

Organization Justice: A perspective of it's impact on Job Satisfaction

¹Anjali Singh, ²Thanesa Iyer, ³Dr.Jaya Yadav

¹Student, ²Research Scholar, ³Professor

¹Amity Business School,

¹Amity University, Noida, India

Abstract: Job satisfaction has a significant impact on employees organization commitment towards the achieving the goals of organization. Many studies shows the harmful effect of poor perception of organization justice by employee across organization. Thus this study seeks to analyze the relationship between perceived organization justice with job satisfaction of employee and to determine its impact on job satisfaction of employees. For the purpose of research a study was undertaken on 103 employees of various public sector organizations across various states in India. Responses were collected from employees using standardized instrument of Job satisfaction and Organization Justice to gauge their perception regarding Organization justice and job satisfaction of employees. Correlation and regression was used for analysis using SPSS. The finding of the study shows that there is positive relationship between the perceived organization justice and job satisfaction and from regression analysis its evident that organization justice has impact on job satisfaction of employees. It was concluded from the study that among all three types of organizational justice, Interactional justices has the major impact on employees job satisfaction hence measures must be taken by organizations to change employee poor perception of organization justice as this will lead to low productivity thereby affecting organization growth in long term

Keywords: *Distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, job satisfaction*

1. INTRODUCTION

Employees are vital for any organization whether it is profitable or non-profitable in nature. In order to add value in organization, management and the manger should ensure that all the employees are treated fairly. These days the biggest problem any organization is facing is to retain their employees. This is where organization justices comes into place.

Organization justices refer to employee's perception of their organization's behaviors, decision and actions towards them and its impact on employees personal attitude and behavior at work. Thus organization Justice is individual perception about how fairly they have been treated in organization..The term connected with this concept is fairness.

Employees are extremely sensitive towards decision their employers make on day-top-day basis whether it be a petty issue or major decision, making employees judge these decisions as fair or unfair. Hence it can stated that poor perception of organization justice somewhere effect the job satisfaction of employees. As employee may feel dissatisfied when not treat fairly.

Organization justice is categorized into three types and each of them effect job satisfaction in someway as per various researchers hence an overview of three type of organization justice and its impact of job satisfaction are as discussed in subsequent section

1.1 Types of Organization Justice:

There 3 types of organization justice as described below:

1.1.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice is employees concern about the fairness of outcomes they receive in the organization. Outcomes may be classified on the basis of need, contribution and according to these outcomes employee determine fairness by comparing with others. These comparison inturn lead to problem of injustices and biasedness at workplace. Employees feel dissatisfied if they compare their rewards and treatment with others employees especially when they are at same level. Comparison includes pays, workload, work schedule. Perception of unfair treatment and unfair distribution of rewards create tension among employees and effect workplace

1.1.2 Procedural justice

Procedural justice refers to employees perception about the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process. It means the steps and procedure taken to reach the decision and used to reach the outcome and result. This justice is sheathing a huge array of organization policy and processes. The difference between distributive and procedural justice is that one suggest that outcomes is the reason of satisfaction and procedural suggest process is important for satisfaction. When a situation cannot be solved by parties, a leader or manger should ensure policies and procedure are such that it suggest that the decision is neutral and unbiased, on fact based and accordingly appropriate action should be taken. When employees feels that their problem is honestly and fairly resolved they will willing support the decision. If the organization procedure are perceived to be honest and fair, employee will be more satisfied and will accept resolution of procedure and form positive attitude towards the organization.

1.1.3 Interactional justice

Interactional justice is a degree to which people are affected by decision and whether they are treated by dignity and respect. It is connected to human support of workplace justice. There are some common categories of this type of justice which are judgments, duplicity, aggression, breach and disrespect, respect, dignity by authority, behavior of manager and supervisor who is involved in making policies and problem solving. The main focus of this type of justice is on the quality of interpersonal treatment received while passing workplace procedures. This justice concerns about fairness and un-biasedness of non-procedural justice. This justice include effect of various responses and action supervisor show to employees for displaying social sensitivity for example-whether employees are treated respectfully and with dignity by supervisor. There are two type of interactional justice which are informational justice and interpersonal justice. Interactional and procedural justice may effect employees and lead to dissatisfaction but through interactional justice others justice can be resolved or handled because it is specifically related to the manner or way people were treated at workplace.

1.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been hugely examined over last few decades of organizational research. Out of various factor affecting job satisfaction the major one's being compensation (pay, rewards, incentives), employees involvement (participation of employees in decision making process), purpose and direction (clarity of goals and expectation). As an idea with multiple dimensions and facts job satisfaction has been defined as a global construct. It explain what an individual get offered and what one wants from their job. Job satisfaction indicates the attitude and reaction a person or employees perceive about their job and their organization in which they work. We can describe job satisfaction as employees effective reaction to the job. We can assume that job satisfaction is an employees reaction for their treatment they receive in organization by comparing their actual outcomes and desired outcomes.

1.3 Impact of three types of Organization Justice on Job Satisfaction:

Various literatures describes the impact of three types of organization justice on job satisfaction

1.3.1 Distributive justice impact on job satisfaction

Distributive justice can lead to dissatisfaction in employees. It affect an employees when he compare his own salary with other employees and when the rewards for work is not equal in organization for everyone. If employees at same level gets different responsibilities or get appreciation which is less for the same job then employee may feel dissatisfied thereby showing impact of distributive justice on job satisfaction

1.3.2 Procedural justice impact on job satisfaction

Procedural justice can lead to employees dissatisfaction in the organization when decision are taken that effects all the members. Hence, when any manger or leader take decision regarding any project, in respect of his/her subordinates or team member then it is supervisor's first responsibilities to concern or inform his subordinate and ensure their input is considered and any valid changes suggested are incorporated according. Leader should always keep in mind that the they should provide extra information to workers when requested in unbiased manner.

1.3.3 Interactional justice impact on job satisfaction

Interactional justice effects direction and purpose of employees at workplace. Thus employees must have a clarity of his goals and roles. He must have a whole idea of what is expected from him. Rather than only involved in his work he has to have knowledge about what is going in organization. Workers must have confidence about their work that the work and time he or she is investing is making some difference in shaping the future of organization

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are different research studies in which negative impacts are found on the aims of workers to renounce their professions dependent on procedural equity and interactional equity. In some other researches positive relations have been found between aspects of hierarchical equity on authoritative responsibility, procedural equity and interactional equity.

McFarlin and Sweeny (1992) procedural equity concerns the subordinates view of decency of the considerable number of procedures utilized by their bosses to assess their execution, to impart execution criticism and to decide their prizes. Workers for the most part believe systems to be reasonable. Procedural equity is a vital indicator of working environment mentalities and practices. It influences assessments of associations, experts, and runs and is emphatically identified with hierarchical citizenship practices and occupation fulfillment (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Sweeney and McFarlin Senior member, 1993; Clay-Warner et al. 2005)

(Greenberg 1987; 1990) study was concerned with how people perceive and react to fairness in work related contexts (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Ploy hart & Ryan, 1997). Organizational justice has received much attention because many important organizational attitudes and behaviors can be directly linked to employees' perception of fairness (Roch & Shanock, 2006). Even though various types of justice exist, two in particular have received the greatest attention from researchers (Greenberg, 1990) - employees' response to the outcomes that they receive, and the procedure (means) by which they acquire the outcomes (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Individual judgements of the fairness of outcomes are referred to as distributive justice (Leventhal, 1976), whilst individual perceptions of fairness of the procedure used to decide the outcomes are referred to as procedural justice. Both of these concepts are widely used to evaluate perceptions of fairness in the workplace and have been found to be associated with a wide variety of employee attitudes such as organizational commitment (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), job and pay satisfaction (Clay-Warner et al.,

2005; Colquitt et al., 2001; Sweeney & McFarlin Dean, 1993), and organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, 1991). A third, less well researched type of organizational justice, interactional justice was proposed by Bies and Moag (1986) and defined as the fairness of the interpersonal treatment that one receives. The theoretical distinction between these three dimensions of organizational justice has received empirical support in a number of meta-analytical studies (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

There are different research studies in which negative impacts are found on the aims of workers to renounce their professions dependent on procedural equity and interactional equity. In some other research examines positive relations have been found between aspects of hierarchical equity on authoritative responsibility, procedural equity and interactional equity. Yaghoubi, M., et al. (2009) in her exploration demonstrated that there is a noteworthy connection between authoritative equity and occupation fulfillment (Yaghoubi et al., 2009). SeyyedJavadin; Farahi; and TaheriAtar. (2008) showed the impact of the different elements of hierarchical equity on various parts of occupation fulfillment.

As indicated by the kind of employment and individual abilities, work fulfillment will be accomplished if the measure of installment is reasonable. Clearly, no one needs to get cash at any expense. Numerous individuals intentionally want to get less cash yet work some place that is predictable with their wants or where they feel less segregation.

Deconinck and Sitwell (2001) studied that procedural justice is most effected predictor of satisfaction with manger while distributive is strong reason of payment satisfaction. Positive correlation has been found by zainlipour, fini and mirkamali (2010) between dimensions of organization justices with heads, colleagues and satisfaction and promotions

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Objective

- To determine the relationship between perceived organization justices and job satisfaction
- To determine the impact of perceived organization justice on job satisfaction

3.2 Hypothesis

In order to attain objective the hypothesis framed were

- *Hypothesis for Objective 1:*

H0: There is no relationship between organization justice and job satisfaction

H1: There is relationship between organization justices and job satisfaction

- *Hypothesis for Objective 2:*

H0: There is no impact of organization justice on job satisfaction

H1: There is impact of organization justice on job satisfaction

3.3 Reasearch Design

Research design used for this study is descriptive design. Descriptive research design is a scientific method which involve observing and describing the subject behavior without influencing it

3.4 Research Sample

- Sampling Technique : Simple Random sampling
- Sample size: 103 respondents
- Sample composition / sample unit – Employees working in various public sector organization
-

3.5 Mode of Data Collection:

Both primary and secondary data have been used in the study. Primary data was collected with the help of standardized questionnaire

The secondary sources of information were gathered from books, journals, papers and internet regarding organization justice and job satisfaction. Related academic books, reviewing books were also used to get knowledge about the topic

3.6 Instrument Used

Questionnaire for organization justices was taken from moor man (1991) and for job satisfaction questionnaire was by Paul E. Spector (1994)

3.7 Area of Study

Participant belongs from different company across various cities namely Delhi Ncr, Bangalore, Hyderabad, and Dhanbad.

3.8 VARIABLE UNDER STUDY

For the purpose of study the various dependent and independent variables are identified as mentioned below

- **Independent variable**
 - Distributive Justice: This justice deals with the employees' concerns about the fairness of outcomes they receive.
 - Procedural Justice: Procedural justice is concerned with how employees view the fairness of process and policies.
 - Interactional justice: Degree to which the employee is affected by decision and whether they are treated by dignity and respect.
- **Dependent variable**
 - Compensation – Compensation is a cash or non-cash payment employees receive in exchange of their work they do in job
 - Employee involvement – The direct participation of employees to help an organization to fulfill mission and meet objectives by applying idea, efforts towards decision making and solving problem
 - Purpose & direction- This means proper communication of organization purpose and employees responsibilities towards its employer.

3.8 Data Collection Tool

Correlation and regression analysis is used in SPSS in order to achieve the objective of study

4.1 DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

In this data analysis, interpretation, verification by done using SPSS statistical tools

4.1 Reliability Analysis

The observation and interpretation of reliability is as shown below

Table 4.1:Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.922	36

Interpretation: The questionnaire includes 36 questions. By seeing Cronbach Alpha value in the above table we can interpret that the value of cronbacha is .922 which state that the questionnaire used is reliable as the cronbach's alpha value should be greater than 0.07

4.2 Correlation Analysis

The observation and interpretation of correlation analysis are as shown below:

4.2.1 Assumed correlation

H0-There is no relationship between perceived organization justices and job satisfaction

H1-There is relationship between perceived organization justices and job satisfaction

4.2.2 Observation

The observation obtained on the basis of correlation analysis is as shown in table 4.2

Table 4.2: Correlation Analysis

		DJ	PJ	ID	COMPENSATION	EMPLOYEES INVOLVEMENT	PURPOSE AND DIRECTION
DJ	Pearson Correlation	1	.613**	.666**	.407**	.314**	.257**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.001	.009
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
PJ	Pearson Correlation	.613**	1	.723**	.429**	.404**	.369**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
ID	Pearson Correlation	.666**	.723**	1	.588**	.488**	.471**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
COMPENSATION	Pearson Correlation	.407**	.429**	.588**	1	.601**	.608**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
EMPLOYEES INVOLVEMENT	Pearson Correlation	.314**	.404**	.488**	.601**	1	.649**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
PURPOSE AND DIRECTION	Pearson Correlation	.257**	.369**	.471**	.608**	.649**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102

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

4.2.3 Interpretation

As $p < 0.05$ for all the three organization justice variables with that of job satisfaction variables. Therefore null hypothesis is rejected and it can be stated that there is strong correlation between organization justices and job satisfaction

4.3 Regression Analysis

4.3.1 Assumed hypothesis

Ho: There is no impact of organization justice on job satisfaction

Ha: There is impact of organization justices on job satisfaction

4.3.2 Observation

The regression analysis was undertaken to determine the impact three type of organization justices variables on each of the job satisfaction variables namely compensation, employees involvement and purpose & direction

4.3.2.1 Impact of organizational justice on compensation

Table 4.3: Model summary-Compensation

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.588 ^a	.346	.326	2.980

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ

Interpretation: In the above table $R=0.588$, $R\text{ Square}= .346$ and $\text{Adjusted } R\text{ square}= .326$ which means that 32.6 variation in job satisfaction is caused due to perceived organization injustices

Table 4.4: Anova-Compensation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	459.945	3	153.315	17.262	.000 ^a
	Residual	870.379	98	8.881		
	Total	1330.324	101			

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ
b. Dependent Variable: COMPENSATION

Interpretation: The above anova table shows that overall significance of the model is at confidence interval. Since p value is 0.00 which is less than 0.005 so this, model is accepted as a good fit

Table 4.5: Coefficients-compensation

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	7.500	1.962		3.823	.000
DJ	.030	.120	.029	.255	.800
PJ	.002	.134	.001	.011	.991
ID	.376	.086	.567	4.382	.000

a. Dependent Variable: COMPENSATION

Interpretation: As beta value is found to be 56.7 % is clearly indicating the model has good predictive power
 Job Satisfaction = 7.500 + 0.367 × Interactional justice (4.1)

4.3.2.2 Impact of Organizational Justices on Employees Involvement

Table 4.6: Model summary-Employees Involvement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.495 ^a	.245	.222	2.711

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ

Interpretation: In the above table R=0.495, R Square= .245 and Adjusted R square= .222 which means that 22.2% variation in job satisfaction is caused due to perceived organization injustices

Table 4.7: Anova-Employees Involvement

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	233.713	3	77.904	10.602	.000 ^a
	Residual	720.130	98	7.348		
	Total	953.843	101			

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ
 b. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEES INVOLMENT

Interpretation: In the above anova table it shows that the overall significance of the model at confidence interval whether is a good fit or not. Since p value =0.00 which is less than 0.005 so this means that the above model is accepted as a good fit

Table 4.8: Coefficient- Employees Involvement

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	9.808	1.785		5.495	.000
DJ	-.044	.109	-.049	-.403	.688
PJ	.112	.122	.120	.915	.362
ID	.243	.078	.434	3.120	.002

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEES INVOLMENT

Interpretation: As beta value is found to be 43.4 % is clearly indicating the model has good predictive power

$$\text{Job Satisfaction} = 9.808 + 0.243 \times \text{Interactional justice} \quad (4.2)$$

4.3.2.3 Impact of organizational justices on purpose & direction

Table 4.9: Model summary-Purpose & direction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.481 ^a	.231	.208	3.225

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ

Interpretation: The above table shows that 20.8 % variation in direction and purpose is caused due to perceived justices

Table 4.10: Anova: Purpose & direction

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	306.775	3	102.258	9.832	.000 ^a
	Residual	1019.303	98	10.401		
	Total	1326.078	101			

a. Predictors: (Constant), ID, DJ, PJ

b. Dependent Variable: PURPOSE AND DIRECTION

Interpretation: The above anova table examines the overall significance of the model at confidence interval, whether is a good fit or not. Since p value=0.00 which is less than 0.05 so this model is accepted as a good fit

Table 4.11: Coefficient-Purpose & direction

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.187	2.123		5.269	.000
	DJ	-.131	.129	-.124	-1.009	.315
	PJ	.105	.145	.095	.719	.474
	ID	.320	.093	.484	3.451	.001

a. Dependent Variable: PURPOSE AND DIRECTION

Interpretation: As beta value is found to be 48.4 % is clearly indicating the model has good predictive power

$$\text{Job Satisfaction} = .11.187 + 0.320 \times \text{Interactional justice} \quad (4.3)$$

4.3.3 Interpretation

As $p < 0.05$. Therefore null hypothesis is rejected. Hence it can be state that organization justice has impact on all variables of Job satisfaction namely compensation, employees involvement and purpose & direction

5. FINDINGS

On the basis of correlation and regression analysis it was found that organization justices has a major impact on job satisfaction of employees. Clearly employees who perceives that they are not been treated fairly are not satisfied with their job. The regression and correlation analysis clearly reveals that there is strong correlation between perception of organization justice and job satisfaction.

Further analysis reveal that out of all type of organizational justice interactional justice has a upper hand on perception of employees job satisfaction. Hence regression analysis was undertaken to determine and predict the impact of perception of organization justice on job satisfaction of employee and analysis reveal that there is a cause-effect relationship between perception of organization justice and job satisfaction .thus prediction equation were obtained for the measuring the impact of perception towards three type of organization justice and each of the job satisfaction variables. The equations obtained are eq:4.1,eq:4.2,eq:4.3

The predication equation clearly indicates that poor perception of organization justices can make employee feel that he is not rightly paid. On addition an employees may also show poor job involvement and may lack direction and purpose

6. CONCLUSION

Job satisfaction is vital for organization success. Lack of job satisfaction often lead to lack of organization commitment. Hence the strong association found between perception towards organization justice and job satisfaction indicates that there is strong need for organization to ensure that the employees feel fairly treated as employee perceived towards organization justices was found to have cause-effect relation with job satisfaction. Hence there are lot of chances that employees may be suffering from towards job satisfaction across various organization as majority of researches proves that employees often feel that they are not fairly treated and their organization is not impassion towards them. Paving way for poor perception of organization justice among employees across global. This organization should take strong measure to change the perception of employees towards organization justices as this will lead to increase job satisfaction enhancing the perception of employees which in turn will help increase organization productivity and help the organization to achieve its goal. Thus in nutshell it can be stated that making employees have a positive perception towards organization justice will help the organization to gain a competitive edge over others. The outcome of study can also help in prediction job satisfaction and the basis of employees perception towards organization justice .thus paving way for the organization to take a step forward towards their employees to understand how they feel about them

7. RECOMMENDATION

Job satisfaction is very important factor for every employees of any organization. Employees are the most important assets for all organization. Injustices in organization are the biggest factor that effects the commitment of organization. Hence following are the recommendation that may help organization enhance employees their perception towards organization justices

- Organization should focus and try to avoid injustices
- All the employees should be treated equally
- While making any decision regarding employees or work, employees should be participated in process and their idea should be considered
- There should be clarity and transparency in various human resources activities ,like performance appraisal incentives, promotion etc. in organization
- Employees must have some clear goal from organization and able to understand where he is going in organization. Also organization should ensure that employees understand their contribution to organization in terms of profitability so that their goals are align with the objective of organization

8. SCOPE OF FUTURE RESEARCH

Since the study was conducted only taking employees of few companies it could be conducted for specific organization and also at different branches of same organization. Alongside a similar study with a bigger sample size can be undertaken. A comparative study can also be undertaken across various sectors

REFERENCE

- [1] Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, pp. 267- 299). New York: Academic Press. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- [2] Ahmadi, S.A.A., Daraei, M.R., Rabiei, H., & Takallo, Y.S.H. (2012). The study on relationship between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intentions a comparison between public sector and private sector. *International Business Management*, 6(1), pp. 22-31. doi: 10.3923/ibm.2012.22.31
- [3] Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1(2), pp. 177-198. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048015>
- [4] Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S., & Chen, Z.X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), pp. 267-285. doi: 10.1002/job.138
- [5] Assmar, E.M.L., Ferreira, M.C., & Souto, S.D.O. (2005). Justiça organizacional: umarevisãocrítica da literatura. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 18(3), pp. 443-453. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722005000300019>
- [6] Beuren, I.M., Klein, L., Lara, F.L., & Almeida, L.B. (2016). Percepção de justiça nos sistemas de controle gerencial aumentam comprometimento e confiança dos gestores? *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 20(2), pp. 216-237. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2016140083>
- [7] Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), pp. 43-55.
- [8] Chetty, K., & Neeraja, B. (2017). A study on impact of organizational justice perception on job satisfaction: Indian software employees' perspective. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 15(4), pp. 387-399.
- [9] Choi, S. (2011). Organizational justice and employee work attitudes: The federal case. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(2), pp. 185-204. doi: 10.1177/0275074010373275
- [10] Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), pp. 278-321. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- [11] Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), pp. 386-400. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386
- [12] Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O.L.H., & Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), pp. 425-445. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.425
- [13] Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(1), pp. 55-61. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.1.55>

- [14] Greenberg, J. (1993a). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In: Cropanzano, R. (Org.). Justice in the workplace: approaching fairness in human resource management. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [15] Greenberg, J. (1993b). Justice and organizational citizenship: A commentary on the state of the science. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), pp. 249-256. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01419448>
- [16] Klendauer, R., & Deller, J. (2009). Organizational justice and managerial commitment in corporate mergers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(1), pp. 29-45. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910922528>
- [17] Konovsky, M.A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), pp. 489-511. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(00\)00042-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00042-8)
- [18] Lai Wan, H. (2007). Human capital development policies: enhancing employees' satisfaction. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(4), pp. 297-322. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590710746450>

