The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p)

Volume 5, Issue 1, DIP: 18.01.088/20170501

DOI: 10.25215/0501.088

http://www.ijip.in | October-December, 2017

**Original Research Paper** 



# The Effect of Perception of Organisational Justice on Job Satisfaction of Employees in an Airline Company

Dr. Shobha Menon<sup>1</sup>\*, Mrs. Radhika Wadke<sup>2</sup>

# **ABSTRACT**

Although the associations between organizational justice and various work outcomes are well established in western literature, very few studies have examined the relationship of justice perceptions with work attitude and work behaviour in the Indian setting, especially in the aviation industry. This study explored the relationship and examined the influence of Organisational justice between organizational justice and job satisfaction among employees working in an airline company within the Indian setting. Organizational justice scale that was developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and Fernand and Awamleh's Job satisfaction Scale, (2006), scale were used to collect data. The target population of this study were employees from an airline company in Mumbai metropolitan city. The data was analysed using SPSS. The findings revealed a positive association between organizational justice and job satisfaction and further endorsed the fact that organizational justice can be an antecedent to job satisfaction. Further the results also suggested that distributive and interactional justice were more positively related to job satisfaction as compared to procedural justice. The results lend support to the notion that one can predict job satisfaction by investigating perceptions of organizational justice.

**Keywords:** Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice, Informational Justice, Job Satisfaction.

In recent years, increasing attention has been given to justice constructs and their antecedents and consequences on work behaviour. (Colquitt and Greenberg 2003) Researchers have attempted to prove that various facets of the workplace are linked to job performance. They suggest that organisational justice has led them to explain it as a precedence that strongly affects attitudes of workers or rather dimensions of work behaviour like job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment. They further consider it as the key variable to affect the performance (Du et al., 2005; Loi et al., 2009; Zainalipour et al., 2010 Colquitt et al., 2001). Fairness therefore was

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Principal, Valia C.L. College Of Commerce & Valia L.C. College Of Arts, D N Nagar, Andheri W, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, SVKM's N M College of Commerce and Economics, Bhaktivedanta Swami Marg, Gulmohar Road, Juhu Scheme, Vile Parle West, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India \*Responding Author

<sup>© 2017</sup> Menon S & Wadke R; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

clearly proved to be vital to individuals in everyday life, particularly, at the workplace. (Ambrose, 2002).

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Attention to the justice constructs has enriched recent literature in organizational justice and led researchers to believe that the perception of organizational justice is associated with work outcomes. It was Greenberg, (1996) who coined the term organizational justice and defined it as "a concept that expresses an employee's perception about the extent to which they are treated fairly in the organization". Therefore it can be said that the concept of organizational justice was viewed as being related to the employees' perception of the decisions and practices of organizational management and their perception of fairness for the same. From 1950s to 1970s, the study of justice was primarily concerned with distributive justice. Folger and Cropanzano defined distributive justice as the 'perceived fairness of the outcomes or allocations that an individual receives' (1998, p. xxi). Much of the research on distributive justice was derived from the Equity Theory propounded by Adams, (1965). Adams (1965) stated that workers are concerned not only about their absolute earnings but also about the comparative salary. This theory asserted that employees compare their inputs and outcomes with the inputs and outcomes of relevant others. As a consequence, people might feel as being inequitably treated, which was directly connected with their perception of justice and might impact their job satisfaction. Ten years later, Thibaut and Walker (1975) discovered a new dimension of organizational justice, namely procédural justice that focused on the processes that led to decision outcomes. Procedural justice is the perceived fairness of procedures, which are used to determine outcome decisions or rather the legitimacy of the outcome. (Folger and Konovsky, 1989). Bies and Moag (1986) were the first who proposed interactional justice, which focuses on the employees' perceptions of the interpersonal behaviour exercised during the representation of decisions and procedures. In other words, interactional justice relates to the fairness of interpersonal communication relating to organisational procedures (McDowall and Fletcher, 2004). Informationnel justice focuses on the explanations provided to employees, that conveyed information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why the allocations were distributed that the employee received.

Job satisfaction is the outcome variable in this study. Locke, (1969) defined job satisfaction as "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering". While Robbins (2006) perceived job satisfaction as an attitude one has toward the job, the difference between the amount of rewards that a worker received and the amount of reward that they believed should be accepted. When employees feel that they are treated unfairly, they respond affectively or behaviorally; showing low commitment or high turnover or low job satisfaction (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006).

### Objectives Of The Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- 1. To explore the levels of organizational justice as perceived by employees of an airline industry in Mumbai metropolitan.
- 2. To study the relationship between employees perceptions towards organizational justice and job satisfaction.

### Research Question

This study is conducted to address certain key questions about the perception of organizational justice in an airline industry. The researcher attempted to explain the influence of organizational justice (Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice) on job satisfaction. For this the following questions were posed

- 1. To what extent is the level of perceived organizational justice in an airline industry?
- 2. Is there any relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction?

### Hypotheses

To answer the questions posed by the author, and based on the literature reviewed, the researcher proposed the following hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

H1: There is a significant relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Data and Sample 1.1.

Demographic		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Males	45	100
Age	51-60yrs	42	93.3
	41-50yrs	1	2.22
	31-40yrs	2	4.44
Educational level	Post graduate	20	44.44
	Graduate	25	55.55
Work experience	>21yrs	43	95.55
	14-20 yrs	2	4.44
Designation	Manager	43	95.55
	Deputy Manager	2	4.44

To gather data for this study the method of convenience sampling was used in selecting the respondents. Data was collected from 45 flight attendants from the airline industry within Mumbai metropolitan city. The total sample comprised of 100% males of whom 93% were 51 to 60 years and 7% were below 50. Out of the total respondents 56% were graduates and 44% were post graduates. . In term of organizational age, 96% of the respondents are working in the airline for more than 21 years and 4% were working for 14 to 20 years. As for the designation of the flight attendants, 96% were Managers and 4% were deputy managers.

#### 1.2. Measures used

Distributive Justice: Neihoff and Moorman (1993) scale was used to measure perceptions of distributive justice using a 5-item scale. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in Western studies was (0.90), (Moorman et al., 1998), the reliability coefficient alpha for distributive justice in this study was (0.82).

Procedural Justice: Perceptions of procedural justice were measured with a 6-item scale developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). Employees responded to each item using a 5points Likert scale. The alpha coefficient for this scale in Western studies was (0.90), Neihoff and Moorman (1993), the reliability Cronbach's alpha for procedural justice in this study was (0.85).

Interactional Justice: Perceptions of Interactional justice were measured with 09-items measuring the degree to which employees felt their needs were considered, and adequate explanations were made for job decisions. All items used a five-point format. The alpha coefficient for this scale in Western studies was (0.90), Neihoff and Moorman (1993), the reliability Cronbach's alpha for distributive justice in this study was (0.78).

Job Satisfactions: Fernand and Awamleh's, (2006), scale of job satisfaction was used to assess the level of job satisfaction among employees. This questionnaire has 7-items using a five-point Likert scale to measure the responses to each item (from strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5). The alpha coefficient for this scale in Western studies was (0.87), Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006), the reliability Cronbach's alpha for job satisfactions in this study was (0.78).

### ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### Procedural Justice

Table 1 displays the respondents perception of various items included in procedural justice. The majority of the respondents had negative attitudes towards their managers. Respondents felt that the managers took job decisions without taking into consideration the concerns of the employees and they did not collect accurate and complete information to arrive at job decisions. Respondents also perceived that their managers would neither clarify the decisions made nor provide additional information to them when requested. Moreover they felt that decisions were not applied consistently to all affected employees. However on the positive side respondents perceived that the job decisions were made in an unbiased manner.

#### 1.4. Distributive justice

Table 2 reflects the means and standard deviations of the employees attitude towards various items under distributive justice applied by their managers. Employees displayed a negative orientation towards distributive justice. They felt that their work schedule, level of pay, workload, job responsibilities and overall rewards received was unfair.

#### 1.5. Interactional justice

Table 3 depicts the means and standard deviation studied of employees attitudes toward the behaviour of their managers. Accordingly it is observed that employees felt their manager did not treat them with kindness, consideration, respect and dignity. When decisions were made about their job the employees felt that managers were insensitive to personal needs, that managers dealt with them in an untruthful manner and that managers did not show concern for their rights as employees. Furthermore, employees perceived that managers neither discussed the implications of job decisions made nor offered any adequate justification and sensible explanations regarding those decisions.

#### 1.6. Job satisfaction

Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations of the responses studied of the employees' attitude towards job satisfaction. Though in general the employees were satisfied with their job, they expressed dissatisfaction towards the fact that their opinions were not respected at work and their work went unrecognised. Though they felt that most employees were very satisfied with their job, they were not satisfied with the way their boss handled them at work. Further they were reasonably satisfied with their pay as compared to the pay for similar jobs in other firms and reasonably satisfied with the personal relationship maintained between the boss and his/her employees.

#### 1.7. Relationship between Organisational justice and job satisfaction.

The correlation analysis was done between three dimensions of organizational justice variables (Independent Variables) and job satisfaction (Dependent Variable). Testing the research hypotheses was made based on the significance of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients calculated for pairs of variables. The test for correlation was done for every independent variable with the dependent variable. Table 5 shows the SPSS output of the Pearson correlation tests of all the variables identified as organizational justice variables and job satisfaction. The bivariate correlation has been undertaken to test hypotheses.

From table 5 it is observed that all Pearson coefficient values are positive and also significant (p < 0.05) This indicates that there exists significant positive correlation between every pair of two variables i.e organisational justice is positively correlated to job satisfaction.

From the table it can be job satisfaction was highly correlated with distributive justice ie 0.719(p = 0.00 < 0.05) and interactional justice i.e 0.676 (p = 0.00 < 0.05). Since all p<0.05 they show good significance.

The model summary Table 6 contains the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), which measure the independent variables ability in explaining the variance in the dependent variable. Model 1 showed that the independent variable (distributive justice) explained 51.7% of the variance in the dependent variable (JS) but it increases to 61.7% when interactional justice was added in model 2.

ANOVA Table 7 indicates significance of regression analysis. It shows if dependent variable significantly depends on independent variable or not. Table 7 of ANOVA shows that this is significant regression (Model 1: F= 46.031 df 1=1and df 2 = 43 and for model 2 F= 33.85 df p=0.00<0.05). Hence the dependent variable, job satisfaction (JS) 1=1 and df 2=42significantly depends upon the independent variable distributive justice (DJ) in model 1 and significantly depends upon the independent variable distributive justice and interactional iustice model 2.

### REGRESSION MODEL

### Model 1

Job satisfaction = Bo + B1 (Distributive Justice)

= 1.442+ 0.584 (Distributive Justice)

The b-values tell us about the relationship between job satisfaction and each predictor. If the value is positive we can tell that there is a positive relationship between the predictor (OJ) and the outcome (JS). Therefore as value of Organizational Justice increases, the value of job satisfaction will increase.

B value also tells us to what degree each predictor affects the outcome if the effects of all other predictors (independent variables) are held constant.

In fact B value for predictor (OJ) 0.584indicates that as Organizational Justice increases by one unit, value of job satisfaction increases by 0.584units if the effects of all other predictors (independent variables) are held constant.

### Model 2

Job satisfaction = Bo + B1 (Distributive Justice) + B2(Interactional justice) = 1.127+ 0.400 (Distributive Justice)+ 0.359 (Interactional justice)

Here both the independent variables are significantly related. This is the final regression model.

The B value for predictor (DJ) 0.400 indicates that as Organizational Justice increases by one unit, value of job satisfaction increases by 0.400units and The B value for predictor (IJ) 0.359 indicates that as Organizational Justice increases by one unit, value of job satisfaction increases by 0.359 units if the effects of all other predictors (independent variables) are held constant.

Table 1, Employees Perceptions towards procedural Justice

	Items	Means	Standard deviation
1.1	Job decisions are made by the manager in an unbiased manner	3.02	1.03
1.2	My manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.	2.24	0.91

	Items	Means	Standard deviation
1.3	To make job decisions, my manager collects accurate and complete information.	2.42	0.94
1.4	My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.	2.13	1.06
1.5	All job decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees.	2.82	1.07
1.6	Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers.	1.91	0.90

Table 2, Employees Perceptions towards Distributive Justice

	Items	Means	Standard deviation
2.1	My work schedule is fair	2.49	0.99
2.2	I think that my level of pay is fair.	2.96	1.02
2.3	I consider my workload to be quite fair.	2.60	1.16
2.4	Overall the rewards I receive here are quite fair.	2.89	1.17
2.5	I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.	2.71	0.99

Table 3, Employees Perceptions towards Interactional Justice

			Standard
	Items	Means	deviation
	When decisions are made about my job, the	2.78	1.04
3.1	manager treats me with kindness and consideration.	2.70	1.04
	When decisions are made about my job, the	2.93	1.10
3.2	manager treats me with respect and dignity.	2.73	1.10
	When decisions are made about my job, the	2.24	1.05
3.3	manager is sensitive to my personal needs.	2.24	1.03
	When decisions are made about my job, the	2.36	0.98
3.4	manager deals with me in a truthful manner.	2.30	0.98
	When decisions are made about my job, the		
	manager shows concern for my right as an	2.22	1.04
3.5	employee.		
	Concerning decisions made about my job, the		
	manager discusses with me the implications of the	1.80	0.89
3.6	decisions.		
	The manager offers adequate justification for	2.11	1.01
3.7	decisions made about my job.	2.11	1.01
	When making decisions about my job, the manager	2.07	0.86
3.8	offers explanations that make sense to me.	2.07	0.00

	Items	Means	Standard deviation
3.9	My manager explains very clearly any decisions made about my job.	1.96	0.90

# Table 4, Level of Job Satisfaction among employees

			Standard
	Items	Means	deviation
4.1	In general I am satisfied with this job	3.76	0.77
4.2	I find that my opinions are respected at work	2.98	0.99
4.3	Most people on this job are very satisfied with it.	2.73	0.89
4.4	I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I do	2.91	1.12
4.5	I am satisfied with the way my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other firms	3.29	1.12
4.6	I am satisfied with the personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees.	3.16	1.00
4.7	I am satisfied with the way my boss handles employees.	2.42	0.89

# Table 5, Correlations

		JS	PJ	DJ	IJ
Pearson Correlation	JS	1.000	.504	.719	.676
	PJ	.504	1.000	.420	.678
	DJ	.719	.420	1.000	.582
	IJ	.676	.678	.582	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	JS	•	.000	.000	.000
	PJ	.000	•	.002	.000
	DJ	.000	.002	•	.000
	IJ	.000	.000	.000	

# Table 6, Model Summary

				Std.	Change Statistics				
			Adjusted	Error of					
		R	R	the	R Square	F			Sig. F
Model	D.	~	a	TD 4° 4	C)	CI.	104	100	CI.
Model	R	Square	Square	Estimate	Change	Change	df1	df2	Change
1	.719 <sup>a</sup>	_	.506	.4980883	.517	46.031	1	43	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), DJ

b. Predictors: (Constant), DJ, IJ

Table 7, ANOVA

Model	1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.420	1	11.420	46.031	$.000^{a}$
	Residual	10.668	43	.248		
	Total	22.088	44			
2	Regression	13.632	2	6.816	33.852	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	8.456	42	.201		
	Total	22.088	44			

### CONCLUSION

This study explored employees' perceptions toward organizational justice in the form of (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and examined how these perceptions correlate with their job satisfaction. The findings revealed a positive association between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Further the results also suggested that distributive and interactional justice were more positively related to job satisfaction as compared to procedural justice. This finding endorsed the fact that organizational justice can be an antecedent to job satisfaction. Thus these results lend support to the notion that one can predict job satisfaction by investigating perceptions of organizational justice.

These results build on the work of previous researchers who demonstrated that organizations and their managers influence employee behavior. Cultivating a sense of organizational justice may benefit an organization through decreased absenteeism and employee turnover. (Alsalem and Alhaiani, 2007). Organizations that ignore procedural, distributive and interactional justice run the risk of lower satisfaction.(Lind and Tyler, 1988). Consequently, cultivating employees' sense of organizational justice is the key to job satisfaction.

### Acknowledgements

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

*Conflict of Interests:* The author declared no conflict of interests.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Adams, J.S. "Inequity in Social Exchange." Berkowitz, L. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1965. 267-299.
- Ambrose, M.K, M.A Seabright and M Schminke. "Sabotage in the workplace: the role of organisational injustice." Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 89 No.1 (2002): 947-965.
- Bies, R.J and Moag J. "Interactional Justice: communication criteria of Justice." Lewicki, R.J., N.H Sheppard and M.H Bazerman. Research on Negotiation in Organisation. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, n.d. 43-55.
- Colquitt, J. A and J Greenberg. The Handbook of organisational justice. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Earlbaum, 2003.

- Colquitt, J. A. "On the Dimentionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 86 (2001): 386-400.
- Cropanzano, R. and R Folger. "Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy:beyond equity theory." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 74 (1989): 293-299.
- Du, J., J.Q Liao and F.S Wang. "The Study of justice perception in performance management and the degree of satisfaction." Science and Technology Progress and Policy, Vol. 7 *No. 3* (2005): 191-192.
- Fernandes, Cedwyn and Raed Awamleh. "Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment." Management Research News, Vol. 29 No. 11 (2006): 701-712.
- Folger, R. and M.A Konovsky. "Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions." Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 32 No.1 (1989): 115-30.
- Greenberg, J. The Quest for Justice on the Job. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.
- Locke, E. A. "What is job satisfaction?" Organisational Behavior and Human Performance (1969): 309-336.
- Loi, R., J Yang and J. M Diefendorff. "Four-factor justice and daily job satisfaction: A multilevel investigation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 94 (2009): 770-781.
- McDowall, A. and C Fletcher . "Employee development: an organisational justice perspective." Personnel Review, Vol. 33 No 1 (2004): 8.
- Niehoff, B. P and R. H Moorman. "Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organisational citizenship behavior." Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 36 No. 3 (1993): 527-56.
- Robbins, S. P. Perilaku Organisasi. Jakarta: Indeks, 2006.
- Thibaut, J. and L Walker. Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analyis. NJ: Earlbaum: Hillsdale, 1975.
- Zainalipour, H., A.A.S Fini and S. M Mirkamali. "A study of relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction among teachers in Bandar Abbas middle school." Procedia Social and Behaviora Science, Vol. 5l (2010): 1986-1990.
- How to cite this article: Menon S & Wadke R (2017). The Effect of Perception of Organisational Justice on Job Satisfaction of Employees in an Airline Company. International Journal of Indian Psychology, Vol. 5, (1), DIP: 18.01.088/20170501, DOI: 10.25215/0501.088