

A Study of the Relationship between the Components of Organizational Justice and the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Physical Education Teachers

Firoozi, M.^{1*}, Kazemi, A.² and Sayadi, N.¹

¹*Department of Psychology, College of Humanities, Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran*

²*Department of Applied Linguistics, College of Humanities, Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran*

ABSTRACT

The present research sought to investigate the relationship between organisational justice and the dimensions of job satisfaction of physical education teachers. The research method was descriptive, in general, and correlational, in particular. The population included all the 275 physical education teachers of the city of Khorramabad, Iran in the academic year 2013-14. Out of this population, applying Krejcie and Morgan's formula for Sample Size Determination, 162 individuals were selected, using stratified random sampling. The data collection instruments were Niehoff and Moorman's Organisational Justice Questionnaire and Wysocki and Kromm's Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The data were analysed by running the Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression. The results indicated that there is a positive and meaningful correlation between the components of organisational justice and dimensions of job satisfaction. Regression analysis showed that out of the components of organisational justice, distributive justice has the capability of predicting all dimensions of job satisfaction. Moreover, procedural justice has the capability to predict satisfaction with co-workers and their supervisors. Finally, interactive justice does not contribute to the dimensions of job satisfaction.

Keywords: Distributive justice, interactive justice, job satisfaction, organisational justice, procedural justice

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 01 March 2016

Accepted: 16 December 2016

E-mail addresses:

m.firoozi@yu.ac.ir (Firoozi, M.),

akazemi@yu.ac.ir (Kazemi, A.),

nasrinsayadi1077@gmail.com (Sayadi, N.)

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

As an area of inquiry in organisational behaviour, as Greenberg, Mark and Lehman (1985) first put it, sports could serve as a manifestation of justice. In other words, justice in larger society could be

represented in sports, and based on one's understanding of justice in sports, it is possible to draw conclusions about justice in society as a whole. These ideas were later put into practice by other scholars (Jordan, Gillentine, & Hunt, 2004; Jordan, Turner, Fink, & Pastore, 2007). In the latter work, they were able to establish a link between organisational justice and job satisfaction among head basketball coaches at the collegiate level. According to Jordan et al. (2007), one of the most important psychological characteristics of each individual that can impact his/her performance is the motivation to act. One type of such motivation is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction refers to the attitudes or views of the personnel towards the job, the working environment and, more generally, to the emotional reaction of the individual to the defined role (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Diener, 2000). Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as the pleasant and positive emotional reaction to experiences in one's job and career. It has also been considered as one of the indexes of job-related happiness (Zhang, Wu, Miao, Yan, & Peng, 2014).

It is necessary to point out that different theories lead to different characterisations of job satisfaction. An oft-cited theory is Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs. According to Maslow (1971), this hierarchy of needs can be considered as the relevant framework within which we can determine how various personal needs are satisfied in the context of the work we do. According to this theory, needs could be classified into

physiological needs, safety needs, affection and belongingness needs, esteem needs and self-actualisation or self-development needs. Moreover, according to Maslow (1971), an individual cannot be satisfied unless the needs of a previous level are met, at least to some extent.

Given the discussion so far, there is no doubt that job satisfaction is highly important for organisations. Various studies carried out so far suggest that a lot of variables are related to job satisfaction. However, most previous studies carried out on job satisfaction have focussed on income, characteristics of jobs, conflict between job and family life, stress and leadership (Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, 2010). However, recently, most researchers have focussed on the impact of personal characteristics on job satisfaction (Zhang et al., 2014). One individual characteristic which can have a significant effect on job satisfaction is organisational justice. Organisational justice refers to the impression of fairness (Di Fabio, & Palazzeschi, 2012). This type of justice has also been defined as the perception of individuals and groups of just behaviour on the part of organisations and their responses to such perceptions (Samad, 2006). Individuals in an organisation assess their work experiences as either fair or unfair. If the members of an organisation see the decisions made by an organisation as being just, it is highly likely that these members will reciprocate with higher job satisfaction and get involved in the behaviours related to

their roles (Fischer, 2004). Bies and Moag (1986) hold that organisational justice has three dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactive justice. The first activity about organisational justice focusses on distributive justice. The studies in this vein have emanated from the ideas of Adams (1965), who suggested the Equality Theory, which is a motivational theory in the first place. It describes individual efforts to achieve equity and fairness in social interactions and exchanges. According to this theory, employees usually compare their inputs and outcomes with those of their co-workers and evaluate them to see whether their rewards are fair or not (Leventhal, 1976). It could be said that job dissatisfaction occurs when one perceives the proportion of one's input to his/her output to be unfair and unequal (Ambrose et al., 2007). Thus, distributive justice emphasises the perceived justice of distribution of organisational outcomes (Fischer, 2004; Fortin & Fellenz, 2008; Greenberg, 1987; Kang, 2007; Othman, 2008), which involves the fair distribution of rewards and resources (Greenberg, 1987; Milkovich, Newman, 2005; Othman, 2008). In addition, employees make judgements about fairness in decision-making by organisations to determine whether they are free of prejudice, are exact, modifiable and represent the views and concerns of the employees or not (Greenberg, 1986; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). In other words, procedural justice refers to the perception of individuals of the

degree of fairness in decisions made by leaders to determine outcomes (Kang, 2007; Lue, 2008; Rubin, 2009; Shi, Lin, Wang, & Wang, 2009). Interactive justice is the third component of organisational justice, which was pointed out by Bies and Moag (1986) for the first time. It refers to the quality of interpersonal relationships between authorities (Bies & Moag, 1986). Recent studies regard interactive justice as consisting of interpersonal justice (sincerity and respect), and informational justice (adequate, honest explanations) (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1993). Such components of justice correlate with different outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, citizenship, withdrawal and quitting one's job (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Some of the studies carried out so far suggest that organisational justice could predict a lot of organisational variables such as increased performance (Mohamed, 2014), respect for and trust in employees (Sang Long, Wan Mardhia, Tan Owee, & Low, 2014), satisfaction with working environment (Elnaga & Imran, 2014), satisfaction with pay and supervisor (Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009; Najafi, Noruzi, Khezri Azar, Nazari Shirkouhi, & Dalvand, 2011) and job satisfaction (Schappe, 1998). In a meta-analysis, Viswesvaran and Ones (2002) showed that the correlation coefficient between procedural justice and job satisfaction was 0.36 and that of distributive justice and job satisfaction was 0.35.

Therefore, given the discussion so far, the findings suggest a significant correlation between organisational justice and job satisfaction. However, there have been very few studies in which the relationship between components of organisational justice with those of job satisfaction has been investigated concurrently. Thus, the current study sought to fill the gap by seeking to determine to what extent components of organisational justice could predict job satisfaction and its components.

METHODOLOGY

The research design adopted in the study was descriptive, in general, and correlational, in particular. The population was all the teachers of physical education formally employed with the Department of Education, Khorram Abad, Iran. Based on the information provided by the Bureau for Development and Planning of Personnel, the total population was 275 people. Applying Krejcie and Morgan's sample size formula, 162 teachers (80 males and 82 females) were chosen, using stratified random sampling. The instruments used in the study were the Organisational Justice Questionnaire developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weysocki and Kromm (1986). The former questionnaire was validated by Naami and Shokrkon (2004) for use in the Iranian context. This questionnaire consists of three components of distributive justice (six items), procedural justice (nine items) and interactive justice (five items), with a

5-point Likert scale. Naami and Shokrkon (2004) established the coefficients of construct validity and the Cronbach alpha (reliability), which were reported to be 0.42 and 0.85 for general organisational justice, 0.46 and 0.78 for distributive justice, 0.57 and 0.82 for procedural justice and 0.40 and 0.64 for interactive justice, respectively. In the present study, the reliability of the organisational justice questionnaire, established through the Cronbach alpha, was calculated as 0.85. The Job Satisfaction Questionnaire comprised 40 items. In this questionnaire, five components measure satisfaction with work itself, with the supervisor, with co-workers, with promotional policies, with pay and with fringe benefits on a scale of 5. In the study carried out by Kouzechian, Zareie and Talebpour (2003), the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was 0.92. In this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.91. For data analysis, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression Analysis (enter method) were used. It is also necessary to point out that because in the current study, Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs and Adam's Equality Theory were considered as the frameworks within which job satisfaction was addressed, the data were analysed with an eye to these motivational theories.

FINDINGS

Table 1 depicts the correlation between the variables in the current study.

Table 1
Correlation coefficient between the variables in the study

Variable	MD	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Distributive justice	14.74	3.25	1							
2.Procedural justice	18.72	4.62	0.14	1						
3.Interactive justice	29.70	6.95	0.19*	0.71**	1					
4.Work itself	36.63	7.52	0.35**	-0.06	0.03	1				
5.Supervisor	27.75	5.85	0.23**	0.21**	0.14	0.33**	1			
6. Co-workers	35.23	7.50	0.36**	-0/13	-0.01	0.49**	0.36**	1		
7.Promotion	16.27	4.80	0.25**	0/04	0.07	0.37**	0.48**	0.36**	1	
8.Pay	17.96	5.40	0.24**	0.05	0.09	0.17*	0.31**	0.34**	0.54**	1

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01

As suggested by the findings, the correlation coefficients between the components of job satisfaction and the dimensions of organisational justice ranged from 0.14 to 0.36. In order to determine to what extent and in what direction organisational justice can predict job satisfaction, multiple regression was run. The results are given in Tables 2-6.

Prediction of Satisfaction with Work Itself through Organisational Justice

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between organisational justice and satisfaction with work itself, use was made of multiple regression analysis.

According to Table 2, the dimensions of organisational justice can account for 14% of variance of satisfaction with work itself. Out of the components, distributive justice, with a beta value of 0.36, as the

Table 2
Regression analysis of dimensions of organisational justice and the component of work itself

Cri variable	R	R ²	B	β	P
Distributive justice			0.88	0.36	0.001
Procedural justice	0.37	0.14	-0.29	-0.17	N.S
Interactive justice			0.09	0.08	N.S

first component, contributed the most to the prediction of satisfaction with work itself.

Prediction of Satisfaction with Supervisor through Organisational Justice

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between organisational justice and satisfaction with supervisor, use was made of multiple regression analysis.

Table 3
Regression analysis of dimensions of organisational justice and the component of supervisor

Variable	R	R ²	B	β	P
Distributive justice			0.39	0.22	0.001
Procedural justice	0.29	0.08	0.27	0.21	0.05
Interactive justice			-0.04	-0.05	N.S

According to Table 3, the dimensions of organisational justice can account for 8% of the variance of satisfaction with supervisor. Out of the components, distributive justice and procedural justice, with a beta value of 0.22 and 0.21 each, contributed the most to the prediction of satisfaction with supervisor as the second dimension of job satisfaction.

Prediction of Satisfaction with co-workers through Organisational Justice

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between organisational justice and satisfaction with co-workers, use was made of multiple regression analysis.

According to Table 4, the dimensions of organisational justice can account for 17% of variance of satisfaction with co-workers. Out of the components, distributive justice, with a beta value of 0.38, and procedural justice, with a beta value of -0.26, contributed the most to the prediction of satisfaction with co-workers as the third dimension of job satisfaction.

Table 4
Regression Analysis of Dimensions of Organisational Justice and the Component of Co-workers

Variable	R	R ²	B	β	P
Distributive justice			0.89	0.38	0.001
Procedural justice	0.41	0.17	-0.43	-0.26	0.01
Interactive justice			0.12	0.11	N.S

Prediction of satisfaction with job promotion through organisational justice

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between organisational justice and satisfaction with job promotion, use was made of multiple regression analysis.

Table 5
Regression analysis of dimensions of organisational justice and the component of promotion

Variable	R	R ²	B	β	P
Distributive justice			0.36	0.24	0.003
Procedural justice	0.25	0.06	-0.03	-0.02	N.S
Interactive justice			0.03	0.04	N.S

According to Table 5, the dimensions of organisational justice can account for 6% of variance of satisfaction with job promotion. Out of the components, distributive justice, with a beta value of 0.24, contributed the

most to the prediction of satisfaction with job promotion as the fourth dimension of job satisfaction.

Prediction of Satisfaction with Pay through Organisational Justice

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between organisational justice and satisfaction with pay, use was made of multiple regression analysis.

Table 6
Regression analysis of dimensions of organisational justice and the component of pay

Variable	R	R ²	B	β	P
Distributive justice			0.38	0.23	0.004
Procedural justice	0.26	0.07	-0.16	-0.13	N.S
Interactive justice			0.11	0.13	N.S

According to Table 6, the dimensions of organisational justice can account for 7% of variance of satisfaction with pay. Out of the components, distributive justice, with a beta value of 0.23, contributed the most to the prediction of satisfaction with pay as the fifth dimension of job satisfaction.

Taken together, the findings of the study, as shown in Tables 2 through 6, invariably indicated that distributive justice could significantly predict all the components of job satisfaction, which is clearly consistent with Adam's Theory of Equality. In addition, the findings were in line with Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of needs. According to this theory, an individual is satisfied with

her or work when his/her expectations of the workplace and jobs are met.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of the regression analysis showed that correlation between the components of organisational justice and those of job satisfaction varies. Out of the components of organisational justice, just distributive justice had the capability of predicting all the components of job satisfaction; satisfaction with work itself had a beta value of 0.36, satisfaction with supervisor had a beta value of 0.22, satisfaction with co-workers had a beta value of 0.38, satisfaction with job promotion had a beta value of 0.24 and satisfaction with pay had a beta value of 0.23. In other words, distributive justice contributed the most to the prediction of all the components of job satisfaction. This finding is in line with the relevant findings in the literature (Colquitt et al., 2001; Elnaga & Imran, 2014; Loi et al., 2009; Najafi et al., 2011; Sang Long et al., 2014; Schappe, 1998; Whisenant, 2005). From a theoretical perspective, the findings related to distributive justice can be justified with reference to the Equality Theory of Adams. According to this theory, through comparison between their inputs and outcomes with those of others, individuals can judge whether they have been give fair rewards or not (Kang, 2007). Given this finding, if some arrangements are in place by the Department of Education so that teachers of physical education see their rewards and benefits as being fair in exchange for the services that they render,

their job satisfaction and motivation could be enhanced. On the other hand, procedural justice could account for satisfaction with supervisor with a beta value of 0.21 and satisfaction with co-workers with a beta value of -0.26. Thus, it could be said that the nature of the teaching profession of teachers of physical education is such that the presence or lack of perception of justice in practice or interaction has possibly nothing to do with the components of job satisfaction. This could be taken to imply that teachers of physical education do not consider their job success in line with their personal interests. The lack of a significant relationship between procedural justice and the components of job satisfaction (except satisfaction with supervisor) suggests that the feeling of equality or lack of it in organisational policies and decision making has probably no impact on the attitudes of teachers of physical education towards job satisfaction. The supremacy of distributive justice, compared with other components of organisational justice, suggests some analytical discussions. Consistent with Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs (1970), in reaction to the environment, humans give priority to those characteristics and components that are closer to their basic needs. Given that distributive justice deals with the distribution of resources, life chances and different opportunities within an organisation, it is more important than other components of organisational justice. The other point has to do with the nature of the population of interest. Some needs

are priority for them until met so much so that until these needs are met, they will be priority. In other words, according to Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs (1970), the low level needs of teachers of physical education (i.e. material needs) are not met, and this does not allow them to pay attention to higher-order needs such as being respected and being valuable, and has an impact on lower-order needs. However, the findings of the present study regarding the priority of distributive justice suggest that there are shortcomings in meeting the basic needs of teachers of physical education, and they are due to shortages of resources or defects in distribution. Given that distributive justice is the best predictor of components of job satisfaction, Education Department authorities need to pay careful attention to equal payment to staff so that staff can trust the distribution of resources. This is important as it can pave the way for job satisfaction and could promote motivation.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267–299.
- Ambrose, M., Hess, R. L., & Ganesan, S. (2007). The relationship between justice and attitudes: An examination of justice effects on event and system-related attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 21–36.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43–55.

- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307–311.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & 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.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2012). Organizational justice: Personality traits or emotional intelligence? An empirical study in an Italian hospital context. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 49(1), 31–42.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55, 34–43.
- Elnaga, A. A., & Imran, A. (2014). The impact of employee empowerment on job satisfaction: Theoretical study. *American Journal of Research Communication*, 2(1), 13–26.
- Fischer, R. (2004). Rewarding employee loyalty: An organizational justice approach. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8(3), 486–503.
- Fortin, M., & Fellenz, M. R. (2008). Hypocrisies of fairness: Towards a more reflexive ethical base in organizational justice research and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(3), 415–433.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 340–342.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54(1), 81–103.
- Greenberg, J., Mark, M. M., & Lehman, D. R. (1985). Justice in sports and games. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 8(1), 18–33.
- Jordan, J. S., Gillentine, J. A., & Hunt, B. P. (2004). The influence of fairness: The application of organizational justice in a team sport setting. *International Sports Journal*, 8(1), 139–149.
- Jordan, J., Turner, B., Fink, J., & Pastore, D. (2007). Organizational justice as a predictor of job satisfaction: An examination of head basketball coaches. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 1(3), 321–344.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 157–167.
- Kang, D. S. (2007). Perceived organizational justice as a predictor of employees, motivation to participate in training. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 47, 757–775.
- Kouzechian, H., Zare'ie, J., & Talebpour, M. (2003). Relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction of male managers and teachers of Khorasan province schools. *Olympic*, 11(1, 2), 43–52.
- Lambert, E. G., Cluse-Tolar, T., Pasupuleti, S., Hall, D. E., & Jenkins, M. (2005). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on social service workers. *Social Justice Research*, 18(4), 411–427.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 91–131.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp.27–55). New York, NY: Springer.
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. *Justice and Social Interaction*, 3, 167–218.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 1, 1297–1343.
- Loi, R., Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Four-factor justice and daily job satisfaction: A multilevel investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 770–781.
- Lue, Y. (2008). Procedural fairness and inter firm cooperation in strategic alliances, *Strategic Management Journal*, 29, 27–46.
- Maslow, A. H. (1972). *The farther reaches of human nature*. Maurice Bassett, NC, USA.
- Maslow, A. H., Frager, R., & Cox, R. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (Vol. 2). J. Fadiman, & C. McReynolds (Eds.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, G. M. (2005). *Compensation management*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Mohamed, S. A. (2014). The relationship between organizational justice and quality performance among healthcare workers: A pilot study. *The Scientific World Journal*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/757425>.
- Naami, A. Z., & Shokrkon, H. (2004). Evaluation of simple and multiple relationships with organizational justice, job satisfaction in employees of a company. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 3(1), 57–70.
- Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Khezri Azar H., Nazari Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. R. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), 5241–8.
- 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.
- Othman, R. (2008). Organizational politics: The role of justice, trust and job ambiguity. *Singapore Management Review*, 30(1), 43–53.
- Rubin, E. V. (2009). The role of procedural justice in public personnel management: Empirical results from the Department of Defense. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 125–143.
- Samad, S. (2006). Procedural and distributive justice: Differential effects on employees' work outcomes. *The Business Review*, 5(2), 212–218.
- Sang Long C., Wan Mardhia, M., Y., Tan Owee, K., Low, H. H. (2014). The impact of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 29(1), 117–124.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). Understanding employee job satisfaction: The importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4), 493–503.

- Shi, J., Lin, H., Wang, L., & Wang, M. (2009). Linking the big five personality constructs to organizational justice. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international Journal*, 37(2), 209–222.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2002). Examining the construct of organizational justice: A meta-analytic evaluation of relations with work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38(3), 193–203.
- Whisenant, W. (2005). Organizational justice and commitment in interscholastic sports. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(3), 343–357.
- Wysocki, J., & Kromm, G. M. (1986). The job feeling scale. *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.
- Zhang, J., Wu, Q., Miao, D., Yan, X., & Peng, J. (2014). The impact of core self-evaluations on job satisfaction: The mediator role of career commitment. *Social Indicators Research*, 116(3), 809–822.

