CAUSAL LINKAGES AMONG THE STUDY VARIABLES

Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Employees’ perception of both distributive and procedural justice play a central role in determining job satisfaction (Dailey & Kirk, 1992). Evidence from literature presents job satisfaction as a relative stable state (Steel & Rentsch, 1997), still number of other researchers have found that there can be variability in levels of satisfaction due to organizational level variables (Arnold & Spell, 2006; Bowling, Beehr, Wagner, & Libkuman, 2005; Levin & Stokes, 1989). Job attitudes (e.g. job satisfaction) have both affective and cognitive components (Cialdini, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1981; Petty, Wegener, & Fabrigar, 1997). A strong body of evidence suggests that, an employee’s perception of justice affects the levels of experienced job satisfaction (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Moorman, 1991). The study of Job satisfaction is important because it has been identified as one of the key aspects of job attitude leading to other organizational outcomes, as turnover, absenteeism and productivity (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). As already defined, organizational justice is employees’ perception of fairness, these are generally four in type: distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational (Ambrose et al., 2007; Colquitt et al., 2001).

A multilevel investigation study (Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009) between four factors of justice and satisfaction reports that interpersonal and informational justice were positively related to daily job satisfaction. The study also hypothesized distributive and procedural justice at a between-person level and within-person level. Yet another study of 237 employees from two manufacturing units asserts that procedural justice is a better predictor of ‘benefits’ satisfaction than distributive
justice (Arnold & Spell, 2006). Here satisfaction is operationalized as satisfaction from benefits, and only two components of justice, distributive and procedural, were studied. Thus we hypothesize the following,

Hypothesis 1. The perception of organizational justice positively influences employees' job satisfaction.

Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment

A great number of researchers have attempted to study the relation between individual differences to work attitudes (Agho, 1993; Curry et al., 1986; Jerdee, 1966; Klein & Verbeke, 1999; Martins & Parsons, 2007; Steers, 1977; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2000; Walumbwa, Lawler, & Avolio, 2007; Wiener, 1982; Zanna, Olson, & Fazio, 1980), organizational commitment is one such attitude which is significantly researched in the organizational behavior literature.

Personal attributes, job characteristics and work experience are categorized as three determinants of commitment (Steers, 1977). Organizational justice as a component of the organizational structure affects the employees' levels of commitment (Curry et al., 1986). It is reported that distributive justice is a better predictor of commitment than procedural justice (Lowe & Vondanovich, 1995), on the contrary yet another study reports that, commitment is mainly related with procedural justice and substantially with other forms of justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Tremblay, Cloutier, Simard, Chenevert, & Vandenberghe, 2010). Since the literature presents such contradicting views, it seems necessary to identify the effect of justice on commitment in this context.
Hypothesis 2. The perception of organizational justice positively influences employees' organizational commitment.

Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: The Mediation of QWL

Organizational Justice and QWL

The concepts of fairness, justice and equity are considered cornerstones of a healthy society (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978) and are of fundamental importance in the workplace (Cosier & Dalton, 1983). Perceptions of inequity have been generally associated with substantive employee responses in the workplace (Cosier & Dalton, 1983).

We can find a latent link between justice and QWL in some of the preliminary literature on justice (Adams, 1965; Bies & Moag, 1986a; Deutsch, 1975; Greenberg, 1990b; Homans, 1961; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Deutsch (1975) has conceptualized distributive justice as “the distribution of the conditions and goods which affect individual well-being” this well-being broadly includes psychological, physiological, economic, and social aspects. Further it can be seen that, QWL is defined as a construct which relates to the well-being of employees (Chan & Wyatt, 2007). Thus, we can infer an inherent link between the concept of organizational justice and that of the QWL. For instance, social relations in the organization, which is one of the factors of QWL (Akranavičiūtė & Ruževičius, 2007; Walton, 1974) is related with the social aspect of well-being and in turn with distribution of conditions and goods which affects such well-being. One of the study constructed to observe the relationship of morality, ethics and justice with QWL asserts that, justice is positively related to QWL (Kriel, 2006). Stated differently, in order for employees to be able to
obtain healthy levels of quality of worklife, they need to experience a sense of organizational justice (Kriel, 2006).

The concept of organizational justice is fundamental in understanding a wide range of human attitudes and behaviours in the organization (Hartman, Yrle, & Galle Jr, 1999). The basic phenomenon besides such proposition is that employees’ perception of justice affects their job attitudes and organizational outcomes (Koh & Boo, 2004). In similar context, Leigh et al., (1988) also concluded that, employees visualize a broader organizational environment than merely to their particular role in attributing their satisfaction with the job (Leigh et al., 1988). This belief of a “broader organizational environment” is consistent with the views of Gestalt School of thoughts, which says that, “individuals are aware directly of a configuration or structure which is grasped as a whole and not merely as an assemblage of its parts” (Harre & Lamb, 1983). Hence we can say that, employees evaluate their organization as being fair on basis of the broader organizational environment; that is, organizational fairness is evaluated in terms of its effectiveness to provide a better QWL. This notion of broader organizational environment can be thought of as QWL, defined as a concept that encompasses a wide range of organizational phenomenon (Campbell et al., 1976; Davis & Cherns, 1975; Loscoceo & Roschelle, 1991; Walton, 1974). Further, as we would argue, this broader organizational environment or the perception of QWL would lead to cause job satisfaction.

The relationship of justice and QWL can also be argued on basis of the equity theory. Homans (1961) and Adams (1965) have argued on the issue of distributive justice that, “relations among men can be seen as involving principles of exchange, and that one of the crucial factors to each of the parties in a relationship is his
perception of his rewards and costs relative to those of the other person” as quoted by Regan (Regan, 1971):628. Within this framework when the individual employee delivers a specific amount of output in terms of disseminating his organizational responsibility, then as a principle of exchange the organization is expected to provide a certain level well-being in the organization. This general level of well-being is seen as conceptually similar to the concept of QWL (Van Laar, Edwards, & Easton, 2007). Reciprocity is an important phenomenon of human behavior, it is a universal “principal component” of moral codes as well as it is regarded as a “duty” under certain circumstances (Gouldner, 1960a).

The linkage between justice and QWL can also be explained using the social exchange theory and the reciprocity norm. Exchange relationships in the organizational setting is a continuum, ranging from a pure economic exchange at one end to an increasing degree of social exchange on the other (Song, Tsui, & Law, 2009). From the perspective of social exchange theory, we expect that employees’ perception of fairness is related with their QWL. This logic is consistent with the view of Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), who suggested that the “social exchange relationship evolves when employers take care of employees”. On basis of such a reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960a), between employers and employees, we argue that there exists an expectation of a fair degree of QWL in return to employees’ contribution to the organization. Further, as Homans (1958) has conceptualized, the relation between an employee (actor) and the organization (environment) is contingent on reciprocal behavior(s) from one another. We contend that, such contingent behavior is of “spiral nature”, and would occur in following steps, (1) the organization provides fair treatment to the employees, creating an obligation for the latter to reciprocate, (2) the employees reciprocate this reward (of fair treatment) by
performing the assigned job, creating an obligation for the organization to reciprocate, (3) progressing to the next level, the organization reciprocates by providing a better QWL, which further creates an obligation for the employee to reciprocate, (4) the employee continuous his/her behavior by performing on the assigned job.

In a social exchange relation the views of both parties, i.e. in an organizational scenario both the employee and the organization are involved, and the assigned job is the medium through which the reciprocal social relation is developed (Emerson, 1976). This analogy of job as medium in the organizational setting is parallel to Skinner Box as a medium of social interaction between Skinner and the pigeon, in the Homans (1958) view.

There are two sets of basic assumptions for the described “spiral nature” of the social exchange relation in an organization. First, when an individual engages in an exchange relation, what he/she gives is a cost (performing on the assigned job in our case), and what he/she receives may be looked at as a reward (fair treatment, better QWL and job satisfaction in our case) (Homans, 1958). Second, there is a hierarchical arrangement of the rewards that an employee receives. It means that, at the most elementary level fair treatment is required; when this need is relatively fulfilled employees are concerned about the next level of a better QWL. Following this and only when the preceding two needs are relatively fulfilled, the employee experiences a positive affective orientation towards the job, referred to as job satisfaction. This assumption is consistent with Homans’s (1974) “deprivation-satisfaction proposition” which says that, “the more often in recent past a person has received a particular reward, the less valuable any further unit of that reward becomes for him” (Homans, 1974; 29).
Conclusively, in the literature on the relationship between justice and satisfaction, a trend can be seen that certain factors of justice (e.g. distributive or procedural) are able to explain only specific outcome variables (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Thus, to advance a clearer picture of the influence of justice on employee’s QWL, we hypothesize the following,

_Hypothesis 3a. Organizational justice positively influences employees’ QWL._

**QWL and Job Satisfaction**

From an organizational lens, studying the linkage between QWL and job satisfaction is a clear objective, primarily because high performance can be achieved with high job satisfaction (Ivancevich, 1979; Norris & Niebuhr, 1984). Some managers and employees interpret the QWL concept as closely related to the concept of job satisfaction (White & Bednar, 1986). QWL could be defined as work place strategies, processes and environment combination, which stimulates employee’s job satisfaction.

In an organizational context, QWL is important since there is evidence demonstrating that the nature of the work environment is related to satisfaction of employees and work-related behaviors (Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987). QWL is also found to affect employees’ work responses in terms of organizational identification, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job involvement, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation (Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Efraty, Sirgy, & Claiborne, 1991; Huang, Lawler, & Lei, 2007; Igbaria et al., 1994). In a review of the health and well-being literature there is a link between people who experience greater QWL with those who also experience higher levels of health and well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Other work-related behaviors such as
absenteeism, reduced productivity and efficiency also appear to be affected by experienced levels of QWL.

The linkage between QWL and job satisfaction can also be inferred from one of the definitions of QWL available in the literature, which defines QWL as a set of favorable conditions and the elements of the workplace environment that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing workers with rewards, job security and growth opportunities (May, Lau, & Johnson, 1999). QWL has also been interpreted as ‘internal service quality’ of the work environment that contributes to employee satisfaction (Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser Jr, & Schlesinger, 1994; Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 2008). QWL is said to differ from job satisfaction (Champoux, 1981; Davis & Cherns, 1975; Hackman & Suttle, 1977; Kabanoff, 1980; Lawler, 1982a; Quinn & Shepard, 1974; Staines, 1980) but QWL is thought to lead to job satisfaction (Chan & Wyatt, 2007). QWL refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life (job satisfaction), satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, & Lee, 2001). Some researchers (Danna & Griffin, 1999) see QWL as a hierarchy of concepts that include non-work domains such as life satisfaction (at the top of the hierarchy), job satisfaction (at the middle of the hierarchy) and more work-specific facets of job satisfaction including such things as pay, co-workers, and supervisor (lower in the hierarchy).

Job satisfaction is related to an organization’s success and thus managers have begun to work toward enhancing employees overall QWL (Drafke & Drafke, 2008). The relationship between these two variables thus exists as an individual employee’s understanding of the external, internal, and individual factors and a component that
both make up and improves an individual’s QWL which will further assist in anticipating, coping with, and understanding behavior that occurs in the organization.

Researchers have viewed job satisfaction as an attitudinal disposition and as an outcome of QWL (Johnsrud, 2002). A study conducted large Midwestern utility, specifically to check for the effect of implementation of QWL programs on union and organizational commitment, concluded that job satisfaction is also affected by the organizational efforts of QWL programs (Fields & Thacker, 1992).

One of the study conducted on managers from three sectors of industry viz., Public, Private and Cooperative, found significant correlation between QWL and job satisfaction (Karrir & Khurana, 1996). Yet another study of QWL among Australian employees, reports data about the level of satisfaction with different job aspects—salary, work load, work pressure, control over the way of doing work, health and safe standards at work place, the type of job, relations among co-workers, trust in the management, recognition of work efforts and employees’ treatment by the immediate manager, opportunity for development of a career and job skills, information about work, balance between working and private life. The data of the attitudes toward work environment, obtained in these successive researches suggest a relationship between stable high-quality work life and job satisfaction (Bearfield, 2003).

Hypothesis 3b. Employees’ QWL positively influences their job satisfaction.

The existing literature speaks about relationships between justice and satisfaction; however the intervening effect of QWL is not studied. Thus on basis of the above stated linkages, theories, and addressing the gap in the literature, we propose that QWL can provide a better explanation for the influence of justice on satisfaction. We strongly support this mediation relation, because even though if the
perception of justice is high for an employee, it would not directly translate into satisfaction, unless such a perception of fairness is reflected in terms of the overall QWL. For instance, ‘growth and security’, one of the component of QWL (according to Walton, 1974) if perceived as being provided equitably in the organization, only then an individual employee will feel satisfied. QWL would essentially mediate the influence of justice on job satisfaction because, as we know the latter is attributed to the overall organizational environment (Leigh, Lucas Jr, & Woodman, 1988) and QWL is a construct label for various organizational phenomenon in the work environment (Campbell, et al., 1976; Davis and Cherns, 1975; Loscoceo and Roschelle, 1991; Ostrow, 2002; Walton, 1974). So, for job satisfaction, although fairness is a necessary condition because it is the most fundamental aspect in the workplace (Cosier & Dalton, 1983), however, such perception of justice would translate into job satisfaction only when an employee is able to find the reflections of fairness in terms of the available QWL in the organization. In a way, it can be inferred that, QWL is the foremost outcome of the organizational justice and therefore the influence of the latter on job satisfaction would be directed through an employee’s perception of the former. Thus, it is hypothesized that with the introduction of QWL, the relationship between justice and satisfaction can be better explained.

Hypothesis 3c. Employees’ QWL mediates the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

Organizational Justice and Commitment: The Mediation of QWL

QWL and Organizational Commitment

It has been found that organizations with enhanced state of QWL will enjoy a significant leverage in recruitment and retention of valuable employees (May et al.,
1999). This is primarily because better organizational environment and job characteristics have been found to be positively associated with the levels of organizational commitment (Huang et al., 2007).

Studies have shown that different dimensions of QWL result in distinctive effects on organizational commitment (Huang et al., 2007). Further literature also contends that, control over work and greater participation in workplace, as resultants of QWL interventions would increase commitment to the organization (Fields & Thacker, 1992). They have studied two company and union as two entities to which employees can be committed; and found that both the forms of commitment increases with employees involvement in the QWL processes (Fields & Thacker, 1992). With a deeper analysis, studies have suggested that increased commitment is an expected outcome of participation in QWL interventions (Steers, 1977; Walton, 1985).

_Hypothesis 4a. Employees’ QWL positively influences their organizational commitment._

Some researchers have presented QWL as a cooperative effort amongst the union and management and they say that such efforts can affect both organization and union related attitudes of the participating employees (Fields & Thacker, 1992).

The construct of organizational commitment has been a focus of an extant research since the emergence of the concept by a measure developed by Porter and colleagues in 1974. Various researchers have investigated the concept of commitment in different kinds of settings and have linked it to a host of different variables (Fields & Thacker, 1992; Steers, 1977; Steers & Porter, 1983). As antecedents to organizational commitment, Steers & Porter (1983) have hypothesized that the structural level variables of an organization contribute towards fostering
organizational commitment. Therefore, QWL that provide employees with opportunities for on-the-job development and utilization, learning and improvement, safe work environment should result in increased commitment to the organization (Normala, 2010).

However, we contend that in order for increased commitment to occur the employees must believe that their evaluation of an increased QWL has fair antecedents. This is to say that, it is mainly the perception of fairness that leads to organizational commitment, but such linkage is better appraised by the employees only when they feel that the component of fairness has actually contributed to their QWL. Although both are perceptual variables, still the linkage between justice and commitment is necessarily mediated by QWL because it is the latter that gives a clear picture of the fairness situation in the organization. Thus, the following mediation hypothesis is formulated,

\textit{Hypothesis 4b. Employees’ QWL mediates the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment.}

\textbf{Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: The Mediation of PsyCap}

\textit{Organizational Justice and PsyCap}

If we are discussing in the domain of positive organizational behavior, intuitively, the relationship of justice-PsyCap should not sound surprising to us. The reason behind this contention is that, both concepts at their outset are positive in nature, where PsyCap is strength and justice is a means to strengthen the same. The pioneers of POB, like that of positive psychology, do not claim to have discovered the importance of positivity (Luthans et al., 2007a; Peterson & Luthans, 2006). It is
recognized that much of the early history of the study of how organizational behavior (e.g., the theories of motivation, emotion) and contemporary theories (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, positive affect, citizenship, justice etc) themselves have an inherent positive orientation (Luthans et al., 2007a). Thus, we can infer from this argument that perception of justice would surely influence employees’ PsyCap.

It has been observed that, whenever employees were either overpaid or underpaid in comparison to another employee with equal contributions, it triggered an unpleasant state, which lead changes in the level of experienced job satisfaction (Greenberg, 1987). Thus, we can infer that, any kind of injustice would prompt negative affect and similarly justice would prompt a state of positive affect.

Fredrickson (2004), in the broaden and build theory of positive emotions maintains that, positive affect provides a broad cognitive context, which in turn builds an individual’s personal resources as intellectual, social and psychological resources (Fredrickson, 2004). Drawing support from broaden and build theory, we argue that there is a causal link between organizational justice and employees PsyCap. Similar to the contention that injustice would trigger negative emotions (Greenberg, 1987), the presence of justice would elicit positive emotions for an individual employee. The condition of positive emotions would broaden an employee’s cognitive context and build personal resources (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001, 2004). These personal resources also includes an individual’s psychological resources (Fredrickson, 2004). Further, as we know that an PsyCap is a construct label given to the best fit capacities of an individual that comprises of four core-capacities of hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy (Luthans, 2002c; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans et al., 2007a; Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004). Therefore, a link between
justice and PsyCap can be observed as, the presence of organizational justice would create positive emotion, which helps to build an individual’s PsyCap, which qualifies as a psychological resource.

*Hypothesis 5a. Organizational justice positively influences employees’ PsyCap.*

**PsyCap and Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (Locke, 1976; Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964), it consists of an affective (Locke, 1976) and a cognitive component (Organ & Near, 1985). It is also defined as the extent to which an employee expresses a positive affective orientation toward a job (Smith et al., 1969). It is a global concept relating to various other aspects of work, such as pay, supervision, or workload (Cook et al., 1983).

There is a the general expectancy that success is derived from optimism and the belief in one’s own abilities is derived from efficacy, based on this linkage literature presents that employees who are high on PsyCap report being more satisfied with their job (Luthans et al., 2007a). Studies have found a significant positive relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction (Avey et al., 2010b; Avey et al., 2008). Besides this, PsyCap was reported to be a better predictor of satisfaction than the personality traits as conscientiousness and extraversion (Luthans et al., 2007a).

The positivity of an individual is likely to contribute to higher job performance, increased satisfaction, greater work happiness, and higher organizational commitment
(Luthans et al., 2008b; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), further hope and resilience was significantly related to satisfaction (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

**Hypothesis 5b.** Employees’ PsyCap positively influences their job satisfaction.

We do not differ from the views of the existing researchers that justice leads to satisfaction (Arnold & Spell, 2006; Dailey & Kirk, 1992). However, we contend that such satisfaction is more at the surface level and relatively short lived. Further, we propose that, perception of higher levels of organizational justice influences PsyCap, which in turn translates into influencing job satisfaction. In this mediation relation, when employee feels satisfied primarily because of his/her PsyCap (Avey et al., 2010b; Avey et al., 2008; Luthans et al., 2007a), then such satisfaction would be more deep rooted and lasting, as it is arising out of his/her strengths (referred here as PsyCap). Thus, satisfaction under such conditions is generated out of employees’ own strengths rather than from an organizational level variable as organizational justice.

This linkage of PsyCap mediating the relation between organizational justice and job satisfaction can also be explained using the conservation of resource theory. This theory suggests that, individuals strive to obtain, build and conserve those resources which they value, and that psychological stress occurs when any such resources are lost or threatened with loss (Hobfoll, 1988, 1989). In response to any threat of loss, individuals would either try to protect such resources or seek compensatory resources. Failing to do both these, individuals might reduce their performance efforts in response to ongoing challenge of depleting resources. Applying this theory to explain the mediation of PsyCap in justice - satisfaction relationship, we argue that, availability of organizational justice would provide an individual employee with an additional source of enhancing or adding up to their
psychological resource. In this explanation, we describe PsyCap as a valued psychological resource. In different studies, the core-constructs of PsyCap, namely, hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy have been categorically described as psychological and personal resources (Avey et al., 2009; Bandura, 1997; Boudrias et al., 2011; Hobfoll, 2001; Taylor et al., 2011; Utsey, Giesbrecht, Hook, & Stanard, 2008; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007). Thus, organizational justice would function as a source of enhancing one’s PsyCap, which in turn would translate into higher levels of perceived job satisfaction. Similar to our previous argument, we contend that such satisfaction would be more deep rooted and lasting, primarily because the cause of satisfaction here is individual’s own strength, which is developed by an organizational variable, like organizational justice.

*Hypothesis 5c. Employees’ PsyCap mediates the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.*

**Organizational Justice and Commitment: The Mediation of PsyCap**

*PsyCap and Organizational Commitment*

Organizational commitment is defined as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Porter et al., 1974), it is an extent to which an employee identifies with and is involved in an organization (Curry et al., 1986). Using group and role theory as basis, Reichers (1985) has argued that, commitment is a process of identification with the goals of an organization's multiple constituencies; these constituencies comprises of the top management, customers, unions, and/or the general public at large (Reichers, 1985).
The relationship of commitment has been studied with many of its antecedent variables as organizational support, professionalism, workplace spirituality, human resource management practices (Bartol, 1979; Curry et al., 1986; Panaccio & Vandenberghhe, 2009; Savaneviciene & Stankeviciute, 2011; Vandenberghhe, 2011); but there are limited studies identifying the influence of employees’ PsyCap on their levels of organizational commitment. Similar to the case with satisfaction, employees who score high on PsyCap are the ones who are more committed towards their organization, this relationship is inferred out of the general expectancy theory which says that, success is derived from optimism and the belief in one’s own abilities is derived from efficacy (Luthans et al., 2008b). Further, PsyCap is also argued to be related to commitment because the organization fulfils an individual employees needs for efficacy and accomplishment for those who are high on PsyCap (Avey et al., 2011).

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees with strong affective commitment remain with an organization because they want to, but those with a strong continuance commitment stay because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment stay because they feel they ought to. Employees who score high on PsyCap are the ones who are more committed towards their organization, this relationship is inferred out of the general expectancy theory which says that success is derived from optimism and the belief in one’s own abilities (Luthans et al., 2008b). Further, the results of a recent meta-analysis projects that PsyCap is positively related to organizational commitment (Avey et al., 2011).

A variety of studies demonstrate a clear linkage between the positive psychological capacities of employees and desirable workplace outcomes. However,
to date, little empirical research exists which has examined such relationships. One of the study done in the healthcare industry reported that there is an important linkage between self-reported positive psychological capital (PsyCap) and supervisors’ ratings of their commitment to the mission of the organization (PsyCap scores are of the nurses, the target population in this case, whereas commitment is reported by the supervisors of the nurses). The authors found a highly significant positive relationship between PsyCap and commitment to the mission, values, and goals of the hospital (Luthans & Jensen, 2005).

In a recent study conducted on the manufacturing employees found a significant relationship of PsyCap with job satisfaction and organization commitment (Larson & Luthans, 2006). The study specifically identifies a significant influence of employee’s hope levels on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Larson & Luthans, 2006). Importantly, the employees’ PsyCap had a significant added impact over human and social capital on these work attitudes.

The positivity of an individual is likely to contribute to higher job performance, increased satisfaction, greater work happiness, and higher organizational commitment (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). In a large cross-sectional sample of employees, hope was related to their satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Further, it was also found that employees’ level of resilience related to their satisfaction, commitment, and happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). As a comparison with other predictor variables, it was found that, PsyCap was related to affective organizational commitment significantly stronger than core self-evaluations, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion (Youssef & Luthans, 2007),
indicating that PsyCap was once again the greatest contributor to predicting, in this case, affective organizational commitment.

Utilizing three diverse samples, Luthans and colleagues showed that employees’ psychological capital is positively related to their performance, satisfaction, and commitment and a supportive climate is related to employees’ satisfaction and commitment (Luthans et al., 2008b). The study’s major hypothesis that employees’ psychological capital mediates the relationship between supportive climate and their performance was also supported.

In a recent developmental study (Bressler, 2010), on 124 soldiers of the US Army Reserves, reports that hope and optimism correlate with affective commitment but not with continuance commitment. As an implication, the study suggests that, hope and optimism relate with affective commitment, and thus the soldiers who are emotionally attached to the organization will most likely stay.

**Hypothesis 6a.** Employees’ PsyCap positively influences organizational commitment.

It is to note that the perception of justice is not as black and white, rather it is in the shades of ‘grey’. This means that the perception of justice is spread across a continuum, and there is nothing called as “no justice”, it is the degree of fairness/justice that an employee perceives. So, even if such a perception is low or high for an employee it would not directly get translated into commitment or no commitment. We contend that, such a causal effect of justice on commitment would be directed through an employees’ PsyCap. Higher the employees’ PsyCap higher is the probability that they would remain committed to the organization, despite modest levels of perceived fairness, because: (1) they are hopeful that the fairness situations
would improve in the organization; (2) they are optimistic about such a situation and about the overall organizational canvas; (3) they are confident of their own abilities and therefore are less affected by any fairness contingencies in the organization; (4) they are resilient enough to bounce back from – in case there are any contingencies arising out of unfair situations. Based on this argument we hypothesize the following:

_Hypothesis 6b. Employees’ PsyCap mediates the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment._
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