

Impact of Organizational Trust on Organizational justice and Organizational Commitment: A Case of University of Sargodha

Abstract

In this constantly changing environment it is important to have an edge over the competitors. Having best HRM practices can be of vital significance in this regard. Organizational justice and trust are imperative concepts because they contribute substantially in the progress of positive or negative emotions of employees regarding their job, thus affecting their organizational commitment. This study emphasizes upon determining the association of perceived organizational justice and trust among the employees at the education sector and the role it plays upon organizational commitment. A case of University of Sargodha Main Campus and Lahore campus is conducted. The scope of this study included determination of perceptions of employees regarding organizational justice, organizational trust, and organizational commitment and if there exists a substantial relationship among the perceptions of organizational justice and organizational trust in determining organizational commitment of employees. The results of regression analysis disclosed there is a substantial impact of organizational justice on organizational trust, organizational trust on organizational commitment and organizational justice on organizational commitment. More over the organizational trust acts as a mediating variable amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment. These results are validated by the observations and qualitative analysis.

Key Words: Organizational Justice, Organizational Trust, Organizational Commitment, University of Sargodha

Introduction

Organization is the social unit of people that is structured and managed to meet a need or to pursue collective goals (Robbins, Judge, & Vohra, 1996). It is essential for the organization's viability to have a competitive advantage. The resource-based view (RBV) says that the competitive advantage of a firm rests mainly in the application of a cluster of valuable tangible or intangible resources at the firm's disposition (Wernerfelt, 1984; Mahoney, 2001; Pitelis, 2007; Murad & Asaduzzaman, 2014). Even though the area of SHRM did not result unswervingly from the RBV, it has evidently been contributing to its growth as it was mainly the

* Maryam Lashari, PhD. Scholar, Maryam.lashari24@hotmail.com

** Amani Moazzam, Assistant Professor, amani.ias@pu.edu.pk

*** Yaamina Salman, Assistant Professor, yaamina@gmail.com

**** Sidra Irfan, Assistant Professor, Sidrairfan.ias@pu.edu.pk

RBV that drew focus in the study of strategy in the direction of internal firm assets as sources of competitive advantage rather than external factors (Hoskisson, Hitt, Wan, & Yiu, 1999). Owing to their importance many major job attitudes have been the focus various studies.

In management research organizational justice and trust has achieved important focus of study as trust makes supportive behavior possible, drops transaction costs at work and lessens conflict (Rousseau et al, 1998). Organizational justice which consists of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice has been discovered to be correlated to trust in organizations. (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987). Majority of the researches on organizational justice and trust have been conducted in corporate sector, whereas the focus of this research would be unique to educational setting.

Organizational commitment is studied in three manners: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment is a feeling of connection and a sense of being a contribution to the organization. Normative commitment is a notion of loyalty among employees to keep service. Continuance commitment is an understanding of expenses linked with parting the organization or knowledge of inadequacy of options. (Hartman & Bambacas, 2000)

The above discussion has highlighted the importance of organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational commitment. A case of University of Sargodha, Lahore Campus and Sargodha Campus were studied. Like any other organization, university is also an intentional arrangement of people to bring about definite resolution of conveying knowledge and promoting education (Robbins & Coulter, 2001). It would be interesting to study the perceptions of faculty members since it is the epitome of success in any society.

Literature Review

Organizational Commitment

Commitment can be characterized into three types i.e. “(1) commitment towards job, (2) commitment towards career and (3) commitment towards organization (Burud, 2004)”. Since its foundation in 1960, researchers have focused greatly on the concept of organizational commitment amid the three categories of commitment. In the present study we have focused on the commitment of the individuals to the organization.

“Strength of an individual’s identification and involvement in a particular organization” has been defined as organizational commitment (Porter et al., 1974). According to certain researchers acknowledgment by means of the present organization and degree of individual’s contribution and partaking in the job constituted the organizational commitment. Keeping that in view the description of organizational commitment comprises three staple components i.e. “(1) willingness to perform for the organization, (2) considering organizational goals very important and (3) willingness to work with the organization” (Agarwal S. D., 1999; Chen Z. X., 2002; Allen and Meyer, 1990).

Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed the three dimensional model in early 90’s. A lot of appreciation has been given to this model as so far it covers all the

basic dimensions (Vandenberghe, 2008). The dimensions contended by Meyer and Allen (1991) are affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment. Affective commitment comprises the employees' emotional attachment, involvement and recognition with the organization and its desired outcomes" (Meyer & Allen, 1993; Mowday, 1979). The general responsibility and devotion of employees to the organization is defined by Weiner (1982) as normative commitment. The cost associated with leaving the organization" is defined as continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1996).

Organizational Justice

Exploring the research on organizational justice we see that organizational justice has been identified long since as prerequisite for efficacious functioning of organization (Greenberg, 1990) and also the satisfaction of personnel working there. As more researchers studied this concept, its three broad dimensions were developed (Martinez-tur et al, 2006) which are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice emerged as the first dimension of justice. The impartiality perceived by employees in the rewards given to them by their organization is called distributive justice. (Moorman, 1991). The second dimension of justice that emerged in the literature was of procedural justice. The percept of employees regarding the objectivity of the procedure through which they receive rewards is called procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) (Moorman, 1991) and the lastly added dimension is of interactional justice (Greenberg, 1990) which is about the fair-mindedness of the way supervisors interact with their employees and the impartiality with which they share information with employees. As a matter of fact a further division has been done by some research scholars into informational and interactional justice where the impartiality of information shared with employees is described as informational justice and the objective treatment of employees by their supervisors is called interactional justice (Coloquitt, 2001).

Organizational Trust

Initially organizational trust was defined as the healthy expectations of trustor regarding trustee's purposes in a risk-involving situation. So when measures were developed (Cook & Wall, 1980) for this conceptualization then respondents were asked questions regarding intentions and motives of the trustee. A different insight was provided by Myer and colleagues (1995) when they developed a model of trust. Here the attention was given to the vulnerability of the trustee where they have to work in a risk involving situation without continuous scrutiny, (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995), how they will act.

Various dimensions of trust has been the focus of researchers in the past. But in considering the context of organization there is a substantial role played by trust in supervisor (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). Research has shown that supervisors play a substantial role in building trust of employees on organizations by building relational contracts which in turn fulfils the perceptions employees regarding the obligations of the organization (Whitener, 1997). Thus trust in supervisor is a substantial dimension of trust.

Regrettably, the focus of most of the research (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) has been trust in supervisor only. However, there is proof, that employees

distinguish among many exchange associates at the organization—colleagues, supervisors, administration (Becker, 1993; Reichers, 1985). To be sure, Whitener (1997) contended that “trust can be developed among employees in no less than two dissimilar forms of referents- specific representatives e.g. supervisor and universal agents e.g. employer”.

Linkage between Organizational Trust, Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

As practices of human resource management interactional justice has been indicated to be linked to trust in supervisor whereas distributive and procedural justice has been depicted to be correlated to trust in organization empirically (Pearce, Branyiczki, & Bakacsi, 1994). Moreover, as superiors construct interpersonal agreements and accomplish employees’ perceptions of the organization’s responsibilities, personnel trust in the organization rises (Whitener, 1997).

Empirical evidence has been found to link trust in organization to organizational commitment (Liou, 1995). Trust acts as a mediator (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) in the relationship amongst dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) and work related attitudes and behaviors of employees. Aryee (2002) conducted a study on a government association in India to study social exchange framework of employee attitudes and behaviors. Their effects showed that the three organizational justice dimensions (procedural, distributive and interactional) were linked only to trust in organization while interactional justice showed link with trust in supervisor. Their study additionally disclosed that trust in organization in some measure intervened the association amongst distributive and procedural justice and the work attitudes of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions and in full measure mediated the link amongst interactional justice these employment outcomes.

Trust implies the perception of fairness. In order to ascertain best performance among employees (Brokener & Siegel, 1996) it is imperative upon management to capitalize upon trust. A strong relationship is found to exist among interactional justice and organizational support which means that good treatment by supervisors builds the trust of employees in the organization (Mourad, 2014). The study conducted in Saudi companies by (Mourad, 2014) investigated the result of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice upon supervisor support, organization support, supervisor trust and organization trust. It also found a relationship to exist among perceived supervisor support and perceived supervisor trust. The study concluded that trust in supervisor played a substantial role in shaping the employees fairness perceptions in organization.

Meta-analytic results confirm an association amid justice perceptions and central organizational outcomes, including citizenship behavior, organizational commitment and job performance. These results have also showed association amongst trust measurements to related results, such as citizenship behavior, task performance and counterproductive behavior (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001)

It has been disclosed by researchers that organizational trust is a substantial forecaster of organizational commitment (Gilbert, 1998). A positive link amongst organizational trust and commitment has been shown by several empirical researches in different circumstances. Thus it looks to be reasonable to anticipate that the level of organizational trust among employees will affect their commitment towards organization (Geykens, Steenkamp, & Kumar, 1998)

It has been found out that the factors that influence the organizational commitment are trust and organizational justice (Brehm, 2004). The research conducted by (Dolan, 2005) specified that there exists a firm positive link amongst procedural justice and trust in the organization. Moreover (Stinglhamber, 2006) maintained that there is a communal association amongst organizational justice and organizational trust, such that organizational justice affects organizational trust.

The study conducted by Alexander & Ruderman (1987) showed ample exclusive effects of trust in management on procedural justice. It has been found that procedural justice influences the assessment of the organization and its system (Cropanzano, 1991; Sweeney, 1997), and consequently it would have major effect on organizational trust. Arguably, when employees are assured just procedural handling, their level of trust in organization would increase. In an organization that had just undergone organizational downsizing Sharon M. Hopkins (2006), studied perceptions of “distributive justice, procedural justice, trust, organizational commitment, satisfaction, and turnover intentions” among stayers. Outcomes proposed that trust played the role of partial mediator in the relationship amongst “distributive justice and both organizational satisfaction and affective commitment”. Moreover, the trust perceptions mediated the relationship among procedural justice and turnover intentions .

The constructs of organizational justice and organizational trust and their effect on organizational commitment have been applied to University of Sargodha, Sargodha Campus and Lahore Campus:

In this study the following operational definitions of variables were used

Organizational Justice

Organizational Justice is termed as the fairness with which the activities of organization are carried out (Greenberg, 1990). It is distributed into three main constructs: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional or informational justice. For Organizational Justice the instrument developed by Coloquitt (2001) is used.

Organizational Trust

Organizational trust is termed as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). For measuring organizational trust the survey developed by Pamela (2000) was used.

Organizational Commitment

It was suggested by Mowday, Porter, & Steers (1982) that organizational commitment is composed of “(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization”. For Organizational Commitment the instrument developed by Meyer & Allen (1996) has been used.

Like any other organization, this university is also an intentional arrangement of people to bring about definite resolution of conveying knowledge and promoting education (Robbins & Coulter, 2001). It would be interesting to study the perceptions of faculty members since it is the epitome of success in any society. Equity theory, equity sensitivity theory and the relative deprivation theory highlight the importance of organizational justice. These theories contend that the employees are sensitive to the perceptions of fairness regarding their organizations. The side bet theory exchange relationships, reciprocity theory and the social exchange theory highlight the tradeoff amongst the commitment of employees and the outcomes achieved by them. It shows that if their organization is just towards them their trust and commitment level would increase. Similarly the organizational support theory and psychological contract theory suggest that if organizations show support to employees they reciprocate by showing enhanced trust and commitment level and psychologically feel obliged to remain loyal with their organization.

Based on the above discussion, the university setting is studied for the role played by organizational trust among organizational justice and commitment.

In view of the above discussion it seems logical to hypothesize that:

Research Hypotheses

- H1:** There is a substantial impact of Organizational Justice and its correlates on Organizational Trust
- H2:** There is substantial impact of Organizational Trust and its correlates on Organizational Commitment
- H3:** There is a substantial impact of Organizational Justice and its correlates on Organizational Commitment
- H4:** Organizational Trust plays a mediating role amongst Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

Research Methodology

A method of case is used in which survey research and cross sectional design has been used because it is consistent with the requisites of the study that is hypothesis testing and checking impact of variables on each other. In order to do an in depth analysis interviews were also conducted and observation was used by the researcher to validate the responses. After identification of themes, theoretical model is established. Survey research is used in this study because anonymity of the respondent is principal and the cost is minimal. It was also ensured that there is no misunderstanding in survey and respondents were given enough time to reflect

on answers. Interviews and observations were used to validate the research as well as to get better insight of the reasons behind the responses.

Population

The total population of the present study comprised of all regular teaching staff of fifteen different faculties having employment status of either permanent or temporary nature of the University of Sargodha. The total population of the University of Sargodha comprised of 850 members in total distributed among fifteen different faculties namely Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Management Sciences, Faculty of Commerce, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Faculty of Life Sciences, Faculty of Medical and Dentistry, Faculty of Oriental Learning, Faculty of Islamic and Oriental Studies, Faculty of Science and Faculty of Agriculture. There are further constituent departments of all the fifteen faculties.

Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The population comprised of all the teaching staff of University of Sargodha. The surveys were circulated to all the faculty members working in the University of Sargodha to obtain the greatest count of respondents. In order to enhance the generalizability of the study in the third step semi structured interviews were also conducted with eight employees on convenience basis.

Determining the Sample Size

There were 105 faculty members in University of Sargodha, Lahore Campus and 518 faculty members in University of Sargodha, Main Campus to whom the questionnaires were distributed. 210 questionnaires were finally returned by these faculty members. Out of these nine questionnaires were filled less than fifty percent so they were discarded. The problem of missing values was resolved by plugging in the mid-point in SPSS. So a total of 201 respondent's answers giving a response rate of 33.7 percent were recorded and used for analysis.

In the second step twelve employees were selected for semi structured interviews. Out of which eight employees finally agreed to give the interviews which consisted of one female associate professor, two male associate professor, one female assistant professor, two female lecturers and two male lecturers.

Data Analysis

Observations

The faculty members at the main campus seemed to be more confident and glad with their jobs. Their course load was justified and there were proper policies regarding functioning in the organization. The faculty members at Lahore campus had to face a lot of trouble in this regard. There were no proper policies. One of the faculty members told the researcher off the record that if any faculty member tries to probe the registrar regarding any policies of the university, then most of the time answers are given in the form of written notices, the copy of which is also issued to the director. Researcher also observed that most of the faculty members were forcefully given a lot of administrative work in the form of

internal controller examinations and internal time table in charge for every department. No relaxation or financial compensation was granted in their course load to compensate for these additional duties. Researcher also observed that the faculty members at Lahore campus were very insecure regarding their jobs. They told the researcher that there was a lot of organizational politics and only the lucky new employees were able to stick it out for more than a year.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

The respondent composition of various departments is described below. The number of respondents from Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Life Sciences, Faculty of Medical were 2 , Faculty of Dentistry,5, Faculty of Oriental Learning,6, Faculty of Islamic and Oriental Studies,7, Faculty of Science,5, Faculty of Agriculture,12, Faculty of Management Sciences,71, Faculty of Commerce,17, Faculty of Education,3, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,4, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences,15, Faculty of Law,4, Faculty of Pharmacy,4, Faculty of Engineering and Technology,7, and respondents belonging to any other faculty were 36.

In terms of designation, 97 were lecturers, 23 were assistant professors, 45 were associate professors and 36 were professors. According to their experiences with the current organization, 137 faculty members were there for less than one year, 50 faculty members were there for greater than one and less than two years and 14 faculty members were there for greater than three and less than five years

Reliability Test

The results for the reliability examination of the scale used in the study are mentioned below:

Table 1: Reliability Analysis of Variables

Variable	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Affective Commitment	6`	0.633
Continuance Commitment	6	0.832
Normative Commitment	8	0.902
Procedural justice	7	0.730
Distributive Justice	3	0.742
Interactional Justice	4	0.789
Informational Justice	5	0.840
Trust in Supervisor	10	0.611
Trust in Organization	16	0.644

Regression Analysis

This section comprises of the regression analysis. We have mentioned in our research question that in this study we are going to study if there exists a

substantial impact of organizational justice on organizational trust, organizational trust on organizational commitment and organizational justice on organizational commitment.

The results of the regression analysis with their respective scores are described below.

Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Trust

Since we have mentioned in our research question that we are going to study the impact of organizational justice on organizational trust as also mentioned by hypothesis 1A, for which we have conducted regression analysis. The p-value in ANOVA table (0.000) is very low, less than 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is substantial. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.330 with the significance score of 0.000 indicating that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 69.773, value of R-statistic, which in this case shows how much of the organizational trust's difference is due to organizational justice is .401. It means that 40.1 percent of the difference in organizational trust is due to organizational justice.

H1/1.a: There is a substantial impact of Organizational Justice and its correlates on Trust in Organization and Trust in Supervisor

For the purpose of testing above hypotheses eight regressions were run. The results are presented in Table 2. From the table we can see significant impact of regressed dimensions of organizational justice on organizational trust dimensions, except for the impact of procedural justice and interpersonal justice in case of trust in supervisor. This could point to the fact that all supervisors are treated and considered separately from the organization, as judgments about the supervisors is not considered as judgment about the organization.

Table 2: Detail of Simple Multiple Regression with Organizational Justice as independent Variable, and Organizational Trust as dependent variable

		ANOVA (sig)	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Unstandardized Coefficients (Sig)	Constant	R/Adjusted R Square
Organizational Justice	Organizational Trust	0.000	0.330	0.000	69.773	0.404
Distributive	Trust in Supervisor	.000	.962	.000	27.271	.381
	Trust in Organization	.000	.830	.000	39.514	.329
Procedural	Trust in Supervisor	.106	.136	.106	36.812	.013
	Trust in Organization	.000	.714	.000	34.772	.418
Interactional	Trust in Supervisor	.072	.172	.000	37.654	.016
	Trust in Organization	.000	.958	.000	38.317	.574
Informational	Trust in Supervisor	.204	.091	.000	38.530	.008
	Trust in Organization	.000	.772	.000	39.322	.666

Effect of Procedural Justice on Trust in Organization

Our hypothesis H1/1.a states there is a significant impact of Procedural justice on Trust in Organization. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.000, value of slope is 0.714. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 34.772, value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the organizational trust's difference is due to procedural justice is .714.

Effect of Distributive Justice on Trust in Organization

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of distributive justice on Trust in Organization. The p-value in ANOVA table (0.000) is very low, less than 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is significant. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.830. Moving across the row for “Distributive Justice” in the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 39.514, value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the trust in organization’s difference is due to distributive justice is .830. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of distributive justice.

Effect of Interactional Justice on Trust in Organization

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Interactional justice on Trust in Organization .In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.000) is very low, less than 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is significant. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.958. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 38.317, value of R- statistic is .958. It means that 95.8 percent of the difference in trust in organization is due to interactional justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice.

Effect of Informational Justice on Trust in Organization

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Informational justice on Trust in Organization. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. The p-value in ANOVA table 0.000, value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.772. , in the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 39.322, value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the trust in organization's difference is due to informational justice is 0.666. It means that 66.6 percent of the difference in trust in organization is due to informational justice. The value of adjusted R square has decreased with the addition of informational justice.

Effect of Procedural Justice on Trust in Supervisor

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Procedural justice on Trust in Supervisor. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.106) is greater 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is not significant.

Effect of Distributive Justice on Trust in Supervisor

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Distributive justice on Trust in Supervisor. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.962. It means that for every one percent increase in distributive justice there will be 0.962 percent increase in trust in supervisor. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 22.271. , value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the trust in supervisor's difference is due to distributive justice is .962.

Effect of Interactional Justice on Trust in Supervisor

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Procedural justice on Trust in Supervisor. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. The p-value in ANOVA table (0.072) is greater 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is not significant.

Effect of Informational Justice on Trust in Supervisor

Our hypothesis H1/1a states there is a significant impact of Informational justice on Trust in Supervisor. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.204) is greater 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is not significant.

Effect of Organizational Trust on Organizational Commitment

Our hypothesis H2 states there is a significant impact of Organizational Trust on organizational commitment. The p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, the value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.483. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the organizational commitment's difference is due to organizational trust is .343.

H2/1.a: There is a significant impact of Organizational Trust and its correlates on Organizational Commitment and its correlates.

For the purpose of testing the above hypotheses six regressions were run. The results are presented in Table 3. From the table we can see significant impact of the correlates of organizational trust on the correlates of organizational commitment, except for continuance commitment in case of trust in supervisor. This could point to the fact that supervisors are considered as distinct from the organization as a whole and are not considered as an important factor of switching cost.

Table 3: Detail of Simple Multiple Regression with Organizational Trust as independent Variable, and Organizational Commitment as dependent variable

		ANOVA (sig)	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Unstandardized Coefficients (Sig)	Constant	R/Adjusted R Square
Organizational Trust	Organizational Commitment	.000	1.483	.000	60.591	.343
Trust in Supervisor	Affective Commitment	.000	.210	.000	20.225	.496
	Normative Commitment	.000	.407	.000	8.896	.080
	Continuance Commitment	.890	.011	.000	23.263	.000
Trust in Organization	Affective Commitment	.000	.725	.000	20.225	.496
	Normative Commitment	.000	.918	.000	21.176	.353
	Continuance Commitment	.000	.865	.000	20.815	.475

Effect of Trust in Supervisor on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Supervisor on Affective Commitment. In order to find this out regression analysis is conducted. The the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.210. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 20.225. , the value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the affective commitment's difference is due to trust in supervisor is 0.496.

Effect of Trust in Supervisor on Normative Commitment

The hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Supervisor on Normative Commitment. The p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000), the value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.401. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 8.896. , value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is due to trust in Supervisor is 0.080. The value of adjusted R square has decreased considerably with the addition of normative commitment.

Effect of Trust in Supervisor on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Supervisor on Continuance Commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.890) is greater 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is not significant.

Effect of Trust in Organization on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Organization on Affective Commitment. The p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.725. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 20.225. , value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the affective commitment's difference is due to trust in organization is 0.496..

Effect of Trust in Organization on Normative Commitment

Our hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Organization on Normative Commitment. The p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, the value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.918. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 21.176, the value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is due to trust in organization is 0.353. The value of adjusted R square has decreased with the addition of normative commitment.

Effect of Trust in Organization on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H2/1.a states there is a significant impact of Trust in Organization on Continuance Commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.865. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 20.815. The value of R- statistic, is 0.475. The value of adjusted R square has increased considerably with the addition of continuance commitment.

Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment

Our hypothesis H3 states there is a significant impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, the value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.180. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 0.209, the value of R- statistic, is 0.949.

H3/1.a: There is a significant impact of Organizational Justice and its correlates on Organizational Commitment and its correlates

For the purpose of testing the above hypotheses twelve regressions were run. The results are presented in Table 4. From the table we can see significant impact of the correlates of organizational justice on the correlates of organizational commitment.

Table 4: Detail of Simple Multiple Regression with Organizational Justice as independent Variable, and Organizational Commitment as dependent variable

		ANOVA (sig)	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Unstandardized Coefficients (Sig)	Constant	R / Adjusted R Square
Organizational Justice	Organizational Commitment	.000	1.180	.000	.209	.949
Distributive	Affective Commitment	.000	.639	.000	1.703	.916
	Normative Commitment	.000	1.077	.000	3.418	.653
	Continuance Commitment	.000	.313	.004	2.158	.688
Procedural	Affective Commitment	.000	1.021	.000	2.179	.818
	Normative Commitment	.000	1.277	.000	2.856	.522
	Continuance Commitment	.000	1.148	.000	2.340	.677
Interactional	Affective Commitment	.000	.468	.000	2.692	.958
	Normative Commitment	.000	1.185	.000	.376	.774
	Continuance Commitment	.000	1.127	.000	1.448	.851
Informational	Affective Commitment	.000	.339	.000	4.298	.971
	Normative Commitment	.000	.471	.004	1.901	.782
	Continuance Commitment	.000	.395	.000	3.357	.860

Effect of Procedural Justice on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Procedural Justice on Affective Commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000, the value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.021. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 2.179 The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Affective commitment’s difference is due to Procedural justice is 0.818.

Effect of Distributive Justice on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Distributive Justice on Affective Commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.639. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 1.703. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Affective commitment’s difference is due to Distributive justice is 0.916. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of distributive justice.

Effect of Interactional Justice on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.aa states there is a significant impact of Interactional justice on Affective commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.468. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 2.692. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Affective commitment's difference is due to Interactional justice is 0.958. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice.

Effect of Informational Justice on Affective Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Interactional justice on Affective commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table IS 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.339. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 4.298. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Affective commitment's difference is due to Informational justice is 0.971. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of informational justice.

Effect of Procedural Justice on Normative Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Procedural justice on normative commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.227. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.035 indicates that the relationship is not significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 2.856. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is due to Procedural Justice is 0.552. It means that 55.2 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Procedural Justice.

Effect of Distributive Justice on Normative Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Distributive justice on normative commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.077. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 3.418. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is due to Distributive Justice is 0.653. It means that 65.3 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Distributive Justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of distributive justice.

Effect of Interactional Justice on Normative Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Interactional justice on normative commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.185. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is .376. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is

due to Interactional Justice is 0.774. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice.

Effect of Informational Justice on Normative Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.ac states there is a significant impact of Informational justice on normative commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is -.471. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.004 indicates that the relationship is not significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 1.901. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Normative commitment's difference is due to Informational Justice is 0.782. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of informational justice.

Effect of Procedural Justice on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of Procedural justice on continuance commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 1.148. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.063 indicates that the relationship is not significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 2.340. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Continuance Commitment's difference is due to Procedural Justice is 0.677.

Effect of Distributive Justice on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of distributive justice on continuance commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table (0.000) is very low, less than 0.001. It shows that model as a whole is significant. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is .217. It means that for every one percent increase in Distributive Justice there will be 0.217percent increase in Continuance Commitment. Moving across the row for "Distributive Justice" in the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.004 indicates that the relationship is not significant. The value of constant is 1.448 and the value of adjusted R square is .851.

Effect of Interactional Justice on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of interactional justice on continuance commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.759. In the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 3.357. It means that even if the effect of Interactional Justice is removed, 3.357 percent of the Continuance Commitment will still rise. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Continuance Commitment's difference is due to Interactional Justice is .860. The value of R square has increased with the addition of this variable in the model.

Effect of Informational Justice on Continuance Commitment

Our hypothesis H3/1.a states there is a significant impact of informational justice on continuance commitment. Since the p-value in ANOVA table is 0.000. The value of the slope that measures the strength of the relationship is 0.395. In

the coefficients table, the significance score of 0.000 indicates that the relationship is significant. The value of intercept (constant) is 3.357. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much of the Continuance Commitment’s difference is due to Informational Justice is 0.860. It means that 86 percent of the difference in Continuance Commitment is due to Informational Justice.

Mediation Analysis

In light of the literature reviewed, we proposed that the relationship amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment is mediated by organizational trust. Our research question no. 5 stated this. The hypothesis H4 stated that organizational trust plays a mediating role amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment. To confirm this, multiple regression was conducted by the researcher. The model that we used proposed organizational justice as independent variable, organizational trust as mediating variable and organizational commitment as independent variable. In order to ensure the authenticity of the model, organizational justice was also used as mediating variable and organizational trust as independent variable, keeping organizational commitment as dependent variable.

The results obtained from the mediation analysis are mentioned in the following table:

Table 8: Detail of Simple Multiple Regression with Organizational Justice as independent Variable, and Organizational Commitment as dependent variable and Organizational Trust as mediating variable

VARIABLES	ANOVA SIG	UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		R SQUARE	ADJUSTED R SQUARE	SOBEL TEST STATISTIC	P VALUE FOR SOBEL TEST STATISTIC
		B	Std. Error				
Organizational Justice, Organizational Trust, Organizational commitment	.000	.33	.03	.404	.401	4.25	.00
Organizational Trust, Organizational Justice, Organizational Commitment	.000	1.224	.106	.404	.401	10.87	.00

The correlation coefficients for each path showed the links to be statistically significant. This was done to ensure the possible tests for mediator analysis at bivariate level. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational justice (IV) and trust (mediator) is.33. The standard error for this coefficient is .03. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational trust (new IV) and organizational commitment (DV) is.23. The standard error for this coefficient is .05.

Sobel test is used to test whether a mediator conveys the effect of an independent variable to a dependent variable. The test statistic for Sobel test is

4.25 with an associated p-value of .00. Since it is less than alpha value of .05, so there exists mediation.

With organizational trust as independent variable and organizational justice as mediating variable the raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational trust (new IV) and organizational justice (new mediator) is 1.23. The standard error for this coefficient is .10. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational justice (new IV) and organizational commitment (DV) is 1.13. The standard error for this coefficient is .02. The test statistic for Sobel test is 10.87 with an associated p-value of .00. Since it is less than alpha value of .05, so this confirms mediation. Thus it concludes what we proposed in the light of the literature review that organizational trust plays a mediating role amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment as this is also supported by the statistical analysis.

The results from linear regression showed significant effect of organizational justice on trust, organizational justice on organizational commitment and organizational trust on organizational commitment. These outcomes were steady with the qualitative analysis i.e. the interviews conducted with the faculty members. No significant impact of interactional justice was found in trust in supervisor which contradicts with the study of Pilai, Schriesheim, & Williams (1999). The possible explanation for this could be that employees did not place much importance on their relationship with their supervisor. Also no significant impact of distributive justice was found on continuance commitment. But procedural and interpersonal justice impacted continuance commitment significantly. The possible explanation for this could be more importance placed on interpersonal relationships among employees than the rewards distributed by the organization.

Multiple regression was used to study the mediating role of organizational justice which was confirmed with Sobel statistic of 4.25. Thus the results showed that there is a significant impact of organizational justice on organizational trust, there is a significant impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment and there is a significant impact of organizational justice on organizational commitment. Also the organizational trust acts as a mediator amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment. This is consistent with the study of Samuel, Pawan, & Zhen (2002); Alexander & Rudderman (1987) Pearce Branyiczki, & Bakacsi (1994); Huo (1996); Mourad (2014).

The qualitative analysis mentioned in discussion below, as well as the quantitative showed that there were overall more negative sentiments among the employees of the University of Sargodha, Lahore campus as compared to University of Sargodha, Lahore campus.

Discussion

The simple linear regression amongst Organizational justice as an independent variable and organizational trust as a dependent variable showed the existence of a significant relationship with a strength of .330. It confirms our first hypothesis H1: There is a significant impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Trust. The value of R- statistic, which in this case shows how much

of the organizational trust's difference is due to organizational justice is .401 The results of qualitative analysis also showed that employees responding positively towards the presence of organizational justice showed enhanced level of organizational trust. For example the employee who said *"I have been working here for 7 years now. I can safely say I do not face any trust deficit or else I wouldn't have been here. There are all kinds of employees in the organization. Some new comers do complain about this. But that's them. I can't say the same about me. And I think if they become more vocal with their supervisors, 90 percent of their complaints would be lessened"* also said *"I am treated with respect and dignity. Students are very good and respectful. Colleagues are very good. Management and administration is also very cooperative. I also try to give them their due share of respect. The criteria to distribute rewards is pretty fair already"*

The results showed that 71.4 percent of the difference in organizational trust is due to procedural justice supporting our hypothesis. The qualitative analysis showed higher level of trust in supervisor in main campus and lesser in Lahore campus. Being established only a few years ago can be the possible explanation for this.

The results of linear regression show that 83.0 percent of the difference in trust in organization is due to distributive justice. The employees of main campus did not complain much regarding distribution of rewards. Their common response was that there is always room for improvement but they were overall satisfied. The statistical results show that 95.8 percent of the difference in trust in organization is due to interactional justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice. However there was no significant association amongst interpersonal justice and trust in supervisor The statistical results also showed that 66.6 percent of the difference in trust in organization is due to informational justice. All the interviewees acknowledged the importance of informational and interactional justice but some of the employees complained about its scarcity

However there was no significant association amongst interpersonal justice and trust in supervisor. Some employees showed lack of informational and interactional justice. These negative sentiments were mostly showed by lecturers and from Lahore Campus. Employees, from Sargodha Campus, showed complete existence of and satisfaction with informational and interactional justice. It can be analyzed from the analysis of interview data that employees placed great emphasis on the trust in their supervisors which were the heads of the department in this case. Employees particularly from Sargodha campus showed complete trust level on their heads. The employees from the Sargodha campus seemed to be satisfied with their supervisors as well as their organization. A few employees also said that there is always room for improvement. But they did not complain about it in particular. Whereas the employees at Lahore Campus complained about the unstable rule and regulations and changes in the organization.

The results of statistical analysis showed 35.3 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to trust in organization. However the value of adjusted R square has decreased with the addition of normative commitment. The results of statistical analysis also showed that 47.5 percent of the difference in continuance commitment is due to trust in Organization. The value of adjusted R

square has increased considerably with the addition of continuance commitment.. The employees at Sargodha campus showed the higher existence of affective component of commitment. Mixed views were shared by the employees from Lahore campus.

Employees showed diversified views regarding normative commitment. Faculty members from Sargodha Campus mostly showed presence of normative commitment. The faculty members from Sargodha had more level of continuance commitment. The senior faculty members showed increased level of continuance commitment than new employees thus supporting the views of Meyer and Allen (1984).

The results of linear regression show that 94.9 percent of the difference in Organizational commitment is due to Organizational Justice thus supporting our hypothesis. The analysis of the interviews showed that employees who perceived that there exists great deal of organizational justice, appeared to have increased level of organizational trust as well as organizational commitment. For example employee who said *"I have no issues with the current system of distribution of rewards, also said "I am treated with respect and dignity. My colleagues and management is respectful towards me"*. The results of statistical analysis show that 81.8 percent of the difference in Affective commitment is due to Procedural justice thus accepting our hypothesis.

The results of linear regression show that 55.2 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Procedural Justice thus accepting our hypothesis. However the results of linear regression show the significance score of 0.063 which indicates that the relationship is not significant thus rejecting our hypothesis. The results of statistical analysis also show that 91.6 percent of the difference in Affective commitment is due to Distributive justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of distributive justice thus accepting our hypothesis.

The statistics in linear regression indicates that the relationship is not significant, thus rejecting our hypothesis. The results of statistical analysis show that that 65.3 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Distributive Justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of distributive justice thus supporting our hypothesis.

The results of linear regression show that 95.8 percent of the difference in Affective commitment is due to Interactional justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice thus accepting our hypothesis. The results of linear regression shows that that 77.4 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Interactional Justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of interactional justice thus accepting our hypothesis. The results of statistical analysis show that 86 percent of the difference in continuance commitment is due to interactional justice thus supporting our hypothesis. The analysis of the interviews of the respondents shows clear linkage amongst organizational justice, trust and commitment. Also a clear difference exists amongst the perceptions of employees of Sargodha Campus and Lahore Campus. The employees at Sargodha campus appeared to be more

committed with their organization while employees at Lahore campus shared some negative sentiments.

The results of statistical analysis show that that 97.1 percent of the difference in Affective commitment is due to Informational justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of informational justice thus accepting our hypothesis. The results of statistical analysis show that 78.2 percent of the difference in normative commitment is due to Informational Justice. The value of adjusted R square has increased with the addition of informational justice, thus accepting our hypothesis. The results of statistical analysis show that 86 percent of the difference in Continuance Commitment is due to Informational Justice thus supporting our hypothesis. The analysis of the interviews of the respondents shows clear linkage amongst organizational justice, trust and commitment. Similarly any employee who showed negative sentiments regarding the perception of organizational justice, reciprocated the response towards organizational justice and showed decreased level of organizational commitment, again supporting the results obtained from statistical analysis.

In light of the literature reviewed, we proposed that the relationship amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment is mediated by organizational trust. To confirm this, multiple regression was conducted by the researcher. The model that we used proposed organizational justice as independent variable, organizational trust as mediating variable and organizational commitment as independent variable. In order to ensure the authenticity of the model, organizational justice was also used as mediating variable and organizational trust as independent variable, keeping organizational commitment as dependent variable. The correlation coefficients for each path showed the links to be statistically significant. This was done to ensure the possible tests for mediator analysis at bivariate level. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational justice (IV) and trust (mediator) is .33. The standard error for this coefficient is .03. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational trust (new IV) and organizational commitment (DV) is .23. The standard error for this coefficient is .05. Sobel test is used to test whether a mediator carries the influence of an independent variable to a dependent variable. The test statistic for Sobel test is 4.25 with an associated p-value of .00. Since it is less than alpha value of .05, so there exists mediation.

With organizational trust as independent variable and organizational justice as mediating variable the raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational trust (new IV) and organizational justice (new mediator) is 1.23. The standard error for this coefficient is .10. The raw regression coefficient for the association amongst organizational justice (new IV) and organizational commitment (DV) is 1.13. The standard error for this coefficient is .02. The test statistic for Sobel test is 10.87 with an associated p-value of .00. Since it is less than alpha value of .05, so this confirms mediation. Thus it concludes what we proposed in the light of the literature review that organizational trust plays a mediating role amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment as this is also supported by the statistical analysis.

Relative deprivation theory contends that deprivation is experienced by individuals when they found after comparing their rewards with their reference

groups that they are under rewarded. It strongly corresponds to the dimensions of organizational justice viz. distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional or informational justice (Folger & Martin, 1986) (Crosby, 1984). Last but not the least Organizational support theory OST (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002); (Wayne, Shore, L, & Liden, 1997) contends that employees have confidence that their organization pays worth to their input and is anxious about their wellbeing, when they readily and consistently reward their contributions. The reason for the increased satisfaction level of faculty members of Sargodha Campus can thus be owed to their organizational support which is lacking in case of University of Sargodha, Lahore Campus.

Conclusion

This section encompasses the research outcomes in the light of the research questions:

What are the perceptions of employees regarding organizational justice? What are the perceptions of employees regarding organizational trust? What are the perceptions of employees regarding organizational commitment? Does there exists a significance of the relationship among the fairness perceptions of organizational justice and organizational trust in determining organizational commitment of employees? Does organizational trust mediates the relationship amongst organizational justice and commitment?

Konovsky and Pugh (1994) found in a study that trust acts as an instrument through which organizational justice shapes employee outcomes. Trust implies the perception of fairness. In order to ascertain best performance among employees (Brokener & Siegel, 1996) it is imperative upon management to capitalize upon trust. A strong relationship is found to exist among interactional justice and organizational support which means that good treatment by supervisors builds the trust of employees in the organization (Mourad, 2014). The results of in the present study showed there is a significant impact of organizational justice on organizational trust, organizational trust on organizational commitment and organizational justice on organizational commitment. More over the organizational trust acts as a mediating variable amongst organizational justice and organizational commitment. These results are validated by the observations and qualitative analysis in the discussion chapter.

The interesting aspects of the results was shown by the contrasting results shown by the faculty members of main campus and Lahore campus. The possible explanation for the lack of professionalism in Lahore campus can be owed to the fact that this is five to six years old only. Also another possible explanation could be that the employers might not be aware of the importance of the consequences of lack of organizational justice, trust and commitment. However the faculty members at Lahore Campus need to be more vocal about their concerns and should be brave enough to raise their voice in front of management, so that they make their issued known. This research will contribute in enhancing their awareness as well. The main campus needs to realize the importance of research and their attitude towards the aspiring researchers should be more encouraging. Moreover not just educational sector but other organizations can replicate this study to their organizations owing to the significance of these concepts.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this research support the studies of Samuel, Pawan, & Zhen (2002); Alexander & Rudderman (1987) Pearce Branyiczki, & Bakacsi (1994); Huo (1996); Mourad (2014); Cohen Crash and Spector (2001); Lavelle (2009); Rezaiean (2010); Stinglhamber (2006); Geykens, Steenkamp, & Kumar (1998); Cropanzano (1991) and Sweeny (1997). Although organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational commitment are popular concepts but little research has been done specifically in understanding their impact on one another in academia. In this study we applied the Western concepts and instruments in the Asian context which also checks their generalizability in our local context. This study will focus on the interesting aspect of academia, how these variables affect the attitudes and perceptions of faculty members.

Practical Implications

First of all the management of University of Sargodha, main campus and Lahore campus can take advantage from this study. They will be able to understand the existing perceptions and issues of their employees and how they can better the situation. This study can also be advantageous for other public sector universities and their sub campuses. Universities can make use of the findings of this research to increase the commitment level of employees by focusing on building their level of organizational justice and organizational trust.

Limitations

- Since the results showed more negative sentiments among the employees of University of Sargodha, Lahore campus so the management of Lahore campus can make use of innovative HR strategies to increase organizational justice, trust and eventually commitment while reducing their negative sentiments. Similarly the sub campuses of other public sector universities can also take advantage of this study.
- Since a case study approach has been used so there exists internal validity, but at the same time external validity has been compromised. So there lies the issue of generalizability.
- Even in educational sector this research included faculty members only. For future dimensions, all the administrative employees can also be included in the study to check the validity of results.

Recommendations

- The University of Sargodha, particularly Lahore campus should become more attentive to the concerns of their employees. For example lower level of organizational justice and trust was shown by women as compared to men. The possible reason can be lack of women friendly policies or overall rigid culture of the organization. Thus they should make use of this study and make requisite and relevant changes in the policies and functioning of their organization.
- This research can be extended by studying role of other relevant variables such as turnover intentions, ostracism, and organizational citizenship behavior in the local context.

- This study focused only on main campus and Lahore campus of University of Sargodha. For future research Gujranwala campus can also be studied to see its comparison with Lahore campus.
- The focus of this research has been educational sector only. The external validity of this research can be checked by applying this study in corporate sector as well.
- Instead of focusing solely on the relationship amongst organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational commitment, researchers can also study the antecedents and consequents of these variables in the context of Pakistan, focusing on culture dimension in particular.
- In this study cross sectional method was used which gives detailed and comprehensive view but only for one point in time. Researchers can use longitudinal research to study the effects and impact of such variables over extended period of time. Such research can play a dynamic role in designing innovative management strategies.

References

- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 177-198.
- Bigley, G. A., & Pearce, J. L. (1998). Straining for shared meaning in organizational science: problems of trust and distrust. *Academy of Management Review*, 405-21.
- Brehm, J. &. (2004). Supervisors as trust brokers in social-work bureaucracies. In *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation (pp. 41-64). New York.
- Brokener, J., & Siegel, P. (1996). Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive justice: the role of trust. *Sage Publications*, 390-413.
- Burud, S. T. (2004). Leveraging the new human capital: Adaptive strategies, results. *Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing*.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 424-445.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment, and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 39-52.
- Crosby, F. (1984). *Relative deprivation in organizational settings*. Research in organizational behavior.
- Dolan, T. B. (2005). Testing the Causal Relationships between Procedural Justice, Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines*, 79-89.
- Folger, R., & Martin, C. (1986). Relative deprivation and referent cognitions: Distributive and procedural justice effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22(6), 531-546.

- Fombrun, C. J., Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1984). Strategic human resource management. *Wiley*.
- Geykens, I., Steenkamp, J., & Kumar, N. (1998). Generalizations about Trust in Marketing Channel using Meta Analysis. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 223-248.
- Gilbert, J. A. (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedents. *Public Personnel Management*, 321-338.
- Hartman, L. C., & Bambacas, M. (2000). Organizational commitment: A Multi method scale analysis and test of effects. *International Journal of Organization Analysis*, 89-108.
- Hoskisson, R. E., Hitt, M. A., Wan, W. P., & Yiu, D. (1999). Theory and research in strategic management: Swings of a pendulum. *Journal of management*, 25(3), 417-456.
- Konovsky, M., & Pugh, S. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 656-669.
- Liou, T. (1995). Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: a study of the juvenile detention center. *International journal of Public Administration*, 1269-1295.
- Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 709-734.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1996). The Measurement and Antecedent of Affective Continuance and Normative Commitment to The Organization. *Journal Of Occupational Psychology*, 1-88.
- Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 845-855.
- Pamela, S. Z. (2000). Measuring Organizational Trust Cross-Cultural Survey and Index. *International Association of Business Communicators*.
- Pearce, J., Branyiczki, I., & Bakacsi, G. (1994). Person-based reward systems: a theory of organizational reward practices in reform-communist organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 261-282.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2001). In E. Cliffs, *Management*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Vohra, N. (1996). *Organizational Behavior*.
- Stinglhamber, F. D. (2006). Perceived Support as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Justice and Trust A Multiple Foci Approach. *Group & Organization Management*, 442-468.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis.
- Vandenberghe, C. a. (2008). The role of pay satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover intentions: A two-sample study. *Journal of Business and psychology*, 275-286.
- Wayne, S., Shore, J., L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management journal*, 40(1), 82-110.
- Whitener, E. (1997). The impact of human resource activities on employee trust. *Human Resource Management Review*, 389-404.