



12th International Strategic Management Conference, ISMC 2016, 28-30 October 2016, Antalya, Turkey

The Moderating Role of Self Efficacy on the Perceptions of Justice and Turnover Intentions

"Duysal Aşkun Çelik, Hakkı Okan Yeloğlu, Olcay Bige Yıldırım" *

"a, Smart Solutions Human Resources Management Consultancy, Beyoğlu, 34437, Turkey"

"bBaşkent University, Ankara, 06810, Turkey"

cMarmara University, Istanbul, 34180, Turkey"

Abstract

Previous research in organizational behavior has reported many variables serving as either mediators or moderators in the predictive relationship between justice perceptions and turnover intentions. So far, none of the studies seems to have considered the possible influence of self-efficacy as a moderating variable in that relationship. Positive organizational behavior approach strongly offers usage of individual capacity variables for producing positive organizational outcomes (Luthans, 2002). In this study, we have explored the moderating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between justice perceptions and turnover intentions. Nine-hundred and four employees coming from private companies of Istanbul and Ankara, in Turkey, participated in the study. To analyze the results, we have used confirmatory factor analyses and regression analyses. Our results revealed important findings in relation to the moderating effects of different self-efficacy dimensions. We have found a negative relationship between justice perceptions and turnover intentions. For self-efficacy dimensions, many interaction effects were as expected, except for those high in willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior. We discussed the results in light of certain theoretical assumptions and offered related recommendations for organizational practice and future research.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of the organizing committee of ISMC 2016.

Keywords: Self Efficacy, Perceptions of Justice, Turnover Intentions

1. Introduction

The relationship between organizational justice perceptions and turnover intentions have been a long debate in organizational behavior (OB) research. As in many other organization- related research models, the researchers studied the relationships between justice and turnover again through organization related variables. As an example, commitment (Ali & Jan, 2012; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998; Karim, 2009; Poon, 2012), social support (Soltis, Agneessens, Sasovova, & Labianca, 2013), trust (Bal, de Lange, Ybema, Jansen, & van der Velde, 2011; Farooq & Farooq, 2014), perceived job characteristics (Li & Bagger, 2012), and satisfaction (Hendrix et al., 1998) served as mediators or moderators in that relationship. It seems that the role of individual variables (such as personality, self-esteem, self-efficacy, awareness...etc.) were underrepresented in OB research in general and in justice

* Corresponding author. Tel. + 90-532-3639603
Email address: olcayb@marmara.edu.tr

research in particular. Although the reasons and the rationale for this might be discussed at another time, it might be worthwhile to consider an emerging “positive trend” in the field.

2. The Rise of Positive Organizational Behavior (POB): Increasing Awareness of the Role of Individual Strengths

Luthans (Luthans, 2002), in his article on (POB), talked about how OB field had given more concentration on the workplace dysfunctions in terms of theory building and research applications while the popular business books mainly had a strength focus, trying to influence the readers of today’s business toward a more healthy workplace applications, relations and management. This inevitably led those in organizations to follow the bestsellers’ advice and suggestions, especially those who were in the HR and/or management roles. Luthans (2002) therefore suggested that the OB field had to make the necessary shift in perspective towards people’s strengths that actually meant cognitive and emotional resources. Changing this perspective required changes in research variables to be studied, as well as changes in related research models that benefited real-world applications like those of selection methods, training modules, managerial practices and all other kinds of workplace developmental programs. In his thorough attempt to define POB, Luthans (2002) has chosen to include strengths of individuals as having certain psychological capacities that composed of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, subjective well-being, and emotional intelligence (CHOSE). Among these capacities, self-efficacy, although being most recognized and established over the years of theory and research, was considered very little or was even ignored in OB research (Luthans, 2002). More importantly, self-efficacy for Luthans was a remarkable construct mainly for the following: Apart from an individual’s own abilities and skills, the belief in those abilities led to positive choices, motivational effort and perseverance that are all very influential for an individual’s performance. As a result, being a high performer, the manager/employee concentrates on the task, gives all s(he) can to accomplish it, and perseveres when s(he) meets obstacles in the workplace.

2.1. Self-efficacy related research in OB

Self-efficacy as a moderator in job and work-related variables was in a few, if not in many studies. As an example, in a study that tried to understand the relationship between the job demands and work-related psychological responses among Malaysian technical workers, Panatik, O’Driscoll, & Anderson (2011) found that self-efficacy moderated the impact of job demands on psychological strain. When the individual had low self-efficacy, high job demands had higher negative effect on feeling anxiety and depression. However, the researchers failed to find a significant moderator effect related to the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. They attributed these mixed findings to a possible culture effect. In Malaysia, work demands meant serving the in-group needs not the person him or herself. Therefore, having high job demands reflected a form of sacrifice to one’s in-group. Thus, it might not lead to a decision to leave the organization. As a result, an individual variable such as self-efficacy might have played a moderator role concerning those specific variables. Similarly, in a study carried out with middle school teachers in China, Yu, Wang, Zhai, Dai, and Yang (2014) found a mediating role of self-efficacy while trying to explain the work stress-job burnout relationship.

In an attempt understand the influential role of future time perspective on several work-related outcomes, Park and Jung (2015) came up with the finding that occupational self-efficacy influenced turnover intention through career and organizational commitment. This meant that occupational self-efficacy might be having a role in one’s commitment to his or her career and organization. Apart from attitudinal and emotional variables, others have studied self-efficacy as a predictor for an important outcome variable such as performance. Judge, Jackson, Shaw, Scott and Rich (2007), in their study that looked at the self-efficacy’s contribution to work performance, found a prediction effect especially in tasks that were less complex. Looking at the above studies, we might infer that self-efficacy, whether being measured as a state or a trait, as a general or an occupational construct, seems to be playing some roles in attitudinal and/or outcome variables in OB research. As the original definition implies, self-efficacy relates to one’s judgments about one’s ability to act and manage tasks under many conditions that includes ambiguity, unpredictability, and most naturally, stress (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). In addition, as part of the following definitions and according to the social cognitive theory, self-efficacy related to high effort and persistence, as they are also part of the individual’s motivational behaviors (Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2012). When it comes to the give and take between the employee/manager and the organization, one can naturally wonder the processes and/or outcomes of such relationship especially when an individual has high self-efficacy, meaning that s(he) is giving his/her best to the task at hand, spending considerably high effort, and having a strong belief in what s(he) is able to accomplish no matter how the organizational environment looks like. As well as having a judgment about the personal capabilities, the individual inevitably would be developing judgments about what is going around in terms of organizational rewards, performance incentives, the processes by which those outcomes are attained, and the way organizational actors play roles during

those exchanges.

2.2.Organizational Justice and Related Outcomes

Organizational justice described the relationship of fairness to one's workplace. It mainly reflected a perception about fair treatment and the way in which this type of perception influenced other workplace variables (Moorman, 1991). Hendrix et al. (1998) talked about Cronpanzano and Greenberg (1997), two leading researchers in the justice field, to have noted the topic to be of high interest especially during the 1990s for I/O psychology, human resource management and OB researchers.

As for the dimensions of organizational justice, distributive justice, representing the perceived fairness of tangible rewards, was the focus of early justice research (Hendrix et al., 1998). Later on, a justice dimension that reflected the fairness of the procedures used to achieve related outcomes, namely, procedural justice (see Folger & Greenberg, 1985) was established (Hendrix et al., 1998). Another dimension to be a part of procedural justice named as interactional justice (see Bies, 1987; Moorman, 1991) which involved fairness perceptions related to the way managers and others who are in charge of controlling resources/rewards treat those on the receiving end (Bies & Moag, 1986; as cited in Meisler, 2013). Among the many outcome variables related to justice, turnover was a frequently studied one. However, according to Posthuma, Maertz, and Dworkin (2007), there was no established success regarding the relationship especially between procedural justice and actual turnover behavior. Although Posthuma et al. (2007) mention the availability of strong research support for the turnover intentions; there were inconsistencies in terms of the predictive power of procedural justice for the behavioral domain. The possible reason for that was measuring procedural justice as one single construct. As part of their empirical effort to better understand the relationship between procedural justice and turnover, Hendrix et al. (1998) proposed that there needs to be two categories under procedural justice: Formal and informal. The formal procedures reflected the justice/injustice by the whole organization, whereas the informal procedures came from those in authority positions. While the former dealt with policies, rules and procedures, the latter involved informal actions such as giving feedback and general treatment of the employee. As a result of their study with employees working full-time in a production plant, Hendrix et al. (1998) found that procedural justice, especially interpersonal justice component affected actual turnover through intrinsic job satisfaction, commitment, attendance motivation and turnover intentions. It is also important to note that there was a direct effect of turnover intentions on actual turnover.

In general, studies of justice-turnover relationship concentrated on several variables mediating or moderating in between. However, as we mentioned earlier, the mediating or moderating variables were mostly under the organization-related attitudes and behaviors category. Having said that, we thought it might still be useful to mention brief summaries of those research findings.

In their study where they have explored the age and trust as possible moderators in the relation between procedural justice and turnover, Bal et al. (2011) found that there were negative relations considering age and procedural justice with turnover and negative relationship between procedural justice and turnover especially for employees with high trust. This meant that when employees perceived high procedural justice and who had high trust for their organizations were more likely to stay in the organization. In addition, older employees who had higher trust levels were more willing to stay. Here it might be important to note that age or trust alone did not have significant moderating relationships, but they had effects in combination. Trust as a variable alone also played a significant role in a study using an employee sample from a south Asian Telecommunication Company. According to the research findings, both distributive and procedural justice increased trust in one's organization and therefore the result was decreased turnover (Farooq & Farooq, 2014).

Taking justice as a social environmental variable, Li and Bagger (2012) investigated the mediating role of job characteristics. Job characteristics partially mediated the influence of especially procedural justice on turnover intentions. With job characteristics, the authors meant task significance, feedback and autonomy which would be relevant for procedural justice perceptions as they represented accurate information given to employees for decision making, opportunities to challenge decisions, giving employees freedom of expression, and providing consistency.

Among organization related attitudes, commitment usually was a mediating variable. As an example, Karim (2009), in his study carried out with middle level managers from two organizations in Pakistan; found that commitment mediated the relationship between procedural justice and turnover, whereas distributive justice had a direct influence without an interplay of any mediating variable. Here it might be useful to highlight the importance of procedural justice for the individual employees' commitment levels. Similarly, another study from Pakistan by Ali and Jan (2012) demonstrated that there were positive relations between two justice dimensions (distributive and procedural) and commitment levels, and negative relations with turnover intentions in a sample of medical representatives. Poon (2012), in his study with employees from diverse organizations in Malaysia, also tried to explore similar relationships

this time via affective commitment. In this study, distributive justice also had a negative effect over turnover intentions but this time through affective commitment. Here the researcher treated procedural justice as a moderator variable in the relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention. As a result, high levels of procedural justice laid the ground for both direct and indirect effect of distributive justice on turnover intentions (through affective commitment), and low of levels of procedural justice did so for only an indirect effect by distributive justice. Although the results of this study might seem a bit complicated, it might be useful to remind us the possible contributions by different justice dimensions in many different types of influential combinations.

Finally, in a study carried out with employees from a large manufacturing company in Turkey, Ölçer (2015) found that commitment mediated the relationship between procedural justice and turnover intentions more strongly compared to the distributive justice.

Apart from commitment, trust and job characteristics, job embeddedness was having a moderator role in justice-turnover relationship. Karatepe and Shahriari (2014), in their study with Iranian hotel employees, found a strong moderator role of job embeddedness. Negative influences of all justice types on turnover intentions were stronger among employees who had high levels of job embeddedness.

Looking through the available literature results, the studied variables do not address a direct and clear relationship from justice to turnover. This would inevitably lead us to explore additional variables in question that might help to understand the dynamic nature that seems to be evidently prevalent in the justice-turnover relationship. Here a possible presence of an individual difference variable might be useful to expand our understanding of this seemingly complex relationship pattern.

2.3.Possible Role of Self-Efficacy in Justice-turnover intention relationship

From the research findings related to justice perceptions and turnover intentions, we might naturally infer that justice is an important variable to prevent turnover escalation in organizations. If/when employees/managers perceive that there are fair procedures and distribution of resources in one's organization, they would be less willing to leave and more likely to stay in the organization (Farooq & Farooq, 2014; Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014; Li & Bagger, 2012; Poon, 2012). Equity theory by Adams (1963; as cited in Farooq & Farooq, 2014) posits that in organizations employees give their skills, expertise, accumulated experience, educational capacities, and, from a self-efficacy perspective, give their effort to their tasks, projects, departments, in short, to their organization as a whole. In exchange of these inputs, they are in the position to receive rewards such as pay, promotion or other types of incentives.

As self-efficacy implies one's firm belief in his/her abilities, skills and effort, we believe those individuals who are high in their self-efficacy, might be more sensitive to a certain give and take between themselves and their organizations. This would involve resources, procedures as well as relationships. This means that all types of justice perceptions would be included in our research model. Therefore, we thought that it might be valuable to offer the following research hypotheses:

H₁: There is a negative relationship between all types of justice perceptions and turnover intentions.

H_{2a}: For those individuals having high self-efficacy, the relationship between all types of justice perceptions and turnover intentions is strong.

H_{2b}: For those individuals having low self-efficacy, the relationship between all types of justice perceptions and turnover intentions is weak.

Our first hypothesis follows from previous research findings related to justice-turnover relationship. The last two hypotheses suggest that individuals having a certain level of self-efficacy would be differing in their justice perception levels, in other words, in their sensitivity concerning justice related issues.

3. Methods

Sample and Procedures: We selected and surveyed the employees of private sector in Ankara and Istanbul, two metropolitan cities in Turkey. We collected the data by convenience sampling from March 2015 to September 2015. Two data collectors collected questionnaires from these two different cities and ensured the consistency of the survey during data collection time. After the collection of data, we entered it to the relevant software to analyze the results. We tested the validity of the scales. To test the validity of the scales, we used confirmatory factor analyses. To examine the model fit, indices of chi square-degree of freedom ratio (χ^2/df), comparative fit index (CFI), goodness of fit index (GFI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used for the assessment (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham, 2006). For the Organizational Justice scale, value of chi square-degree of freedom ratio (χ^2/df) was 6,948; comparative fit index (CFI) was 0,934; goodness of fit index (GFI) was 0,871 and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0,081. For Self Efficacy Scale, value of chi square-degree of freedom ratio (χ^2/df) was 8,527; comparative fit index (CFI) was 0,901; goodness of fit index (GFI) was 0,882 and the root mean

square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0,091. Finally, for the Turnover Intention scale, value of chi square-degree of freedom ratio (χ^2/df) was 8,621; comparative fit index (CFI) was 0,994; goodness of fit index (GFI) was 0,991 and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0,092. Nine-hundred and four employees completed the survey. Fifty-three percent of the respondents who completed the questionnaire were female and fifty-four of them were married. Almost 26 percent of the respondents were managers. The average age of the respondents was 34 and had worked at their companies for 5 to 8 years.

3.1.Measures

Organizational justice. Organizational justice was the independent variable of the study. We measured participant perceptions of procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. We used several valid and reliable scales of the relevant studies Folger and Konovski, Williams, Malos and Palmer, 2002). For procedural justice, we used Moorman's (1991) procedural justice scale. Participants of the study were informed about the "procedures in making decisions about collection of information, challenging the decision, generating standards, etc". For interactional justice, combinations of Moorman's (1991) and Folger and Konovski's (1989) scales were used. Here we assessed the perceptions about respondents' managers. Sample statements in the scale included: "Your supervisor considered your viewpoint"; "Your supervisor was able to suppress personal biases, etc". The combination of Moorman's (1991) and Williams, Malos and Palmer's (2002) scales measured distributive justice. Some items in the scales were as follows: "Fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities", "Fairly rewarded in view of the amount of experience you have". Yürür adapted Turkish version of this scale as a whole in 2005.

Self-Efficacy. We used the self-efficacy scale developed by Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, and Rogers (1982). Yıldırım and İlhan adapted the Turkish version of the scale in 2010. We used three sub-dimensions for self-efficacy, which were moderating variables in this study. These three sub-dimensions were "willingness to initiate behavior", "willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior", "persistence in the face of adversity". We simply used the term "Wib" for "willingness to initiate behavior", "Wee" for "willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior" and "Pinfa" for "persistence in the face of adversity". Respondents were asked to indicate whether various statements applied to them with a five-point likert-type scale.

Turnover Intention. This variable was the dependent variable of our study. We used four items from the turnover scale by Rosin and Korabik (1991) to get the perception of the respondents about their turnover intention. The sample items were: "I am thinking of changing my job", "I am actively seeking a new job". Again, we used a five-point Likert-scale.

Conclusion

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for, and correlations among, the study variables that are independent, moderator and dependent variables. The main results showed that there were negative and statistically significant relations among turnover intention and sub dimensions of justice. This result supported the main relation between justice and turnover intention. Table 2 shows the regression results. We then suggested nine models for testing the moderation effects of sub-dimensions of self-efficacy. In all models, there were negative relationships between the sub-dimensions of justice and turnover intention. This result supported the main theoretical background of the study. The other findings showed that most of the sub-dimensions of justice and the sub-dimensions of the self-efficacy variables had statistically significant relations.

TABLE 1
Correlations and Descriptive Statistics^a

Variables	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Distributive Justice	3,14	1,17						
2.Interractional Justice	3,33	1,06	,751**					
3.Procedural Justice	2,87	1,12	,614**	,642**				
4.Wib	2,55	1,31	0,04	,096**	0,02			
5.Pinfa	3,41	0,49	,079*	,128**	0,06	,476**		
6.Wee	3,48	0,82	,086**	,189**	,170**	,222**	,469**	
7.Intention to Turnover	3,56	0,71	-,464**	-,429**	-,392**	-,080*	-,076*	0,00

^an=904.

* p < .05

** $p < .01$

As we can see from Table 2, all sub-dimensions of justice had negative effects on intention to turnover. Besides, in each model, we tested the moderating effects of self-efficacy subdimensions on intention to turnover. In Model 1, 2 and 3, the interaction effect of procedural justice and willingness to initiate behavior (-,2329; $p < 0,01$), persistence in the face of adversity (-,0940; $p < 0,05$) and willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior were all-significant concerning the intention to turnover (,1874; $p < 0,01$). In model 4, the interaction effect of interactional justice and willingness to initiate behavior was tested. The results showed that this interaction was also statistically significant (-,2796; $p < 0,01$). In model 5, the interaction effect of the persistence in the face of adversity and interactional justice was not significant (-,0805; $p > 0,05$). Model 6 tested the interaction effect of interactional justice and willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior. In this model this interaction effect was statistically significant (,1336; $p < 0,01$). Model 7, 8 and 9 tested the interaction effects of self-efficacy dimensions and distributive justice dimensions. In model 7, the moderating effect of willingness to initiate behavior (-,1835; $p < 0,01$) was significant. But in model 8, we found no evidence concerning the interaction effect (-,0156; $p > 0,05$). Finally, in model 9 the moderating effect of willing to expend effort in completing the behavior was statistically significant.

After analyzing the results of regression models, we depicted graphs to demonstrate the relation between the sub dimensions of organizational justice and turnover intention based on different levels of sub-dimensions of self-efficacy. We included graphs only when there was a significant effect of the moderating variable. Figure 1 shows all the relations and the levels of self-efficacy variable. The levels for self-efficacy variables were low, average and high. Generally, it seems obvious to say that there were negative relations between organizational justice and intention to turnover. Additionally, the slopes were all different in levels in seven graphs. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.

To consider the moderating effects, we took into account the three different levels. These levels labeled as low, average and high. Each graph showed that in each level, there were negative relations between sub-dimensions of justice and intention to turnover variables. However, at the average and high levels of self-efficacy sub-dimensions, this effect was higher compared to the low levels. On the other hand, as seen from Table 2, there were insignificant moderating effects not taken in to consideration. Therefore, we can say that Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 were partially supported.

Discussion

Looking at the above findings, we can see that our results supported most of our hypotheses. Starting with Hypothesis 1, in all steps of the analyses, there was a negative relationship between all kinds of justice perceptions and turnover intentions. The results are mostly consistent with the previous research however, studies carried out with non-western populations yielded mixed findings. As an example, in a sample of employees coming from a Nigerian organization, there was a negative influence both by procedural and distributive justice on turnover intentions, but not by interpersonal justice (Umar, 2015). Other group of studies especially carried out in Turkey also revealed mixed findings. To give a brief overview, Turunç (2011), in his study with employees coming from governmental and private banking institutions, found that except procedural justice, both justice dimensions had a negative effect over turnover intentions. Turunç (2011) attributed these findings to the inflexibility present in the banking industry with respect to procedures and the presence of bureaucracy especially in the governmental organizations. In contrast to Turunç (2011)'s findings, Özer and Günlük (2010) found a significant negative influence of procedural justice among 240 accountants working in different parts of Turkey.

Different findings in different studies should remind us of the availability of possible other determinants combined with justice perceptions and turnover intentions. In addition, sometimes the availability of positive justice perceptions in one domain might be compensating for the other. For example, perception of procedural justice that is positively high might sometimes compensate for distributive justice that might be low. Also, because there is an argument about the conceptual overlap between interactional and supervisory procedural justice, may be there needs to be further studies to explore whether these two will compensate for each other or not especially in the presence of distributive justice (Poon, 2012).

Considering Hypothesis 2 and 3, there was a partial support. The moderating effect of self-efficacy in its low-medium and high levels combined with its different dimensions made a difference in its equation with different types of justice. For procedural justice, especially those individuals who have high willingness to initiate behavior and who were able to persist in the face of adversity were more inclined to think about leaving in times of procedural injustice. Here an important difference in the moderating effect appears when the individual is high in expending effort in completing the behavior. Those individuals who are expending considerable effort in completion of work behavior were less inclined to leave the organization in times of injustice. This shows an important individual pattern regarding how self-

efficacy might play a role in justice perceptions and related outcomes. May be those individuals, because they have already spent or are already spending a lot of effort in their tasks, in other words, because they are already giving a lot from themselves, may be finding it harder to leave. This might remind us of the cognitive dissonance theory by Festinger (1957) where people always try to seek consistency in their beliefs, attitudes and behaviors when they seem to be inconsistent. In our example, our individual employee or the manager is already spending a lot of effort to the task or work at hand. Therefore leaving the organization would render those efforts futile in his or her mind so although he or she sees an injustice in procedures, he or she might still decide to stay just to keep him or herself consistent inside.

For interactional justice, the moderating effect of persistence was insignificant. This might be because either those who are persistent in the face of difficulties do not really concentrate on the relationship patterns, but instead on the task and the environment itself, or, there might be other reasons we might not be seeing yet in terms of the interaction effect concerning interactional justice. There was again the same result for spending the effort dimension; those individuals spending high effort were less inclined to leave the organization in times of injustice. For this, we might state similar reasons as we did for the procedural justice. Considering distributive justice, we obtained similar results as with the interactional justice where persistence did not have any significant role, and spending the effort again had an unexpected relationship the reasons of which we have tried to outline. For the insignificant moderating effect of persistence, those persistent individuals might not be seeing distributive justice as one of their core problems, they might be either ignoring or, like in interactional justice, might even not be seeing any injustice situation at all. In other words, because they are able to persist in times of difficulty, they may not be seeing what is occurring in front of them as injustice.

From our second the third hypotheses tests, we were able to see that self-efficacy might be an important, even a vital personal characteristic considering the influential strength of justice perceptions on turnover intentions. From an organizational standpoint, if/when employees leave, all of them also take away their knowledge, skills, and, most importantly, expertise. This most obviously hurts the healthy functioning of the organization (Soltis et al., 2013) which results in poor performance and other undesirable outcomes. On a personal level, because individuals with high self-efficacy perceptions are more likely to bring more successes later on (Sherer et al., 1982), the organizations would be losing their high talents who would be bringing inputs that are more valuable to their work groups, departments and to their work environment as a whole.

Because justice perceptions are important for employees especially high in self-efficacy, organizations might benefit if they remain sensitive to the below points:

- Allocation of fair rewards, application of fair procedures (including performance evaluations, feedback systems) (Karim, 2009).
- Leadership styles that include fairness in communication, feedback and task allocation.
- Constant check and follow-up regarding employee perceptions about what is going on inside the organization especially with respect to pay, promotion, procedures and supervisory interventions.

Regarding those employees who are high in spending effort, approaches that are more sensitive needed. Even though our study did not find a special concern about justice for these employees in terms of developing turnover intentions, this should not mean that those employees do not really care about justice issues and that organizations should be insensitive to applying justice. On the contrary, the organizations, especially the management should be on the lookout for those employees who, day by day, hour by hour, are spending extra effort on their tasks, projects and work goals. They are those employees who might be giving without expecting anything in return, and, unfortunately, might be candidates for being burnouts soon. In fact, in a study that investigated the role of justice perceptions on job satisfaction and burnout, Şesen (2010) has found that distributive and interactional justice affected burnout through job satisfaction. This means that although those employees might not be thinking of leaving their organization, they might be losing satisfaction from their jobs as organizations kept on being ignorant about their contributions and natural expectations for fair treatment.

Limitations of our Study and Suggestions for Future Research

Our study used a convenience sample that was cross-sectional. The nature of the sample and the type of data collection does not allow us to infer cause-effect relationships from available analysis methods no matter how robust the statistic tools might be.

Secondly, using a general self-efficacy measure might not be an ideal tool to use for future studies that might further benefit from using more work-related measures such as occupational self-efficacy.

Similarly, using actual turnover data might be a better option compared to turnover intentions. Although many discuss using turnover intentions would also suffice, there have been studies which showed that the relationship between

intentions and actual turnover might not be that straight and more complex and richer measures might be necessary (Turner, 2009).

In terms of justice perceptions, compared to more general perception measures, more in depth measures might yield results that are more robust. As an example, understanding which types of procedures (Posthuma et al., 2007), what types of rewards, and whose style of interacting/communication leads to what kind of justice perceptions in each domain would be more valuable for future studies on justice.

On a general level, entering different individual variables to the justice-turnover models might also be useful. As an example, in a study that investigated the empirical exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence, perceived organizational justice and turnover intentions, Meisler (2013) has found that emotional intelligence served as a predictor of justice perceptions in explaining turnover intentions. Here it is important to note that emotional intelligence was located as an independent, not a mediator or a moderator variable. Future studies might also include emotional intelligence in this equation, or it might also be worthwhile to look at self-efficacy as an independent contributor to the justice-turnover relationship where justice perceptions might serve as a mediator.

Another variable, such as locus of control might also be considered for future studies. As the definition implies, locus of control refers to a person's view of situations resulting from an external or internal determinants (Szabo, Chang, & Chancellor-Freeland, 2015) and it might fit well to the understanding of justice perceptions. In fact, in a study carried out employees coming from a governmental organization, Meydan (2010) found that locus of control served as a significant moderator in the relationship between justice perceptions and behaviors of intrapreneurship.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5): 422.
- Ali, N., & Jan, S. (2012). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment and turnover intentions amongst medical representatives of pharmaceuticals companies of Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences Volume VI Number, 2*: 202.
- Bal, P. M., de Lange, A. H., Ybema, J. F., Jansen, P. G., & van der Velde, M. E. (2011). Age and trust as moderators in the relation between procedural justice and turnover: A large-scale longitudinal study. *Applied Psychology*, 60(1): 66-86.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 41(3): 586.
- Bies, R. J. (1987). The predicament of injustice - the management of moral outrage. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9: 289-319.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 1(1): 43-55.
- Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2012). Relationships between occupational self efficacy, human resource development climate, and work engagement. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 18(7/8): 370-383.
- Cronpanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: tunneling through the maze. In: CL Cooper, & IT Robertson (Eds.). *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 12: 317-372.
- Farooq, M., & Farooq, O. (2014). Organizational justice, employee turnover, and trust in the workplace: A study in South Asian telecommunication companies. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 33(3): 56-62.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, Ill: Row, Peterson.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3:141-183.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural justice and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1):115-130.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., and Tatham, R.L. (2006), *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hendrix, W. H., Robbins, T., Miller, J., & Summers, T. P. (1998). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on factors predictive of turnover. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13(4): 611-632.
- Judge, T. A., Jackson, C. L., Shaw, J. C., Scott, B. A., & Rich, B. L. (2007). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: the integral role of individual differences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(1): 107.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Shahriari, S. (2014). Job embeddedness as a moderator of the impact of organisational justice on turnover intentions: A study in Iran. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(1): 22-32.
- Karim, J. (2009). Justice-turnover relationship : commitment as a mediator. *The ICFAI University journal of organizational behavior*, 8(1): 7-27.
- Li, A., & Bagger, J. (2012). Linking procedural justice to turnover intentions: A longitudinal study of the mediating effects of perceived job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(3): 624-645.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1): 57-72.
- Meisler, G. (2013). Empirical exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence, perceived organizational justice and turnover intentions. *Employee Relations*, 35(4): 441-455.
- Meydan, C. H. (2010). Adalet algısı-iç girişimci davranışlar ilişkisinde kontrol odağının şekillendirici rolü. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36: 195-222.
- 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.
- Ölçer, F. (2015). The investigation of the relationship between organizational justice and turnover intention: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *Economic Computation & Economic Cybernetics Studies & Research*, 49(3).
- Özer, G., & Günlük, M. (2010). Örgütsel adaletin muhasebecilerin iş memnuniyeti ve işten ayrılma eğilimlerine etkisi. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(2): 459-485.

- Panatik, S. A., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Anderson, M. H. (2011). Job demands and work-related psychological responses among Malaysian technical workers: The moderating effects of self-efficacy. *Work & Stress*, 25(4): 355-370.
- Park, I.-J., & Jung, H. (2015). Relationships among future time perspective, career and organizational commitment, occupational self-efficacy, and turnover intention. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 43(9): 1547-1561.
- Poon, J. M. (2012). Distributive justice, procedural justice, affective commitment, and turnover intention: a mediation-moderation framework. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(6): 1505-1532.
- Posthuma, R. A., Maertz, C. P., & Dworkin, J. B. (2007). Procedural justice's relationship with turnover: Explaining past inconsistent findings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(4): 381-398.
- Rosin, H. M., & Korabik, K. (1991). Workplace variables, affective responses, and intention to leave among women managers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64(4):317-330.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological reports*, 51(2): 663-671.
- Soltis, S. M., Agneessens, F., Sasovova, Z., & Labianca, G. J. (2013). A social network perspective on turnover intentions: The role of distributive justice and social support. *Human Resource Management*, 52(4): 561-584.
- Szabo, Y. Z., Chang, A., & Chancellor-Freeland, C. (2015). Locus of control predicts cortisol reactivity and speech performance in response to acute stress in undergraduate students. *College Student Journal*, 49(2): 225-236.
- Şeşen, H. (2010). Adalet algısının tükenmişliğe etkisi: İş tatmininin aracı değişken rolünün yapısal eşitlik modeli ile testi. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2): 67-90.
- Turner, J. H. (2009). *Measuring turnover: A review of traditional measurement methods and development of measurement techniques based on survival analysis*. Paper presented at the Academy of Marketing Studies.
- Turunç, Ö. (2011). Örgütsel adaletin çalışanların örgütsel özdeşleşme ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi: Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü. *İş, Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 13(1): 143-166.
- Umar, S. (2015). *Influence of Organizational Justice on Employee Turnover Intention Among Nigerian Employees*. Paper presented at the International May Conference on Strategic Management, Nigeria.
- Williams, M. L., Malos, S. B., & Palmer, D. K. (2002). Benefit system and benefit level satisfaction: An expanded model of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management*, 28(2):195-215.
- Yıldırım, F. & İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). Genel özyeterlilik ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21(4):301-308.
- Yürür, S. (2005). Ödüllendirme sistemleri ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkilerin analizi ve bir uygulama. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*, Bursa: Uludağ University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2014). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*: 1-8.

TABLE 2
Results of Regression Analyses^a

Variables	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5	Model6	Model7	Model8	Model9
Turnover Intention ^b									
Constant	2,5498** (.0400)	2,5515** (.0403)	2,5164** (.0396)	2,5609** (.0396)	2,5547** (.0398)	2,5252** (.0390)	2,5515** (.0387)	2,5480** (.0388)	2,5561** (.0384)
Procedural Justice	-.4373** (.0386)	-.4436** (.0381)	-.4696** (.0420)						
Interactional Justice				-.5092** (.0393)	-.5257** (.0383)	-.5623** (.0374)			
Procedural Justice							-.5265** (.0342)	-.5352** (.0346)	-.5675** (.0342)
Wib	-.1555 (.0890)			-.0790 (.0851)			-.1197 (.0866)		
Pinfa		-.0950 (.0542)	.1182* (.0467)		-.0369 (.0529)	.1354* (.0446)		-.0720 (.0521)	.0603 (.0449)
Wee									
Procedural X Wib	-.2329** (.0735)								
Procedural X Pinfa		-.0940* (.0471)							
Procedural X Wee			.1874** (.0440)						
Interactional X Wib				-.2796** (.0734)					
Interactional X Pinfa					-.0805 (.0442)				
Interactional X Wee						.1336** (.0409)			
Distributive X Wib							-.1835** (.0607)		
Distributive X Pinfa								-.0156 (.0378)	
Distributive X Wee									.1375** (.0408)
F	57,7545**	55,2494**	51,3739**	96,4037**	76,7532**	81,8700**	109,6231**	92,5379**	92,4168**
Adj-R ²	.1689	.1599	.1726	.1987	.1871	.1992	.2254	.2165	.2253

^aUnstandardized regression coefficients are shown. Standard errors are in parentheses.

^bDependent Variable

* p < 0.05,

** p < 0.01

FIGURE 1

Effects of Moderation on the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Turnover Intention

