



MIDOCEAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Management

Department of Project Management

Organizational Justice and Commitment: Implications for Saudi Project Teams

Abdullatif Abdullah Almosa

Final Project - 2

Second Semester - 2026

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Midocean University and the Faculty of Management for providing the academic framework and learning resources that supported this final project. I am also grateful to everyone whose encouragement contributed to the completion of this research. The project benefited from the course lectures, templates, and statistical guidance that shaped the organization of the literature review, methodology, analysis, and recommendations.

Dedication

This project is dedicated to my family for their continuous encouragement, patience, and support throughout my academic journey, and to every project professional who works to create fair, collaborative, and committed teams.

Abstract

Purpose: This study examines the effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment and interprets the results for the management of project teams in Saudi Arabia. Organizational justice is represented by distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, while organizational commitment is represented by affective, continuance, and normative commitment. **Methodology:** A quantitative, cross-sectional, secondary-data design was applied to an anonymized SPSS dataset containing 148 employee responses and 31 five-point Likert items. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alpha, corrected item-total correlations, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures, Bartlett's tests, principal component analysis, Pearson correlations, and simple and multiple linear regression were used. **Findings:** Overall organizational justice and organizational commitment were high. The two constructs were strongly and positively correlated ($r = .730$, $p < .001$), and organizational justice explained 53.3% of the variance in commitment. Distributive justice was the strongest individual predictor, followed by procedural justice. Interactional justice was significant in the simple regression but did not retain an independent effect in the simultaneous model. **Originality and implications:** The supplied dataset represents Gulf workforce evidence rather than a Saudi probability sample. The contribution therefore lies in combining robust statistical findings with evidence-based implications for Saudi project teams, including transparent workload and reward allocation, consistent decision procedures, employee voice, respectful explanations, and documented appeal mechanisms. The findings should be validated through future primary research among Saudi project professionals.

Keywords: organizational justice; organizational commitment; project teams; Saudi Arabia; distributive justice; procedural justice.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgment	1
Dedication	1
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
List of Tables	4
List of Figures	4
Chapter 1: Introduction	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
Chapter 3: Research Methodology	17
Chapter 4: Statistical Analysis and Findings Discussion	22
Chapter 5: Research Limitations, Recommendations and Conclusion	31
References	34
Appendices	36

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Summary of Selected Previous Studies	15
Table 3.1: Operational Definitions of Research Variables	17
Table 3.2: Structure of the Research Instrument	19
Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Research Sample	22
Table 4.2: Reliability Results	24
Table 4.3: KMO and Bartlett Tests	25
Table 4.4: Component Loading Ranges and Explained Variance	25
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables	26
Table 4.6: Correlations between Justice and Commitment	27
Table 4.7: Simple Regression Hypothesis Tests	27
Table 4.8: Multiple Regression Results	28

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Research Model	9
Figure 1.2: Project Structure	10
Figure 3.1: Research Onion	18
Figure 4.1: Age Distribution of the Research Sample	24
Figure 4.2: Mean Scores of Research Dimensions	26

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION



1.1 Research Background

Saudi Arabia is implementing a broad economic and institutional transformation through Vision 2030. The transformation is being delivered through portfolios of programs and projects that involve government entities, public investment organizations, private companies, contractors, consultants, and multicultural professional teams. The Vision 2030 Annual Report 2025 describes a continuing shift toward delivery, institutional performance, human capability, and private-sector participation. PIF's 2026-2030 strategy similarly emphasizes sustained value creation, operational excellence, governance, transparency, and efficient execution. These priorities increase the importance of management practices that help organizations retain capable employees, maintain collaboration, and sustain commitment under demanding project conditions (Public Investment Fund, 2026; Saudi Vision 2030, 2026).

Project teams operate under temporary structures, changing stakeholder requirements, resource constraints, schedule pressure, and interdependence between specialist roles. Within such environments, employees continuously evaluate whether assignments, rewards, decisions, communication, and managerial treatment are fair. These evaluations form the basis of organizational justice. When team members believe that outcomes are fairly distributed, procedures are consistent and transparent, and managers communicate respectfully, they are more likely to trust the organization and reciprocate through positive attitudes and behavior (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2007).

Organizational commitment reflects the psychological relationship between an employee and the organization. The three-component model distinguishes affective commitment, which concerns emotional attachment; continuance commitment, which concerns the perceived costs of leaving; and normative commitment, which concerns a sense of obligation to remain (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Commitment is important in projects because turnover or withdrawal can disrupt knowledge

continuity, stakeholder relationships, team coordination, and delivery performance. A committed employee is more likely to remain engaged with organizational goals and support collective responsibilities, although the quality of commitment matters because affective commitment generally produces more desirable outcomes than commitment based only on exit costs (Meyer et al., 2002).

The relationship between justice and commitment is supported by social exchange theory. Fair treatment signals that the organization values employees and respects their contribution; employees may reciprocate with stronger identification, loyalty, and willingness to continue the relationship (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Meta-analytic research has consistently linked organizational justice with commitment, satisfaction, citizenship behavior, and performance-related attitudes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Saudi research has also reported that justice is relevant to employee attitudes and organizational commitment (Elamin, 2012; Karasneh & Ab Ghani, 2021).

This study analyzes an existing Gulf workforce dataset to assess the effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment. Because the supplied dataset is coded entirely as UAE nationals and does not identify the respondents as project employees, the numerical findings are not presented as Saudi population estimates. The Saudi focus is maintained by interpreting the results for project-team management and by identifying practices that Saudi organizations can test through direct primary research. This distinction protects the validity of the study while allowing the available evidence to contribute to an important Saudi management issue.

1.2 Research Problem

Saudi organizations are delivering increasingly complex projects while competing for skilled employees and attempting to build high-performing, stable teams. Formal project controls can define scope, schedule, cost, risk, and governance, but they do not automatically ensure that employees perceive managerial decisions as fair. Workload allocation, access to development opportunities, recognition, incentives, performance evaluation, role assignment, and change decisions can all affect perceptions of justice. When these processes appear inconsistent or inadequately explained, employees may reduce their psychological attachment even when the project remains technically well managed.

The central research problem is therefore the limited practical understanding of how the different dimensions of organizational justice relate to organizational commitment and which

dimensions deserve the greatest managerial attention. Existing international and Saudi studies support a relationship, but the relative contribution of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice may differ by context. The supplied dataset offers an opportunity to test the relationship statistically and to identify evidence-informed implications for Saudi project teams, while recognizing that the dataset itself was not collected as a Saudi project-sector survey.

1.2.1 Theoretical Gap

Organizational justice and organizational commitment are well-developed constructs, but studies sometimes treat justice as a single overall perception and commitment as a single outcome. This can conceal the distinct effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and the multidimensional nature of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The study addresses this gap by analyzing both overall constructs and their dimensions, then comparing simple regression results with a simultaneous model that identifies unique predictive effects.

1.2.2 Empirical and Contextual Gap

Saudi evidence remains less extensive than evidence from Western and Asian contexts, particularly for temporary, multidisciplinary, and project-based teams. Saudi studies have examined justice in educational, postal, health, and general organizational settings, but direct evidence for project professionals remains limited. In addition, the available dataset was collected in a Gulf workforce context and contains no project-sector classification. The study therefore produces benchmark evidence and a clearly bounded set of implications rather than claiming direct generalization to Saudi project employees.

1.3 Research Significance

1.3.1 Theoretical Significance

- Integrates the three justice dimensions with the three-component model of organizational commitment.
- Tests overall and dimension-level relationships using reliability, validity, correlation, and regression analysis.
- Compares bivariate effects with unique effects in a simultaneous regression model.
- Adds a Gulf-region empirical analysis to literature that is still dominated by non-Arab organizational settings.

1.3.2 Practical Significance

- Provides project managers with evidence on the importance of fair workload, reward, and opportunity allocation.
- Highlights procedural consistency, employee voice, transparency, and review mechanisms as management priorities.
- Supports PMOs and human-resource functions in designing team climate indicators and retention practices.
- Connects people-management practices with Saudi priorities related to operational excellence, governance, human capability, and effective project delivery.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What is the perceived level of organizational justice in the supplied workforce dataset?
2. What is the perceived level of organizational commitment in the supplied workforce dataset?
3. Does overall organizational justice have a statistically significant effect on organizational commitment?
4. Do distributive, procedural, and interactional justice have statistically significant effects on organizational commitment?
5. Which justice dimension has the strongest unique effect on organizational commitment?
6. What implications do the results provide for managing project teams in Saudi Arabia?

1.5 Research Objectives

1. To measure the levels of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice.
2. To measure affective, continuance, normative, and overall organizational commitment.
3. To evaluate the reliability and construct validity of the questionnaire scales.
4. To test the effect of overall organizational justice on organizational commitment.
5. To test and compare the effects of the three organizational justice dimensions.
6. To develop evidence-informed recommendations for Saudi project-team management.

1.6 Research Hypotheses

- H1: Overall organizational justice has a statistically significant positive effect on organizational commitment.
- H1a: Distributive justice has a statistically significant positive effect on organizational commitment.
- H1b: Procedural justice has a statistically significant positive effect on organizational commitment.

- H1c: Interactional justice has a statistically significant positive effect on organizational commitment.

1.7 Research Model




Figure 1.1: Research Model

Source: Researcher preparation.

1.8 Scope of the Study

Conceptually, the study focuses on organizational justice as the independent variable and organizational commitment as the dependent variable. Organizational justice includes distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Organizational commitment includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Methodologically, the study uses a quantitative cross-sectional analysis of 148 anonymized responses contained in the supplied SPSS dataset. Geographically, the empirical dataset represents a Gulf workforce sample coded as UAE nationals; Saudi Arabia is the application context for the managerial interpretation. The study does not claim that the respondents worked on Saudi projects or that the numerical estimates represent Saudi employees.

1.9 Project Structure




Figure 1.2: Project Structure

Source: Researcher preparation.

Chapter 1 introduces the study, problem, significance, questions, objectives, hypotheses, model, and scope. Chapter 2 reviews the concepts, theories, previous studies, and Saudi project-management context. Chapter 3 explains the research design, data source, operational definitions, instrument, ethics, and analysis procedures. Chapter 4 presents the statistical analysis and discusses the findings. Chapter 5 identifies limitations, recommendations, future research directions, and the overall conclusion.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW



2.1 Introduction

This chapter establishes the theoretical and empirical foundation of the study. It reviews organizational justice, organizational commitment, the relationship between them, and their relevance to project teams in Saudi Arabia. The chapter also summarizes selected previous studies and develops the hypotheses tested in Chapter 4.

2.2 Theoretical Foundations

2.2.1 Equity Theory

Equity theory proposes that employees compare the ratio of their inputs, such as effort, experience, time, and responsibility, with the outcomes they receive, such as pay, recognition, opportunity, and status. They also compare this ratio with relevant others. Perceived imbalance creates tension and can motivate employees to alter effort, seek changes, withdraw psychologically, or leave the relationship (Adams, 1965). In project teams, equity comparisons may concern workload, overtime, visibility to senior management, access to training, recognition for milestones, and allocation of high-value assignments.

2.2.2 Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory explains employment as a continuing relationship based on reciprocal obligations. Fair procedures and respectful treatment communicate that the organization values employees. Employees may reciprocate with trust, commitment, citizenship behavior, and willingness to support organizational goals. Unfair treatment weakens the exchange relationship and may reduce attachment or increase withdrawal (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This theory provides the principal explanation for the expected positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.

2.2.3 Group-Value and Relational Perspectives

Relational perspectives emphasize that fair procedures and respectful treatment also communicate social standing and inclusion. Employees care not only about material outcomes but also about whether decision processes recognize their dignity and membership in the group. This is particularly relevant in diverse project teams, where communication, voice, and respectful explanations can influence whether members feel accepted and valued.

2.3 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness in organizational outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal treatment. Greenberg (1987) organized the field into a coherent set of justice theories, and later research established multidimensional measurement models. Colquitt (2001) provided strong evidence that justice dimensions are related but distinct. The present study uses three dimensions that match the supplied dataset.

2.3.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice concerns the fairness of outcomes. Employees assess whether rewards, responsibilities, opportunities, and other results are appropriate relative to contribution, need, or equality rules. In project settings, distributive justice can be affected by the allocation of demanding work packages, overtime, incentives, promotions, professional development, recognition, and access to influential stakeholders. A technically correct allocation may still be perceived as unfair if criteria are unclear or applied inconsistently.

2.3.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice concerns the fairness of the processes used to make decisions. Fair procedures are generally consistent, unbiased, based on accurate information, open to employee voice, correctable when errors occur, and aligned with ethical standards. Project organizations apply procedures when assigning resources, approving changes, evaluating performance, resolving claims, selecting vendors, and escalating risks. Procedural justice is therefore closely connected to governance and transparency.

2.3.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice concerns the quality of interpersonal treatment and explanations provided during decision implementation. It includes dignity, respect, propriety, honesty, timeliness, and adequate information. Project managers frequently communicate unpopular or high-pressure

decisions. Even when the outcome cannot be changed, respectful explanation can reduce uncertainty and protect the working relationship. Interactional justice is therefore essential for stakeholder communication and team climate.

2.4 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a psychological state that characterizes an employee's relationship with the organization and influences the decision to remain. Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that commitment consists of three components. The components can coexist, but they have different psychological foundations and consequences.

2.4.1 Affective Commitment

Affective commitment is emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment remain because they want to. It is generally associated with favorable outcomes such as attendance, citizenship behavior, and performance (Meyer et al., 2002). In projects, affective commitment can support voluntary cooperation, knowledge sharing, and resilience during uncertainty.

2.4.2 Continuance Commitment

Continuance commitment reflects awareness of the costs associated with leaving. Employees may remain because they need to preserve accumulated benefits, relationships, experience, or alternative opportunities. Continuance commitment can support retention, but it may not produce the same discretionary effort as affective commitment. Project organizations should therefore avoid interpreting retention alone as evidence of strong identification.

2.4.3 Normative Commitment

Normative commitment is a perceived obligation to remain. It can develop through socialization, loyalty norms, organizational investment, or a sense that continued membership is the right action. In project environments, normative commitment may be strengthened when employees believe the organization has invested in their development or supported them during difficult assignments.

2.5 Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

The expected relationship is positive because fairness improves the quality of the employee-organization exchange. Distributive justice can strengthen commitment by demonstrating that

contribution is recognized. Procedural justice can increase trust in future decisions even when a specific outcome is unfavorable. Interactional justice can protect dignity and reduce uncertainty through respectful communication. Meta-analyses show that justice dimensions are consistently associated with organizational commitment and related attitudes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

The dimensions overlap because the same event can generate multiple fairness judgments. For example, a project bonus decision has a distributive outcome, a decision procedure, and an interactional explanation. This overlap makes it useful to compare simple regressions with a simultaneous model. A dimension may show a strong bivariate relationship but a weaker unique effect after shared variance with other dimensions is controlled.

2.6 Relevance to Saudi Project Teams

Saudi Arabia's transformation agenda involves major programs and projects across infrastructure, tourism, housing, logistics, technology, culture, energy, and public services. Official strategy documents emphasize operational excellence, governance, transparency, private-sector participation, and human capability. These priorities require teams that can retain knowledge, coordinate across organizations, and remain committed throughout long delivery cycles (Public Investment Fund, 2026; Saudi Vision 2030, 2026).

The Saudi labor market is also expanding and diversifying. The Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development has highlighted increasing participation and the development of skills for high-growth sectors. Greater workforce mobility and competition for specialized skills make commitment and retention increasingly important. Fair management practices are therefore relevant not only as ethical principles but also as mechanisms for maintaining workforce stability and organizational capability (Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development, 2025).

Project teams in Saudi Arabia often include Saudi nationals and expatriate specialists working across client, consultant, contractor, and supplier organizations. Differences in contract conditions, authority, language, and access to opportunities can increase sensitivity to fairness. Project managers cannot eliminate every difference, but they can establish transparent criteria, consistent procedures, meaningful voice, respectful communication, and documented review mechanisms.

2.7 Selected Previous Studies

Table 2.1: Summary of Selected Previous Studies

Study	Context / Method	Main Finding	Relevance
Colquitt et al. (2001)	Meta-analysis of 183 studies	Justice related to commitment, satisfaction, citizenship behavior, and performance.	Established broad evidence for justice outcomes.
Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001)	Meta-analysis of 190 samples	Justice predicted work attitudes and behavior.	Supported multidimensional justice effects.
Meyer et al. (2002)	Meta-analysis of commitment research	Affective commitment had the strongest favorable correlations with outcomes.	Clarified differences among commitment components.
Elamin (2012)	600 Saudi employees across 24 organizations	Justice significantly influenced satisfaction and commitment; distributive justice was especially important.	Direct Saudi evidence.
Al Naggar & Saad (2019)	174 Saudi Postal Corporation employees	Organizational justice significantly affected job involvement.	Shows justice relevance in a Saudi public-service setting.
Karasneh & Ab Ghani (2021)	Arar Technical College, Saudi Arabia	Organizational justice and its dimensions significantly affected commitment.	Direct support for the present hypotheses.
Colquitt (2001)	Construct-validation studies	Justice dimensions were empirically distinguishable and reliably measurable.	Supports the measurement model.
Cropanzano et al. (2007)	Management review	Fairness improves trust, cooperation, and managerial effectiveness.	Provides practical justice-management guidance.
Meyer & Allen (1991)	Conceptual development	Commitment includes affective, continuance, and normative components.	Supports the dependent-variable structure.
Suliman & Al Kathairi (2013)	Employees in the UAE	Organizational justice was linked with commitment and performance.	Relevant Gulf evidence consistent with the supplied dataset.

Source: Researcher synthesis of the cited literature.

2.8 Hypothesis Development

2.8.1 Overall Organizational Justice and Commitment

Justice communicates organizational support and relationship quality. Employees who perceive their organization as fair are expected to identify more strongly with it and to be more willing to maintain membership. Therefore, H1 predicts a positive overall effect.

2.8.2 Distributive Justice and Commitment

Fair outcomes demonstrate that effort and contribution are recognized. Because project work frequently involves visible differences in responsibility, pressure, overtime, and recognition, distributive justice is expected to increase commitment. H1a predicts a positive effect.

2.8.3 Procedural Justice and Commitment

Fair procedures increase confidence that present and future decisions will be consistent, evidence-based, unbiased, and correctable. Employee voice also supports inclusion. H1b therefore predicts a positive effect of procedural justice on commitment.

2.8.4 Interactional Justice and Commitment

Respectful communication and adequate explanations preserve dignity and strengthen the social exchange relationship. H1c therefore predicts a positive effect of interactional justice on commitment.

2.9 Conclusion

The literature supports a multidimensional relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment. Equity and social exchange theories explain why fair outcomes, procedures, and treatment should strengthen commitment. Saudi studies provide contextual support, while the project-team setting adds practical importance because commitment influences continuity, cooperation, and knowledge retention. Chapter 3 explains how the hypotheses were tested using the supplied dataset.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY



3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the methodology used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses. It presents the operational definitions, research design, data source, sample, instrument structure, ethical considerations, and statistical procedures. The methodology follows a quantitative design because the study examines measurable relationships between defined variables.

3.2 Operational Definitions of Research Variables

Table 3.1: Operational Definitions of Research Variables

Variable	Operational Definition	Measurement
Distributive justice	Perceived fairness of organizational outcomes, rewards, workload, recognition, and opportunities.	Mean of DJ1-DJ5
Procedural justice	Perceived consistency, neutrality, accuracy, voice, and correctability of organizational decision procedures.	Mean of PJ1-PJ5
Interactional justice	Perceived dignity, respect, honesty, and adequacy of explanations received from decision makers.	Mean of IJ1-IJ5
Organizational justice	Overall fairness perception across distributive, procedural, and interactional dimensions.	Mean of 15 justice items
Affective commitment	Emotional attachment, identification, and desire to remain with the organization.	Mean of AC1-AC5
Continuance commitment	Perceived costs or losses associated with leaving the organization.	Mean of CC1-CC6
Normative commitment	Perceived moral obligation or loyalty to remain with the organization.	Mean of NC1-NC5
Organizational commitment	Overall psychological attachment represented by affective, continuance, and normative components.	Mean of 16 commitment items

Source: Researcher preparation based on Colquitt (2001) and Meyer and Allen (1991).

3.3 Research Design (Research Onion)




Figure 3.1: Research Onion

Source: Researcher preparation.

The research philosophy is positivism because the study treats organizational justice and commitment as measurable constructs and uses statistical tests to examine relationships. The approach is deductive because hypotheses were developed from established theory and previous research. The methodological choice is mono-method quantitative. The strategy is analysis of an existing survey dataset. The time horizon is cross-sectional because all responses represent one period rather than repeated observations. The analysis techniques include descriptive statistics, reliability and validity assessment, correlation, and regression.

3.4 Research Population, Sample and Sampling

3.4.1 Research Population

The intended conceptual population is employees working in organizational settings where fairness perceptions and commitment are relevant. The practical Saudi application population is professionals working in project-based organizations, including clients, PMOs, contractors, consultants, and public entities. However, the supplied dataset does not document the original sampling frame, organization, industry, recruitment method, or project involvement. These unknowns prevent a defensible claim that the empirical sample represents the intended Saudi population.

3.4.2 Research Sample

The accessible sample consists of 148 complete cases in the supplied SPSS file. Demographic variables include gender, age, education, work experience, position, and nationality. All respondents are coded as UAE nationals. The study therefore treats the dataset as an anonymized Gulf workforce sample and limits generalization accordingly. The sample is sufficiently large for the planned reliability, correlation, and regression analyses, but it is not a probability sample of Saudi project professionals.

3.5 Data Collection Method and Research Instrument

The study uses secondary quantitative data supplied in SPSS format. The file contains 31 Likert-scale items and computed dimension scores. Response categories range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The original questionnaire document and verbatim wording were not included in the available course materials. Consequently, the study reports item codes and construct structure accurately but does not claim that reconstructed appendix statements are the exact wording administered to respondents.

Table 3.2: Structure of the Research Instrument

Construct	Dimension	Item Codes	Number of Items
Organizational justice	Distributive justice	DJ1-DJ5	5
Organizational justice	Procedural justice	PJ1-PJ5	5
Organizational justice	Interactional justice	IJ1-IJ5	5
Organizational commitment	Affective commitment	AC1-AC5	5
Organizational commitment	Continuance commitment	CC1-CC6	6
Organizational commitment	Normative commitment	NC1-NC5	5

3.6 Types and Sources of Data

The empirical data are secondary quantitative data because the researcher received an existing anonymized dataset rather than directly administering the survey. The literature review uses secondary documentary data from peer-reviewed studies, books, and official Saudi strategy and labor-market sources. No direct interviews, observations, or identifiable personal records were used.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

The dataset contains no names, contact information, employee numbers, or identifiable organizations. The analysis is reported in aggregate form. No attempt was made to identify individual respondents or infer sensitive characteristics. The study also avoids misrepresenting the sample as Saudi or project-sector data. Transparent reporting of the dataset's limits is an ethical requirement because inaccurate claims about population and context could mislead readers.

3.8 Statistical Analysis Procedures

1. Data screening: checking the number of cases, missing values, and values outside the 1-5 response range.
2. Sample profile: calculating frequencies and percentages for demographic variables.
3. Reliability: calculating Cronbach's alpha and corrected item-total correlations.
4. Construct validity: calculating KMO measures, Bartlett's tests of sphericity, and one-component principal component loadings for each dimension.
5. Descriptive analysis: calculating means, standard deviations, minimums, maximums, levels, and rankings.
6. Correlation analysis: calculating Pearson coefficients between justice dimensions and overall commitment.
7. Hypothesis testing: conducting simple linear regressions for H1 and H1a-H1c and a simultaneous multiple regression to compare unique effects.
8. Decision rule: treating p-values below .05 as statistically significant.

For interpretation of five-point means, the range was divided into equal intervals: 1.00-1.80 very low, 1.81-2.60 low, 2.61-3.40 moderate, 3.41-4.20 high, and 4.21-5.00 very high. Correlation strength was interpreted in relation to magnitude and direction, while R-squared represented the proportion of variance in commitment explained by the predictor.

3.9 Conclusion

The study uses a positivist, deductive, quantitative, cross-sectional design based on an anonymized secondary dataset of 148 employees. The instrument contains three organizational justice dimensions and three organizational commitment dimensions. The methodology combines reliability, validity, descriptive, correlation, and regression procedures. The limits of the data source are explicitly recognized so that Chapter 4 can present statistically accurate findings without overstating their Saudi generalizability.

CHAPTER 4

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS DISCUSSION



4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the statistical analysis of the supplied questionnaire dataset and discusses the findings in relation to organizational justice and organizational commitment. The analysis describes the research sample, assesses questionnaire validity and reliability, calculates descriptive statistics, tests the hypotheses, connects the results with previous literature, and identifies implications for Saudi project-team management.

The SPSS file contained 148 cases and 45 variables. The substantive questionnaire consisted of 31 Likert-scale items measured from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Frequencies and percentages were used for the sample profile; Cronbach's alpha, corrected item-total correlations, KMO, Bartlett's test, and principal component loadings were used for reliability and validity; and means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and linear regression were used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses. Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < .05$.

4.2 Sample Profile

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Research Sample

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	77	52.0
	Female	71	48.0
Age	Below 20	11	7.4
	20-29	48	32.4
	30-39	54	36.5
	40-49	29	19.6
	50 and above	6	4.1
Education	High School	17	11.5

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Diploma	20	13.5
	University Degree	73	49.3
	Master's Degree	29	19.6
	PhD/DBA	9	6.1
Work experience	2-5 years	40	27.0
	6-10 years	44	29.7
	10-15 years	41	27.7
	More than 15 years	23	15.5
Position	Entry-level employee	30	20.3
	Junior employee	53	35.8
	Senior employee	48	32.4
	Senior executive employee	17	11.5
Nationality	UAE National	148	100.0

Source: Statistical analysis of the supplied SPSS dataset (N = 148).

The gender distribution was balanced, with males representing 52.0% and females 48.0%. The largest age group was 30-39 years (36.5%), followed by 20-29 years (32.4%). Nearly half of the respondents held a university degree (49.3%), and 56.7% reported between two and ten years of experience. Junior and senior employees together represented 68.2% of the sample. The nationality variable contained only one category, UAE national. This confirms that the results are Gulf workforce evidence and cannot establish Saudi employee attitudes directly.




Figure 4.1: Age Distribution of the Research Sample

Source: Researcher analysis of the supplied dataset.

4.3 Validity and Reliability Tests

4.3.1 Data Screening

All 148 cases were retained. A range check found one response coded as 0 for item AC3, although the valid questionnaire range was 1-5. This value was treated as missing for item-level calculations. The affective commitment and overall organizational commitment scores were computed from the remaining valid items, so the respondent remained in the analysis. No other out-of-range values were identified.

4.3.2 Reliability Analysis

Table 4.2: Reliability Results

Scale	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Corrected Item-Total Range	Assessment
Distributive Justice	5	.939	.769-.867	Excellent
Procedural Justice	5	.920	.715-.864	Excellent
Interactional Justice	5	.963	.869-.915	Excellent
Affective Commitment	5	.768	.316-.683	Acceptable
Continuance Commitment	6	.927	.747-.840	Excellent
Normative Commitment	5	.855	.436-.772	Good
Organizational Justice - overall	15	.970	.694-.870	Excellent

Scale	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Corrected Item-Total Range	Assessment
Organizational Commitment - overall	16	.937	.353-.769	Excellent

Source: Researcher analysis of the supplied dataset.

All dimensions and both overall constructs exceeded the .70 reliability threshold. Overall organizational justice achieved an alpha of .970, while organizational commitment achieved .937, indicating very strong internal consistency. Interactional justice had the highest dimensional reliability (.963). Affective commitment had the lowest alpha (.768), but it remained acceptable. Its minimum corrected item-total correlation (.316) suggests one comparatively weak item that should be reviewed in future administration.

4.3.3 Construct Validity

Table 4.3: KMO and Bartlett Tests

Construct	KMO	Bartlett Chi-square	df	p-value	Suitability
Organizational Justice (15 items)	.951	2,573.11	105	< .001	Excellent
Organizational Commitment (16 items)	.927	1,847.37	120	< .001	Excellent
Full Questionnaire (31 items)	.941	4,751.38	465	< .001	Excellent

Source: Researcher analysis of the supplied dataset.

Table 4.4: Component Loading Ranges and Explained Variance

Dimension	Loading Range	Variance Explained	Interpretation
Distributive Justice	.847-.921	80.4%	All items acceptable
Procedural Justice	.811-.920	75.8%	All items acceptable
Interactional Justice	.916-.947	87.3%	All items acceptable
Affective Commitment	.330-.909	54.9%	One loading below .40
Continuance Commitment	.824-.895	73.3%	All items acceptable
Normative Commitment	.581-.874	63.9%	All items acceptable

Source: Researcher analysis using one-component principal component analysis.

KMO values were above .90 and Bartlett's tests were statistically significant, demonstrating excellent suitability for factor analysis. Five of the six dimensions showed loadings well above .40. Affective commitment contained one loading of .330. Because the dimension still achieved acceptable internal consistency and the original item wording was unavailable, no item was deleted. The item should be reviewed for wording or reverse scoring before a future Saudi survey.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics for Research Variables

Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Level	Rank
Interactional Justice	3.645	1.158	1.00	5.00	High	1
Continuance Commitment	3.532	1.003	1.00	5.00	High	2
Distributive Justice	3.527	1.181	1.00	5.00	High	3
Organizational Justice - overall	3.518	1.069	1.00	5.00	High	4
Organizational Commitment - overall	3.490	.872	1.00	5.00	High	5
Normative Commitment	3.484	.943	1.00	5.00	High	6
Affective Commitment	3.447	.932	1.00	5.00	High	7
Procedural Justice	3.384	1.097	1.00	5.00	Moderate	8

Source: Researcher analysis (N = 148).




Figure 4.2: Mean Scores of Research Dimensions

Source: Researcher analysis of the supplied dataset.

Overall organizational justice was high ($M = 3.518$, $SD = 1.069$), and organizational commitment was also high ($M = 3.490$, $SD = .872$). Interactional justice had the highest mean ($M = 3.645$), suggesting comparatively positive perceptions of respectful interpersonal treatment. Procedural justice recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.384$) and was the only dimension classified as moderate. This identifies consistency, transparency, voice, neutrality, and appeal mechanisms as the

principal improvement area. Continuance commitment ranked highest among the commitment dimensions, followed by normative and affective commitment.

4.5 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.6: Correlations between Justice and Commitment

Predictor	Outcome	Pearson r	p-value	Interpretation
Organizational Justice - overall	Organizational Commitment - overall	.730	< .001	Strong positive
Distributive Justice	Organizational Commitment - overall	.713	< .001	Strong positive
Procedural Justice	Organizational Commitment - overall	.703	< .001	Strong positive
Interactional Justice	Organizational Commitment - overall	.629	< .001	Strong positive

Source: Researcher analysis. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

The strongest relationship was between overall organizational justice and organizational commitment ($r = .730$). Distributive justice was the strongest individual dimension ($r = .713$), followed closely by procedural justice ($r = .703$). Interactional justice was also strongly related to commitment ($r = .629$). The results show that higher fairness perceptions consistently occur alongside stronger organizational commitment.

4.6 Hypothesis Testing

Table 4.7: Simple Regression Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	Regression Path	B	Beta	F	R-squared	p-value	Decision
H1	Overall justice -> commitment	.596	.730	166.92	.533	< .001	Supported
H1a	Distributive justice -> commitment	.526	.713	151.16	.509	< .001	Supported
H1b	Procedural justice -> commitment	.559	.703	143.02	.495	< .001	Supported
H1c	Interactional justice -> commitment	.474	.629	95.58	.396	< .001	Supported

Source: Researcher analysis. Dependent variable: overall organizational commitment.

The main hypothesis was supported. Overall organizational justice significantly predicted commitment (Beta = .730, $p < .001$) and explained 53.3% of its variance. Each dimension also had a significant positive effect when tested separately. Distributive justice explained 50.9% of the variance, procedural justice 49.5%, and interactional justice 39.6%. Therefore, H1 and H1a-H1c were supported in the simple regression tests.

Table 4.8: Multiple Regression Results

Predictor	B	Standardized Beta	t	p-value	Result
Distributive Justice	.276	.373	3.046	.003	Significant unique predictor
Procedural Justice	.216	.272	2.144	.034	Significant unique predictor
Interactional Justice	.099	.132	1.410	.161	Not independently significant

Source: Researcher analysis. Predictors entered simultaneously; dependent variable: overall organizational commitment.

When the three justice dimensions were entered simultaneously, distributive justice remained the strongest unique predictor (Beta = .373, $p = .003$), followed by procedural justice (Beta = .272, $p = .034$). Interactional justice did not add a statistically significant unique effect after overlap with the other dimensions was controlled (Beta = .132, $p = .161$). This does not mean interactional justice is unimportant; it had a strong simple relationship and the highest descriptive mean. Instead, its predictive information substantially overlapped with the broader fairness climate represented by distributive and procedural justice.

4.7 Discussion of Findings

4.7.1 Overall Justice and Commitment

The strong positive relationship between organizational justice and commitment is consistent with social exchange theory and prior meta-analyses. Fair treatment signals that employees are valued, which encourages reciprocal attachment and loyalty (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). The result also agrees with Elamin's (2012) Saudi study, which found that justice influenced work-related attitudes, and with Karasneh and Ab Ghani (2021), who reported a significant effect on commitment at Arar Technical College.

4.7.2 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice was the strongest individual predictor in both the correlation and simple regression analyses and retained the strongest unique effect in the simultaneous model. Employees appear particularly responsive to whether workload, rewards, recognition, and opportunities are distributed fairly. Elamin (2012) also identified distributive justice as an important predictor in Saudi organizations. For project teams, this finding is directly relevant because managers allocate demanding assignments, overtime, visibility, development opportunities, and recognition across temporary teams.

4.7.3 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice had the lowest mean but remained a strong and significant predictor. The moderate mean indicates room for improvement in consistency, transparency, neutrality, voice, and correction mechanisms. In Saudi project organizations, these issues arise in staffing, performance appraisal, change control, schedule recovery, resource prioritization, procurement interfaces, and escalation. The result supports the argument that employees can accept difficult outcomes more readily when the process is fair and understandable.

4.7.4 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice recorded the highest mean and had a strong bivariate relationship with commitment. Respectful communication, dignity, and adequate explanations therefore remain important. Its loss of significance in the simultaneous model suggests overlap with the other justice dimensions rather than absence of value. Project managers should not neglect interactional justice because communication is the channel through which procedures and outcomes are explained and interpreted.

4.7.5 Implications for Saudi Project-Team Management

The findings imply that Saudi project organizations should treat fairness as a project-governance and people-management issue. Work packages, overtime, incentives, development opportunities, and recognition should use transparent criteria connected to responsibility and contribution. Team members should have a meaningful opportunity to raise concerns before major decisions are finalized. PMOs should document resource, change, and performance decisions and provide review or escalation channels. Managers should explain difficult decisions respectfully, especially during scope changes, schedule pressure, and resource constraints. Finally, short justice and commitment measures can be included in team pulse surveys and lessons-learned reviews to identify emerging risks to continuity and cooperation.

These implications are particularly relevant to multidisciplinary and multicultural teams. Nevertheless, the numerical estimates should be treated as benchmark evidence rather than Saudi population parameters. Direct replication is necessary among Saudi project professionals, with sector, project type, nationality, contract arrangement, leadership style, and project phase considered as possible moderating factors.

4.8 Conclusion

Chapter 4 analyzed 148 cases from the supplied dataset. Reliability was acceptable to excellent, and KMO and Bartlett results supported construct analysis. Overall justice and commitment were high, while procedural justice was the only moderate dimension. Correlation and simple regression supported the main hypothesis and all sub-hypotheses. Overall justice explained 53.3% of commitment variance. In the simultaneous model, distributive and procedural justice retained significant unique effects, while interactional justice did not add significant incremental prediction. The findings align with international and Saudi literature and support practical fairness interventions in Saudi project teams, subject to the stated limits of the dataset.

CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION



5.1 Introduction

This chapter identifies the limitations that affect interpretation of the findings, presents recommendations for Saudi project organizations, proposes future research directions, and provides the final conclusion.

5.2 Research Limitations

1. Geographic limitation: all respondents were coded as UAE nationals. The results cannot be treated as estimates for Saudi employees.
2. Sector limitation: the dataset did not identify industry, organization, or whether respondents worked in project teams.
3. Sampling limitation: the original sampling frame, recruitment process, and response rate were not available, so representativeness cannot be established.
4. Secondary-data limitation: the researcher did not control the original questionnaire administration, translation, or data-collection conditions.
5. Instrument limitation: the original verbatim item wording was unavailable. The study could verify item codes and statistical structure but could not inspect wording quality or reverse-scoring instructions.
6. Cross-sectional limitation: the data capture one point in time and cannot prove causality or show how justice and commitment change across project phases.
7. Common-method limitation: justice and commitment were measured using self-reported questionnaire responses, which may increase shared-method variance.
8. Model limitation: leadership, organizational support, job satisfaction, trust, culture, and project conditions were not included, although they may influence commitment.
9. Data-quality limitation: one AC3 response was outside the 1-5 range and was treated as missing. One affective commitment loading was also comparatively weak.

5.3 Recommendations for Saudi Project Organizations

1. Establish transparent allocation criteria. Project managers should document how work packages, overtime, incentives, recognition, training, and high-visibility opportunities are assigned.
2. Strengthen procedural consistency. PMOs should standardize key people-related decisions and ensure that similar cases are treated using comparable criteria.
3. Provide employee voice. Team members should have structured opportunities to present information, raise fairness concerns, and contribute before decisions with major personal impact.
4. Create review and appeal mechanisms. Organizations should provide neutral escalation paths for contested workload, performance, and reward decisions without retaliation.
5. Improve managerial explanations. Leaders should communicate the reasons, evidence, constraints, and expected consequences of decisions in a timely and respectful manner.
6. Monitor team fairness and commitment. Short pulse surveys can be used at mobilization, major milestones, change events, and closeout to identify deteriorating perceptions.
7. Integrate fairness into project governance. Justice-related indicators can be included in PMO dashboards, risk reviews, lessons learned, and leadership performance criteria.
8. Train project leaders. Development programs should include bias awareness, conflict resolution, difficult conversations, multicultural communication, and fair decision design.
9. Connect recognition to contribution and collaboration. Reward systems should acknowledge both individual delivery and cooperative behavior that supports the whole project.
10. Conduct a Saudi primary study. A dedicated survey should be administered to project professionals in construction, technology, infrastructure, energy, tourism, and public-sector programs.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

- Replicate the model using a probability or stratified sample of project professionals in Saudi Arabia.
- Compare public-sector, private-sector, and PIF portfolio project environments.
- Test whether nationality, gender, organizational level, contract type, or project phase moderates the relationship.
- Include mediators such as perceived organizational support, trust, job satisfaction, and project identification.
- Use longitudinal designs to examine justice and commitment from project initiation through closeout.
- Combine surveys with interviews to understand why specific decisions are perceived as fair or unfair.
- Examine links with project outcomes such as turnover intention, knowledge sharing, collaboration, safety behavior, and schedule performance.

5.5 Final Conclusion

This research examined the effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment and interpreted the findings for Saudi project teams. The statistical analysis demonstrated that overall justice was strongly and positively related to commitment and explained more than half of its variance. Distributive justice emerged as the strongest unique predictor, while procedural justice also retained a significant effect. Interactional justice was strongly related to commitment in the bivariate analysis and remained an important part of the overall fairness climate, although it did not add significant unique prediction after the other dimensions were controlled.

The practical message is that project organizations should not treat commitment as an employee characteristic that managers cannot influence. Commitment is partly shaped by everyday decisions about outcomes, procedures, and treatment. Fair distribution, transparent procedures, employee voice, respectful communication, and review mechanisms can strengthen the employee-organization relationship. These practices are compatible with Saudi priorities related to governance, operational excellence, human capability, and effective delivery.

The study's main caution is equally important. The supplied data were not collected from a Saudi project sample. The findings therefore provide a statistically sound benchmark and a basis for recommendations, not direct Saudi population estimates. A future Saudi primary study is required to confirm the magnitude of the relationships in project-based sectors. Subject to this limitation, the evidence strongly supports organizational justice as a practical management priority for developing stable, cooperative, and committed project teams.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Al Naggar, S. A., & Saad, M. A. (2019). The impact of organizational justice on job involvement level on Saudi Postal Corporation. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 6(7), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2019.07.003>
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI Press.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.27895338>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Elamin, A. M. (2012). Perceived organizational justice and work-related attitudes: A study of Saudi employees. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 8(1), 71-88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20425961211221633>
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306437>
- Karasneh, M. Z., & Ab Ghani, H. (2021). The effect of organizational justice on organizational commitment at Arar Technical College in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Management*, 12(1), 1492-1502. <https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.12.1.2021.131>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)

- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development. (2025). Progress in the Saudi labor market. <https://www.hrsd.gov.sa/en/knowledge-centre/articles/progress-saudi-labor-market>
- 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>
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256591>
- Public Investment Fund. (2026). PIF strategy 2026-2030: From growth to realization. <https://www.pif.gov.sa/en/strategy-and-impact/our-strategy/>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Saudi Vision 2030. (2026). Vision 2030 annual report 2025. <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/en/annual-reports>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (7th ed.). Wiley.
- Suliman, A., & Al Kathairi, M. (2013). Organizational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451311279438>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaire Coding Framework

Important note: The original questionnaire wording was not included in the supplied materials. The statements below are construct-aligned, adapted descriptions provided to document the coding framework. They should not be presented as verbatim copies of the instrument originally administered. The actual statistical analysis used the item codes and responses contained in the SPSS file.

Appendix Table A.1: Construct-Aligned Item Framework

Code	Adapted Item Description
DJ1	My work outcomes are appropriate for the effort I contribute.
DJ2	My rewards are appropriate for the work I complete.
DJ3	My workload and responsibilities are distributed fairly.
DJ4	My opportunities and recognition are fair compared with my contribution.
DJ5	Overall, the outcomes I receive are fair.
PJ1	Decision procedures are applied consistently.
PJ2	I can express my views before important decisions are made.
PJ3	Decisions are based on accurate and relevant information.
PJ4	Decision procedures are free from improper bias.
PJ5	There are opportunities to review or correct unfair decisions.
IJ1	Managers treat me with dignity.
IJ2	Managers treat me with respect.
IJ3	Managers communicate honestly when decisions are made.
IJ4	Managers explain decisions adequately.
IJ5	Managers consider the personal impact of their decisions.
AC1	I feel emotionally attached to this organization.
AC2	I feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.
AC3	The organization has personal meaning for me.
AC4	I identify with the organization and its goals.
AC5	I would be happy to continue my career with this organization.
CC1	Leaving the organization would involve significant personal cost.

Code	Adapted Item Description
CC2	It would be difficult for me to leave at present.
CC3	I have invested a great deal in remaining with this organization.
CC4	I have limited attractive alternatives to leaving.
CC5	Leaving would disrupt important benefits or relationships.
CC6	Remaining is partly a practical necessity.
NC1	I feel an obligation to remain with the organization.
NC2	Loyalty to the organization is important to me.
NC3	I would feel guilty if I left without a good reason.
NC4	The organization deserves my continued commitment.
NC5	Remaining with the organization is the right thing to do.

Source: Researcher adaptation aligned with the supplied coding structure; not verbatim original wording.

Response scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree.

Appendix B: Hypothesis Decision Summary

Appendix Table B.1: Hypothesis Decision Summary

Hypothesis	Statement	Decision
H1	Overall organizational justice positively affects organizational commitment.	Supported
H1a	Distributive justice positively affects organizational commitment.	Supported
H1b	Procedural justice positively affects organizational commitment.	Supported
H1c	Interactional justice positively affects organizational commitment.	Supported in simple regression

Source: Researcher analysis.