
Organizational justice as antecedent of Job satisfaction: An empirical study among information technology professional

* R. Uma

** Dr K.P Balakrishnan

ABSTRACT

Organizational actions involving distribution of resources, procedures involved in decisions concerning the distribution and the nature of communication for conveying the decisions are evaluated by the employees for their fairness. Organizational justice is the employee perception of the fairness of the organizational actions and decisions. The perception of justice (fairness) an employee holds towards organizational actions shapes the employee attitude and behavior. Organizational justice – outcome relationship have been widely investigated and organizational justice is found to promote job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust. This research work has specifically investigated the impact of the dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional justice) on job satisfaction among professionals employed in Information technology industry. A sample of 173 respondents was collected by convenience sampling method. Data was analyzed by Pearson's correlation and multiple regression using SPSS. The results have proven organizational justice as significantly related to job satisfaction. Distributive and procedural justice was found to be strong predictors of job satisfaction.

Keywords: Organizational justice, Job satisfaction, Distributive justice, Procedural Justice, Transactional justice.

The pet milk theory advocates the concept – “happy workers are productive workers.” Job satisfaction is an indicator of employee happiness in the workplace and is strongly linked to employee job performance. The meta-analytic study of (Judge et.al., 2001), the conceptual review of (Duggah, 2014) and the empirical works of (Inuwa, 2016) & (Khan et.al., 2012) have proven job satisfaction to influence employee job performance. Due to the importance of employee job satisfaction for its ability in promoting job performance, it becomes significant to analyze the antecedent impact of variables that leads to employee job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an attitudinal component and is defined as the amount of happiness and contentment an employee associates with the job. The determinants of job satisfaction constitute - individual factors, nature of the job and situational factors. Organizational justice is a situational factor which is established as a predictor of job satisfaction. Organizational justice refers to the employee perception of the behavior of the organization, which shapes the attitude of the employees towards the organization. The dimensions of organizational justice include – distributive justice, procedural justice and transactional justice. Employees react to the fair (justice) practices inside the organization and one such reaction is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is the response of the employee for the fair treatment (justice) received by them inside the organization. The need for organizational justice and its importance in forging strong employer-employee relationship and promoting effective team work is underscored by (Cropanzano et.al., 2007).

Organizations are closely coordinated social systems for the attainment of certain goals, with focus on profit. The relationship that governs the employer-employee is based on “quid pro quo” – giving something in exchange for receiving something. Employees offer their labor (physical/ mental) for compensation/ benefits from the organization. Though the exchange relationship is dominated by socio-economic motive, there exists a common human need for equal treatment inside the organization. Employee job satisfaction is not limited to fulfillment of physiological, safety, security, social and esteem needs but includes fulfillment of the need for fairness (justice) in the methods they are treated within the organization.

The antecedent ability of organizational justice with respect to job satisfaction rests on the foundation of the motivational theory of needs and equity theory. Needs are connected with satisfaction. Satisfaction is the contentment, which an individual experiences when a need is fulfilled. Needs arise out of the physiological or psychological imbalance experienced by the individual. Fulfillment of needs makes an individual satisfied and non-fulfillment leads to frustration. Organization is a place which offers the employees a platform for satisfying the physiological, security, social, esteem needs. Along with these -----

* Assistant Professor Department of Business Administration NIFT - TEA College of Knitwear Fashion (Affiliated to Bharathiar University).

** Principal NIFT - TEA College of Knitwear Fashion (Affiliated to Bharathiar University)

needs, employees also feel the need for organizational justice. Inside an organization, an employee's need for justice is said to be fulfilled, when the employee perceives fairness in the organizational policies, procedures and practices (degree of fairness in the distribution of rewards, the procedure used in determining the distribution and the method of interpersonal communication determines job satisfaction). Distributive justice satisfies the economic need of employees through a system of fair compensation. Procedural justice satisfies the social need of employees through a system of procedural fairness which creates trust among employees towards organization and superiors, thereby offering a platform for harmonious interpersonal relationship. Transactional justice satisfies the status and esteem needs of employees through maintaining dignity and politeness in the communication process, as dignity and polite treatment is a symbol of respect an employee garners inside the organization. When the employees perceive the organizational environment as fair, their need for justice is fulfilled and leads to development of favorable attitude among them. Job satisfaction being attitudinal, is a consequence of the fair perception associated with employee experience of the treatment meted out to him in the organization. When the justice perception is high, it enhances job satisfaction (Choudhary et al., 2013).

According to the equity theory of motivation, employees are motivated to fulfill the need for maintaining fairness in the exchange relationship between their efforts (inputs) and rewards (outcomes). Labor is exchanged for benefits. When the employee perceives the outcome – input ratio as fair, his need for fairness in the exchange relation is fulfilled and makes him satisfied with the job. The above theories offer credibility for the antecedent power of organizational justice with respect to job satisfaction.

Organizational justice is the aggregate of distributive, procedural and transactional justice. Together the three elements determine the overall fairness perception. But each dimension of justice is distinct in composition and differs in predicting organizational outcomes. Hence from an organizational context each of these dimensions must be individually examined for its antecedent value. The work of (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009) have established that though distributive justice, procedural justice and transactional justice together constitute organizational justice and are correlated, they must be treated as three different components working together for overall justice. The work of (Colquitt, 2011) endorsed the four component conceptualization (distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice) of organizational justice and proved that the four components vary in their impact in producing organizational outcomes. The study by (Folger & Konovsky, 1986) analyzed the consequences of distributive and procedural justice in which distributive justice was proven as significantly related to outcome satisfaction and procedural justice to be significant in relation with organizational commitment and trust. (Moorman, 1991) have confirmed the distinction between procedural and interactional justice. This research work has examined both the aggregate impact of organizational justice in promoting job satisfaction and also the individual impact of each dimension on the elements of job satisfaction

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Organizational justice

Organizational justice as a concept saw a phased growth. The first phase began with the equity theory of Adam's which was concerned with the maintenance of balance in the relationship between employee effort (input) and benefit (outcome). Imbalance in the relation affects employee behavior. The equity theory emphasized equality in the distribution of resources/ rewards and the notion of organizational justice in the initial period was limited only to the "distributive" aspect. The second phase began with the work of Levanthal (1980) who underscored the need for fairness in the decision making procedures that dealt with the distribution of resources. Procedures that are followed in resource allocation must be fair and fairness in the decision making process and procedures was termed as "procedural justice". The third phase was about the fairness in the interaction/ communication process between superiors and subordinates involved in the distribution of resources and decision making process in organization. Bies & Moag (1986) pioneered the importance of fairness in communication process. The need for fairness in the communication process refers to the dignity and respect in the interaction process involving superiors and subordinates and the need for information accuracy in communication. "Transactional justice" was the term given for fairness in communication process. Justice in organizational context was studied from three different perspectives until 1987, when Greenberg coined the term "Organizational Justice" and defined as the employee evaluation of the behavior of the organization, bringing under its fold distributive, procedural and transactional dimensions.

Organizational Justice and job satisfaction

The study by (Ajala, 2017), (Mahboob, 2017) and (Ali&Omran, 2019) have confirmed all the three dimensions of organizational justice as having significant relation with job satisfaction. The work of (Alzubi, 2010) has proven employee perception of organizational justice as an antecedent of job satisfaction. Employee perception of fairness in the reward system (distributive justice) inside the organization as a cause for job satisfaction is established by (Bakhshiet.al.,2009) and (Sethi et.al., 2013). The work of (Choudharyet.al., 2011) offers a theoretical reason behind the antecedent ability of organizational justice in promoting job satisfaction. According to the authors employee perception of fairness in outcomes, procedures and interpersonal exchanges shapes their attitudes. (Choudharyet.al., 2013) have established that higher the perception of justice, higher the level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction being an attitudinal component is determined by organizational justice. This theoretical underpinning have been empirically proven by (Dundar and Tabancali, 2002) in their study and have concluded that whenever employee perception of organizational justice rises, there is a corresponding rise in job satisfaction. (Fattet.al.,2010) have underscored a weak relation between distributive justice and job satisfaction and a strong relation between procedural justice and job satisfaction. The predictive power of distributive and interactional justice in promoting job satisfaction is proven by (Menon&Wadke, 2016). The work of (Nurak& Riana, 2017) found interactional justice and informational justice as valid predictors of job satisfaction, whereas distributive and procedural justice was found non-significant. In the work of (Pieters, 2018), interpersonal justice was confirmed as the strong predictor of job satisfaction. (Sia& Tan, 2016) confirmed the role of distributive justice and interactional justice as positively affecting job satisfaction but not procedural justice. The work of (Usmani and Jamal, 2013) is significant as it involved the elements of temporal justice (time) and spatial justice (resource distribution) besides the three components of organizational justice for their impact on job satisfaction and concluded that distributive, interactional and temporal justice as significantly related to job satisfaction. The work of (Yaghoubiet.al., 2012) have confirmed the positive relation between all the three components of organizational justice with job satisfaction. The effect of all the three dimensions of organizational justice on the determinants of job satisfaction (supervision, coworkers, pay, promotion and nature of job) was analyzed and it was established that procedural justice was positively correlated with all the elements of job satisfaction whereas distributive justice and interactional justice positively related with all the elements of job satisfaction excepting the nature of the job (Zainalipour et.al., 2010).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To investigate the impact of organizational justice in promoting job satisfaction among professionals employed in the Information technology industry.
- To investigate the impact of the different dimensions of organizational justice towards the various elements of job satisfaction among professionals employed in the Information technology industry.

HYPOTHESIS

H₀₁: There is no significant relation between job content and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₂: There is no significant relation between work environment and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₃: There is no significant relation between leadership style and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₄: There is no significant relation between equal pay for equal work and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₅: There is no significant relation between promotion chances and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₆: There is no significant relation between interpersonal relation and the dimensions of organizational justice.

H₀₇: There is no significant relation between job security and the dimensions of organizational justice.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

The respondents for the study are professionals in the Information Technology industry in Coimbatore district of Tamilnadu. The sample size is 173. Convenience sampling technique was employed in the research study. Structured questionnaire was constructed to tap the respondent opinion towards organizational justice and job satisfaction. Pearson's Correlation and Multiple regression Analysis using SPSS were the statistical techniques employed for data analysis.

Organizational justice Questionnaire

The three dimensions of Organizational justice were measured involving 11 attributes. A five point Likert Rating scale was used and respondents recorded their ratings on the scale of 1 to 5. (1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree).

| Variable | Dimensions | Attributes |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Organizational Justice | Distributive Justice | Fairness in reward allocation according to experience |
| | | Fairness in reward allocation according to efforts |
| | | Fairness in workload |
| | | Fairness in promotion |
| | Procedural Justice | Work place decisions are taken by executives in unbiased manner. |
| | | Executives get opinion of all employees before making decisions |
| | | Decisions are based on accurate information |
| | | All employees are treated as the same |
| | Transactional Justice | Superior treats subordinates in a polite manner |
| | | Superior treats with subordinates with dignity |
| | | Superior communicates information on a timely manner |

Job satisfaction questionnaire

The questionnaire on job satisfaction involved 7 elements – job content, work environment, leadership style, equal pay for equal work, chances for promotion, interpersonal relation and job security. Respondents rated their satisfaction towards the elements on a 5 point Likert rating scale of 1 to 5. (1= highly dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= neutral, 4= satisfied, 5= highly satisfied).

Reliability analysis

| VARIABLE | Number of items | Cronbach's alpha |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Job satisfaction | 7 | .981 |
| Organizational justice | 11 | .990 |

The Cronbach's alpha values are indicative of the reliability of the measuring scale.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Pearson's Correlation Coefficient between the dimensions of organizational justice and job satisfaction.

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| 1 Job Satisfaction | 1 | | | |
| 2 Distributive Justice | .952* | 1 | | |
| 3 Procedural Justice | .979* | .980* | 1 | |
| 4 Transactional Justice | .952* | .916* | .938* | 1 |

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

The values of correlation coefficient from Table 1 indicate a strong and positive relation between the dimensions of organizational justice and job satisfaction.

Table 2 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of job content and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .956 ^a | .913 | .910 | | .66328 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Job content

Table 2.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 4.029 | .380 | | 10.617 | .001 |
| Distributive Justice | -.199 | .094 | -.381 | -2.116 | .038 |
| Procedural Justice | .667 | .112 | 1.239 | 5.954 | .001 |
| Transactional Justice | .074 | .082 | .093 | .910 | .366 |

Dependent Variable: Job content

Level of significance @5%

From Table 2 the R square value for job content being 0.913(91.3%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 91.3% variation in the job satisfaction element of job content.

From Table 2.1 the significance value for distributive and procedural justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with job content, whereas transactional justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with job content.

Table 3 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of work environment and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .953 ^a | .908 | .904 | | .29750 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Work environment

Table 3.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | .123 | .170 | | .722 | .473 |
| Distributive Justice | -.077 | .042 | -.340 | -1.834 | .071 |
| Procedural Justice | .176 | .050 | .751 | 3.505 | .001 |
| Transactional Justice | .191 | .037 | .547 | 5.211 | .001 |

Dependent Variable: Work environment

Level of significance @5%

From Table 3 the R square value for work environment being 0.908(90.8%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 90.8% variation in the job satisfaction element of work environment.

From Table 3.1 the significance value for procedural and transactional justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with work environment, whereas distributive justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with work environment.

Table 4 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of leadership style and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .952 ^a | .906 | .902 | | .31316 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Leadership style

Table 4.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | .263 | .179 | | 1.470 | .146 |
| Distributive Justice | -.132 | .044 | -.556 | -2.964 | .004 |
| Procedural Justice | .323 | .053 | 1.325 | 6.114 | .001 |
| Transactional Justice | .063 | .039 | .174 | 1.638 | .106 |

Dependent Variable: Leadership style

Level of significance @5%

From Table 4 the R square value for leadership style being 0.906 (90.6%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 90.6% variation in the job satisfaction element of leadership style.

From Table 4.1 the significance value for distributive and procedural justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with leadership style, whereas transactional justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with leadership style.

Table 5 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of equal pay for equal work and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .942 ^a | .887 | .882 | | .37053 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Equal pay for equal work

Table 5.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | -.055 | .212 | | -.258 | .797 |
| Distributive Justice | .113 | .053 | .443 | 2.147 | .035 |
| Procedural Justice | .165 | .063 | .628 | 2.637 | .010 |
| Transactional Justice | -.053 | .046 | -.134 | -1.150 | .254 |

Dependent Variable: Equal pay for equal work

Level of significance @5%

From Table 5 the R square value for equality in pay being 0.887 (88.7%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 88.7% variation in the job satisfaction element of equality in pay.

From Table 5.1 the significance value for distributive and procedural justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with equality in pay, whereas transactional justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with equality in pay.

Table 6 Multiple regression between job satisfaction element of chances for promotion and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .949 ^a | .900 | .896 | | .31231 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Chances for Promotion

Table 6.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | .355 | .179 | | 1.987 | .051 |
| Distributive Justice | .059 | .044 | .257 | 1.332 | .187 |
| Procedural Justice | .164 | .053 | .696 | 3.118 | .003 |
| Transactional Justice | .000 | .039 | .000 | -.003 | .997 |

Dependent Variable: Chances for Promotion

Level of significance @5%

From Table 6 the R square value for chances of promotion being 0.900 (90.0%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 90% variation in the job satisfaction element of chances for promotion.

From Table 6.1 the significance value for procedural justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with chances for promotion, whereas distributive and transactional justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with chances for promotion.

Table 7 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of interpersonal relation and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .932 ^a | .869 | .863 | | .26879 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Interpersonal relation

Table 7.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 1.085 | .154 | | 7.055 | .001 |
| Distributive Justice | -.089 | .038 | -.518 | -2.336 | .022 |
| Procedural Justice | .066 | .045 | .374 | 1.458 | .149 |
| Transactional Justice | .277 | .033 | 1.049 | 8.357 | .001 |

Dependent Variable: Interpersonal relation

Level of significance @5%

From Table 7 the R square value for interpersonal relation being 0.869 (86.9%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 86.9% variation in the job satisfaction element of interpersonal relation.

From Table 7.1 the significance value for distributive and transactional justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with interpersonal relation, whereas procedural justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with interpersonal relation.

Table 8 Multiple regression between the job satisfaction element of job security and the dimensions of organizational justice

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | R | Std. Error Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | .914 ^a | .835 | .828 | | .36511 |

Predictors: transactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice

Dependent variable: Job security

Table 8.1 Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | .742 | .209 | | 3.553 | .001 |
| Distributive Justice | -.025 | .052 | -.122 | -.491 | .625 |
| Procedural Justice | .101 | .062 | .470 | 1.640 | .106 |
| Transactional Justice | .185 | .045 | .576 | 4.101 | .001 |

Dependent Variable: Job security

Level of significance @5%

From Table 8 the R square value for job security being 0.835 (83.5%), meaning that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and transactional) together account for 83.5% variation in the job satisfaction element of job security.

From Table 8.1 the significance value for transactional justice ($p < .05$), indicates a significant relation with job security, whereas distributive and procedural justice with ($p > .05$), indicates a non-significant relation with job security.

CONCLUSION

The correlation analysis indicates a strong and positive relation between the dimensions of organizational justice and job satisfaction. Though organizational justice is positively related to job satisfaction, the predictive ability of the different dimensions of organizational justice with respect to the various elements of job satisfaction varies in their effect. Job content is significant in relation with distributive and procedural justice and not with transactional justice offering weak support for H_{01} . Work environment is significant in relation with procedural and transactional justice and non-significant with distributive justice lending weak support for H_{02} . Leadership style is significant in relation with distributive and procedural justice and non-significant with transactional justice lending weak support for H_{03} . Equal pay for equal work is significant in relation with distributive and procedural justice and non-significant with transactional justice lending weak support for H_{04} . Chance for promotion is significant in relation only with procedural justice and non-significant with distributive and transactional justice offering moderate support for H_{05} . Interpersonal relation is significantly related with distributive and transactional justice and non-significant with procedural justice lending weak support for H_{06} . Job security is significantly related with transactional justice and is non-significant with distributive and procedural justice lending moderate support for H_{07} . The findings are in sync with the works of (Colquitt, 2011) & (Folger & Konovsky, 1986) who underscored the differential impact created by distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice is significant in relation with the job satisfaction elements of job content, leadership style, equal pay for equal for work and interpersonal relationship and non-significant with work environment, promotion and job security. Procedural justice is significant in relation with job content, work environment, leadership style, equal pay for equal work and chances for promotion and non-significant with interpersonal relationship and job security. Transactional justice is significant in relation with only three elements of job satisfaction – work environment, interpersonal relationship and job security. Due to the significant relation of procedural and distributive justice with most of the elements of job satisfaction, procedural and distributive justice are proven as strong predictors of job satisfaction among Information technology professionals. The predictive ability of transactional justice is weak as it is found to be significant only with three elements of job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

-
- Ajala, E.M. (2017). A Relationship Study Between Organizational Justice & Job Satisfaction among Industrial Employees in Ogun State, Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, 20(2), 26 – 42.
- Akbolat, M., Isik, O., Yilmaz, A., & Akca, N. (2015). The Effect of Organizational Justice Perception on Job Satisfaction of Health Employees. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behavior & Decision Sciences*, 1(2), 360 – 372.
- Akram, U., Khan, M.K., Yixin, Q., Bhatti, M.H., Bilal, M., Hashim, M., & Akram, Z. (2016). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction of Banking Employees. *European Journal of Business & Management*, 8(16), 55 – 63.
- Ali, A.J.M., & Omran, S.A. (2019). Organizational Justice and its Role in Achieving Job Satisfaction (An Analytic Study in the Directorate of Baquba Municipality). *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, 9(4), 477 – 489.
- Al-Zubi, H.A. (2010). A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 5(12), 102 – 209.
- Ambrose, M.L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The Role of Overall Justice Judgements in Organizational Justice Research: A Test of Mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94 (2), 491-500.
- Atahayneh, Z.L., Khasawneh, A., & Abedalhafiz, A. (2014). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction as Perceived by Jordanian Physical Education Teachers, 10(4), 131 – 138, doi:10.5539/ass.v10n4p131.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction & Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 4(9), 145 – 154.
- Choudhary, N., Philip, P.J., & Kumar, R. (2011). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Effectiveness. *Industrial Engineering Letters*, 1(3), 18 – 24.
- Choudhary, N., Deswal, R.K., & Philip, P.J. (2013). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employees' Workplace & Personal Outcomes: A Study on Indian Insurance Sector. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(4), 1 -14.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.L.H., & YeeNg, K. (2001). Justice at the Millenium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 425-445.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E., & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34-48.
- Duggah, S.I., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job Satisfaction Theories: Traceability to Employee Performance in Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business & Management*, 16 (5), 11-18.
- Dundar, T., & Tabancali, E. (2012). The Relationship between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Job Satisfaction Levels. *Procedia – Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5777 – 5781, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.513.
- Fatt, C.K., Khin, E.W.S., & Heng, T.N. (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employees Job Satisfaction: The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2(1), 65 – 72.
- 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.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12 (1), 9-22.
- Inuwa, M. (2016). Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance: An Empirical Approach. *The Millenium University Journal*, 1 (1), 90-103.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresan, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The Job Satisfaction – Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative & Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3), 376-407, doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.127.3.376.

Khan, A.H., Nawaz, M.M., Aleem, M., &Hamed, W. (2012). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance: An empirical Study of Autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (7), 2697-2705.

Leventhal, G.S. (1976). What should be done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships.1-52.

Mahboob, F. (2017).Organizational Justice and its impact on Job Satisfaction in Public Sector Universities of Peshawar. *International Journal of Business Studies Review*, 3(2), 1 – 13.

Menon, S., &Wadke, R. (2016).The Effect of Employee Perception of Organizational Justice of Employees in an Airline Company. *International Journal of Management Science & Technology*, 7(12), 446 – 456.

Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (6), 845-855.

Nurak, L.A.D., & Riana, I.G. (2017). Examine the Effect of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *Journal of Management and Marketing Review*, 2(3), 30 – 37.

Pieters, W.R. (2018). Assessing Organizational Justice as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement in Windhoek. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(0), 1 – 11.

Rahman, M., Haque, M., Elahi, F., &Miah, W. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Investigation. *American Journal of Business & Management*, 4(4), 162 – 171, doi: 10.11634/216796061504714.

Sethi, M., Iqbal, H., &Rauf, M.O. (2013).Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and Employee Job satisfaction.*Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 100 – 117.

Sia, L.A., & Tan, T.A.G. (2016).The Influence of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction in a Hotel Setting. *DLSU Business and Economics Review*, 26(1), 17 – 29.

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 & Economics Research*, 2(1), 351 – 383.

Yaghoubi, E., Mashinchi, S.A., Ahmad, E., Hadi, A., & Hamid, E. (2012).An Analysis of Correlation between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(3), 995 – 1002, doi :10.5897/AJBM11.1622.

Zainalipour, H., Fini, A.A.S., &Mirkamali, S.A. (2010). A Study of Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction among School Teachers in Bandar Abbas Middle School. *Procedia Social &Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 1986 – 1990, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.401.

#####