

Managing Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Effect of Procedural Fairness

Selin METIN CAMGOZ

Hacettepe University
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Science
Department of Business Administration
06532, Ankara- Turkey
Tel: +90 (312) 297 87 00/142 , E-mail:selinm@hacettepe.edu.tr

Pinar BAYHAN KARAPINAR

Hacettepe University
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Science
Department of Business Administration
06532, Ankara- Turkey
Tel: +90 (312) 297 87 00/143, E-mail: pbayhan@hacettepe.edu.tr

Abstract

The present study aims to propose and test an integrative model that considers the mediating effect of procedural justice on the relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction (JS). Such inquiry is important in that it tests a mediated relationship that reflects a process of connecting personality with behavior. We hypothesized that the personality traits of an employee would affect their justice perceptions and consequently, their level of JS. Survey data were collected from 218 employees working in insurance companies. Hierarchical regression analyses postulated that Big-Five and JS relationships were mediated by procedural justice. The relationships between conscientiousness and JS were completely mediated by procedural justice, while the relation between extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism and JS were partially mediated by procedural justice. Our findings indicate that organizations should focus more on developing employees' justice which is the underlying relationship between personality and JS.

Keywords: Big-Five, mediating effect, procedural justice, job satisfaction

Key Words: Job satisfaction, mediating effect, procedural justice, personality.

1.Introduction

Job satisfaction is one of the best research concepts in both management and psychology literature, and associated with important work related outcomes, such as, higher levels of job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, lower levels of turnover (Hulin & Judge, 2003), and counterproductive behavior (Gottfredson & Holland, 1990). Therefore researchers try to determine the antecedents of job satisfaction and invest considerable amount of resources to increase the satisfaction of their employees (Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997).

The existence of individual differences in job satisfaction has been recognized for as long as job satisfaction has formally studied, but the dispositional approach to job satisfaction has been the focus of most relevant literature starting from 1980s (Illies & Judge, 2003). The dispositional approach is based on the assumption that personality characteristics are stable over time and are useful in explaining and predicting individuals' attitudes and behaviors. It also argues that job satisfaction may be partly determined by one or more enduring individual characteristics (Illies & Judge, 2003; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Staw & Cohen- Charash, 2005). Among dispositional approach scholars, Weiss and Adler (1984) stated that individuals dispositions, which are stable overtime, determine at least to some extent their attitudes and behaviors in organizations. Moreover, Staw and Ross (1985) indicated that individuals possess a disposition toward the happiness which significantly affects their job satisfaction in different types of jobs and organizations.

However, some scholars argue that job satisfaction is influenced by some factors other than individual traits (Cohrs, Abele, & Dette, 2006). One such factor is the individual's evaluation of organizational justice. The literature regarding organizational justice displays that justice perceptions have direct relationships to job satisfaction such that those individuals who perceive that the procedures as fair, are more satisfied with their work environment (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Thus, the present study aims to propose and test an integrative model that considers both personality traits and procedural justice perceptions as predictors of job satisfaction. Such inquiry is important in that it tests a mediated relationship that reflects a process of connecting personality with work attitudes.

We examined the procedural justice as the specific mediator, reasoning that several personality traits will aggravate individuals perception of fairness and thus facilitate their satisfaction at work. We argue that personality- job satisfaction linkage should be explained, in part, through some motivational variables that more proximally reflect their evaluation of work environment and experiences. In the following paragraphs, we will first investigate the relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction, justice and job satisfaction, personality traits and organizational justice and finally discuss the medated effects.

2 .Theoretical Background and Hypothesized Relationships

2.1.Personality trait influences on job satisfaction

The understanding of how personality affects job satisfaction is underdeveloped despite the work that currently exists. Given the robustness of Big-Five (Digman, 1990) and its power in describing personality, specifically we focused on the Big- five personality traits, which includes the dimensions of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience.

Of these traits conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion and neuroticism have most obvious connections with job satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). The early study of Furnham and Zacherl (1986), investigating the relationship between personality and job satisfaction measured by a multi-dimensional scale, showed that psychoticism and neuroticism correlated negatively while extraversion correlated positively with job satisfaction. Employees with high neuroticism scores tended to be less satisfied with the amount of work, their coworkers and their pay, while employees with high psychoticism (tough-minded) tend to be less satisfied with their supervisors, the nature of work and their co-workers than with low psychoticism (tender-minded) scores. People with high extraversion scores, on the other hand, correlated positively with all sub dimensions of satisfaction. Similarly Brief, Butcher and Roberson (1995) found that neuroticism has the strongest negative correlation with job satisfaction. The results of the recent meta-analysis of Judge et al. (2002) based on 163 independent samples displayed that employees' personalities, specifically emotional stability, conscientiousness and extraversion are important in understanding job satisfaction with correlations of .29, .26, and .17 respectively. The theory and research on the links between personality traits and job satisfaction lead us to expect that, among those; conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion will positively predict job satisfaction while neuroticism will negatively predict job satisfaction. We cannot make a specific prediction with respect to openness to experience trait in predicting job satisfaction due to limited theoretical research.

2.2. Organizational justice-job satisfaction relationships

Organizational justice is defined as the perception of fairness of the employees in the workplace related with the ways how they have been treated fairly in their jobs and job related outcomes. The basic reasoning of justice theories is that justice perceptions are the major determinants of individuals' reactions to their decisions. The taxonomy that is often used to describe organizational justice is distributive and procedural justice (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991). Initially, organizational justice literature focused on the distributive justice, which describes the perceived fairness of outcomes an employee receives. Over time, scholars begin to consider the procedural justice or the perceived fairness of procedures to determine the outcomes (Folger & Greenberg, 1985) and interactional justice, as the third form of justice, which refers to perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment. Interactional justice has been conceptualized as being composed of two facets, informational and interpersonal justice. Although those forms of justice are correlated, research suggests that these factors can be empirically distinguished from one another (Colquitt et al., 2001).

In the current study, the focus is on the perceptions of procedural justice. Procedural justice, stemmed from both Thibaut and Walker's (1975) control theory and Lind and Tyler's (1988) group value model, emphasises the perceived fairness of the methods and procedures leading to decision outcomes (Folger& Cropanzano, 1998). Early work on organizational justice demonstrated that justice perceptions have positive correlations with job satisfaction (Mossholder, Bennett & Martin 1998). Findings of numerous studies demonstrate fairly well that fairness is essential to the employee's overall quality of life within an organization and as perceptions of distributive and procedural fairness increase, job satisfaction also increases (Alexander & Ruderman 1987; Lambert, Edwards, Camp & Saylor, 2005; Lind & Tyler 1988; Randall & Mueller, 1995; Sweeney & Mc Farlin 1993). Likewise, individuals who perceive that they are receiving unfair treatment are more likely to feel angry, and dissatisfied (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa 1986). The study of Martin and Bennett (1996) suggests that procedural and distributive justice yielded significant contributions in predicting job satisfaction. However Lissak, Mendes and Lind (1983) reported that procedural justice was more important in predicting job satisfaction than was distributive justice among their sample of Canadian Armed Forces.

Similarly, Alexander and Ruderman (1987) found that procedural justice was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than was distributive justice. Results of the Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis, indicate that procedural justice is the more important antecedent of job satisfaction. Since, procedural justice has been shown to be an important predictor of job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001) and there is a growing body of research that examines the correlates of procedural justice (Dulebohn & Ferris, 1999; Folger & Konovsky, 1989), the current study utilizes only the perceptions of procedural justice.

From a conceptual perspective with inductive reasoning, it is meaningful that individuals who have negative unfair evaluations about the procedures in their organization would be less satisfied from their work. One of the plausible explanations for this view comes from social exchange theory. It predicts that individuals who perceive that they are receiving unfair treatment are more likely to feel frustrated and dissatisfied. Based on the reasoning above, we hypothesize that procedural justice will be positively related to job satisfaction.

2.3. Personality traits and organizational justice relationships

Though the introduction of procedural justice provided a potential new direction for research, some studies have investigated the relationship between personality traits and procedural justice. Early studies examined the effects of traits like locus of control (Sweeney, McFarlin, & Cotton, 1991) and delay of gratification (Joy & Witt, 1992) on attitudinal or behavioral reactions of the employees. Recently, Van Hiel, De Cremer and Stouten (2008) indicated that individual differences, such as high belongingness, social reputation needs (Tyler & Lind, 1992), high self-doubt and self-esteem instability (De Cremer & Sedikides, 2005; Van den Bos & Lind, 2002) increase individual's sensitivity concerning procedural fairness information.

However, limited number of studies explained specifically on the link between the Big-Five and procedural justice. Skarlicki, Folger, and Tesluk (1999) provided some evidence for the role of neuroticism and agreeableness on fairness perceptions. Similarly, Truxillo, Bauer, Campion, and Paronto (2006) provided encouraging findings, with a sample of actual law enforcement applicants, such that neuroticism was negatively related to job applicants' fairness perceptions regarding whether or not they were fairly treated in personnel selection tests. In a recent study Shi, Lin, Wang and Wang (2009) indicated that agreeableness and neuroticism were important correlates of all types organizational justice. Specifically, agreeableness was found to be positively related to procedural justice, while neuroticism was found to be negatively related to procedural justice. Thus, we expect that each of the four personality traits will have significant associations with procedural justice.

2.4. Mediated relationships: Personality- procedural justice- job satisfaction

There is general agreement that the distal measures of personality traits link to work attitudes and behavior through proximal motivational constructs (Barrick, Stewart, Piotrowski, 2002; McCrae & Costa, 1996). In personality-job satisfaction linkage, issues of justice or fairness are fundamental motivational key concerns. Research about organizational justice has demonstrated that concerns about fairness might affect the attitudes and the behavior of employees (Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003). In their work settings, employees usually judge the fairness of decision making procedures used by the organizations and evaluate whether those procedures are fair and unbiased (Greenberg, 1986; Judge & Colquitt, 2004; Leventhal, 1980). One might argue that justice perceptions and dispositional explanations of job satisfaction like personality traits are not mutually exclusive, even they may relate to one another. These influences may be both additive and independent determinants as well explaining different portions of variance in job satisfaction.

As noted our general hypothesis is that personality traits influence, in part, job satisfaction through justice evaluations. The proposed model builds on previous research which argues that personality traits are distal variables that influence job satisfaction through the mediating effects of proximal justice evaluation process. The proximal effect of procedural justice is expected to be associated with distal Big-Five traits of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and neuroticism. Agreeableness relates to individuals' interpersonal tendencies concerning with the degree of cooperation, helpfulness and the courtesy that the individual has (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Agreeable individuals value cooperative environments (e.g., Barrick et al., 2002) and are motivated to maintain harmonious relationships with their coworkers. In doing so, one might argue that agreeable individuals would likely to be sensitive to fair procedures which could enhance harmony within the group (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006) and consequently experience more satisfying work environments (Judge et al., 2002). Conscientiousness refers to the degree to which an individual is oriented toward duty, achievement, self-control and responsibility. Schmidt and Hunter (1998) argue that conscientious employees are more sensitive to violation of standards and want to receive more formal procedures to achieve better work outcomes.

Thus, it can be argued that conscientious individuals who strive to achieve better outcomes are more likely to engage in processes which may lead to higher levels of procedural justice and subsequently result in higher job satisfaction. On the other hand, traits like neuroticism and extraversion may also influence which jobs or work situations people favorably or unfavorably evaluate (Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1985; Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005), and how they perceive procedures in their organization (Shi et al., 2009). For instance, employees with high level of neuroticism show anger and anxiety. They tend to dwell on their mistakes, shortcomings and focus more on the negative aspects of the world. Thus, neurotics tend to have negative evaluations and lower level of justice perceptions concerning procedures which in turn affect their level of satisfaction unfavorably. Contrary to neurotics, extraverts tend to experience more positive emotions and perceive their working environment more positively (Brief et al, 1995). It is argued that extraversion might play a role in shaping the individuals' perceptual process in evaluating the fairness of the situations and procedures favorably (Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006). Additionally, extraverts are defined as sociable, talkative and assertive (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Given this profile, extraversion should be important in facilitating the expression of their thoughts. Since the expression of voice and participation increases the fairness, extraverted employees may be more likely to perceive higher levels of procedural justice (Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990). Accordingly, they exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction.

The literature reviewed above showed that mediation conditions applied to this study: (a) relevant personality traits are valid predictors of job satisfaction (JS), (b) personality traits are related to procedural justice (PJ), and (c) PJ is related to JS. Thus, it is plausible to expect that procedural justice mediates the relationship between relevant personality traits and job satisfaction as such;

H1: Procedural justice will mediate a positive relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction.

H2: Procedural justice will mediate a positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction.

H3: Procedural justice will mediate a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction.

H4: Procedural justice will mediate a negative relationship between neuroticism and job satisfaction.

3. Methods

3.1. Sample and the procedure

The data analyzed in this study was a part of a larger ongoing project addressing job satisfaction. This study consists of convenience sample of employees working at insurance companies in Turkey. Participants were responsible for serving their own clients individually and they were compensated according to pay for performance plans. The sample included 218 employees working in the units. Participants were assured that their responses were confidential. The standard, self-administered questionnaires were distributed to 300 employees; of those 218 were returned with a response rate of 72.6 %. Females made up 37.1 % of the sample. The age of the respondents was 30.9 years, ranging from 24 to 64 years. The average tenure of the employees were 5.7.

3.2. Measures

The research survey was designed to gather information about personality traits, procedural justice and job satisfaction. Responses to all of the following multi-item scales were averaged to form composite variables.

Procedural justice: Procedural justice items were measured by Sweeney and McFarlin's (1997) scale. The scale consists of 13 items. Sample items are "I am not sure what determines how I can get a promotion in this organization" and "There are adequate procedures to get my performance rating reconsidered if necessary". Respondents rated five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree (1)" to "strongly agree (5)". Higher scores were indicative of greater procedural justice. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.81.

Big- Five Personality: This study used the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991). Some examples of the sets of items in the questionnaire are as follows: "Likes to cooperate with others/is generally trusting" for agreeableness; "perseveres until the task is finished/does a thorough job" for conscientiousness; "is outgoing/ talkative" for extraversion and "gets nervous easily/worries a lot" are for neuroticism "Is original/has an active imagination" for openness to experience. Respondents rate each item on a 5-point scale ranging from "disagree strongly (1)" to "agree strongly (5)". BFI was chosen because of its brevity and because it has proven useful for cross-cultural research (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998). The Turkish translation and adaptation of the instrument was conducted by Sümer, Lajunen and Ozkan (2005) with the translation and back translation procedure. Internal reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for each of the BFI subscales are all in reasonable intervals ranging from 0.71 to 0.81.

Job Satisfaction: 20-item short form of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to assess employees' satisfaction with their current jobs. Responses to items were made on 5-point Likert scale ranging from "very dissatisfied (1)" to "satisfied (5)".

Turkish adaptation and validity of the Turkish version of the instrument has been established by Bilgic (1998). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.92. In order to reduce common method biases, we followed several suggestions of Podsakoff & Organ (1986) and the remedies of Chang, Witteloostuijn & Eden (2010); we (a) used different scale endpoints and response anchors for the criterion and predictor variables, (b) manipulated the order of the questionnaire items (c) used Harman's single factor-test. All items were entered together into factor analysis, and the results of the unrotated factor solution were examined. As a result, no single factor accounted for the majority of the covariances and no general factor was apparent suggesting common method variance was not a serious issue (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

4. Results

4.1. Preliminary analyses

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Following the two step procedure recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), we first examined the measurement model and then tested the hypotheses. Thus, we conducted a series of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test the factor structure of the main study measures. For procedural justice, the examination of the fit-indexes suggest that the single factor model did fit the data after removing item 4. Examination of the fit-indexes for the one-factor model of procedural justice suggested a good fit to the data [$\chi^2(df = 44) = 92.6$, GFI=0.89, CFI=0.87, TLI=0.84 and RMSEA=0.05]¹. Ideally, a non-significant chi-square is desired but if chi-square value turns out to be less than the three times of the degrees of freedom, the model is again regarded as acceptable (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

The fit indexes of the five-factor model of BFI did not suggest a good fit to the data initially [$\chi^2(df = 892) = 4823$, RMSEA=0.13]. Two items had insignificant loadings namely, item 6 ($t=1.85$, $p>0.05$) related to extraversion and item 22 ($t=1.17$, $p>0.05$) related to agreeableness. After those items were removed, CFA was conducted on the remaining items. Based on the modification indices, a path of covariance was then added between error terms of item 40 and 43 loading on openness to experience scores. The final model shows a better fit to our data, where $\chi^2(df = 808) = 1674.42$, GFI= 0.89, CFI=0.90, TLI=0.89 and RMSEA=0.07). Indexes were created for each dimension of BFI by averaging the relevant items.

One-factor solution for the job satisfaction scale was validated with CFA. Examination of the fit-indexes for the one-factor model of procedural justice suggested a good fit to the data [$\chi^2(df = 170) = 286$, GFI=0.94, CFI=0.92, TLI=0.91 and RMSEA=0.05].

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, alpha coefficients and intercorrelations among the study variables. For the reliability tests, final reliability coefficients of the scales and subscales yielded high internal reliability coefficients (in a range between .71 and .92).

Insert table (1) about here

The correlations among the variables provide initial support for our hypotheses. Significant positive correlations were found between the job satisfaction and procedural justice ($r=.48$, $p<.01$), agreeableness ($r=.26$, $p<.01$), conscientiousness ($r=.22$, $p<.01$), extraversion($r=.22$, $p<.01$), and neuroticism ($r=-.25$, $p<.01$). Consistent with the previous research, individuals who score high in procedural justice tended to be more satisfied with their job. Moreover, procedural justice was correlated with conscientiousness ($r=.38$, $p<.01$), extraversion($r=.30$, $p<.01$), neuroticism($r=-.18$, $p<.01$) and agreeableness ($r=.16$, $p<.01$).

4.2. Hypothesis Testing

Mediated regression analysis

Mediated regression procedures were used to test the hypothesized models. Baron and Kenny (1986) suggested that three conditions are needed to prove the mediational hypothesis: First, the independent variables must significantly influence the mediator; second, the mediator must significantly influence the dependent variables, third the independent variables must significantly influence the dependent variables; and if all of these conditions took place, the effect of independent variables would be weakened when the mediator was entered in the last step. If the independent variables become insignificant when the mediator enters to the equation than full mediation occurs. The results of the series of mediated regression analysis are presented in Table 2.

¹ The criteria for a good fit (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2006): χ^2/df ratio <3 , GFI=goodness-of-fit index (GFI ≥ 0.90), TLI=Tucker Lewis Index (TLI ≥ 0.90), RMSEA=root mean square error approximation (RMSEA <0.08), CFI =comparative fit index (CFI ≥ 0.90).

Equations 1a through 1d tested the relationship between agreeableness and JS as mediated by PJ; equations through 2a to 2d tested the relationship between conscientiousness and JS as mediated by PJ; from 3a to 3d tested the the relationship between extraversion and JS as mediated by PJ; and finally 4a through 4d tested the the relationship between neuroticism and JS as mediated by PJ.

Insert table (2) about here

As shown in equations from 1a to 1d in Table 2, the three mediation conditions are confirmed. Both PJ and agreeableness were related to JS but the relationship between agreeableness and JS was weakened (decreased from .237 to .179) when PJ was added to the regression model. We used the Sobel test (1982) to test whether the the indirect effect of agreeableness on JS via the mediator is significantly different from zero using the relevant parameter estimates and standard errors (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Sobel test was significant ($z=1.97$, $p=.05$), indicating that PJ partially mediated the relationship between agreeableness and JS. Thus, H1 is confirmed.

As it can be seen in Equations from 3a to 3d in Table 2, both PJ and extraversion were related to JS but the relationship between extraversion and JS was weakened (from .226 to .102) when PJ was added into the model. Sobel test was significant ($z=3.87$, $p<.01$) indicating that PJ partially mediated the relation between extraversion and JS, and thus supporting H2. Similarly for the equations 4a to 4d in Table 2, both PJ and neuroticism were related to JS but the relative weight of neuroticism on JS was weakened (from -.26 to -.18) when PJ was added into the model. Sobel test was significant ($z=-2.55$, $p<.01$)) indicating that PJ partially mediated the relation between neuroticism and JS. So, H4 is supported.

Finally, equation 2a indicated that conscientiousness was positively related to PJ, while equation 2b showed that PJ was positively related to JS. Equation 2c indicates that conscientiousness is significantly related to JS, however equation 2d demonstrates that the effect of conscientiousness become insignificant when the mediator (PJ) enters to the equation. This indicates that PJ acts as a full mediator in the relationship between conscientiousness and JS, supporting H3.

5. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to further investigate the mediating effect of procedural justice in personality-job satisfaction linkage. We found agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness were positively, while neuroticism was negatively related to job satisfaction. Moreover, procedural justice was positively related to job satisfaction, replicating earlier researches. The originality of the present study is that it extends the prior literature by providing distal personality traits and proximal justice perceptions into personality-job satisfaction relationship. This study provides encouraging evidence that some employees with certain personality traits are more vulnerable to fairness issues and consequently contribute to job satisfaction. Our results demonstrate that the relationships between conscientiousness and job satisfaction were completely mediated by procedural justice, while the relationship between extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism and job satisfaction were partially mediated by procedural justice.

Conscientiousness was found to be strongest mediating variable out of other personality traits. The effect of conscientiousness on job satisfaction is fully mediated through procedural justice. Thus conscientious individuals were more likely to perceive procedural fairness which linked to higher job satisfaction. Conscientious individuals are commonly described as reliable, dutiable and achievement oriented. These characteristics are relevant to justice perceptions because they pertain the tendency to follow rules and conform to the norms of the organizations (Mount et al., 2006). Conscientious individuals also feel secure themselves under conditions of conformity and control. In determining the outcomes, the presence of procedures allows employees to have a sense of control over the organizational decision making (Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995) with increasing justice perceptions initially and enhancing job satisfaction subsequently.

The dispositional effects of extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism on job satisfaction were partially mediated by procedural justice. The major portion of the relationship between extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism and job satisfaction was indirect through procedural justice perceptions of employees, suggesting the lack of procedural justice is even more important. These findings demonstrate that extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism predict job satisfaction because they predispose employees to react in certain ways to their job situations and experiences, as reflected in their fairness evaluations of the procedures (Mount et al., 2006). The finding that employees evaluations of fairness perceptions as extrinsic motivational variable explains, in part, the influence of their personality traits on job satisfaction is an important first step in understanding the mechanisms through which personality traits influence such attitudinal reactions at work.

On the other hand, equally important finding was that procedural justice did not fully mediate the personality and job satisfaction relationships; that is extraversion; agreeableness and neuroticism have also direct relationships with job satisfaction that was independent of one's fairness evaluations of procedures. Additionally, recent research suggests that the perceptions about procedural justice encompass not only situational and contextual assessments of fairness (Lucas, Alexander, Firestone, & LeBreton, 2007), but also stable dispositional tendencies of personality traits like extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism to perceive favorable attitudinal reactions.

5.1. Practical Implications

The mediation effects of procedural justice on the relation between Big-Five personality traits and job satisfaction found in the current study has several practical implications for both employees and managers. The managerial level of employees should comprehend that dispositional and motivational variables are both important determinants of job satisfaction; the impact of dispositional variables is partly indirect by influencing procedural justice perceptions. In this regard, job satisfaction captures the degree to which the employee is happy with the job (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Thus, managers should acknowledge that employees bring certain expectations to their jobs about the fairness of company policies, procedures and practices related with salary, working conditions and performance outcomes. If those expectations are met, it will have greater impact on satisfaction level of the employees toward their job. Our findings indicate that organizations should focus more on developing employee's justice perception which is the underlying relationship between personality and job satisfaction. The level of the dispositional character of the employees can not be easily changed, but procedural justice might be cultivated, or facilitate the effects of personality on job satisfaction by strengthening employees' fair procedural justice perceptions. Specifically, the job satisfaction of employees who compensated according to pay for performance plans might be affected more by the fairness of procedures compared to the satisfaction of employees working in other public and private businesses.

5.2. Limitation

The first limitation of the research concerns the use of convenience sample which relatively limits the generalizability of the results. Future studies might be needed to replicate this study in other occupational samples and other cultures. Another limitation is the cross-sectional design which does not allow for an assessment of causality. Further studies with longitudinal or experimental research designs might confirm the causality of the hypothesized relationships. Another avenue for future research concerns examination of other mediating variables linking personality and job satisfaction. Our result suggest some situational variables like leadership, empowerment, feedback environment, social support in addition to other forms of justice (distributive and informational) might be extended with dispositional variables in predicting job satisfaction. Finally, because the information was collected with a self-report survey, common-method bias is still another concern although several remedies were followed to reduce it.

References

- Alexander, S. & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 177-198.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103* (3), 411-423.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in socialpsychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 43-51.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O.P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big-Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 729-750.
- Bilgiç, R., (1998). The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics of Turkish Workers. *Journal of Psychology, 132*(5), 549-558.
- Brief, A. P., Butcher, A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 62*, 55-62.
- Chang, S.J., Witteloostuijn, A. Van, & Eden, L. (2010). From the Editors: Common method variance in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(2), 178-184.

- Cohrs, J.C., Abele, A.E., & Dette, D.E. (2006). Integrating Situational and Dispositional Determinants of job satisfaction: Findings From Three Samples of Professionals. *The Journal of psychology*, 140, 363-395.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C., Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 165-210). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B.A., Judge, T.A., & Shaw, C.S. (2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 110-127.
- Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. (1991). Procedural justice and worker motivation. In R. M. Steers & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (5th ed) (pp. 131-143). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- De Cremer, D., & Sedikides, C. (2005). Self-uncertainty and responsiveness to procedural justice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41(2), 157-173.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Dulebohn, J.H., & Ferris, G.R. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of performance evaluations' fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 288-303.
- Emmons, R. A., Diener, E., & Larsen, R. J. (1985). Choice of situations and congruence models of interactionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(6), 693-702.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretative analysis of personnel systems. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds). *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 3. pp. 141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
- Furnham, A. & Zazherl, M. (1986). How people make their own environments: A theory of genotype-environment effects. *Child Development*, 54, 424-435.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1990). A longitudinal test of the influence of congruence: Job satisfaction, competency utilization, and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 389-398.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 340-342.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hair, J., Black, B. Babin, B., Anderson, R. & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Heskett, J. L., Sasser, W. E. & Schlesinger, L. A. (1997). *The service profit chain*. New York: Free Press.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes: A theoretical and empirical review. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2003). On the heritability of job satisfaction: The mediating role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 750-759.
- John, O.P., Donahue, E.M., & Kentle, R. (1991). *The 'Big-Five' Inventory-Versions 4a and 54. Technical Report*, Institute of Personality and Social Psychology. Berkeley: University of California.
- Joy, V & Witt, L. (1992), Delay of gratification as a moderator of procedural justice-distributive justice relationship. *Group and Organizational Management*, 17, 297-308.
- Judge, T. J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of workfamily conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 395-404.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 530-541.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 60-84.
- Lambert, E., Edwards, C., Camp, S., & Saylor, W. (2005). Here today, gone tomorrow, back again the next day: Absenteeism and its antecedents among federal correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 165-175.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.

- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 952-959.
- Lind, E. A. & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Lissak, R. I., Mendes, H., & Lind, E. A. (1983). Organizational and Nonorganizational Influences on Attitudes Toward Work, *Unpublished manuscript*, University of Illinois, Champagne.
- Lucas, T., Alexander, S.A., Firestone, I.J., & LeBreton, J.M. (2007). Development and initial validation of a procedural and distributive just world measure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 71-82.
- Martin P.D., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organization commitment. *Group and Organization Management*, 21, 84-104.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: Guilford.
- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.
- Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., & Martin, C. L. (1998). A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19: 131-141.
- Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(2), 531-544.
- Randall, C.S., & Mueller, C.W. (1995). Extensions of justice theory: Justice evaluations and employees' reactions in a natural setting. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(3), 178-194.
- Schmidt, F.L. & Hunter, J.E. (1998). The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Research: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262-274.
- 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.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology 1982* (pp. 290-312). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 56-77.
- Staw, B. M., & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2005). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: More than a mirage, but not yet an oasis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 59-78.
- Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985) Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 469-480.
- Sümer, N., Lajunen, T., & Özkan, T. (2005). Big-Five personality traits as the distal predictors of road accident involvement. In G. Underwood (Ed.), *Traffic and Transport Psychology* (Chapter 18). Elsevier Ltd.
- Sweeney, P. D. & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- Sweeney, P. D. & McFarlin, D. B. (1997). *Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 83-98.
- Sweeney, P.D., McFarlin, D.B., & Cotton, J.L. (1991). Locus of control as a moderator of the relationship between perceived influence and procedural justice. *Human Relations*, 44, 333-342.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., Campion, M. A., & Paronto, M. (2006). A field study of the role of big five personality in applicant perceptions of selection fairness, self, and the hiring organization. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14, 269-277.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 25, pp. 115-191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 1-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Van Hiel, A., DeCremer, D., & Stouten, J. (2008). The personality basis of justice: The five-factor model as an integrative model of personality and procedural fairness effects on cooperation. *European Journal of Personality*, 22, 519-539.
- Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6, 1-50.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations about study variables

Variable	Cronbach α	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Age	-	30.9	4.9	1								
2.Gender	-	-	-	-.052	1							
3.Tenure		5.71	2.7	.656**	-.127	1						
4.Procedural Justice	.81	3.61	.49	-.122	-.109	-.023	1					
5.Agreeableness	.71	4.06	.33	-.044	-.169*	-.102	.161*	1				
6.Conscientiousness	.81	4.31	.61	-.162*	-.048	-.144*	.389**	.354**	1			
7.Extraversion	.77	3.68	.59	-.023	-.062	.009	.302**	.391**	.539**	1		
8.Neuroticism	.78	2.20	.68	-.045	.059	-.004	-.185*	-.408**	-.562**	-.527**	1	
9.Job Satisfaction	.92	3.81	.58	-.153	-.076	-.071	.478**	.264**	.219**	.220**	-.249**	1

N=218, *p<.05, **p<.001

Table 2. Results of the mediated regression analyses

Equation	Independent variable	Dependent variable	b	S.E.	β	R^2	F
1a	Agreeableness	Procedural Justice	.18	.09	.134*	.09	9.70**
1b	Proc Justice	Job Satisfaction	.40	.05	.466**	.21	56.42**
1c	Agreeableness	Job Satisfaction	.28	.08	.237*	.12	12.07**
1d	Procedural Justice (St1)		.38	.05	.443**	-	-
	Agreeableness	Job Satisfaction	.21	.07	.179*	.24	33.49**
2a	Conscientiousness	Procedural Justice	.45	.07	.375**	.14	33.13**
2b	Proc Justice	Job Satisfaction	.40	.05	.466**	.21	56.42**
2c	Conscientiousness	Job Satisfaction	.23	.07	.216**	.07	9.91**
2d	Procedural Justice (St1)		.39	.06	.449**	-	-
	Conscientiousness	Job Satisfaction	.05	.07	.046 ^{n.s.}	.22	28.37**
3a	Extraversion	Procedural Justice	.271	.06	.284**	.09	17.91
3b	Proc Justice	Job Satisfaction	.40	.05	.466**	.21	56.42**
3c	Extraversion	Job Satisfaction	.188	.06	.226**	.06	10.93**
3d	Procedural Justice (St1)		.38	.05	.437**	-	-
	Extraversion	Job Satisfaction	.08	.05	.102**	.23	29.68**
4a	Neuroticism	Procedural Justice	-.16	.06	-.174	.06	7.34*
4b	Proc Justice	Job Satisfaction	.40	.05	.466**	.21	56.42**
4c	Neuroticism	Job Satisfaction	-.21	.05	-.260**	.07	14.73**
4d	Procedural Justice (St1)		.38	.05	.434**	-	-
	Neuroticism	Job Satisfaction	-.15	.05	-.185**	.25	33.79**

^{n.s.} non-significant *p<.05 **p<.001