



Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction

Dr. Shahid Jan¹, Muhammad Irshad²

¹Associate Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan

²Ph D Research Scholar, Department of Management Science, Abasyn University Peshawar, Pakistan

Received: September 12, 2014

Accepted: November 23, 2014

ABSTRACT

The success of any organization greatly depends on organization justices, so organizations required to provided good and ethical environment, where perception of organization justices are carefully developed. Organizations in Pakistan have remained under critics regarding fairness and equity in treating their employees, therefore, organization justices seem to be a victim of unfairness and unethical activities. Concerns of employees have always been observed regarding fairness in allocation of resources and employee relationship with their supervisors. The purpose of this study is to examine the nature and prevalence of organization justice and to identify the impact of organization justices on job satisfaction. For this purpose total 140 self-administrative questionnaires were distributed among the employees of Bata shoes company Lahore and Service shoes industry Mureedka Pakistan. The data were analyzed by using statistical test with 5% level of significance and a 1% probability level.

KEYWORDS: Organizational justices, Distributive justice, Procedural justice, Job satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

Presently the world is encountering another budgetary standard described by speed and benefit, which make associations progressively defenseless to the aftermath of untrustworthy choices and potential wrong doing with the expanded examination in both degree and power by the workers, shareholders and general society by and large with respect to these choices. Without comprehension the procedure of moral choice making there is no hope to guarantee moral conclusions and overcome dishonest ones. In a quick paced, worldwide economy where change is steady, it is challenging to improve runs, and regulations for each circumstance, thusly, today's association need to create moral atmospheres where recognitions of organizational justice are deliberately advanced. Organizational justice is acknowledged a pressure gauge of representative's encounters of reasonableness inside their particular organization.

As the management field becomes more sophisticated in its efforts to link individual works attitude to performances the "justice" construct has emerged as a focal variable. One of the biggest challenges facing organization these days is to treat all their employees and customers in a fair and equitable manner. The hypothesis of justice requests that chiefs be guided via decency and value and in addition absence of bias. Justice is a crucial social esteem that persuades conduct around the representatives. The routes in which workers figure out provided that they have been dealt with equitably in their employments, and the courses in which those determinations impact other work identified variables (Moorman, 1991). Along these lines, organizational justice portrays a people experience in an association regarding organizational reasonableness. Organizational justice have been related to work fulfillment, representatives turnover expectation, authority, organizational citizenship, organizational responsibility, trust, client fulfillment, work execution, worker burglary, part broadness, distance and guide part trade. Reasonableness or justice is one of the distractions in numerous viewpoints at the workplace. Questions of equitability are salient where decisions must be made, regarding various aspects of the employee's jobs. Therefore, when decisions are made regarding allocation of resources, hiring of people, dealing with the employees and customers both decisions producers and the individuals who are influenced by these choices are concerned with their honesty. So also choices in regards to arrangement and different changes in organizational working likewise induce one to think about their equitability.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Understanding impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction in shaping work attitude has recently been come under focus. Organizations in Pakistan have remained under critics regarding the

* **Corresponding Author:** Dr. Shahid Jan, Associate Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan shahidjan@awkum.edu.pk

fairness and equity in treating their employees. Therefore, organizational justice seemed to be a victim of unfairness and unethical activities. Concerns of the employees have always been observed regarding fairness in allocations of resources, adoption of procedures and employees relationships with their supervisors and fair treating of decision recipients. The result of such concerns develops in the form of perceptions of the employees qualifying the work behaviors as injustices. The effects are therefore, results in decreased commitment and subsequently job performance (Daft, 2003). Not only do victims directly affected by organizational injustice but also sometimes take retribution actions. Within this context, it was appropriate to conduct research study to determine the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction.

1.2 Research objectives

The main objective of this study was to extent that organizational justice is related to job performance. The specific objectives thus include:

1. To examine the nature and prevalence of organizational justice in organization.
2. To identify the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.
3. To offer recommendations for improving organizational justice in the organization based upon findings of the study.

1.3 Scope of the study

Organizations in Pakistan are contemplating the issue of low performance, poor productivity and decreased job satisfaction. Attempts in this regard have usually been focused around the processes, procedures, structures and resources to make organizations more productive. However, fairness, equity and equality have always been ignored. Human resource is the most significant component of any organization, therefore, it important to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. The present study was conducted to determine the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice alludes to representative recognitions of equitability (Somers 1995). Organizational justice verifiably starts with the work of Adams (1965) on value hypothesis. Value hypothesis is the recorded foundation of organizational justice. Consistent with Adams (1965) a man experiences cognitive disharmony when things don't go in the way as he anticipated. It predicts that people are propelled by the recognition of in value. The hypothesis states that men and ladies are in a nonstop and endless state of social correlation with a referent aggregation of people. Adams conventional hypothesis expects that reactions to injustices are more flow in structure and involve a need to diminish that level of pain or discord made by the unjust state.

People continually measure their apparent inputs and their conclusions as a degree in examination to a referent single person. Adams characterizes the inputs in social trade as qualities and attributes that an individual owns, for example, age, status societal position instruction exertion, capacity or ability and so on. The results are characterized as things or benefits gained in social trade, for example, remunerates cash, expanded status, power or agreeable work/assignments/duties (Greenberg, 1990). Any inequity generates two diverse social conducts, for example, if an unique recognizes inequity on the grounds that his inputs far surpass his results or the other way around one may need that outrage or blame will accompany. The advertising and administration trains have customarily recognized around three sorts of justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Clemmer 1993; Blodgett, Hill, and Tax 1997; Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998; Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith and Bolton 2002). As of late, Greenberg (1993) contended that this universal three element model of justice is better conceptualized as four separate sorts of justices. He proposed that notwithstanding distributive and procedural justice, interactional justice be part into two different sorts of justice: interpersonal justice, characterized as the decency of interpersonal medication furnished throughout the sanctioning of systems and distributions of results, and instructive justice, characterized as the honesty of clarifications and data.

2.2 Distributive justice

Singular's cognitive assessment with respect to whether the measures and portion of prizes in a social setting are reasonable. In basic terms, distributive justice is one's conviction that each one might as well get what they merit. Hence it is the equitability of distributions or designations of prizes. Representative's

observations of distributive justice are identified with alluring results, for example, work fulfillment, organizational responsibility, organizational citizenship conduct, turnover, and execution (Change, 2002).

Distributive justice is the apparent reasonableness of result distributions, and is normally assessed as for the value of the aforementioned conclusion distributions (Adams 1965; Deutsch 1985; Homans 1961). This research shows that the apparent distributive justice of grievance taking care of absolutely influences clients' responses, incorporating fulfillment with the experience (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith and Bolton 2002), result fulfillment (Clemmer 1993), fulfillment with grumbling taking care of (Goodwin and Ross 1992; Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998; Maxham and Netemeyer 2002), repatronage expectations (Blodgett, Hill, and Tax 1997), by and large satisfaction/return plans (Clemmer 1993; Maxham and Netemeyer 2002), and recognitions of equitability (Goodwin and Ross 1992), and diminishes negative expressions of-mouth (Blodgett, Hill, and Tax 1997).

2.3 Procedural justice

Procedural justice is related to the fairness of the procedure used to make a decision. For example, a pay raise may be based on a sales representative selling more units of a product. Some co-workers may consider this procedure to be unfair, believing management should instead base pay raised on dollar volume. This conclusion may be reached because selling 10 products for a low amount of money each contributes very little to company profits and they are at the same time, easier to sell, selling high priced products may take much longer to finalize, but the profits garnered for the company are also higher. In this case, it is not the outcome in dispute which is the amount of the pay received, instead, it is the perceived justice (fairness) of the procedure used to reach the outcome. It is the exchange between the employee and the employing organization (Collquitt, 2001). Cohen and Spector (2001) used a Meta analysis approach for data analysis and revealed that worker assumption of procedural justice are related to all the desirable organizational outcomes. Korsgaard et al. (2001) argued that procedural justice worker better than distributive justice in the area of job satisfaction. Moreover, procedural justice is considered important particularly to successfully implementing organizational changes. Analysts in showcasing have indicated that client observations of procedural justice are dependent upon comfort, adaptability, opportuneness (of reaction), chance to voice, handle control, process information, supportiveness, effectiveness, suspicion of obligation, and catch up (Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998; Clemmer 1993; Conlon and Murray 1996; Goodwin and Ross 1992). Clients' discernments that grumbling taking care of courses of action are reasonable have a positive impact on numerous conclusions, for example, fulfillment with the experience (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith and Bolton 2002), conclusion fulfillment (Clemmer 1993), fulfillment with dissention taking care of (Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar 1998), in general fulfillment (Maxham and Netemeyer 2002), repurchase expectations (Clemmer 1993; Maxham and Netemeyer 2002) and a negative impact on negative expressions of-mouth conducts (Maxham and Netemeyer 2002).

2.4 Organizational Justices and Job Satisfaction

Streams of research have been focused as to how both can be related in different work settings and environment. DeCohinck and Stilwell (2004) in their study examined the relationship around organizational justice, part status, pay fulfillment, work fulfillment, and organizational duty and with drawl comprehensions. Their consequence demonstrated that procedural justice was an immediate indicator of work fulfillment, while distributive justice predicts pay fulfillment. Both justice variables were just roundabout indicators of organizational responsibility part clash was a huge indicator of organizational duty both straightforwardly and in a roundabout way through work fulfillment. Pay fulfillment and administrator fulfillment had an immediate impact on with drawl cognition.

A study was conducted by Rebecca and Anne (2008) to determine the relationship between employees. Perception of organizational justice & trust and employee antisocial organizational behavior and communication their outcomes showed that discernments of justice and trust adversely anticipated backhanded interpersonal animosity, unfriendliness and misleading. Justice and trust together predicted hostility and deception. Post hoc examination showed that justice and trust connected to foresee withdrawn reactions, and trust interceded the relationship between justice and solitary reactions.

Jordan et al (2007) directed study to measure head crate ball mentors' state of mind of three extents of organizational justice and verify if these demeanor diverse dependent upon Ncca divisional participation or sex of the mentor. This study additionally inspected the relationship between distributive, procedural and Interactional justice and in general work fulfillment. The study uncovered that male b-ball mentors showed essentially higher scores on measures of Interactional and procedural justice while no distinctions was

found for distributive justice. There was no noteworthy contrast on scores for the three measurements of justice dependent upon Ncaa divisional enrollment. Aggregately the three sizes of organizational justice clarified 28.5% of different connected with in general work fulfillment with Interactional and distribution justice each one making remarkable commitment.

Literary works uncovered a corresponding approach concerning organizational justice in the area of remuneration. The effects uncovered that representatives recognize pay fulfillments and profit fulfillment procedural justice discernments are preferable indicators over distributive justice recognitions. The outcomes reasoned that distributive justice observations as to pay assume a more paramount part than procedural justice in work fulfillment and fulfillment with the association. In an alternate study, Andrews et al (2008) inspected the impacts of centralization on the relationship between organizational justice and work fulfillment utilizing referent perceptions hypothesis as a hypothetical establishment. Outcomes demonstrated that the relationships between procedural distributive and Interactional justice and work fulfillment are stronger under states of high centralization.

Warner et al (2005) in their study tried three hypotheses about distribution and procedural justice and their connection to work fulfillment. Their outcomes backed the aggregation esteem show more than the particular. Conclusions demonstrate by demonstrating that procedural justice is a more essential indicator of work fulfillment than is distribution justice. Moreover, they thought that that was downsizing does not change their association with work fulfillment.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The employees of Bata Shoes Limited Lahore Pakistan and Service industries Limited Mureedka Pakistan were considered population for this study. Sample size was 140 randomly selected and self-administrative questionnaire was developed for collection of data. Total 140 questionnaires were distributed, 40 among employees of Bata Shoes Lahore Pakistan and 100 questionnaires among employees of Service industries Limited Mureedka Pakistan. Out of which 20 questionnaires received back from Bata Limited Lahore Pakistan and 60 from Service industries Limited Mureedka Pakistan. The collected data were analyzed by applied appropriate statistics test. In order to test that association between organizational justice and job satisfaction, and other variables of interest a Chi-square test was applied at 5% level of significance and a 1% probability level.

3.1 Reliability Analysis of Data

Cronbach's Alpha (α): Cronbach's Alpha (α) determine up to what extent the scale score measures the true score. It indicates the reliability of the scale ranges from 0 to 1. Mathematically, it is defined as (Cronbach, 1951).

$$\alpha = \frac{N \times \bar{c}}{\bar{v} + (N - 1) \times \bar{c}}$$

where, N shows the number of items, \bar{c} is the average inter-item covariance among the items and \bar{v} indicates the average variance.

Guttman Split-Half Reliability: Guttman Split-Half Reliability measures equivalence is also called parallel forms reliability or internal consistency reliability. Mathematically it can be expressed as:

$$r_G = \frac{2(S_t^2 - S_{t1}^2 - S_{t2}^2)}{S_t^2}$$

where,

S_t^2 = total variance of entire scale; S_{t1}^2 = variance of the 1st half of the scale shows; S_{t2}^2 = variance of the 2nd half of the scale.

3.2 Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis is helpful in deciding about the reliability of collected data. In the present investigation, two different approaches viz Cronbach's Alpha (α) and Guttman split-half reliability were used to obtain the said objective. The results of both the methods tabulated below. It is evident that for each data set (distributive justice, procedural justice and job satisfaction) the Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 70%. The data for which the Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 70% suggesting that the data found is

reliable. The same pattern can be seen from Guttman split-half reliability method, taking in to account the upper λ -value (λ_6). Considering the lower value of Cronbach's Alpha and λ_6 , overall data were subjected to reliability and in both the cases; high values of reliability (α and λ_6) were recorded. These results boom the research confidence to perform further analysis needed to obtain the required objectives.

Cronbach's Alpha (α) and Guttman Split-Half Reliability Analysis

Category	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Guttman Split-Half Reliability	
		λ_1	λ_6
Distributive Justice	0.795	0.596	0.768
Procedural Justice	0.894	0.766	0.921
Job Satisfaction	0.786	0.589	0.800

Employee's response for Distributive Justice

Results regarding the distributive justice for employees of Bata and services shoes companies are displayed in Table for the question that up to what extent the employees outcome reflects the effort s/he have put into their work. Result indicates that 2.5% of the employees from Bata were strongly disagreed and no employees of Service showed this type of opinion. The percentage of employees regarding the extent to which their outcome reflects the efforts he/she have put in their work was higher about "agree" in Service as compared to the employees of Bata. About the same statement, similar higher percentage was recorded for Service employees in comparison to Bata employees.

Tabulation of data for the question that up to what extent which reflects the efforts put into the work by the employees

Response	To what extent your outcome reflects the effort you have put into your work		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	2 (2.5)	-	2 (2.5)
Disagree	-	11 (13.8)	11 (13.8)
Undecided	10 (12.5)	21 (26.2)	31 (38.8)
Agree	6 (7.5)	26 (32.5)	32 (40.0)
Strongly agree	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	4 (5.0)
Total	20 (25)	60 (75)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 12.538, P-value = 0.014; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

Respondent response shows that the outcome of employees is justified in terms of his/her performance. Only 1.2% respondents showed their concern as "Strongly disagree" by Bata but none of the employees of Service did so. Maximum (13.8%) of employee of the Bata were "Agree" while 2.5% were "Strongly agree" with the given statement. Only 4 (5%) responded to "Undecided" about the question under investigation. On the other hand, majority (28.8%) of the Service employees showed their concern as "Undecided" 8.8% "Disagree", 27.5% "Agree" and 10% "Strongly agree".

Tabulation of the data for the question up to what extent that the outcome is justified based on the performance of employees

Response	Your outcome is justified given your performance		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	1 (1.2)	-	1 (1.2)
Disagree	2 (2.5)	7 (8.8)	9 (11.2)
Undecided	4 (5.0)	23 (28.8)	27 (33.8)
Agree	11 (13.8)	22 (27.5)	33 (41.2)
Strongly agree	2 (2.5)	8 (10.0)	10 (12.5)
Total	20 (25.0)	60 (75)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 5.886, P-value = 0.208; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

Results for the question "that up to what extent employee are fairly (distributive justice) treated by the organization i.e. Bata and Service. It is evident that maximum 11 (13.8%) employees "Undecided" about

the statement of both Bata and Service employees. Only 32 (40%) and 3(3.8%) employees of Service and Bata respectively were agree with the given statement. Of the 25% interviewed employees of Bata, 3(3.8%) are found “Strongly agree”, while 2 (2.5%) of Service employees showed the same response.

Tabulation of data for the question that up to what extent distributive justice are fairly followed in this organization

Response	To what extent your organization fairly followed distributive justice		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	2 (2.5)	3 (3.8)	5 (6.2)
Disagree	1 (1.2)	6 (7.5)	7 (8.8)
Undecided	11 (13.8)	17 (21.2)	28 (35.0)
Agree	3 (3.8)	32 (40.0)	35 (43.8)
Strongly agree	3 (3.8)	2 (2.5)	5 (6.2)
Total	20 (25.0)	60 (75.0)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 12.381, P-value = 0.015; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

Employees response for procedural Justice

Respondent information about the extent which reflects the influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures by the Bata and Service, in terms of various responses. It is evident that maximum percent of Service employees showed “Agree” to the extent that influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures which is nearly 2-fold in comparison to the employees of Bata. In comparison to the employees of Service, minimum percent of the employees of Bata were “Disagree” with the given statement.

Tabulation of data up to what extent that the outcome influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures

Response	You have had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	1 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	3 (3.8)
Disagree	1 (1.2)	13 (16.2)	14 (17.5)
Undecided	5 (6.2)	19 (23.8)	24 (30)
Agree	13 (16.2)	23 (28.8)	36 (45)
Strongly agree	-	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)
Total	20 (25)	60 (75)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 6.085, P-value = 0.193; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

Responses of employees show that the outcome is justified in terms of procedures that have been applied consistently. Maximum employees (15% and 26.2%) showed their response as “Undecided” while 6.2% and 20% were “Agree” with the given statement are the employees of Bata and Service respectively. Maximum (18.8%) of Service employees were opted “Disagree” regarding the problem concerned. Only one employees from Bata and four employees from Service showed their concern as “Strongly agree”. A great deal of deviation between Bata and Service regarding the problem under consideration was recorded.

Tabulation of data up to what extent that the outcome of the employee’s are justified in terms of procedures applied consistently

Response	Those procedures have been applied consistently		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	1 (1.2)	4 (5)	5 (6.2)
Disagree	1 (1.2)	15 (18.8)	16 (20)
Undecided	12 (15.0)	21 (26.2)	33 (41.2)
Agree	5 (6.2)	16 (20)	21 (26.2)
Strongly agree	1 (1.2)	4 (5)	5 (6.2)
Total	20 (25)	60 (75)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 5.422, P-value = 0.247; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

Tabulated data indicates the results pertaining to the association between the stated problem of procedural justice and employees of Service & Bata shoes limited. Within the employees of Bata, maximum (12.5%) were “Strongly agree” with the statement that the procedural justice are fairly followed. On the other hand, within the employees of Service, maximum (30%) were unable to decide (Undecided) while 27.5% were “Agree” with the statement. Remaining were found disagree.

Tabulation data for the question that up to what extent procedural justice are fairly followed in this organization

Response	Procedures justice have been followed fairly		Total
	Organization		
	Bata	Service	
Strongly disagree	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	4 (5)
Disagree	-	7 (8.8)	7 (8.8)
Undecided	4 (5)	24 (30)	28 (35)
Agree	4 (5)	22 (27.5)	26 (32.5)
Strongly agree	10 (12.5)	5 (6.2)	15 (18.8)
Total	20 (25)	60 (75)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 20.552, P-value = 0.000; values in parenthesis are the percentages.

3.3 Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

3.3.1 Association between Distributed Justices and Job Satisfaction

Results pertaining to the association between distributed justice and that of job satisfaction are tabulated below. It indicates a significant ($P < 0.05$) association between the studied attributes i.e. distributed justice and that of job satisfaction. It suggests that distributed justice and the job satisfaction are two dependent variables and can not be addressed separately. Majority of the respondents showed their concerned to the category “3” and “e” of the distributed justice and job satisfaction respectively. It suggests that only 15% of the employees were “undecided” to like their jobs. However, the percentage of those who love their job and strongly agree to show their concern was very low i.e. (3.8%).

Association between Distributed Justice and Job Satisfaction

Distributed Justice	Job Satisfaction							Total
	a	b	C	d	E	f	g	
1	-	-	-	1 (1.2)	-	-	4 (5)	5 (6.2)
2	-	-	-	5 (6.2)	2 (2.5)	-	-	7 (8.8)
3	-	-	-	4 (5)	12 (15)	3 (3.8)	9 (11.2)	28 (35)
4	-	-	2 (2.5)	4 (5)	9 (11.2)	5 (6.2)	15 (18.8)	35 (43.8)
5	-	-	-	2 (2.5)	-	-	3 (3.8)	5 (6.2)
Total	-	-	2 (2.5)	16 (20)	23 (28.8)	8 (10)	31 (38.8)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 27.813, P-value = .033; values in parenthesis are the percentages; a = I hate it; b = I dislike it; c = I don't like; d = I am indifferent to it; e = I like it; f = I am enthusiastic about it; and g = I love it.

3.3.2 Association between Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction

Tabulated indicates the results regarding the association between procedural justice and job satisfaction. It is evident that maximum employees i.e. 12 (15%) respond to the category “4” and “g” of the procedural justice and job satisfaction (I love it) respectively. The same was observed for category “5” and “g” of the procedural justice and job satisfaction (I love it) respectively. In addition, a high value of Chi-square (49.52) and lowest P-value (0.000) suggests that the procedural justice and job satisfaction are strongly associated. Furthermore, it can be stated otherwise, that procedural justices could develop relationship with job satisfaction, or, this means that if organizations bring changes in the procedural justices, it will also change the employees' perception towards job satisfaction. In total, maximum number of employees (38.8%) responds to love their job, while minimum (2.5%) were of the opinion that they don't like it.

Association between Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction

Procedural Justices	Job Satisfaction							Total
	a	b	C	d	E	f	g	
1	-	-	2 (2.5)	2 (2.5)	-	2 (2.5)	3 (3.8)	9 (11.2)
2	-	-	-	4 (5)	9 (11.2)	5 (6.2)	1 (1.2)	19 (23.8)
3	-	-	-	6 (7.5)	8 (10)	1 (1.2)	11 (13.8)	26 (32.5)
4	-	-	-	4 (5)	2 (2.5)	-	12 (15)	14 (17.5)
5	-	-	-	-	2 (2.5)	-	12 (15)	14 (17.5)
Total	-	-	2 (2.5)	16 (20)	23 (28.8)	8 (10)	31 (38.8)	80 (100)

Chi-square = 49.52, P-value = 0.000; values in parenthesis are the percentages; a = I hate it; b = I dislike it; c = I don't like; d = I am indifferent to it; e = I like it; f = I am enthusiastic about it; and g = I love it.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusion: Private sector organizations are characterized by provision of job and low wages, irrespective of performance of employees that may not lead to job satisfaction; however they have HR practices, which help them in job satisfaction. Organization justices are considered one of the most important factors in job satisfaction. Within the organization justices, two types of justices like procedural justice and distributive justice were considered. In addition, the job satisfaction was measured on a Likert scale from four different directions. The following main results were obtained from the given study.

1. Procedural Justice has developed strong relationship with job satisfaction ($P < 0.05$) irrespective of the organization (Service and Bata). It shows that if organization brings changes in procedural justices, it will also change employee perception towards job satisfaction.
2. Distributive justice also developed a significant ($P < 0.05$) relationship with job satisfaction suggesting distributive justice and job satisfaction are not independent phenomena, and organizations are required to take both the factors in to account while bringing any change and/or change in their policies associated with justice and job satisfaction.
3. Overall, procedural justice and distributive justice played a vital role in job satisfaction and perception of the employees.

4.2 Recommendations: Based on the findings, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Distributive and procedural justices are strongly associated with job satisfaction, so organization should work on these factors in order to enhance job satisfaction.
2. Organization needs to identify discriminating practices which have influence on job satisfaction. Furthermore, organization should identify those types of justices which are not useful.
3. It is suggested that employee want fare treatment, equity and justice in the organization, so organization should bring fare policy regarding these factors.
4. Organization needs to improve their practices regarding organization justices, as they have potential to lead employees towards job satisfaction
5. In general, organizations are required to increase the salaries of the employees in order to enhance job satisfaction.
6. Formal or informal recognition / award system should be introduced, by which employees outcome should be recognized and rewarded.
7. A counseling system may be established for employees regarding the problems on the job, which will enhance employees' loyalty to their job satisfaction.

5. REFERENCES

1. Adams, S.J. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchanges," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, Leonard Berkowitz ed. New York: Academic Press, 267-99.
2. Andrews, S., M.C. Baker, T.L. Hunt and G.Tammy. (2008). The interactive effects of centralization on the relationship between justice and satisfaction. *Journal of leadership and organizational studies*.
3. Blodgett, J.G., J.H. Donna and S.S. Tax. (1997). The Effects of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice on Post-Complaint Behavior. *Journal of Retailing*. 73 (2): 185-210.

4. Change, E. (2002). Distributive justice and organizational commitment revisited: Moderation by Layoff in the case of Korean employees. *Journal of Human Resource Management*. 41: 261-270.
5. Clemmer, E.C. (1993). An Investigation into the Relationships of Justice and Customer Satisfaction with Services, in *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, R. Cropanzano, ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 193-207.
6. Cohen, C.Y. and P.E. Spector. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*. 86: 278-321.
7. Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice. A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*. 86: 386-400.
8. Daft R.L. (2003). *Management* (6thed) Mason OH Thomson learning southwestern PP. 45-360.
9. DeConinck J.B and C.D. Stilwelb. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role rates pay satisfaction and supervision satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research* 57(3): 225-231.
10. Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive Justice: A Social-Psychological Perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
11. Goodwin, C. and I. Ross. (1990). Consumer Responses to Service Failures: Influence of Procedural and Interactional Fairness Perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 25: 149-163.
12. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice. Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16: 399-432.
13. Greenberg, J. (1993). The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and Informational Classes of Organizational Justice. In *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*, Russell Cropanzano, ed., Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 79-103.
14. Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
15. Jordan, T.S., B.A. Turner, J.S. Fink, and D.L. Pastore. (2007). Organizational Justice as a predictor of job satisfaction. On examination of head basketball coaches. *Journal of the study of sports and athletes in education*, 1 (3): 321-344.
16. Korsgaard, M.A., H.J. Sampienza, and D.M. Schweigar. (2001). Beaten before began. the role of procedural justice in planning change. *Journal of Management*, 29(4) 497-516.
17. Maxham, J.G. and N. Richard. (2002). Modeling Customer Perceptions of Complaint Handling Over Time: The Effects of Perceived Justice on Satisfaction and Intent. *Journal of Retailing*, 78: 239-252.
18. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours. Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of applied psychology*, 76:845-855.
19. Rebecca, C. and H. Anne. (2008). Organizational Justice and Management Trust as Predictors of antisocial employees responses. *Communications quarterly*, 56(4): 357-375.
20. Smith, A. K and N.B. Ruth. (2002). The Effects of Customers' Emotional Responses to Service Failures on their Recovery Effort Evaluations and Satisfaction Judgments. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 30 (1): 5-23.
21. Smith, A.K., N.B. Ruth and J. Wagner. (1999). A Model of Customer Satisfaction with Service Encounters Involving Failure and Recovery. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (8): 356-72.
22. Somers, M.J. (1995). Organizational commitment turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16:49-58.
23. Tax, S.S., W.B. Stephen and M. Chandrashekar. (1998). Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3): 60-76.
24. Warner, J.C., J. Reynolds and P. Roman. (2005). Organizational Justice and Job satisfaction: a test of three competing models. *Social Justice Research*, 18 (4): 391-410.