

## The Relationship Between Organizational Justice Components and Organizational Commitment in Professional Coaches

Received: 2021-03-03

Accepted: 2022-02-19

Vol. 2, No.4. Autumn. 2021, 68-76

Mozafar Yektayar<sup>1\*</sup>  
Mozhgan Khodamoradpoor<sup>2</sup>  
Reza Nikbakhsh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor of Sport Management, Islamic Azad University Sanandaj Branch, Sanandaj, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor of Physical Education and Sport Science, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran.

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor of Physical Education and Sport Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\*Correspondence:  
Mozafar Yektayar: Associate Professor of Sport Management, Islamic Azad University Sanandaj Branch, Sanandaj, Iran

Email: [paper.sci07@gmail.com](mailto:paper.sci07@gmail.com)  
Orcid: [0000-0002-4490-6774](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4490-6774)

### Abstract

**Purpose:** This study investigated the relationship of organizational justice with organizational commitment of the professional sports trainers of Iran.

**Methods:** 293 professional sports coaches of Iran were totally selected as the study sample. Research method was correlational, and for assessing organizational justice and organizational commitment, Organizational Justice Questionnaire (Rego and Cunha, 2006) and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Meyer, Allen 1997) were respectively used. First, to check for normal distribution of the data Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and then to analyze it Pierson's correlation coefficient and multiple correlation were utilized.

**Results:** The results showed that organizational justice and its components had a significant and positive correlation with each of the components of organizational commitment.

**Conclusion:** The relationship between components of organizational justice and organizational commitment which is obtained as the result of this study can play a significant role in recognition and understanding of the managers for taking measures to improve the perception of organizational justice and organizational commitment of the trainers.

**Keywords:** Organizational justice, organizational commitment, professional coaches, Iran.

## Introduction

In order to improve and develop management and access to organizational goals, managers are forced to study human behavior and its formation. Organizations are composed of unique individuals, so each person, based on the attitudes, feelings, desires, intrinsic and acquired properties and his environmental conditions, behaves specifically at certain times (Rezaian, 2005).

Organization is a social system whose life and stability is dependent on the existence of a strong link between its fundamental components. Perceived in justice has detrimental effects on teamwork because it over shadows man's effort and motivation. In justice and unfair distribution of the organization's achievements and output weakness the employees' spirit and undermines their efforts and activity. Therefore, justice is the key to the survival and sustainability of the development of the organization and its employees (Seyed Javadayn, Faraahi, Attar Taheri, 2008). of the main duties of the managers are observing fair behavior and establishing the sense of justice among their subordinates. Nevertheless, by proper understanding of the way that dimensions of organizational justice influence organizational commitment and its domains, managers can take more appropriate measures in order to develop the sense of justice in organizations. Organizational justice is referred to as the way that employees should be behaved so that they can feel they are treated fairly. In other words, it is attributed to the attempt to express the role of justice in the workplace (Coetzee, 2005). Study of justice in organizations began with Adams' works on equality theory (Adams, 1965). Generally, organization justice has three dimensions of distributive, procedural, and interactional.

Employees' perception of fair distribution of the outcomes is called distributive justice;

procedural justice is fairness of the procedures and official policies of the organization used to determine the consequences. Research findings indicate that processes by which rewards are determined are as important as the distribution of rewards, and their fairness is equally important (Lind & Tyler, 1998). Finally, interactional justice has been defined based on the perceived fairness of interpersonal relationships related to organizational procedures and quality of interpersonal relationships (Cropanzano, Prehar & Chen, 2002). Procedural justice is mostly relevant to organization and organizational policies while interactional justice is mostly associated with supervisors (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

Organizational justice in this study was measured based on the five-component model of Rego and Cunha including: distributive justice in reward (the reward distributed in proportion to the extent of the ability, input and efforts of individuals), distributive justice in tasks (tasks should be distributed fairly in the organization), procedural justice (fairness of the procedures and official policies of the organization used to determine the consequences), interpersonal justice (including interpersonal communication, respect, trust, honesty, kindness, etc.), and information justice (the explanations and information of decision makers concerning the use of procedures and distribution of outcomes (Cloutior & Vilhuber, 2008, Magoshi & Chang, 2009). Better understanding of organizational justice (procedural justice) results in some pleasant outcomes such as high organizational commitment, willingness to stay in the organization, high level of performance and job satisfaction (Brown & Sargeant, 2007, Colquit & et al, 2001) Results of some studies show that people who have a positive attitude towards their organization are more committed, in fact they

are less absent and have higher performance, they are better organization citizens and have greater satisfaction and effectiveness (Colquit & et al, 2001, Clay – Warner & Reynolds , Roman, 2005).

The relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational behavior is an issue that has always been considered by researchers. The second variable investigated in this study is organizational commitment. Organizational commitment indicates psychological attachment to the organization one is employed in (Allen, N.J & Meyer, 1990). Porter & et al, (1974) believe that organizational commitment is manifested in three major recognitions: faith and strong belief in the organization and acceptance of its goals and values, willingness to make relatively high efforts for the organization, and a strong desire to remain as a member of the organization. Porter & et al view was the dominant approach for a period of one to two decades. Organizational commitment is another factor which is associated with organizational justice; organizational commitment is the attitude or orientation towards the organization that relates the identity of the person to organization (Klendauer & Deller, 2009). Organizational commitment includes affective commitment (emotional attachment of the employees to identify with the organization and engaging in organizational activities), continuance commitment (commitment based on valuing the organization and employees are involved in the organization) and normative commitment (people's feelings toward the necessity of staying in the organization) (Spector, 1997). Although all the three types of organizational commitment refer to the possibility of the person's remaining in his organization, but the nature of belonging and attachment to the organization is quite different and it depends on the type of organizational commitment. Those who have

emotional commitment may attempt more to promote and grow in the organization than those who don't have such commitment, this is also true for people with strong normative commitment, but people who have continuance commitment are less willing to behave based on fundamental principles of affective and normative commitment, thus, their tendency to remain in their organization is not as high as those who have the other two types of organizational commitment, namely affective and normative commitment. Human resource specialists are interested in the study of organizational commitment because organizational commitment leads to desirable organizational outcomes such as reducing turnovers, reduce in displacements and improve in job performance and it is pertinent to them (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999, Jaramillo, Mulki & Marshall, 2005).

Seyed Javadayn et al (2008) have also concluded that the effect of various dimensions of organizational justice on organizational commitment and its domains was different and with various degrees. Yet any sense of justice has always had a significant effect on organizational commitment.

Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) expressed, that distributive justice and procedural justice predict outcomes such as performance, job involvement and organizational commitment. The obtained results showed that distributive justice had a significant relationship with performance evaluation and organizational commitment, and procedural justice had a significant relationship with organizational commitment. Many researchers in recent years have studied the relationship between organizational justice and behavioral and attitude in al outcomes such as organizational commitment and organizational civil behavior (Colquit & et al, 2001, Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Perceived

organizational justice has positive relationship with organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational civil behavior (Mayer, Nishii, Schneider & Goldstein, 2007). The study results also indicated that organizational justice and particularly interactional and procedural justice are important prerequisites of organizational commitment. Regarding the relationship between organizational justice and job attitudes, many studies have shown the meaningful effect of the staff's attitudes towards equality and organizational justice on various aspects of organizational behavior such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction. In addition to the researches and efforts that have been done by theorists in the past, which show the importance the attitudes based one quality within the organization (Scholl, 1981, Moday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Recent studies in this field of research also indicate that employees who feel inequality more, have less organizational commitment than other workers (Spector, 1997). Such perception has reducing effect on the staff's performance (Hoffmann, 2005). Generally, the present study seeks to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment in professional sports trainers and find the answer to the question that which predicting components of organizational justice have a stronger relationship with organizational commitment? And also, through which one of the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interpersonal) organizational commitment can be predicted?

### Materials and Methods

The present study was correlational. The study population included all male and female trainers of the national team of Iran (n = 300 N =) who were totally selected as the sample. Measuring tools of the research

variables included: 1 -made questionnaire of individual characteristics; 2 -standard questionnaire of organizational justice (Rego, Arménio and Cunha, Miguel, 2006). 3 -Organizational commitment questionnaire (Meyer & Allen, 1997). For the normal distribution of data Kolmogorov Smirnov test was used; to determine the validity and reliability of data, and identify and resolve potential ambiguities, a preliminary study was performed on 50 of the top leagues' trainers. To determine face and content validity, some experts' opinions were used and to define the construct validity, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was utilized. Confirmatory factor analysis values for the scales of justice were (AGFI =0.987, df= 74, P =0.000) and for organizational commitment, (AGFI =0.967, df =53, P =0.000). Also, to determine the reliability alpha Cronbach was used whose results for organizational justice questionnaires was ( $\alpha=0.93$ ) and for organizational commitment, ( $\alpha=0.89$ ). Regarding the results of alpha Cronbach, it can be acknowledged that the obtained alpha coefficients are acceptable and the measurement tools have a good level of internal consistency. In order to organize and summarize data, descriptive statistics was used, and in inferential statistics, exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis were used to determine the construct validity, also multiple correlation tests and multivariate regression were utilized to predict and determine the relationship between religious attitude and its aspects with organizational justice in athlete trainers. The data was analyzed using «LISREL», version 8.52, and «SPSS» software, version 19.

### Results

Out of the 293 subjects (national teams' coaches) who participated in this study, 218 were men, 74.41% and 75 were women,

25.59%; 224 were married (76.45%), and 69 were single (23.45%); the highest number of respondents were between 41 and 50 years old, 66.9%, and the lowest number of respondents were between 40-31 years old, 13.4%. Also, 79 (26.96%) had a master's degree, 134 (45.74%), a bachelor's degree,

52 (17.75%) had associated degrees and 28 (55/9%), a diploma.

Results obtained in Table 1 indicate that the research data is normally distributed.

**Table 1. Normal distribution of data based on the K-S test results**

	Organizational commitment	Organizational justice
Z value of K-S test	0.74	0.89
Significance level	0.56	0.42
Result	The distribution is normal	The distribution is normal

Results obtained in Table 2 indicate that there is a significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment ( $P = 0.001^{**}$ ,  $r = 0.826$ ). Also, there is a significant relationship between components of organizational justice (distributive in rewards, distributive in tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational),

and organizational commitment of the trainers.

Mean, standard deviation and correlation matrix related to organizational justice and its components with organizational commitment of national teams' coaches are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Correlation matrix related to organizational justice and its components with organizational commitment of national teams' coaches**

Variable	Mean-SD	Organizational justice (Mean-SD)	R	P
Organizational justice	63.29±6.69	74.70±5.54	0.318	0.081*
distributive in reward	13.90±2.01		0.388	0.007*
Distributive in tasks	9.93±2.36		0.251	0.032*
Procedural	8.68±1.79		0.397	0.090*
Interpersonal	12.36±2.05		0.446	0.001*
Informational	10.42±2.15		0.470	0.001*

$p \leq 0.05^*$

Results of the multivariate regression with simultaneous entry method, for predicting organizational justice, based on distributive variables in rewards, distributive variables in tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational variables (components of organizational justice) from the viewpoints of national teams' coaches showed that these variables can be significant predictors of

organizational commitment ( $F(2, 58) = 6.011$ ,  $P = 0.004$ ,  $r^2 = 0.172$ ). The rate to predict organizational commitment based on each of the components of distributive in rewards, distributive in tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational in the national teams' coaches are shown separately in Table 3.



**Table 3. Regression coefficients associated with the prediction of "organizational commitment", based on the "components of organizational justice" of national teams' coaches**

Predictive variables	$\beta$ coefficient	t	P
Distributive in rewards	0.352	2.903	0.017*
Distributive in tasks	0.323	6.241	0.002**
Procedural	0.301	2.765	0.016*
Interpersonal	0.392	3.265	0.014*
Informational	0.365	3.552	0.005**

$p \leq 0.05^*$

### Discussion

One of the approaches that are paid special attention to nowadays, is organizational justice theory. Organizational justice and its components predict many organizational variables such as absence, turnover, and organizational commitment. Reviewing the literature, it became clear that in recent years many researchers have studied the relationship between organizational justice and behavioral and attitude in all outcomes such as organizational commitment and organizational civil behavior (Colquit & et al, 2001, Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

The results indicate that organizational justice and its components have a significant positive correlation with different dimensions of organizational commitment such as affective, normative and continuance in professional athletic trainers, meaning that the more the trainers perceive the organization's outcomes and outputs equitable, the more committed they will be towards their organization. The results of this research are consistent with the studies of Seyed Javadayn & et al (2008), Cohen & et al (2001), Klendauer and Deller (2009), Calquit & et al (2001) and Joiner and Bakalis (2006)

The relationship between organizational

justice and components of organizational commitment (continuance, normative and affective) shows the critical role of justice in the organization.

Based on the results obtained from this research distributive justice in reward and distributive justice in tasks had a positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment of sports trainers; this means that the fairer the rewards and responsibilities in national teams are distributed, the higher the organizational commitment of the team coaches will be.

According to the results of Table 2, distributive justice in rewards had the highest correlation with organizational commitment and this result indicates the importance of the distribution of rewards in sports trainers, so fairness in distribution of rewards should be considered by the managers of national teams.

Another result was that interactional justice was more relevant to organizational commitment than procedural justice; this is consistent with the results of the studies of Rupp and Cropanzano, (2002), Masterson, (2000), and Cropanzano & et al, (2007). It can be concluded that procedural justice is more connected with the team and team policies, while interactional justice is more

related to the supervisor and his/her behavior. Therefore, it can be deduced that because of the existence of interactional justice, trainers trust their supervisors, assess of them fairly and become more willing to continue working with them and thus will show higher commitment, both organizational and affective, toward their teams.

Among the other results of this study is that multiple correlations of components of organizational justice (distributive in rewards, distributive in tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational) with the domains of organizational commitment was of higher than the simple correlations of each of them; the multiple correlation coefficients had a significant relationship except the multiple correlation coefficient components related to procedural justice in predicting affective commitment and multiple correlation coefficient of procedural justice in predicting continuance commitment. based on the findings we conclude that in the three areas of organizational commitment, affective, normative, and continuance, although the components of organizational justice (distributive in rewards, distributive in tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational) explain a part of organizational commitment variance, but about prediction of each of the domains of organizational commitment, affective, normative and continuance, distributive justice (distributive in rewards, distributive in tasks) is responsible for most of the predictions and regarding bet a regression coefficient, component of procedural justice has a negligible role. Results indicated the positive and significant relationship of distributive justice in tasks with the continuous commitment of the trainers, and distributive justice in rewards was significantly associated with all three components of organizational commitment. So, we can conclude that the more the trainers feel that tasks and rewards are distributed

fairly, the higher organizational commitment they will have and outcomes such as turnover will be more important for them.

Also results of the stepwise regression analysis for predicting affective commitment showed that procedural justice doesn't have a significant contribution in predicting affective commitment, because this component does not enter the regression equation. In the stepwise regression for predicting continuance commitment, procedural justice was removed from the regression equation as well, which showed that procedural justice no significant role in predicting continuance commitment. Generally, results of the analysis of the stepwise regression point out that distributive and interactional justice are more related to organizational commitment, these findings are in line with the findings of Hoffmann (2005) Cropanzano & et al (2002) and Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001). It is perceived that organizational commitment is more influenced by the behavior and interaction of supervisors and fair distribution of rewards, tasks and perceived fairness in the interaction. Findings of this research generally indicate the relationship between the two characteristics of organizational justice and its components (distributive in rewards, distribution of tasks, procedural, interpersonal and informational) and organizational commitment.

## Conclusion

Therefore, considering the results it is suggested that in order to increase the desirable organizational outcomes and especially organizational commitment, adequate and appropriate training courses be held so that the managers become familiar with the principles and foundations of organizational justice and its implementation, and encourage the managers to interact with their subordinates so that they could use the practical form of the principles

and findings of the theories of organizational justice, as the result of which the subordinates become more committed to their organization and its goals.

## References

1. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2:267-299.
2. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63:1-18.
3. Brown, D., & Sargeant, M. A. (2007). Job Satisfaction Organizational Commitment and Religious Commitment of Full-Time University Employees. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 16: 211–241.
4. Clay – Warner, J., Reynolds, J., & Roman, P. (2005). Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: A Test of Three Competing Models. *Social Justice Research*, 18(4):391-409.
5. Cloutier, J., & Vilhuber, L. (2008). Procedural justice criteria in salary determination. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6):713-740.
6. Coetzee, M. (2005). The fairness of affirmative action: an organizational justice perspective. PhD thesis, Faculty of Economic and Management science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
7. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2):278-321.
8. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analysis review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86:425-445.
9. Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management*, 27:324-351.
10. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21:34-48.
11. Hoffmann, E. A. (2005). Dispute resolution in a worker cooperative: Formal procedures and procedural justice, *Law & Society Review*, 39:51-82.
12. Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective normative and continuance commitment: Can the right kind of commitment be managed. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3):307-333.
13. Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J., & Marshall, G. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organization commitment and salesperson job performance: 25 years of research, *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6):128-705.
14. Joiner, T. A., & Bakalis, S. (2006). The antecedents of organizational commitment: The case of Australian casual academics. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6):439-452.
15. Klendauer, R., Deller, J. (2009). Organizational justice and managerial commitment in corporate mergers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(1):29-45.
16. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social Psychology of procedural*



- justice. New York, Plenum Press.
17. Magoshi, E., & Chang, E. (2009). Diversity management and the effects on employee's organizational commitment: Evidence from Japan and Korea. *Journal of World Business*, 44:31-40.
  18. Masterson, S. S., Lewis-McClellan, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, S. M. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The Differing effects for fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43:738-748.
  19. Mayer, D., Nishii, L., Schneider, B., & Goldstein, H. (2007). The precursors and products of justice climates: Group leader antecedents and employee attitudinal consequences. *Personnel Psychology*, 60:929-963.
  20. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  21. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee organization linkages: The psychology of commitment*, New York Academic press.
  22. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59:603-605.
  23. Rego, A., & Cunha, M. (2006). A Five-Dimensional Model of Organizational Justice. *Documentos de Trabalho em Gestão*. Universidade de Aveiro, DEGEI.
  24. Rezaeiian, A. (2005). *Hopeful Judgment and Organizational Justice*. Samt Publications.
  25. Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multi foci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89:925-946.
  26. Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organization commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(4):589-599.
  27. Seyed-Javadayn, S. R., Faraahi, M. M., & Attar Taheri, G. (2008). Recognition the Influence of Various Aspects of Organizational Justice on Different Dimensions of Job and Organizational Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Management*, 1(1):55-70.
  28. Spector, P. E. (1997). The role of frustration in anti-social behavior at work. In R.A. thousand Oaks, *Perspectives on Justice: Theory and Applications (PP87-108)*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
  29. Tang, T. L., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 61(3):25-31.