



## A RELATIONSHIP STUDY BETWEEN ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES IN OGUN STATE, NIGERIA

Ajala, E.M. .

Department of Social Work,  
Faculty of Education,  
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
Tel. No.: +2348035653535  
Email: [majekajala@yahoo.com](mailto:majekajala@yahoo.com)

### ABSTRACT

Employees are often heard complaining about their workplace management on issues relating to injustice in decision making, remuneration and interpersonal relationship which they considered working against their performance at work. It is against this background that this study looks at the influence of organizational justice on job satisfaction of employees in the manufacturing sector in Ogun State. The descriptive research design of the ex-post facto was used for the research. The population of the study consists of staff of five firms at the manufacturing sector in Ogun state, Nigeria. Five firms were randomly selected from manufacturing firms within the industrial estate of Ogun State. From each firm, respondents were clustered into junior, middle and senior categories that are supervised by management level staff. Twenty staff that voluntarily wishes to partake in the research were selected to make sixty respondents from each firm giving a total of three hundred respondents. The main instrument used for the study is a questionnaire tagged "Organisational Justice and Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (OJAJSQ)" with four sub-sections namely Distributive Justice Scale (DJS), Procedural Justice Scale (PJS), Interactional Justice Scale (IJS), Job Satisfaction Scale (PWS) with a responding format of a 4-point rating scale ranging from strongly agree (SA) = 4 to strongly disagree (SD) = 1 with reliability of 0.87. The questionnaires were personally administered by the researcher to the respondents. Data were analysed using simple percentages for demographic characteristic of the respondents, mean and standard deviation used for item analyses of the questionnaire content and hypotheses using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance. Finding showed that there is strong relationship between the three dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction in the following descending order distributive justice ( $r = 0.955$ ); procedural justice ( $r = 0.968$ ) and interactional justice ( $r = 0.966$ ). This implies that the level of job satisfaction is a direct response to the perceived existence of organisational justice at the workplace. It was recommended that personnel managers and operational managers should pro-actively put mechanisms in place to enhance job satisfaction of employees and ultimately improve productivity and sustenance of both the organisation and the employees. Industrial social workers should advocate on behalf of employees so that managers would pay more attention to the means or the process of decision making for the organisational justice which could lead to substantial individual job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Relationship study, Organisational justice, Job Satisfaction, Industrial Employees

### INTRODUCTION

In highly competitive global economy, workplace or institution must strive to identify factors that will influence the performance and job satisfaction of employees with the intent of attaining the organisational goals. In order to keep employee satisfied, committed and loyal to the organisation, the organisations need to be fair in its system regarding distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Work organisations receives better response from their employees in terms of attitudes, loyalty and output based on employees perception about prevalence of organisational justice in matters of process, regulations, communications and allocation systems. Employees' having greater satisfaction from their work shows better degree of output, determination, dedication and intends to stay for a longer time with the organisation. Hence, existence of organisational justice in organisations, firms and institutions is inevitable (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Equity theory basis for the study of organisational justice, focuses the perceptions individuals establish when they make judgement about their level of inputs compared to resulting outcomes (Adam, 1965). These perceptions borders on the climate of fairness which exists within the organisation. Those fairness perceptions then emerge to shape the level of



organisational justice or fairness thought to exist with the organisation (Greenberg, 1987, 1990; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001; Greenberg, Mark & Lehman, 1985).

When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organisation in every aspect, they are inclined to show positive attitude and behaviours like job satisfaction. Employees are more satisfied when they feel they were rewarded fairly for the work they have done by making sure these rewards were for genuine contributions to the organisation and consistent with the reward policies. The reward could include a variety of benefits and perquisites other than monetary gains. Employees with higher job satisfaction feel important as they believe that the organisation would be of tremendous future and in the long run care about the quality of their work, be more committed to the organisation, have higher retention rates and tend to have higher productivity (Fatt, Khin, & Heng, 2010).

## Literature Review

### *(A). Theoretical Conception Framework*

The theoretical framework guiding organisational justice and job satisfaction will be of great assistance in understanding the relationship between the two variables which is germane to this research. As for organisational justice, the term justice signifies how things ought to be; nonetheless, what is fair has been found to be very difficult to establish (Zamini, 2014). The concept of justice is considered to be a social construct. What is perceived as just is dependent on what the majority of a group consider it to be (Colquitt, Colon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Therefore, organisational justice is defined as individuals' opinion of what is fair in the organisation. Organisational justice, therefore, is a multi-dimensional concept that signifies the typical perceived fairness of outcomes (e. g. Pay, promotion etc) of the organisation (Zamini, 2014). It is also seen as workers perceiving various aspects of their organisational lives as just or unjust. Finding showed that perceptions of fair decision outcomes relate to higher levels of organisational commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Martin & Bennett, 1996), job satisfaction (Martin & Bennett, 1996); turnover intention (Dailey & Kirk, 1992) and individual work effort (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001) and less absenteeism (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Furthermore, organisational justice promote positive employees reaction at work based on issues that are not related to reward or compensation scheme, e. g. Organisational citizenship behaviour (Dalal, 2005).

Barsky and Kaplan (2007) conceptualise organisational justice to have three subdivisions namely distributive justice, procedural justice and interpersonal justice. The idea of justice in the organisational context particularly the distributive justice was initially investigated by Homans (Homans, 1961). Adams (1965) investigated distributive justice by comparing employees pay-off ratio (monetary or status) to their input of time and energy, contrasting it to that of their colleagues (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). On the other hand, procedural justice puts emphasis on the course of the decision-making process. Specifically, it shifts its focus from the outcome to the path leading to it (Hegtvedt & Markkovsky, 1995). The third aspect of organisational justice is based on social exchange theory and the norm of social reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Colquitt (2001) further looked at interactional justice and conceptualised a re-division into two, namely interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice pertains to the level of interpersonal sensitivity of treatment on behalf of the employees' superiors during the application of decisions, while informational justice pertains to the rationalisation provided to employees that explains the procedures and outcomes.

As for job satisfaction, the theoretical definition includes evaluation or expectancy components. For example, Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Similarly,



Mottaz regarded job satisfaction as an effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation. It is widely accepted that job satisfaction as a function of work-related rewards and values (Kalleberg, 1977; Vroom, 1964). Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weik (1970) divided job satisfaction theories into distinct categories: process theories and content theories. Process theories take into account the process by which variables such as expectations, needs and values, and reference groups interact with the job to produce job satisfaction. Content theories are based on various factors which influence job satisfaction. Content based theories essentially investigate what satisfies an individual (Chelladurai, 1999). According to Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009), job satisfaction is theorised as consisting of three components, namely evaluation, cognition and affect. The evaluative component is the employee's general attitude towards the organization, which represents a like or dislike attitude toward the organization. A single-item measurement of one's job satisfaction will generally have the evaluation component governing the given answer.

The cognitive component incorporates the beliefs, expectations and perceptions pertaining to the organization and the extent to which they are met. The cognitions an employee holds revolve around four primary inducement systems: firstly, reward inducement (expectation of pay and promotion), managerial inducement (expectations of how leaders should be and satisfaction with one's supervisor) and task inducement (role expectation and assigned tasks that cohere with one's cognition. Variables such as increased responsibility, autonomy and task identity generally cohere with higher levels of job satisfaction. Lastly, social inducement is one's appraisal of co-workers and whether they aid or obstruct job performance relative to expectations (Bakhshi et al., 2009).

The affective component pertains to the feelings aroused by the cognitions and associations to the organization. Positive feelings are induced by information, response, affirmation of one's importance to the company, and circumstances that reinforce and facilitate self-worth and self-concept. Furthermore, the four inducement systems are also largely involved in arousing affect (Bakhshi et al., 2009). The emotional response of being satisfied (or dissatisfied) with one's job is a response to the judgment of the aforementioned components by an employee. If the employee perceives that the above-mentioned are being achieved at an acceptable level, that person will feel the pleasurable sensation of satisfaction; conversely, if they do not, the frustration will translate into dissatisfaction. The strength of these emotions is dependent on the importance of the component (Henne & Locke, 1985).

#### *(B). Conceptual Review*

The main concepts of organisational justice and job satisfaction are reviewed in segments before looking at the empirical interaction between the two concepts.

#### **Organisational Justice**

Organisational justice can be defined as the role of fairness in organisations as is closely related to employees' perception of fair treatment in the organisation (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Organisational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their job and the way in which those determinations influence other work-related variables (Moorman, 1991). Employee's perception of justice can be classified into distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

According to Adams (1965), distributive justice can be theorized in terms of equity, which means a perceived ratio of outcomes, by using the concept of investments and social exchange. In equity theory, fairness can be perceived by individuals only when there is



equity between inputs and outcomes (Foster, 2007). The fairness of these outcomes provides the foundation for the dimension of distributive justice. Organisational members often feel a greater sense of fairness in the distribution of outcomes when they sense that the process used to arrive at outcomes are fair. With the finding that the procedure used to determine outcomes can be more influential than the outcome itself, the emphasis has gradually shifted from distributive to procedural justice. Procedural justice refers to participants' perceptions about the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process (Nabatchi, Bingham, & Good, 2007). Procedural justice acknowledges individual's awareness of equity more than institute's rules, procedures and regulations whereby such policies are made realistic (Colquitt, Greenberg & Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

According to Leventhal, Karuza & Fry, (1980), six procedural rules should be foundational in all allocation contexts: procedures should be consistent, bias suppression, accurate, correct, representative and ethical. The implication of these procedural rules is that fair procedures should rule the allocation of outcomes in the procedural justice theory, signalling that participants understand that impartiality is a major rule that governs activity (Nabatchi, et al., 2007). Interactional justice is the extension of procedural justice propounded by Bies and Moag (1986). Interactional justice is associated with an individual's perception of fairness regarding the interactions with a decision-maker who is responsible for the process of the outcomes allocations. Research has identified two subcategories of interactional justice: informational justice and interpersonal justice (Folger & Cropanzoni, 1998).

### ***Job Satisfaction***

Job satisfaction can be defined as an individual's total feeling about their job and the attitude they have towards various aspects or facets of their job, as well as an attitude and perception that could consequently influence the degree of fit between the individual and the organisation (Ivancevich & Matteson, 2002; Spector, 1997). Thus, job satisfaction is an individual's perception and evaluation of their job influenced by their own unique needs, values and expectations, which they regard as being important to them (Sempene, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002). Research has indicated that job satisfaction does not come about in isolation; it is dependent on organisational variables such as structure, size, pay, working condition and leadership (Xie & Johns, 2000). Other variables that can influence job satisfactions are salary, working environment, autonomy, communication, and organisational commitment (Lane, Esser, Holte, & McCusker, 2010; Vidal, Valle, & Aragon, 2007; Xie & Johns, 2000). Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) define job satisfaction as the opinions of emotional responses to a particular job utilising five facets as referent points. The five facets are pay satisfaction, satisfaction with promotional opportunities, satisfaction with people associated with the job or co-workers, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with the work itself. This explanation provides a clear simple explanation, which corresponds to one of the most used measures of job satisfaction, the Job Descriptive Index (Balzer, Kihm, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar & Parra, 1997).

### ***Organisational Justice and Job Satisfaction***

Studies have confirmed that there is significant correlation between organisational justice and job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001; Fernandes & Awamleh, 2006; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Shokerkon & Neamii, 2003; Witt & Nye, 1992). Organisational justice and its dimensions have been found to have direct limit to job satisfaction, performance, commitment, and citizenship behaviour (Ajala, 2015; Ajala & Bolarinwa, 2015; Ajala & Emmmanuel, 2014; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt, Noe & Jackson, 2002; Fields, Pang, & Chiu, 2000; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Lam, Schaubroeck, & Aryee, 2002; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). It has been found that both





distributive and procedural justices are prerequisites for job satisfaction. There has been debate as to which one is more important to influence job satisfaction. It has been established that procedural justice which is pertaining to the individual's appraisal of the organisation and its establishments and processes have a strong correlation with organisational citizenship leading to job satisfaction (Ajala, 2016; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). Also, distributive justice has been found to have significant correlation when remuneration and staff turnover are of concern (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987). The influence of different dimensions of organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) on job satisfaction has been shown to have great impact on the success of workplace organisations (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002).

Perceived fairness in the distribution of organisational rewards such as promotion, increased salary, status and performance evaluation (distributive justice) have been found to have a considerable effect of job satisfaction and overall organisational effectiveness (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001). According to McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) distributive justice is the main precursor to job satisfaction due to its capacity to predict employee attitudes concerning personal outcomes. Perception of distributive justice is notably correlated with overall job performance because of job satisfaction (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Procedural justice and its effect on job satisfaction postulate that if employees doubt the justness of procedure leading up to promotion, or any sort of advancement of position, and believe that they are not biased or fair procedure but on influenced intentions, their reason to perform will diminish, and subsequently so will their work motivation (Cobb & Frey, 1996; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). The extent to which an individual places importance on procedural justice is a significant determinant of association that the individual feels with the workplace and colleagues (Tyler & Lind, 1992; Ajala & Adediran, 2014). This implies that strongly connected individuals seek affirmation from the organisation and associates in order to maintain and augment self-esteem and self-concept. Conversely, employees who do not feel strongly connected tend to care less about procedural justice (Ajala & Adediran, 2014; Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt, & Roman, 2005; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Alexander and Ruderman, (1987) found that procedural justice to be a significantly better predictor of job performance than distributive justice. Tepper (2000) found that employee's perception of procedural justice explained effects on job satisfaction when abusive supervision acted as mediator.

In interactional justice, the social exchange theory comes to play. The theory postulates that workers retain the expectancy to be treated fairly, honestly and courteously by the organisation and its representatives. The norm of reciprocity states that if an employee perceived that he or she is being treated fairly, that person will automatically be more positively inclined towards the organisation. Consequently, this will have significant effects on adherence to the organisational culture, motivational, job satisfaction, enhance organisational citizenship and decreased withdrawal behaviours (Ajala, 2015; Colquitt et al., 2001). Findings have shown that there is significant positive correlation between interactional justice and job satisfaction (Altahayneh, Khasawneh & Abedalhafiz, 2014; Karimi, Alipour, Pour & Azizi, 2013; Kaur, 2016; Rahman., Haque., Elahi, & Miah, 2015).

### **Statement of problem**

Employees in an organisation have always been a key asset to the attainment of organisational goals such as increase in productivity level, increase in profit level, staff commitment, and staff retention. Furthermore, employees feel more satisfied when they felt they are rewarded fairly for the work they have done, that managers take them into



confidence when decisions are taken about them, that managers' decisions are unbiased in all ramifications on all issues concerning employees. However, in the manufacturing sectors in Nigeria, employees are heard complaining against their workplace management and sometimes embark on strike to press home their grievances. Some issues raised in their complaints are related to issues related to organisational justice such as injustice in decision making, remuneration and interpersonal relationship. It is against this background that this study looks at the influence of organisational justice on job satisfaction of employees in the manufacturing sector in Ogun State. To this end the following research hypotheses are raised for the research work.

Ho1: There is no significant correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction of employees among industrial employees in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Ho2: There is no significant correlation between procedural justice and job satisfaction of employees among industrial employees in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Ho3: There is no significant correlation between interactional justice and job satisfaction of employees among industrial employees in Ogun State, Nigeria.

## METHODOLOGY

**Research Design:** The descriptive research design of the *ex-post facto* was used for the research. The method presents a description of event as they were and the variables were not manipulated. The design also enhanced easy collection of factual information about the research problems.

**Population:** The population of this study consists of all staff working in the twenty five firms at the manufacturing sector in Ogun state, Nigeria. The choice of the state is based on the fact of concentration of manufacturing firms within the state.

**Sample and Sampling Technique:** Five firms were randomly selected from twenty-five manufacturing firms within the industrial estate of Ogun State. From each firm, respondents were clustered into junior, middle and senior categories that are supervised by management level staff. Twenty staff that voluntarily wishes to partake in the research was selected to make sixty respondents from each firm and a total of three hundred respondents.

**Instrumentation:** The main instrument used for the study is a questionnaire tagged "Organisational Justice and Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (OJAJSQ)" with four sub-sections namely Distributive Justice Scale (DJS), Procedural Justice Scale (PJS), Interactional Justice Scale (IJS), Job Satisfaction Scale (PWS) with a responding format of a 4-point rating scale ranging from strongly agree (SA) = 4 to strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

Distributive Justice Scale (DJS): The instrument consists of 5 items measuring employees' perceptions of distributive justice developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in Western studies was (0.90) Niehoff and Moorman (1993); Al-Zu'bi (2010) had (0.79) while the reliability coefficient for this study is 0.77.

Procedural Justice Scale (PJS): The instrument consists of 6 items measuring employees' perceptions of Procedural Justice developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The



Cronbach's alpha for this scale in Western studies was (0.90) Niehoff and Moorman (1993); Al-Zu'bi (2010) had (0.82) while the reliability coefficient for this study is 0.85.

Interactional Justice Scale (IJS): The instrument consists of 9 items measuring employees' perceptions of Interactional Justice developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in Western studies was (0.90) Niehoff and Moorman (1993); Al-Zu'bi (2010) had (0.80) while the reliability coefficient for this study is 0.78.

Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS): The instrument contains 7 items developed by Fernandes and Awamleh (2006) measuring job satisfaction among employees. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale in Western studies was (0.87) Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006); Al-Zu'bi (2010) had (0.83) while the reliability coefficient for this study is 0.85.

**Instrument Administration:** The questionnaires were personally administered by the researcher to the willing respondents. Out of three-hundred questionnaires administered, two hundred and ninety-eight (99.3%) were properly filled and used for data analysis. The rate of return is as a result of personal voluntary consent sort before administration of questionnaire.

**Method of Data Analysis:** The data were analysed using simple percentages for demographic characteristic of the respondents, mean and standard deviation was used for item analyses of the questionnaire content and the hypotheses were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

### *Analysis of demographic variables*

Demographic characteristics: Findings from the study showed that 191 (64.7%) were male and 107(35.9) were female. The findings also showed that 29(9.7%) of respondents were aged under 19, 110(36.9%) are between 20-30 years of age, 114(38.3%) are between 31-40 years, and 45(15.1%) are above 40 years. The implication is that all respondents are mature and their perception of what obtain at their workplace will be a true reflection. Furthermore, 37(12.4%) are singled, 254(85.2%) are married, 4(1.3%) are divorcees while 3(1.0%) are widows. 266(89.3%) respondents had higher and first degrees qualifications, 32(10.7%) had secondary school certificates. The implication is that all of the respondents are literate and could understand the questionnaire properly. In term of employment status, 54(18.1) are junior staff, 170(57.0%) are middle level manpower while 74(24.8%) are senior level manpower. Management staffs are excluded because they are the major operators of organisational justice while the views of the chosen respondents form the existence and operation of organisational justice in the workplace. Finding showed that 55(18.5%) of respondents have at least 5year working experience, 134(45%) have 6-10 year work experience, while 109(36.6%) have over 10year work experience. The minimum work experience of respondent is 3 years, hence the issue of organisational justice is familiar to them and they can say whether they have job satisfaction or not.



Table 1: Item analysis of distributive justice scale

SN		Mean	SD	Rank
1	My work schedule is fair	3.1141	.6770	1
2	I think that my level of pay is fair	2.5570	.8439	5
3	I consider my work load to be quite fair	2.8423	.8032	4
4	Overall the rewards I receive are quite fair	3.0671	.7263	3
5	I feel that my job responsibilities are quite fair	3.1007	.9338	2
	GRAND MEAN	2.9362		

The expected average mean for each single item is 4, any value of  $\leq 2$  show a negative effect to the content of that item. Table 1, shows the mean and standard deviations of responses of the studied employees' perceptions towards distributive justice in their organisation. Items having a higher mean score referred to the perception of employees perception towards distributive justice in their organisation in the following descending order: My work schedule is fair (mean=3.11, SD= 0.68); I feel that my job responsibilities are quite fair (mean= 3.10; SD=0.93); Overall the rewards I receive are quite fair (Mean=3.06, SD=0.73); I consider my work load to be quite fair (mean= 2.84; SD=0.80); I think that my level of pay is fair (mean=2.56, SD=0.84).

Table 2: Item analysis of procedural justice scale

SN		Mean	SD	Rank
1	Job decisions are not made by managers in a biased manner	3.0168	.7674	5
2	My managers makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before Job decisions are made	3.0738	.7964	3
3	To make job decisions, my managers collects accurate and complete information	2.9799	.7652	6
4	My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees	3.0436	.7258	2
5	All job-related decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees	3.1342	.8964	1
6	Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers	3.0302	.8056	4
	GRAND MEAN	3.0464		

Table 2, shows the mean and standard deviations of responses of the studied employees' perceptions towards procedural justice in their organisation. Items having a higher mean score referred to the perception of employees perception towards distributive justice in their organisation in the following descending order: All job-related decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees (mean= 3.13; SD=0.89); My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees (Mean=3.04, SD=0.73); My managers makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before Job decisions are made (mean=3.07, SD=0.80); Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers (mean= 3.03; SD=0.81); Job decisions are not made by managers in a biased manner (mean=3.01, SD= 0.77); To make job decisions, my managers collects accurate and complete information (mean= 2.97; SD=0.77).





Table 3: Item analysis of interactional justice scale

SN		Mean	SD	Rank
1	When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and consideration	2.9463	.9048	9
2	When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with respect and dignity	3.0906	.8499	3
3	When decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal needs	3.1443	.7583	1
4	When decisions are made about my job, the manager deals with me in a truthful manner	3.0336	.8075	4
5	When decisions are made about my job, the manager shows concern for my rights as an employee	3.0302	.7537	5
6	Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses with me the implications of the decisions	3.0134	.7913	7
7	The manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job	3.0201	.7652	6
8	When making decisions about my job, the manager offers explanations that make sense to me	3.0940	.6948	2
9	My manager explains very clearly any decisions made about my job	2.9765	.7803	8
	GRAND MEAN	3.0388		

The expected average mean for each single item is 4, any value of  $\leq 2$  show a negative effect to the content of that item. Table 3, shows the mean and standard deviations of responses of the studied employees' perceptions towards procedural justice in their organisation. Items having a higher mean score referred to the perception of employees perception towards distributive justice in their organisation in the following descending order: When decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal needs (mean= 3.14; SD=0.76); When making decisions about my job, the manager offers explanations that make sense to me (mean= 3.09; SD=0.69); When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with respect and dignity (mean=3.09, SD=0.85); When decisions are made about my job, the manager deals with me in a truthful manner (Mean=3.03, SD=0.81); When decisions are made about my job, the manager shows concern for my rights as an employee (mean= 3.03; SD=0.75); The manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job (mean= 3.02; SD=0.77); Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses with me the implications of the decisions (mean= 3.01; SD=0.79); My manager explains very clearly any decisions made about my job (mean= 2.98; SD=0.78); When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and consideration (mean=2.95, SD= 0.90).

Table 4: Item analysis of job satisfaction scale

SN		Mean	SD	Rank
1	In general, I am satisfied with my job	3.0906	.8656	7
2	I find that my opinions are respected at work	3.1409	.8249	1
3	Most people on this job are very satisfied with it	3.1208	.7821	5
4	I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I do	3.1040	.8160	6
5	I am satisfied with the way my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other firms	3.1376	.7900	3
6	I am satisfied with the personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees	3.1242	.8007	4
7	I am satisfied with the way my boss handles employees	3.1376	.8152	2
	GRAND MEAN	3.1222		



The expected average mean for each single item is 4 any value of  $\leq 2$  show a negative effect to the content of that item. Table 2, shows the mean and standard deviations of responses of the studied employees' perceptions towards procedural justice in their organisation. Items having a higher mean score referred to the perception of employees perception towards distributive justice in their organisation in the following descending order: I find that my opinions are respected at work (mean=3.14, SD=0.82); I am satisfied with the way my boss handles employees (mean= 3.14; SD=0.82); I am satisfied with the way my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other firms (mean= 3.13; SD=0.79); I am satisfied with the personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees (mean= 3.12; SD=0.80); Most people on this job are very satisfied with it (mean= 3.12; SD=0.78); I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I do (Mean=3.10, SD=0.82); In general, I am satisfied with my job (mean=3.09, SD= 0.86).

Table 5: Correlations of Organisational Justice Dimensions and Job Satisfaction

Variables	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
Job Satisfaction	.955	.968	.966

(P < 0.05)

Table 5 showed that there is strong relationship between the three dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction in the following descending order distributive justice (r = 0.955); procedural justice (r = 0.968 and interactional justice (r = 0.966). This implies that the level of job satisfaction is a direct response to the perceived existence of organisational justice at the workplace.

### DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The grand mean for the perception of employees towards each of the three levels of organisational justice shows whether the perceptions are negative or positive. Whenever an item mean is less than the grand mean, it means that employee's perception is negative, while when item mean is equal or greater than the grand mean the perception is positive. From Table 1, employees perceive that their work load and level of pay have negative effect on organisational justice, while they have positive perception toward work schedule, reward and job responsibilities. Furthermore, since the grand mean is greater than 2, the perception of employees signifies that distributive justice exist at the work place. From Table 2, employees perceive that managers' decisions are biased, that managers provide clarifications when employees demand for them and employees ability to challenge job decisions have negative effect on organisational justice, while they have positive perception towards other items in procedural justice. Since the grand mean is greater than 2, the perception of employees signifies that procedural justice exists at the work place. Table 3 shows employees perceive that managers treating employees with respect and dignity, managers sensitivity to employees personal needs and managers offering sensible explanations about employees jobs have positive effect on interactional justice, while other items have negative perception towards them in interactional justice. Since the grand mean is greater than 2, the perception of employees signifies that interactional justice exists at the work place.

Furthermore, Table 4 show that employees perceive that overall satisfaction with their work and non recognition for the work done have negative effect on job satisfaction, while their positive perception are seen in all other items in job satisfaction. In all, since the grand mean is greater than 2, the perception of employees signifies that they have job satisfaction at the work place. Table 5 shows a linear relationship between the three justice dimensions and job satisfaction. This is because employees perceive that their job permits realization of job values that they deem important. This is because employees are



guaranteed ability to accomplish success and see progress, have values like autonomy, role clarity, freedom from physical trauma, security of a stable income, fairness in the distribution of promotions, transparency in the process and opportunity to advance (Henne & Locke, 1985). This finding is corroborated by the study of Bakhshi, Kumar & Rani, 2009 that there is correlation between organisational justice and job satisfaction. The finding is consistent with Masterson, Lewis, Goldman and Taylor (2000) findings that procedural justice was found to have a stronger association with job satisfaction than interpersonal justice.

It is of note that the finding state that there is significant correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction. This implies that employees' belief that fairness in distribution will lead to greater individual outcomes since fair distribution means favorable distribution. This finding is in line with McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) that distributive justice compared to procedural justice is superior prediction of job satisfaction. Also, distributive justice is noted to be among various determinants of job satisfaction (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001). Also, Fernandes and Awamleh, 2006 corroborated the finding that there is correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction. Other researches that lend credence to the finding of this research that distributive justice has significant correlation with job satisfaction are Akram, Hashim, Khan, Zia, Akram & Saleem, 2015; Altahayneh, Khasawneh and Abedalhafiz, 2014; Bakhshi, Kummar, and Rani, 2009; Diab, 2015; Fatt, Khin and Heng, 2010; Karimi et al., 2013; Kaur, 2016; Rahman et al, 2015; Usmani and Jamal, 2013.

As for the second hypothesis, the finding showed that procedural justice has a relationship with employee satisfaction. This is because employees perceive that promotion was based on justice practices and their performance was truly considered they become motivated and their satisfaction with job satisfaction. This finding is supported by the findings of Fernandes and Awamleh, 2006; Mossholder, Bennett and Martin, 1998; Wesolowski and Mossholder, 1997 that there is a high correlation between procedural justice and job satisfaction. The above finding confirms the finding of Mastersopn, Lewis, Goldman and Taylor (2000) that procedural justice is a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than interactional justice, although both had significant independent effects. Furthermore, Altahayneh et al., 2014; Diab, 2015; Fatt et al., 2010; Karimi et al., 2013; Usmani and Jamal, 2013 corroborated this finding that procedural justice has positive and significant relationship with employee job satisfaction.

Interactional justice been a fair behaviour with an employed individual in form of approved official methods encourages job satisfaction. The study revealed that there is significant correlation between interactional justice and job satisfaction. This finding is supported by the findings of Altahayneh et al., 2014; Karimi et al., 2013; Kaur, 2016; Rahman et al., 2015 that there is positive and significant correlation between interactional justice and job satisfaction.

### **Implications for Industrial social workers**

1. In the area of disciplinary procedures, industrial social workers should ensure that managers as key aspect of procedural and interactional justice understand that organisational justice and employees' job satisfaction help them to deliver fair systems for disciplinary hearings and actions.
2. Industrial social workers should ensure that managers apply rules of fairing and consistent to all employees, and rewarding them based on performance and without personal bias in order to create a positive perception of distributive and procedural justice.
3. Industrial social workers should advocate on behalf of employees to managers to pay more attention to the means or the process of decision making for the organisational justice as it will lead to substantial individual job satisfaction.



4. Industrial social workers should educate managers to know that the economic costs of acting in a personally fair manner (treating individuals with respect and justification for actions) are minimal when compared to the cost of distributive fairness. Therefore, managers can influence important work attitudes through creation and maintenance of a procedurally fair climate.

### **Recommendations**

1. Managers of organisations should take appropriate measures and actions to ameliorate employees' perception of partiality and justice by implementing justice in distributions and procedures. An employee with the perception of impartiality and feeling about fair and just rewards in response to their original participation towards institution tend to be more contented from job.
2. Personnel managers and operational managers on all levels should be aware of the status of job satisfaction and allowed them to pro-actively put mechanisms in place to enhance job satisfaction of employees and ultimately improve productivity and sustenance of both the organisation and the employees.
3. Being aware of employees' job satisfaction, human resource managers should be proactive and take decisions on interventions that will ensure commitment and involvement from employees.

### **Conclusion**

The study looked at the relationship between the three dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction. It was established that all the dimensions of organisational justice had significant relationship with job satisfaction. It is clear that organisational justice is an essential component and predictor of successful organisation. Organisation that is fair and just in its procedures, policies, interactions and distribution systems will get employees that will give better response to the organisation. Enhancing organisational justice results in satisfied employees with improved outcomes. It is imperative that managers should take actions to improve employees' job satisfaction so as to decrease employees' turnovers intention and increases output with the help of distributive, procedural and interactional justices. In order to increase job satisfaction, efforts must be made in management to improve the organisational justice system. It can be concluded that when organisational justice coupled with job satisfaction are well implemented, there will be significant improvement in employees' commitment, performance and dignity.

**REFERENCES**

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (pp.267-299), New York: Academic Press.
- Ajala, E. M. (2015): The Influence of Organisational Justice on Organisational Commitment in Manufacturing Firms in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *The African Journal of Social Work*, 5(1), 92 – 130.
- Ajala, E. M. (2016): Perceived Correlation between Organisational Justice and Employees' Organisational Citizenship Behaviours in the Civil Service of Ondo and Oyo States, Nigeria. *An International Journal of Psychology in Africa: Ife PsychologiA*, 24(1), 1-11.
- Ajala, E. M. & Adediran, Kehinde (2014): Working conditions, Grievance procedures and Fringe benefits as Determinants of Labour Turnover in Selected Industries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Social Work Education*, 13, 1 – 14.
- Ajala, E. M. & Bolarinwa, K. O. (2015): Organisational Justice and Psychological Well-being of Employees in the Local Government Service of Osun State, Nigeria. *African Research Review: An International Multi-disciplinary Journal*, 9(4), 55-72.
- Ajala, E. M. & Emmanuel, T. O. (2014): Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and perceived workers' productivity in selected workplace organizations: empirical evidence from Nigeria. *Jos Journal of Social Issues*. 7(1), 91-112.
- Akram, U., Hashim, M., Khan, M. K., Zia, A., Akram, Z., & Saleem, S. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction of Banking Employees in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 15(5).
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 177–198.
- Altahayneh, Z. L., Khasawneh, A., & Abedalhafiz, A. (2014). Relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction as perceived by Jordanian physical education teachers. *Asian Social Science*, 10(4), 131.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154.
- Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, & Parra (1997). *User's manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 revision) and the Job In General scales*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University, Department of Psychology.
- Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 286–295.
- Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, and M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Volume 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial behaviour, performance and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill





- Chelladurai, P. (1999). *Human resource management in sport and recreation*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Clay-Warner, J., Hegtvedt, K. A., & Roman, P. (2005). Procedural justice, distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on work attitudes. *Social Psychology, 68*, 89–102.
- Cobb, A.T., & Frey, F.M. (1996). The effects of leader fairness and pay outcomes on superior/subordinate relations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 1401–26.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 278–321.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386–400.
- 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*, 425–445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organisational justice? A historical overview of the field. In J. Greenberg and J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *the handbook of organisational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J., Noe, R., & Jackson, C. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 83-109.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations, 45*(3), 305–317.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241–1255.
- Diab, S. M. (2015). The Impact of Organizational Justice on the Workers Performance and Job Satisfaction in the Ministry of Health Hospitals in Amman. *International Business Research, 8*(2), 187.
- Fatt, C. K., Khin, E. W. S., & Heng, T. N. (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.
- Feinstein, A. H. & Vondrasek, D. (2001). A study of relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment among restaurant employees. *Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Science, 2*(1), 1-25.
- Fernandes, C., & Awamleh, R. (2006). Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management Research News, 29*(11), 701-712.
- Fields, D., Pang, M., & Chiu, C. (2000). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of employee outcomes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21* (5), 547-562.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organisational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(1), 115–130.



- Foster, R. (2007). Individual resistance, organizational justice, and employee commitment to planned organizational change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis/St. Paul.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Looking fair Vs being fair: managing impressions of organisational justice. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 12, 57-111.
- Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, J., Mark, M., & Lehman, D. (1985). Justice in sports and games. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 8(1), 18-33.
- Hegtvedt, K. A., & Markovsky, B. (1995). Justice and injustice. In Cook, K., Fine, G. A., and House, J. (eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, pp. 257–280.
- Henne, D., & Locke, E. A. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(1), 221–240.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ivancevich, J. & Matteson, M. (2002). *Organisational behaviour and management* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 124-143.
- Karimi, A., Alipour, O., Pour, M. A., & Azizi, B. (2013). Relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in ministry of sports and youth in Iran. *International Journal of Sport Studies*, 3(11), 1149-1156.
- Kaur, M. S. (2016). A Study on the Psychological Effect of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Job Satisfaction. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(2), No.1.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698–707.
- Konovsky, M. A., Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1987). Relative effects of procedural and distributive justice on employee attitudes. *Representative Research and Social Psychology*, 17, 15–24.
- Lam, S., Schaubroeck, J., & Aryee, S. (2002). Relationship between organizational justice and employee work outcomes: a cross-national study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 1-18.
- Lane, K. A., Esser, J., Holte, B., McCusker, M. A. (2010). A study of nurse faculty job satisfaction in community colleges in Florida. *Teach. Learn. Nurs.* 5: 16-26.
- Leventhal, G., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. *Justice and Social Interaction*, 3, 167–218.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Plenum, New York.
- Locke, S. (1976). *Human Behaviour*. Aldershot, UK: Saxon House
- Martin, C. L., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organizational Management*, 21(1), 84–104.



- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Moorman, H. R., Blakely, L. G., & Niehoff, P. B. (1998). Does perceived organisational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management*, 41(3): 351-357.
- Mossholder, K. W., Beennett, N., & Martins, C. L. (1998). A multilevel analysis of procedural justice context. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 19, 131-141.
- Nabatchi, T., Bingham, L. B., & Good, D. H. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: A six-factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(2), 148-176.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice As a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-566.
- Rahman, M., Haque, M., Elahi, F., & Miah, W. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Investigation. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 4(4), 162-171.
- Sempene, M., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2): 23-30.
- Shokerkon, H., & Neamii, A. (2003). Survey simple regression and multiple regression between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Psychology*, 201, 57-70.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. California:Sage.
- 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. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the ends and the means: An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Process*, 55 (1), 23-40.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 115-191.
- Usmani, S., & Jamal, S. (2013). Impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice, spatial justice on job satisfaction of banking employees. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 2(1), 351.
- Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D.C. (2002). Examining the construct of organisational justice: A meta-analytic evaluation of relations with work attitude and behaviours. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38(3), 193-203.
- Vidal M. E. S., Valle, R. S., Aragon B. M. I. (2007). Antecedents of repatriate' job satisfaction and its influence on turnover intentions: Evidence from Spanish repatriate managers. *Journal of Business Res.* 60:1272-1281.\*



Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley

Wesolowski, M. A., & Mossholder, K. W. (1997). Relational demography in supervisor subordinate dyads: Impact of subordinate job satisfaction, burnout, and perceived procedural justice. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 18, 351-362.

Witt, L. A., & Nye, L.G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (6), 910–917.

Xie, J. L. & Johns, G. (2000). Interactive effects of absence culture salience and group cohesiveness: a multi-level and cross-level analysis of work absenteeism in the Chinese context. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73: 31-52.

Zamini, A. (2014). Job satisfaction and organizational justice as predictors of attitude concerning organizational reform. A Master's Thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology, LUNDS UNIVERITET