamper and Johlke, (2003)** found that employees who perceive high levels of perceived organizational support are more likely to remain with their companies and have greater job satisfaction than workers who experience low levels of perceived organizational support.

Folger & Konovsky, (1989) proved that procedural justice contributed significantly towards the trust in supervisor, organizational commitment and also pay satisfaction whereas distributive justice contributed only towards pay satisfaction. **McFarlin and Sweeney, (1992)** in their research found that distributive justice tended to be a stronger predictor of personal outcomes than procedural justice, whereas the reverse was true for organizational outcomes. Procedures define the organization's capacity to treat employees fairly. Thus, if they see procedures as fair, employees may view the organization positively, even if they are currently dissatisfied with such personal outcomes as a low pay raise. In contrast, fair procedures produced high commitment and supervisor evaluations, regardless of the level of distributive justice.

Brockner et. al., (1994) explored that when procedural justice was low, there was a marked relationship between outcome negativity and individuals' reactions. However, when procedural justice was perceived to be relatively high, there was little relationship between outcome negativity and reactions. **Konovsky, (2000)** examined that procedural justice moderates the relationships between other justice variables and negative employee behavior. **Hauenstein et al, (2001)** indicated that the relationship between procedural and distributive justice is strong. **Witt et al. (2001)** suggested that management practices that promote perceptions of procedural justice are likely to enhance commitment among employees sensitive to social exchange. **Warner**, (2005) indicated that procedural justice is a more important predictor of organizational commitment for survivors and unaffected workers than for victims, while distributive justice is more important for victims than for either survivors or unaffected workers.

Murtaza et al., (2011) found that both perceptions of distributive and procedural justice play a major role in the development of employees' commitment but procedural justice has shown a greater impact on WAPDA employees. The excellence of management's justice in the organizations promotes employees' perceptions of fair dealing. **Robert et al., (1998)** investigated that procedural justice affect the degree to which employees perceive support from their organization, and this perception of support creates a climate in which the employees are likely to reciprocate with citizen-ship behaviors.

Ambrose and Schminke, (2003) suggested that under different structural conditions, procedural and interactional justice will play differentially important roles in determining the quality of organizational social exchange (as evidenced by perceived organizational support [POS]) and supervisory social exchange (as evidenced by supervisory trust). **Labedo, (2005)** showed that perceived organizational support and justice (distributive & procedural) are complementary concepts that have explanatory power in job satisfaction of extension personnel. The relationships between job satisfaction and distributive and procedural justice were stronger when the respondents had higher levels of perceptions of perceived organizational support than at lower levels. **Jeewon & Kessler, (2008)** examined that perceived distributive justice allows employees to have feelings of organizational support, which in turn provide competitive advantage by inducing employees' beneficial behaviors for their organizations. **Phattanacheewapul et al, (2008)** suggested that all organizational justice and organizational support have significant positive effects. **Yavuz, (2010)** observed that procedural justice; power and success cultures were predictive variables in the affective commitment sub-dimension. If teachers' perception of organizational justice is positive, this will increase their commitment to their organization. Therefore, it may be useful to revise practices of distributive, interactive and procedural justice in schools.

Research Objectives

1. To study the level of perceived organizational support and organizational justice amongst the employees of IT sector organisations.
2. To find out the correlation between perceived organizational support and organisational justice amongst the employees of IT sector organisations.
3. To find out the impact of organisational justice on perceived organizational support amongst the employees of IT sector organisations.
4. To compare organizational justice using psycho demographic factors i.e. age, gender, marital status, work experience of employees of IT sector organizations.

Hypotheses

H_1 There is significant relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactive justice) amongst the employees of IT sector.

H_2 There is significant relationship of organizational justice with psycho-demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, work experience) of employees of IT sector.

H_{2a} There is a relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactive justice) and the age of the employees.

H_{2b} There is no significant difference in the level of organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactive justice) for married and unmarried/single employees.

H_{2c} There is no significant difference in the level of organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactive justice) for male and female employees.

H_{2c} There is a relationship between organizational justice (procedural, distributive and interactive justice) and total work experience of the employees.

H_3 Organizational justice has significant impact on perceived organizational support amongst the employees of IT sector.

Research Design

The above mentioned and other similar studies made the plot for the present study. The study is exploratory cum descriptive in nature. The authors attempt to study perceived organizational support and organisational justice. Four organizations were chosen from IT sector organizations such as Infosys, TCS, Accenture and Tech Mahindra. These organizations have been chosen from the Nasscom list (2008-09) of top 10 software companies (on basis of Indian revenues). All the organisations were chosen from the Chandigarh, Pune, Mumbai, Bengaluru and Noida. The research population selected comprises of the software engineers from the above mentioned organizations. The questionnaires were mailed to 200 employees out of whom 122 employees responded with filled questionnaires.

Data Collection

Primary data was collected through preliminary interviews and questionnaires ultimately. Perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al, 1986) and organisational justice questionnaires (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) were used to undertake the study. The cronbach alpha coefficient of the scales was found to be 0.848. The questionnaire also sought psycho-demographic information of the respondents i.e. age, gender, marital status and total work experience.

Results and Discussion

In order to meet the objectives of the study data collected was analyzed. However, before undertaking a comprehensive data analysis normalcy of data was checked. It was done to determine if the data was suited for parametric or non-parametric tests. Kolmogrov-Smirnov and test were conducted to meet these objectives.

Table 1: Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

	PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL	ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT	JUSTICE
N		122	122
Normal Parameters(a,b)	Mean	4.9783	4.3080
	Std. Deviation	.69999	.90574
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.085	.087
	Positive	.063	.087
	Negative	-.085	-.075
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.935	.959
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.346	.317

a. Test distribution is Normal. b. Calculated from data.

The table 1 present the statistic for the two tests i.eKolmogrov-Smirnov Test. The p value for both the variables was found to be $p_{(pos)}$ = .346 and $P_{(oj)}$= .317. **These results indicated that the data was normally distributed. Based on these results it was decided that the data was suitable for parametric tests and therefore, ANOVA, t-test, Karl Pearson's Correlation and Simple Linear Regression test were used to test the relationship between the two variables.**

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics shown below in the Table 2 has been used to show the level of Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Justice (Distributive, Procedural, Interactive justice). The scale used in the questionnaire was the 7-point Likert scale. Where 4 was the neutral value with all values below 4 (i.e.1, 2 and 3) being low and all values above 4 (i.e.5, 6 and 7) being high.

TABLE 2: Descriptive Statistics

Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceived Organizational Support	122	3.59	6.35	4.9783	.69999
Distributive Justice	122	1.00	7.00	3.9705	1.12483
Procedural Justice	122	2.17	6.00	4.4317	.95075
Interactive Justice	122	2.00	6.78	4.4763	.99304
Organizational Justice	122	2.22	6.59	4.3080	.90574

Perceived organizational support has been found very high as the mean has a high value of 4.9783. Distributive Justice has been found to be rather satisfactory as its value is approximately near the neutral value (mean = 3.9705). The range of the Distributive justice has been found to be rather wide ranging from 1 to 7. Procedural Justice has been found to be high in the sample with the mean value of 4.4317(as the value is above 4). The range of the procedural justice is wide with the minimum of 2.17 to maximum of 6. Interactive Justice has been found to be very high with mean value above 4 (mean = 4.47)

The range of Interactive Justice is also wide with the minimum value ranging from 2 to the maximum value of 6.78. The high value of interactive justice can also be attributed to the fact that in IT industry communication amongst colleagues and supervisors is highly encouraged. Organizational Justice has been thus found to have a high value of mean i.e. 4.3080. Thus from the descriptive Statistics we get the conclusion that the value of all the variables has been found quite high in the IT industry within the chosen sample.

Correlation between Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Justice

Table 4: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Distributive Justice	Between Groups	1.383	2	.691	.542	.583
	Within Groups	151.711	119	1.275		
	Total	153.094	121			
Procedural Justice	Between Groups	8.372	2	4.186	4.932	.009
	Within Groups	101.004	119	.849		
	Total	109.375	121			
Interactive Justice	Between Groups	11.467	2	5.734	6.326	.002
	Within Groups	107.853	119	.906		
	Total	119.320	121			
Organizational Justice	Between Groups	3.756	2	1.878	2.340	.101
	Within Groups	95.508	119	.803		
	Total	99.263	121			

The results of one-way ANOVA (table 4) suggested a very significant difference in the level of Procedural and Interactive Justice among different age levels, getting p-value less than .05 (p=.009 and p=.002 respectively). Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2a}) that there is no significant difference in the level of procedural and interactive justice among the different age level is rejected. Also the relation of age with Interactive justice is stronger (p=.002) than that with procedural justice (p=.009). It can be concluded that employees from different age categories expect different levels of Procedural and Interactive justice.

The expectations of younger employee in case of fair formal procedures and the interaction with supervisors and peers will be entirely different from those of an elder employee. The result further suggested that there is no significant difference in the level of distributive justice (p equals .583) among the different age levels, getting p-value more than .05. Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2a}) that there is no significant difference in the level of distributive justice across the different age level is not rejected or may be accepted.

Marital Status-Wise Comparison

Table 5: Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Distributive Justice	Equal variances assumed	1.710	120	.090
	Equal variances not assumed	2.068	54.560	.043
Procedural Justice	Equal variances assumed	-1.546	120	.125
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.627	42.629	.111
Interactive Justice	Equal variances assumed	-2.676	120	.008
	Equal variances not assumed	-3.040	48.331	.004
Organizational Justice	Equal variances assumed	-1.147	120	.254
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.386	54.565	.171

The results of Independent Samples t-test (table 5) suggested no significant difference in the level of Distributive and Procedural justice for married and single employees, getting p-value more than .05 (p equals .090, .125 and .254 respectively). Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2b}) that there is no significant difference in the level of Distributive and Procedural justice for married and single employees is not rejected or may be accepted. While the results further suggested a significant difference in the level of interactive justice for married and single employees, getting p-value less than .05 (p equals .008). Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2b}) that there is no significant difference in the level of interactive justice for married and single employees is rejected. So it may be concluded that the level of interactive justice i.e. interaction with colleagues and supervisors required by males and females is entirely different from each other.

Gender-Wise Comparison

The results of Independent Samples t-test in Table 6 below suggested no difference in the level of Organizational Justice (Distributive, Procedural, Interactive justice) for male and female employees, getting p-value more than .05 (p equals .228, .325, .410 and .471 respectively).

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Distributive Justice	Equal variances assumed	-.989	120	.325
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.043	104.067	.299
Procedural Justice	Equal variances assumed	-.826	120	.410
	Equal variances not assumed	-.896	110.891	.372
Interactive Justice	Equal variances assumed	-.724	120	.471
	Equal variances not assumed	-.808	116.828	.421
Organizational Justice	Equal variances assumed	-1.213	120	.228
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.365	117.990	.175

Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2c}) that there is no significant difference in the level of Organizational Justice (Distributive, Procedural, Interactive justice) for male and female employees is not rejected or may be accepted.

TABLE 7: ANOVA (Experience-Wise Comparison)

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Distributive Justice	Between Groups	10.977	3	3.659	2.930	.035
	Within Groups	147.360	118	1.249		
	Total	153.094	121			
Procedural Justice	Between Groups	7.219	3	2.406	2.780	.044
	Within Groups	102.156	118	.866		
	Total	109.375	121			
Interactive Justice	Between Groups	5.092	3	1.697	1.754	.160
	Within Groups	114.228	118	.968		
	Total	119.320	121			
Organizational Justice	Between Groups	5.309	3	1.770	2.223	.089
	Within Groups	93.954	118	.796		
	Total	99.263	121			

The results of one-way ANOVA (table 7)suggested a significant difference in the level of Distributive and Procedural Justice across the different levels of work experience of the employees, getting p-value less than .05 (p equals .035 and .044 respectively). Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2d}) that there is no significant difference in the level of Distributive and Procedural justice across the different levels of work experience of the employees is rejected.

These results also suggested that the relationship between work experience and Distributive justice (p=.035) is stronger than that of Procedural justice (p=.044). Thus the employees from different levels of work experience will have more difference in their views of distributive justice than that of Procedural justice. While the results further suggested no significant difference in the level of interactive justice, getting p-value more than .05 (p equals .160) across the different levels of work experience of the employees. Therefore the null hypothesis (H_{2d}) that there is no significant difference in the level of interactivejustice across the different levels of work experience of the employees is not rejected or may be accepted.

Causal Relationship Between Perceived Organisational Support and Organisational Justice

The results are presented in the Table 8, 9 & 10 below.

Table 8: Model Summary

Model 1	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.671(a)	.450	.446	.67439

a Predictors: (Constant), OJ

Table 9:ANOVA (b)

Model 1		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	1 Regression	44.687	1	44.687	98.256	.000(a)
	Residual		54.576	120	.455	
	Total		99.263	121		

a Predictors: (Constant), OJ

b Dependent Variable: POS

Table 10: Coefficients (a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	-.014	.440		-.032	.975
	OJ	.868	.088	.671	9.912	.000

a Dependent Variable: POS

The result of Simple Linear Regression test suggested that organisational justice has significant impact (Result of ANOVA in **Table 9**, with p-value= .000) on perceived organisational support with R=.671 (**Table 8**), slope of regression line=.868 and intercept = -.014 (**Table 10**), therefore null hypothesis (H_{3a}) is accepted.

Findings

- The Perceived Organizational Support has a significant strong positive correlation with Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Interactive Justice. This shows that if the management acts in just and fair manner regarding the pay, procedure and encourage healthy interaction, employees feel that the organization is supportive towards them.
- Perceived Organizational Support is more strongly related with procedural justice than Distributive Justice and Interactive Justice. Employees in IT industry give more importance to fair procedures and thus it is the greatest factor in increasing perceived organisational support.
- There has been found very significant difference in the level of Procedural and Interactive Justice among different age levels. Employees belonging to different age groups have different hopes of procedural and interactive justice from the organization. While the level of distributive justice is same in all the age groups.
- The results show significant difference in the level of Perceived Organizational Support among genders (male and female). Male and female have different views and acceptance of perceived organisational support. Within the same conditions and environment in IT industry male and female perceive organisational support differently. While all the other justices are accepted equally.
- The results show significant difference in the level of Interactive Justice among different marital status (married and unmarried). The fair level of interaction in the organization is viewed differently by married and unmarried employees.
- The results show significant difference in the level of Distributive and Procedural Justice among different levels of work experience. The employees from different levels of work experience have different view of fair level of distributive and procedural justice. While the level of interactive justice and perceived organisational support remains the same.
- The result of Simple Linear Regression test suggested that organisational justice has significant impact on perceived organisational support.

Limitations of the Study

- Some respondents were quite unwilling to complete the questionnaire because of lack of time on their on their part.
- This research was limited only to software engineers working in IT industry. Employees of the top level were not included in the research.

References:

1. Adams (1965). Inequity in social exchange", in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.). Advances in Experimental social Psychology. Academic Press, New York. 2: 267-299.
2. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life,* New York: John Wiley & Sons.
3. Brockner, J., Konovsky, M. A., Schneider, R.C., Folder, R., Martin, C. and Bier, R.J. (1994, April). Interactive Effects of Procedural Justice and Outcome Negativity on Victims and Survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management JournaL. 37(2):* 397-409.
4. Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I.L. and Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived Supervisor Support: Contributions to Perceived Organizational Support and Employee

Retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 83* (3): 565-573.

5. Eisenberger, R.; Armeli, S.; Rexwinkel, B.; Lynch, PD.; and Rhoades, L. (2001). "Reciprocation of perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 8(1): 42-51.
6. Eisenberger, R.; Cummings, J.; Armeli, S.; and Lynch, PD. (1997). "Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment and job satisfaction". *Journal of Applied Psycholog.* 82(3): 812-820.
7. Eisenberger, R.; Huntington, R.; Hutchison, S.; and Sowa, D. (1986). "Perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 71(4): 500-507.
8. Folger, R. and Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journa. 32* (1): 115-130.
9. Gakovic, A. and Tetrick, L.E. (2003). Perceived organizational support and work status: a comparison of the employment relationships of part-time and full-time employees attending university classes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. 24:* 649-666.
10. Greenberg, J. (1993). "Justice and organizational citizenship: a complementary on the state of science". Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal. 6(3):249-256.
11. Hauenstein, N. M., McGonigle, T. and Flinder, S.V. (2001). A meta analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and distributive justice: Implications for Justice research. *Employee responsibilities and rights Journal. 13* (1): 39-56.
12. Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding Organizational justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Mangemet. 26* (3): 489-511.
13. Labedo, O.J. (2005). Relative contributions of perceived organizational support and organizational justice to extension personnel's job satisfaction. *Journal of International Agricultural and extension educatio. 12* (1): 65-75.
14. Maureen L. and Ambrose, A. M. (2003). Organization Structure as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice. Perceived Organizational Support and Supervisory Trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 88* (2): 295-305.
15. McFarlin, D.B. and Sweeney, P. D. (1992, august). Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal andorganisational outcomes. *Academy of Management.* 35(3): 626-637.
16. Moorman, R. H., Blakley, G.L. and Niehoff, B.P. (1998, june). Does Perceived Organizational Support Mediate the Relationship between Procedural Justice and OCB. *Academy of Management Journal. 41(3):* 351-357.
17. Murtaza, G., Shad, I., Shahzad, K., Shah, M.K. and Khan, N. A. (2011). Impact of Distributive and Procedural Justice on Employees' Commitment: A Case study of Public Sector Organization of Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences.* 29: 73-80.
18. Phattanacheewapul, A. (2008). Organizational justice versus organizational support: the driven-factors of employee satisfaction and employee commitment on job performance. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics. 8* (2): 76-82.
19. Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2002).Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 87 (*4): 698–714.
20. Stamper, C.L. and Johlke, M. C. (2003). The Impact of Perceived Organizational Support on the Relationship between Boundary Spanner Role Stress and Work Outcomes. *Journal of Managemen., 29* (4): 569-588.
21. Warner, J.C. (2005). Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice: How Experiences With Downsizing Condition Their Impact On Organizational Commitment. *Social Psychology. 68* (1): 89-102.
22. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. and Liden, R.C. (1997).Perceived Organizational Support and Leader-Member Exchange: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Academy of Management*Journal. *40* (1): 82-111.