

IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON JOB SATISFACTION AMONG THE MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL OF AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Dr.P. Paramanandam*

Ms.Divya. M**

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at studying the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction among the managerial personnel of automobile industry. A sample of 64 managers participated in the study. Questionnaires were administered for data collection. The collected data was analysed with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests. Results indicated that there was a significant correlation between organisational justice and job satisfaction. Approximately 73% of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by the predictor variables, that is, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.

Key Words: Distributive justice, Interactional justice, Job satisfaction and Procedural justice.

***Professor, Department of Management, PSGR Krishnammal College for women, Coimbatore**

**** Research Scholar, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore,**

INTRODUCTION

Organizational justice is a key factor associated with the success of every organization. The term 'organizational justice' refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions and outcomes to be fair in nature. These perceptions can influence attitudes and behaviour for good or ill, in turn having an impact on employee performance and the organisation's success. It refers to fairness and ethical behaviour within an organization. Organizational justice is defined as personal sense from fair wages and benefits. Organizational Justice emphasizes manager decision, perceived equality, effects of justice, and the relationship between individual and environment and describes individuals' perceptions of fairness in organizations.

Distributive justice refers to outcomes being distributed proportional to inputs - the so-called equity principle (Adams, 1965). Outcomes in a work context might take the form of approval, job security, promotion and career opportunities. Inputs would include education, training, experience and effort. As it can be difficult to determine what constitutes an appropriate level of reward for a particular degree of input, people tend to make this judgement in relative terms, looking for a contribution-outcome ratio that is similar to that of their peers.

Procedural justice is concerned with the fairness of the decision process leading to a particular outcome. Procedural justice can outweigh distributive justice, in that people may be willing to accept an unwanted outcome if they believe the decision process leading up to it was conducted according to organisational justice principles. Interactional justice refers to the quality of the interpersonal treatment received by those working in an organisation particularly as part of formal decision making procedures.

In order to keep employees satisfied, committed, and loyal to the organization, the organization needs to be fair in its system regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are inclined to show more positive attitude and behaviours like job satisfaction. Issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organizations, policy making and policy implications that affect decision maker and the people who are affected from such decisions

require special attention in respect of justice. Organizational justice is considered a fundamental requirement for the effective functioning of organizations. Organizational justice is an essential component and predictor of successful organizations.

Job satisfaction is defined as "the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs". This definition suggests job satisfaction is a general or global affective reaction that individuals hold about their job. While researchers and practitioners most often measure global job satisfaction, there is also interest in measuring different "facets" or "dimensions" of satisfaction. Examination of these facet conditions is often useful for a more careful examination of employee satisfaction with critical job factors. Job satisfaction, a worker's sense of achievement and success, is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal wellbeing. This study is aimed at assessing the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction among the managerial personnel of automobile industry.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) examined the effect of distributive and procedural justice on the satisfaction and organizational commitment of university administrative and support personnel (N=138). The result showed that distributive justice was stronger predictor of satisfaction and commitment than were aspects of procedural justice. They concluded that the relative importance of distributive and procedural justice may vary across time or may be an employee using an inductive process in assessing organizational outcomes but it has been proved from past studies that both the variables affect organizational effectiveness.

Schmiesing, Safrit & Gliem (2003) conducted a study aimed to identify factors affecting the perceptions of workers at the University of Ohio towards organizational justice and job satisfaction. The study sample consisted of (246) employees of the University of Ohio. The researcher used two tools for the study; one: to measure the organizational justice and the second to measure job satisfaction. The results showed a weak positive correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction and showed a strong positive correlation between each of the interactive justice and procedural justice and job satisfaction.

Hasan Ali Al-Zu'bi (2010) examined the relationship between of organizational justice encompassed by three components: (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) and job satisfaction. The study investigated the relationship of these justice measures in the Jordanian environment. The data was collected through the distribution of questionnaires among 229 employees of IT Companies through a stratified random sampling. The findings suggested that there was a positive association between organizational justice and job satisfaction. The results of the study also indicated that significant relationship exists between the age of respondents and their perceptions of organizational justice.

Siavash Khodaparast Sareshkeh, Fatemeh Ghorbanalizadeh Ghaziani, Seyed Morteza Tayebi (2012) explored the impact of organizational justice perceptions on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Iranian sport federations' employees. The results indicated that organizational justice affects directly employees' overall organizational commitment. Job satisfaction didn't mediate this effect. Procedural justice has a direct effect on overall job satisfaction. Both distributive justice and interactional justice have a direct effect on overall organizational commitment. Procedural justice as well as interactional justice has a direct effect on satisfaction with coworker and supervisor. Distributive justice has a direct effect on continuance commitment and interactional justice has a direct and an indirect effect on affective commitment.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The present study was aimed at studying the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction among the managerial personnel of automobile industry.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A random sample consisting of 64 managerial personnel working in select automobile industry units participated in the study. Questionnaires were administered for data collection. The collected data was analysed with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests. The perceptions of distributive justice were measured with a 5-item scale developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The

perceptions of procedural justice were measured with a 6-item scale developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). The perceptions of interactional justice were measured with 11-items measuring the degree to which employees felt their needs were considered, and adequate explanations were made for job decisions (Neihoff and Moorman, 1993). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form was used to assess the level of job satisfaction among the employees. Responses were scored as follows: Very Dissatisfied = 1; Dissatisfied = 2; Neither Dissatisfied Nor Satisfied = 3; Satisfied = 4; Very Satisfied = 5.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis of the data collected from the respondents.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the Sample

Demographic factors	Classification	Number of Respondents	Percent
Age (in years)	Below 30	43	67.2
	30 & Above	21	32.8
Gender	Male	31	48.4
	Female	33	51.6
Education	Post graduate	28	43.8
	Graduate	28	43.8
Experience (in years)	Diploma	8	12.5
	1 – 5	32	50.0
	5 – 10	24	37.5
	Above 10	8	12.5
Income (in rupees)	Below 25000	51	79.7
	25000 & Above	13	20.3

Among the 64 respondents, 43 (67.2%) belong to below 30 years age group; 33 (51.6%) are female; 28 (43.8%) are graduates and another 28 (43.8%) are post graduates; 24 (37.5%) belong to 5-10 years experience group; and 51 (79.7%) belong to below 25000 income group.

Table: 2 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of research variables in different age groups

Age		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Job Satisfaction
Below 30	Mean	16.49	19.88	29.26	64.23
	N	43	43	43	43
	Std. Deviation	2.482	3.825	8.154	16.571
30 & above	Mean	16.14	17.48	20.14	52.29
	N	21	21	21	21
	Std. Deviation	1.878	3.776	9.051	23.046
Total	Mean	16.38	19.09	26.27	60.31
	N	64	64	64	64
	Std. Deviation	2.292	3.947	9.430	19.587
F-Value		0.317 (.575)	5.636 (.021)	16.396 (.000)	5.635 (.021)

A high level of distributive justice (Mean=16.49), procedural justice (Mean=19.88), interactional justice (Mean=29.26), and job satisfaction (Mean=64.23) was seen among the below 30 age group.

Significant differences were observed in procedural justice ($F=5.636$; $p<.05$), interactional justice ($F=16.396$; $p<.01$), and job satisfaction ($F=5.635$; $p<.05$) among the respondents of different age groups.

Table: 3 showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of research variables in different gender groups.

Gender		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Job Satisfaction
Male	Mean	16.06	18.45	24.97	57.16
	N	31	31	31	31
	Std. Deviation	1.896	3.982	10.042	17.904
Female	Mean	16.67	19.70	27.48	63.27
	N	33	33	33	33
	Std. Deviation	2.606	3.877	8.797	20.884
Total	Mean	16.38	19.09	26.27	60.31
	N	64	64	64	64
	Std. Deviation	2.292	3.947	9.430	19.587
F-Value		1.105 (.297)	1.607 (.210)	1.141 (.290)	1.570 (.215)

A high level of distributive justice (Mean=16.67), procedural justice (Mean=19.70), interactional justice (Mean=27.48), and job satisfaction (Mean=63.27) was seen among the female respondents.

Significant differences were not observed in the research variables among male and female respondents.

Table: 4 showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of research variables in different education groups

Education		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Job Satisfaction
Post graduate	Mean	16.36	21.25	32.39	70.43
	N	28	28	28	28
	Std. Deviation	2.628	3.063	4.932	8.775
Graduate	Mean	16.46	17.50	22.43	54.75
	N	28	28	28	28
	Std. Deviation	2.151	3.737	9.551	22.710
Diploma	Mean	1.642	17.12	18.25	44.38
	N	8	8	8	8
	Std. Deviation	1.642	4.121	8.498	18.524
Total	Mean	16.38	19.09	26.27	60.31
	N	64	64	64	64
	Std. Deviation	2.292	3.947	9.430	19.587
F-Value		0.068 (.935)	9.458 (.000)	16.638 (.000)	9.551 (.000)

A high level of procedural justice (Mean=21.25), interactional justice (Mean=32.39), and job satisfaction (Mean=70.43) was observed among the post graduate respondents. A high level of distributive justice (Mean=16.46) was observed among the graduates. A low level of job satisfaction (Mean=44.38) was observed among the diploma holders. Significant differences

were observed in procedural justice ($F=9.458$; $p<.01$), interactional justice ($F=16.638$; $p<.01$) and job satisfaction ($F=9.551$; $p<.01$) among different education groups.

Table: 5 showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of research variables in different income groups.

Income (in rupees)		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Job Satisfaction
Below 25000	Mean	16.31	18.61	25.20	56.02
	N	51	51	51	51
	Std. Deviation	2.462	4.040	9.976	18.715
25000 & above	Mean	16.62	21.00	30.46	77.15
	N	13	13	13	13
	Std. Deviation	1.502	2.972	5.317	13.005
Total	Mean	16.38	19.09	26.27	60.31
	N	64	64	64	64
	Std. Deviation	2.292	3.947	9.430	19.587
F-Value		0.177 (.675)	4.986 (.040)	3.350 (.072)	14.680 (.000)

A high level of distributive justice (Mean=16.31), procedural justice (Mean=21.00), interactional justice (Mean=30.46) and job satisfaction (Mean=77.15) was observed among 25000 & above income group. Significant differences were observed in procedural justice ($F=4.986$; $p<.05$), and job satisfaction ($F=14.680$; $p<.01$) among different income groups.

Table: 6 Showing the correlation among the research variables

		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Job Satisfaction
Distributive Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.175	.029	.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.167	.819	.121
	N	64	64	64	64
Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation		1	.838**	.766**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.000	.000
	N		64	64	64
Interactional Justice	Pearson Correlation			1	.838**
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.000
	N			64	64
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation				1
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N				64

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There was a significant correlation between procedural justice and interactional justice ($r=.838$ & $p<.01$); between procedural justice and job satisfaction ($r=.766$ & $p<.01$), interactional justice and job satisfaction ($r=.777$ & $p<.01$).

Table: 7 Showing regression analysis with satisfaction as the dependent variable**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.858 ^a	.737	.724	10.296

ANOVA

Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
17809.012	3	5936.337	55.997	.000
6360.738	60	106.012		
24169.750	63			

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-12.992	10.554		-1.231	.223
	D Justice	1.288	.589	.151	2.187	.033
	P Justice	.681	.626	.137	1.087	.281
	I Justice	1.493	.258	.719	5.782	.000

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, and job satisfaction. F-Test was statistically significant ($F=55.997$ & $p<.01$), which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Square was .737 which means that approximately 73% of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by the predictor variables, that is, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Among the three independent variables, distributive justice and interactional justice have significant impact on job satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

Organisational justice refers to an overall perception of what is fair in the workplace, composed of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. The present study was aimed at studying the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among the managerial personnel of automobile industry. A random sample consisting of 64 managers participated in the study. Questionnaires were administered for data collection. The collected data was analysed with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests. Significant differences were observed in procedural justice, interactional justice, and job satisfaction among the respondents of different age groups. Significant differences were observed in procedural justice, and job satisfaction among the respondents of different income groups. There was a significant correlation between procedural justice and interactional justice, between procedural justice and job satisfaction, and interactional justice and job satisfaction. Approximately 73% of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by the predictor variables, that is, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice.

REFERENCES

- Arti Bakhshi et al (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction
- and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business Management*, 4((9), 145 – 154.
- Choong Kwai Fatt (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction:

- The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2 (1): 56-63.
- Fernandes, C. and Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organizational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management Research News*, 29 (11), 701-712.
- Greenberg J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16:399–432.
- Hasan Ali Al-Zu'bi (2010). A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102 – 109.
- Lawler, E. E., III. (1977). Reward systems. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving Life At Work: Behavioral Science Approaches to Organizational Changes*, Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Martin, J. (1981). Relative deprivation: A theory of distributive justice for an era of shrinking resources. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3, 53-108. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leader Quarterly*, 1, (2), 107-142.
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, (2), 151-176.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, (3), 543-565.
- Reis, H. T. (1986). Levels of interest in the study of interpersonal justice. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (1993). *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.