



Published by:

International Office, Universitas Pendidikan Nasional, Jalan Bedugul No. 39, Sidakarya, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
Email: journal.revenue@undiknas.ac.id Website: <https://journal.undiknas.ac.id/index.php/REVENUE>

p-ISSN : 2723-4584
e-ISSN : -

The commitment of organizational justice: A case study

Putu Irma Yunita¹, Komang Keika Yanti Darma²

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted at the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar, in efforts to foster human resources especially those related to employee commitment to the organization, always strove to provide justice to employees, which was distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. But the reality that occurred at the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar was not all employees have a high commitment. Commitments among employees appeared to be declining, an indication of declining employee commitment can be illustrated by a note from the personnel department that some of the employees were late coming to work, skipping, left office during working hours and there were even some employees who submitted resignation. This study aimed to examine the Commitment to Organizational Justice (Case Study at ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar). The population of this study was all employees at ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar with 33 respondents. The type of data used in this research was quantitative data and the data collection technique used was a documentation study and questionnaire. The data analysis technique used in this study were classical assumption test, multiple linear regression analysis, and model feasibility test. The result of this research showed that; 1) Distributive justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. 2) Procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. 3) Interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. 4) Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice have a positive and significant effect on commitment.

Keywords: distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, employee commitment

Affiliation

¹ Faculty of Economics and Business
Universitas Brawijaya
Jl. Mayjen Haryono 169, Lowokwaru, Malang 65145, Jawa Timur
Email: putuirmayunita@yahoo.com

² Faculty of Economics and Business
Universitas Pendidikan Nasional
Jl. Bedugul No. 39 Sidakarya, Denpasar, Bali-Indonesia
Email: keikayanti@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

The main challenge for organizational leaders is managing human resources more effectively by creating a more equitable work context that will later be in line with management strategies. Human resources in an organization are expected to have a high perception of organizational justice in order to maintain work loyalty so that they can work effectively and efficiently. If justice in the organization does not work well, then employees will not show good performance, even employees can show deviant behavior.

There are various types of justice needed by employees in an organization. The most basic justice needed by employees is distributive justice. Employees assume a company or organization will act fairly if their income matches what is generated. After distributive justice is fulfilled, employees also need procedural justice, which is justice related to making and implementing decisions that refer to fair processes. It is not enough just with distributive justice and procedural justice; employees also need interactional justice. Interactional justice is

concerned with perceptions when organizations implement procedures fairly, by treating people respectfully and explaining decisions well. If all this justice goes well, it will have an impact on the growth of employee commitment to the organization.

Research conducted by (Li & Zeng, 2019) found distributive justice to have a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Procedural justice and interactional justice also have a positive relationship with organizational commitment. This result means that the better the perceived justice by employees, both distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice, the employee commitment will also be higher. Vice versa, if the organization deviates from justice, then employee commitment will also decrease.

Research on fairness to employee commitments was also carried out by (Friday & Ugwu, 2019). The results of his research found that organizational justice has a significant positive relationship with employee commitment. Organizational justice is measured in terms of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice able to increase employee commitment. (Tjahjono et al., 2019) found theoretically that distributive justice and procedural justice generally had different effects on individual satisfaction and commitment. Distributive justice is more dominant than procedural justice in elaborating individual satisfaction. Instead, procedural justice is more important to explain organizational commitment.

Likewise, the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar, in efforts to foster human resources, especially those related to employee commitment to the organization, always strives to provide justice to employees, which is distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. This research is conducted at the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. The ISTA Penatih Denpasar Cooperative is a multi-business cooperative located on Trenggana Street Number 30A Penatih Denpasar. At ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar there are 2 types of customers, namely 1) Members, members are customers who have paid principle deposit and obligatory deposit. 2) Prospective Members are customers who only pay obligatory deposits in accordance with the provisions in force at ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. However, members and prospective members each get services from the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar except the members get profit from the cooperative while the prospective member does not get profit. Until now, the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar has 33 employees, 188 members and also has 1.614 prospective members. Most Voluntary contributions (Savings) reach Rp. 200,000,000, the most Time Deposits (Deposits) reach Rp. 100,000,000, while most loans reach Rp. 300,000,000.

Cooperatives provide services to customers as well as possible, and a good administration system is felt by customers so that customer satisfaction arises. Thus, the cooperative establishes external and internal policies. The external policy is a policy that is oriented to customer satisfaction, while the internal policy is a policy made by the company so that employees have a high commitment to work. This is certainly inseparable from the leadership's role in realizing distributive justice in the form of compensation. The types of compensation are given in the form of salary, position allowance, transport money, bonuses, holiday allowances, and overtime pay. In order to establish good relations and cooperation between leaders and employees and among employees as a form of procedural justice, daily meetings are held for each department and monthly meetings for all employees and monthly meetings for all Cooperative management. In addition, the leader is very friendly to all employees by always greeting when meeting with employees and the leader always fairly resolving problems between employees. Every year the best employee selection is held and given awards. But the reality that occurred at the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar, not all employees have a high commitment. Commitments among employees appear to be declining, an indication of declining employee commitment can be illustrated by a note from the personnel department that some of the employees are late coming to work, skipping, left office during working hours and there are even some employees who submitted resignation.

From the data provided by ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar, it can be seen that the employee has not been maximized with an average absence of 91.1% and the lowest attendance rate was in December, which was 89.4%. Seeing the reality as it is necessary to look for the cause of the reduction in employee commitment to the company, it is very relevant to study the commitment of organizational justice.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is the term used to describe the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace. Specifically, organizational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which those determinations influence other work-related variables (Moorman, 1991). Kim (2009) found that employees who perceived that they were treated fairly by their company tended to develop and maintain communal relationships with the company. Also, when employees felt that they were treated fairly by their company, they were likely to hold more commitment, trust, satisfaction, and control mutuality than when they perceived that they were treated unfairly. Theories of justice are based on social exchange theory where individuals expect that they will get the business exchange and fair remuneration of the organization (Tyler, 1994).

When employees react to the way they are treated at work, their motivation to respond cannot be understood

adequately without taking into account perceived fairness of the outcomes and the procedure used to reach that outcomes (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg 1986). Organizational justice is view of organization members toward justice in distributing available resources. This theory is used as an employee outline to evaluate the justice of three classifications events (Greenberg 1990), namely: (1) distributive justice (results they receive from organization), (2) procedural justice (formal policy or process in achieving something that has been allocated by organization), (3) interactional justice (treatment taken by the decision makers in organization interpersonal).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice refers to the amount of income or rewards distributed to employees. Distributive justice is related to fairness in allocating sources of income when compared to procedural justice that focuses on fairness in the decision-making process (Samad, 2006). Robbins and Judge (2008) define distributive justice as the fairness of the amount and appreciation felt among individuals. Caza and McCarter (2015) refer to it as fairness of reward which is defined as the judgment made by people in relation to the reward, they receive compared to the rewards received by others who are their references.

Distributive justice refers to the fairness that an individual feel from the results they receive from an organization. Determination of distributive justice is based on the basis of equality or contribution of individuals compared to others (Alsalem & Alhaiani 2007). The perception of distributive justice is employee benefits relative to work inputs so that the person will be motivated to solve work problems (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Griffin and Moorhead (2014) emphasize that distributive justice refers to workers' perceptions of fairness in terms of rewards and other valued outcomes that are evenly allocated within the organization. George (2012) emphasize that distributive justice relates to workers' perceptions of fairness of promotion, job assignments, wages and working conditions at work. McShane and Glinow (2018) explain that distributive justice is about employees' perceptions of fairness in the way organizations value employees for their contribution and sacrifice in the organization.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the justice received from the procedures used to make decisions (Chi & Han 2008). According to Robbins and Judge (2008), defined as the perceived fairness of the process used to determine the distribution of rewards. Procedural justice is justice that is judged based on rules or policies and 8 procedures in decision making in organizations (Saima, 2013). According to Kozlowski and Klein (2000), procedural justice is a perception of the process of participation to achieve an outcome by focusing on several criteria to meet fair procedures such as: 1) Consistency, applied consistently to people and time. 2) Accuracy, ensuring that accurate information is collected and used in decision making. 3) Ethical procedures, according to personal standards or in accordance with ethics and morality. 4) Free of bias, ensuring that third parties have no interest in solving problems of any kind.

A person's judgment about justice is not only influenced by what outcomes they receive as a result of certain decisions or distributive justice, but also on the process or how the decision is made. Points to the number of disputing parties in each stage as evidence of process control and decision control. Houlden et al., (1978) stated that the parties to the conflict were willing to give up control in the process phase.

Leventhal (1980) identifies six main rules in procedural justice. If each of these rules can be fulfilled, a procedure can be said to be fair. The six rules in question are consistency, bias minimization, accurate information, can be fixed, representative, and ethical.

Interactional Justice

The final aspect of organizational justice is interactional justice and perhaps the simplest of these three aspects (Cropanzano et al., 2007). According to Robbins (2012), it is defined as an individual's perception of the extent to which an employee is treated with dignity, attention, and respect. Interactional justice refers to fair communication between employee-employer or among employees (Choudhary et al., 2016). Interactional justice refers to the extent to which an authority given to employees is able to be well communicated (Jawad, 2012). In general, interactional justice displays a condition of activities that do not intersect with work, but rather on aspects of interaction both information and interpersonal (Yaghoubi et al., 2011). Tyler (1994) mentions that there are three main things that are taken care of in social interactions which then become an important aspect of interactional justice. The three aspects are award, neutrality, and trust.

Employee Commitment

Luthans (2011) in his view, believes that it is a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization; willing to exert high-level efforts on behalf of the organization; and with definite confidence, and acceptance of organizational philosophy. Knud and Christian (2014) explain that organizational commitment is the extent to which employees identify themselves with the company and its goals. According to Robbins and Judge (2008) organizational commitment is defined as a situation where an individual sit with the organization and its goals and desires to maintain its membership in the organization. John and Don (2011) define organizational commitment

as strong employee involvement in the organization and identify the existence of the organization. Meanwhile, according to Griffin and Moorhead (2014) organizational commitment reflects the identification of individuals, and how the relationship between individuals and their organizations.

METHODS

This research was conducted at the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. The ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar was a multi-business cooperative located on Trenggana Street Number 30A Penatih-Denpasar. As for the reason for the location selection was the commitment of employees in the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar is still low in terms of the population.

Population was a generalization area consisting of objects/subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then drawn conclusions (Sugiyono, 2015). The samples were 33 employees of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar.

The type of data in this study was quantitative data. Quantitative data were data in the form of numbers such as the number of employees and the respondent's answer score regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and employee commitment.

This research used primary data and secondary data. Primary data were data obtained directly from the study site by means of observation and questionnaires to respondents in the form of respondents' answers about distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and employee commitment. Secondary data are obtained by recording official documents that were available.

Data collection techniques used in this study were documentation study and questionnaire. Documentation study that is a data collection technique is carried out by studying relevant literature and documents in the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar covering data on the number of employees and absenteeism data. Questionnaire, which is a technique of collecting data through the submission of written questions in a list of statements compiled systematically.

Before the questionnaire was distributed, it was tested to find out whether the questionnaire is valid and reliable. In this study, the validity and reliability test using SPSS for Windows version 22. Data in this study are analyzed with classical assumption, multiple linear regression, and Model Feasibility Test. The analytical tool used in this study is multiple linear regression analysis with SPSS program. The multiple regression models in this study are as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Validity Test

According to Umar (2002) for testing the level of instrument validity in the study used Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis techniques. After the correlation is obtained, compared to the critics, if sig (sig value) < is smaller than (0.05) the data is significant (valid), otherwise if the value of sig > (0.05) then the data is not significant (invalid).

The following will show the results of the validity test of the variables of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and commitment as shown in table 1 below.

TABLE 1. Validity Test Results

No	Variable	Statement Item	Correlation Coefficient	Sig Value	Explanation
1	Distributive Justice	X1.1	0,633	0,000	Valid
		X1.2	0,914	0,000	Valid
		X1.3	0,910	0,000	Valid
		X1.4	0,865	0,000	Valid
		X1.5	0,856	0,000	Valid
		X1.6	0,814	0,000	Valid
		X1.7	0,809	0,000	Valid
		X1.8	0,809	0,000	Valid
2	Procedural Justice	X2.1	0,460	0,010	Valid
		X2.2	0,562	0,001	Valid
		X2.3	0,613	0,000	Valid
		X2.4	0,684	0,000	Valid

		X2.5	0,742	0,000	Valid
		X2.6	0,742	0,000	Valid
		X2.7	0,706	0,000	Valid
		X2.8	0,636	0,000	Valid
		X3.1	0,564	0,001	Valid
		X3.2	0,763	0,000	Valid
		X3.3	0,804	0,000	Valid
3	Interactional Justice	X3.4	0,857	0,000	Valid
		X3.5	0,698	0,000	Valid
		X3.6	0,838	0,000	Valid
		X3.7	0,799	0,000	Valid
		X3.8	0,767	0,000	Valid
		Y.1	0,912	0,000	Valid
		Y.2	0,830	0,000	Valid
4	Commitment	Y.3	0,881	0,000	Valid
		Y.4	0,929	0,000	Valid
		Y.5	0,889	0,000	Valid
		Y.6	0,682	0,000	Valid

Based on Table 1 above it can be seen that the distributive justice variable with eight indicators, procedural justice with eight indicators, interactional justice with eight indicators and commitment with six indicators each indicator has a value of sig <0.05. So that each indicator for the variables of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and commitment are valid.

Reliability Test

The reliability test uses the alpha coefficient (α) of Cronbach's alpha, with a value greater than 0.60. If the alpha coefficient is greater than 0.60 then the item or variable is reliable, whereas if the alpha coefficient value is smaller than 0.60 then the item variable is not reliable (Sugiyono, 2015). Table 4.3 will describe the results of the reliability analysis of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and commitment variables as follows.

TABLE 2. Reliability Test Results

No.	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Explanation
1	Distributive Justice	0,935	Reliable
2	Procedural Justice	0,779	Reliable
3	Interactional Justice	0,897	Reliable
4	Commitment	0,859	Reliable

Based on table 2 above, it can be seen that the distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and commitment variable are reliable.

Classical Assumption Test Results

Because in this study using parametric statistics with multiple regression models, it was necessary to test the classical assumptions which include the normality test, multicollinearity test and heteroscedasticity test. To analyze the classic assumption test was carried out using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program for Windows version 22. The classic assumption test can be explained as follows:

Normality Test Results

Normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the residual value has a normal distribution or not. A good model is a model that provides residual values that meet the assumption of normality that is sig > (significance level = 0.05). Here are the results of the normality test analysis.

TABLE 3. Data Normality Test Results One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		33
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.000000
	Std. Deviation	1.66974364

Most Extreme	Absolute	.164
Differences	Positive	.164
	Negative	-.119
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.940
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.340

The data in the table above shows the results of the normality test with Kolmogorov smirnov with asymp values. Sig (0.340) > (0.05), it can be concluded that the residual data samples are normally distributed.

Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether there is a correlation between the independent variables in the research model. A good model is a model that has no correlation between independent variables. To detect the presence or absence of multicollinearity in the regression model is to look at the value of Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). If the Tolerance value (TOL) > 0.1 and VIF < 10, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity between independent variables in the regression model. Multicollinearity test results are shown as in table 4 below.

TABLE 4. Multicollinearity Test Analysis Results

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)		
Distributive Justice	.991	1.009
Procedural Justice	.797	1.254
Interactional Justice	.794	1.260

Based on the results of multicollinearity analysis as in table 4 above show that Tolerance the value > 0.1 and VIF value < 10. So, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity between independent variables in this regression model.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test is done to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from one observation residual to another. Heteroscedasticity does not occur if the significance value is greater than 0.05. The results of the heteroscedasticity test as in Attachment 12 show the significance value of each independent variable as in table 5 below.

TABLE 5. Heteroscedasticity Test Analysis Results

Model	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	1.008	.322
Distributive Justice	-1.251	.221
Procedural Justice	1.005	.323
Interactional Justice	-.538	.595

Based on the results of heteroscedasticity test as in table 5 above the distributive justice independent variable has a significance value of 0.221 > 0.05. The independent variable of procedural justice has a significance value of 0.323 > 0.05 and the independent variable of interactional justice has a significance value of 0.595 > 0.05. Thus, it can be said that all independent variables have a significance value > 0.05. This means that the regression model does not occur symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

Analysis of Multiple Linear Regression

This multiple linear regression analysis is used to determine the magnitude of the influence of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on the commitment of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar employees. As a basis for calculation of multiple linear regression models, namely:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3$$

Table 6: Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-3.425	2.650		-1.293	.206
Distributive Justice	.461	.066	.665	6.942	.000
Procedural Justice	.280	.088	.338	3.167	.004
Interactional Justice	.143	.066	.232	2.170	.038
R Square = 0,736		Fcount = 26,982			
Adjusted R Square = 0,709		Sig F = 0,000			

From these results it can be arranged multiple linear regression equations as follows.

$$Y = -3,425 + 0,461X_1 + 0,280X_2 + 0,143X_3$$

The regression equation can be explained as follows.

1. A constant value of -3.425 illustrates that if distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are equal to 0, the commitment of employees of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar is -3,425 units.
2. Distributive justice variable regression coefficient of 0.461 means that for every change or increase of 1 (one) distributive justice unit, the commitment of employees of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar will increase by 0.461, and vice versa, if distributive justice is reduced by 1 (one) unit, then the commitment of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar employees will also decrease. The change shows that there is a positive influence between distributive justice on the commitment of employees of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar.
3. Regression coefficient of procedural justice variable of 0.280 means that for every change or increase of 1 (one) procedural justice unit, the commitment of employees of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar will increase by 0.280, and vice versa, if procedural justice is reduced by 1 (one) unit, then the commitment of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar employees will also decrease. The change shows that there is a positive influence between procedural justice on the commitment of employees of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar.
4. Interactional justice variable regression coefficient of 0.143 has the meaning that for every change or increase of 1 (one) interactional justice unit, the commitment of employees of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar will increase by 0.143, and vice versa, if interactional justice is reduced by 1 (one) unit, then the commitment of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar employees will also decrease. These changes indicate a positive influence between interactional justice on the commitment of employees of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar.

Determination Analysis

To find out the percentage of the effect of the variable under study, the formula used to determine the coefficient of determination (D) is $D = R^2 \times 100\%$. Thus, it can be stated that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have an influence of 73.6% on the commitment of ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar employee. While the remaining 26.4% is influenced by other factors not discussed in this analysis.

Significance of Regression Coefficient Simultaneously Test (F-Test)

Based on the results of data analysis with SPSS in table 6, the significance value obtained for the F test is 0,000. The significance value is $0,000 < 0,05$ so that H_0 is rejected. Thus, the fourth hypothesis proposed in this study, namely distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have a positive and significant effect on commitment is the truth of the test.

Discussion

The effect of distributive justice on commitment

The acceptance of the first hypothesis stating distributive justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. Distributive justice can be defined as fair treatment for employees in terms of salary or wages, bonuses and other rewards. If the leader gives a salary that matches the employee's performance, the employees

will be satisfied and committed to the organization. In this study most of the respondents are men, where men are the breadwinner of the family so that financial needs are more dominant to meet the needs of family life. The more distributive justice is given equitably, the commitment will surely increase. The results of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Li and Zeng (2019) finding distributive justice has a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Edeh and Ugwu (2019) found that organizational justice in the form of distributive justice had a significant positive relationship with employee commitment. Tjahjono et al. (2019) found theoretically that distributive justice generally had an effect on individual commitment.

The Effect of procedural justice on commitment

The acceptance of the second hypothesis which states procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. Procedural justice is the employee's perception and view of the fairness of all processes, as well as the decision procedures in the organization. With the participation of employees in the decision-making process making them feel treated fairly in the company will increase employee work commitments. In this study most of the respondents' length of work are over 10 years so that employees know a lot about the running of the company, problems that occur within the company and others related to company operations. The more employees are involved in making a decision, the more loyal the employees will be, which leads to increased commitment. The results of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Li and Zeng (2019) finding procedural justice has a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Edeh and Ugwu (2019) found that organizational justice in the form of procedural justice had a significant positive relationship with employee commitment. Tjahjono et al. (2019) found theoretically that procedural justice generally had an effect on individual commitment.

The effect of interactional justice on commitment

The acceptance of the third hypothesis states interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. Interactional justice theory explains that if employees are treated by their superiors with dignity, attention and respect, it will increase employee commitment to the company. In this study most of the respondents aged over 40 years which have more experience in life that makes them think more mature. The more often these employees are involved in interactions and the interactions that occur are positive interactions, the more enthusiasm these employees work for because they feel valued which results in increased commitment. The results of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Li and Zeng (2019) finding interactional justice has a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Edeh and Ugwu (2019) found that organizational justice in the form of interactional justice had a significant positive relationship with employee commitment.

The influence of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice on commitment

The acceptance of the fourth hypothesis states distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment. If employees have been given organizational justice in the form of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice well by the company, employee commitment to the company will increase. In this study most of the respondents have long worked in the company and in terms of most of them are adults so that employees feel distributive justice is very important and they feel valued when involved in making decisions as procedural justice and always respected in interacting with leaders as interactional justice so that all this will lead to increased commitment. The results of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Li and Zeng (2019) finding distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Edeh and Ugwu (2019) found that organizational justice in the form of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice had a significant positive relationship with employee commitment.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Conclusions

Based on the discussion that has been described in the previous chapter, the following conclusions are obtained.

1. The sig value for the distributive justice variable is $0,000 < 0,05$, so H_0 is rejected. Thus, the first hypothesis proposed in this study, that distributive justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment, is verifiable.
2. The sig value for procedural justice variable is $0,004 < 0,05$, so H_0 is rejected. Thus, the second hypothesis proposed in this study that procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment is verifiable.
3. The sig value for the interactional justice variable is $0,038 < 0,05$, so H_0 is rejected. Thus, the third hypothesis proposed in this study that interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on commitment is verifiable.
4. The significance value for the F test is 0,000. The significance value is $0,000 < 0,05$ so that H_0 is rejected. Thus, the fourth hypothesis proposed in this study, namely distributive justice, procedural justice, and

interactional justice have a positive and significant influence on commitment is verifiable.

Suggestion

Based on the conclusion above, the suggestion that the writer can propose to the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar is to give awards to employees who have high dedication to the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. Considering the measurement of commitments to the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar is a very important activity to be carried out so that the Institution or leadership can provide an assessment of commitments professionally and objectively, as well as their implications for commitment. In this study it is known that the variables of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have an influence on commitment. Therefore, the three variables need to be carried out continuously in producing maximum and optimal commitment in accordance with the goals and expectations of the ISTA Cooperative Penatih Denpasar. For further researcher, in this study there is a limitation which is relatively small number of research respondents, thereby reducing the ability to generalize the results of this study, so for further researchers are expected to choose research location that have more respondents. Future researchers are also expected to examine other factors that influence commitment in addition to distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice variables.

REFERENCES

Articles

- [1] Alsalem, M. and Alhaiyani, A. (2007). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employees Performance. *Aledari*, 108, 97-110. <https://www.google.com/search?q=Alsalem%2C+M+and+Alhaiyani%2C+A.+2007.+%E2%80%9CRelationship+between+Organizational+Justice+and+Employees+Performance.%E2%80%9D+Aledari%2C+no.+108%3A+97%E2%80%93110&oq=Alsalem%2C+M+and+Alhaiyani%2C+A.+2007.+%E2%80%9CRelationship+between+Organizational+Justice+and+Employees+Performance.%E2%80%9D+Aledari%2C+no.+108%3A+97%E2%80%93110&aqs=chrome..69i57.392j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#>
- [2] Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n12p102>
- [3] Caza, A., & McCarter, M. W. (2015). The performance benefits of reward choice: A procedural justice perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(2), 184-199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12073>
- [4] Chi, N.-W., & Han, T.-S. (2008). Exploring the linkages between formal ownership and psychological ownership for the organization: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(4), 691–711. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X262314>
- [5] Choudhary, N., Deswal, R. K., & Philip, P.J. (2016). Impact of organizational justice on employees' workplace and personal outcomes: a study of Indian insurance sector. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- [6] Choudhary, N., Deswal, R. K., Philip, P. J. (2016). Impact of organizational justice on employees' workplace and personal outcomes: A study of Indian insurance sector. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 7(4), 1-14. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311558338_Impact_of_Organizational_Justice_on_Employees'_Workplace_and_Personal_Outcomes_A_Study_of_Indian_Insurance_Sector_Impact_of_Organizational_Justice_on_Employees'_Workplace_and_Personal_Outcomes_A_Study
- [7] Cropanzano, R. B. D., & Gilliland, S. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34-48. https://www.wku.edu/cebs/doctorate/documents/readings/cropanzano_etal_2007_organizational_justice.pdf
- [8] Edeh, F.O., and Ugwu, J. N. (2019) Organizational justice and employee commitment of selected private secondary. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 18-30. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3480813
- [9] Folger & Konovsky. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256422>
- [10] Friday, E. O., & Ugwu, J. N. (2019). Organizational justice and employee commitment of selected private secondary schools' teachers in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v1i1.3>
- [11] Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 340–342. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.2.340>

- [12] Greenberg, J. (1990), Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- [13] Houlden, P., LaTour, S., Walker, L., & Thibaut, J. (1978). Preference for modes of dispute resolution as a function of process and decision control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14(1), 13–30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(78\)90057-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(78)90057-4)
- [14] Jawad, M. (2012). Role of organizational justice in organizational commitment with moderating effect of employee work attitudes. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (4), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-0543945>
- [15] Kim, HS. (2009). Examining the role of informational justice in the wake of downsizing from an organizational relationship management perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(2), 297-312. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40294999>
- [16] Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. *Social Exchange*, 27-55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5-2>
- [17] Li, X. & Zeng, Y. (2019). How to reduce hospitality employees' deviant behavior: An organizational justice perspective. *International Conference on Economics, Management and Humanities Science*, 929–37. https://webofproceedings.org/proceedings_series/ECOM/ECOMHS%202019/ECOMHS19201.pdf
- [18] Li, X., & Zeng, Y. (2019). How to reduce hospitality employees' deviant behavior: An organizational justice perspective. *International Conference on Economics, Management and Humanities Science*, 929–37. <http://doi.org/10.25236/ecomhs.2019.201>
- [19] Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- [20] Saima, B. (2013). Developing organizational commitment and organizational justice to amplify organizational citizenship behavior in banking sector. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 646-655. <http://www.jespk.net/publications/152.pdf>
- [21] Samad, S. (2006). Procedural and distributive justice: Differential effects on employees' work outcomes. *The Business Review*, 5(2), 212–218.
- [22] 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. <http://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2019.097957>.
- [23] Tyler, T. R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 850–863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.5.850>
- [24] Yaghoubi, E., Mashinchi, S. A., Ahmad, E., Hadi, A., & Hamid, E. (2012). An analysis of correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(3), 995-1002. <http://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1622>

Books

- [25] George, J. M. (2012). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior* (6th ed.) Pearson.
- [26] Griffin, W. (2014). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organization* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- [27] Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Koslowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 3-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [28] McShane, and Glinow, V. (2018). *Organizational behavior* (8th ed.) New York: NY: Mcgraw-Hill Education.
- [29] Robbins and Judge, (2008). *Organizational behavior*. Jakarta: Publisher Salemba Empat.
- [30] Sugiyono. (2015). *Educational Research Methods (Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Approaches)*. Alfabeta.
- [31] Umar, H. (2002). *Business Research Methods*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.