

## ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND JOB SATISFACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

*B.V. Nithi Varshini Devi, Research Scholar, Department of Social Work Nallamuthu Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi.*

*Dr.L. Ranjit, Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Work Nallamuthu Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi.*

### Abstract

In recent years educational institutions are grown well. In the organizations teachers are the pillars of our country produces more number of quality employees. A teacher plays an important role in educating the students and also developing the organizations by their hard work. It is essential that administrators and principals of educational institutions appreciate and understand factors that may influence teachers' job satisfaction. The impact of organizational justice components as encompassed by three specific forms of justice perceptions; distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice on job satisfaction are also analysed in this study. The study revealed that higher organizational justice leads to higher Job Satisfaction of Employees with sample of 400 faculty members in various institutions in Coimbatore district. The results show that components of organizational justice are positively and significant associated with employee's jobs satisfaction.

**Key words:** Educational Institutions, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Justice

### Introduction

A group of peoples that work together for achieving common goals under a structured system is called organization. For the achievement of these goals there is also a need of effective managers or employees. Now organizations are considering human resource as the most precious asset for them because human resource is an important factor for effectiveness and success of organization. Organizational justice apprehensions employees' awareness of equality in place of works and has become a standard perception in considerate workstation boldness and comporment Ambrose et al. (2007); Cropanzano & Rupp (2003). First aspect distributive justice is concerned with fairness of allocation of resources Adam (1955). Second aspect is procedural justice concerned with procedure use to allocating resources Thibaut & Walker (1975) refers to apparent impartiality of decision making process. Third dimension interactional justices concerned with the quality of treatment perceived form decision maker Bies & Moag (1986) refer to respect of the relationship between employee and manager. The last aspect is informational justice that states truth fullness rationalization of important material given to employee Bies & Moag (1986); Colquitt et al. (2012), Greenberg (1993). Spectur (1996) referred job satisfaction as extent a person like his job. When employees feel that they are treated equally by organization in every aspect they are motivated to show positive approach and behaviour like job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is traditionally considered "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience". The main purpose of the study is to gain an insight how job satisfaction is influenced by organizational justices.

### Review of literature

**Byrne and Cropanzano 2001 and Greenberg 1990** Organizational justice in general it said to reflection of perception of justice and related to the environment where working. **Tahire & Mohyeldin, 2007** Decisions taking by management level will be in an equal to all like compensations and advancements. **Alsalem and Alhaiani 2007** Explains organizational justice can help the employees by retaliate against the inequitable outcomes or inappropriate process and interactions. **Moorman 1991** classifies three dimensions for organizational justice is distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice where it includes informational and interpersonal justice in the workplace. **Folger and Konovsky (1989)** found that perceptions of Organizational justice are significantly correlated with pay raise satisfaction as well as with job satisfaction. Others scientists and researchers found the positive relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction by **Witt & Nye, 1992; Cedwyn and Awamleh, 2006; Irving et al, 2004; Shokerkon& Neamei, 2003 and**

**Imani, 2006.** Job satisfaction has been defined as “a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it as offering” **Locke, 1969.** **Gilmer and Deci 1977** asserted "Workers' attitudes toward their jobs reflect the extent to which they are satisfied with their jobs and their work lives. **Yang (2014)** to do the roles of faculties, from the organization they need motivation, support which is affected by the organization. The management has to create morale, and also motivate the teachers with increasing leadership, for successful faculties. The interpersonal relationship with one’s peers and superiors also plays a significant role in job satisfaction. Research has found that people prefer co-workers who share comparable ideals and who enable work achievement, while superiors who are considerate, honest, fair and knowledgeable are preferred **Henne & Locke, 1985.** Evidently, there seems to be a natural relationship surrounding job satisfaction and the justness of various processes. The emotional response of being satisfied (or dissatisfied) with one’s job is a response to the judgment of the aforementioned components by an employee. If the employee perceives that the above-mentioned are being achieved at an acceptable level, that person will feel the pleasurable sensation of satisfaction; conversely, if they do not, the frustration will translate into dissatisfaction. The strength of these emotions is dependent on the importance of the component **Henne & Locke, 1985.**

### Objectives of the study

- ❖ To study the demographic profile of the respondents.
- ❖ To assess the level of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction.
- ❖ To examine the relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction.
- ❖ To examine the influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction.

### Hypothesis

H01: There is a significant variation in Organizational Justice based on demographic variables.

H02: There is a significant variation in Job Satisfaction based on demographic variables.

H03: There is a significant association between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction.

### Methodology

The descriptive research design is used in the study. The arts and science college faculties in Coimbatore district is taken as the universe of the study. The Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors are included in the study. A sample of 100 faculties was included in the study by using Multi stage sampling. Questionnaire method was adopted for the data collection. The questionnaire consists of demographic variables namely age, gender, family type, marital status, educational qualification, designation, dependents, place of living, nature of job, years of experience, monthly income, additional work in-charge, hours spent on work. Organizational justice scale propounded by Niehoff& Moorman (1993) which consists of 20 items with three dimensions measured on 7 point scale was used. Job Satisfaction scale was given by Ricardo Pagan (2014) which consists of 8 items measured by 5 point scale. The data was analysed using mean, SD, t-test and ANOVA to analyse the data.

### Analysis and Interpretation

#### Demographic Variables

The demographic profile of the respondents shows that majority 44.8% belong to 30 and below 30 years, Female respondents constitute 65.8%, 71.3% are Married, 56.0% them are belong to Nuclear family , 30.5% have 2 Dependents, 46.0% living in Rural area, 38.8% of them has PG with M.Phil qualification, 69.5% of them are Assistant professors, 54.3% of their jobs are Temporary, 32.3% of them have below 5 years of experience, 51.8% of their salary is below 15,000, 84.5% have additional work-in charge at workplace, and 61.0% of them are working for 8 and below 8 hours per day.

**Table 1: Organizational Justice**

| Variable | Particulars | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|----------|-------------|--------------------|------------|
|          | Very High   | 78                 | 19.5       |

|                               |          |     |       |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|-------|
| <b>Organizational Justice</b> | High     | 12  | 3.0   |
|                               | Moderate | 243 | 60.8  |
|                               | Low      | 46  | 11.5  |
|                               | Very Low | 21  | 5.3   |
|                               | Total    | 400 | 100.0 |

Table 1: Shows that, 19.5% of faculties had moderate level of organizational justice, 3.0% of faculties had high level of organizational justice, 60.8% of faculties had very high level of organizational justice, 11.5% of faculties had low level of organizational justice, and 5.3 of faculties had very low level of organizational justice.

**Table 2: Job Satisfaction**

| Variable                | Particulars | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------|
| <b>Job Satisfaction</b> | Very High   | 72                 | 18.0       |
|                         | High        | 167                | 41.8       |
|                         | Moderate    | 110                | 27.5       |
|                         | Low         | 26                 | 6.5        |
|                         | Very Low    | 25                 | 6.3        |
|                         | Total       | 400                | 100.0      |

Table 2: Shows that, 18.0% of faculties had very high level of employee engagement, 41.8% of faculties had high level of employee engagement, 27.5% of faculties had moderate level of employee engagement, 6.5% of faculties had low level of employee engagement, and 6.3% of faculties had very low level of employee engagement.

**Table 3: Difference in Organizational Justice based on Demographic Variables**

| Variables   | Test   | Value     | Result   |
|---|--------|-----------|----------|
| Age & organizational justice                            | Anova  | F= 4.560  | 0.004(S) |
| Gender& organizational justice                          | T-test | T= -3.409 | 0.001(S) |
| Family type& organizational justice                     | T-test | T= -3.135 | 0.002(S) |
| Marital status& organizational justice                  | Anova  | F= 7.537  | 0.001(S) |
| No.of.dependents& organizational justice                | Anova  | F= 5.657  | 0.000(S) |
| Place of living& organizational justice                 | Anova  | F= 5.614  | 0.004(S) |
| Educational qualification& organizational justice       | Anova  | F= 3.940  | 0.002(S) |
| Designation& organizational justice                     | Anova  | F= 5.690  | 0.001(S) |
| Nature of job& organizational justice                   | Anova  | F=6.095   | 0.002(S) |
| No.of.y66-ears of service& organizational justice       | Anova  | F=4.816   | 0.001(S) |
| Monthly income& organizational justice                  | Anova  | F=3.533   | 0.004(S) |
| No.of.additional work in-charge& organizational justice | T-test | T= 2.945  | 0.003(S) |
| Hours spent on work & organizational justice            | Anova  | F=4.485   | 0.004(S) |

NS- Not Significant      S - Significant at 0.05 levels

Table 3: Reveals that Organizational Justice is significant with the demographic profile.

**Table 4: Difference in Job Satisfaction based on Demographic Variables**

| Variables                                   | Test   | Value     | Result    |
|---|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Age & Job Satisfaction                      | Anova  | F= 4.860  | 0.002 (S) |
| Gender& Job Satisfaction                    | T-test | T= -3.414 | 0.001(S)  |
| Family type& Job Satisfaction               | T-test | T= 2.996  | 0.003(S)  |
| Marital status& Job Satisfaction            | Anova  | F= 6.109  | 0.002(S)  |
| No.of.dependents & Job Satisfaction         | Anova  | F= 4.598  | 0.001(S)  |
| Place of living& Job Satisfaction           | Anova  | F= 5.949  | 0.003(S)  |
| Educational qualification& Job Satisfaction | Anova  | F= 3.925  | 0.002(S)  |
| Designation& Job Satisfaction               | Anova  | F= 4.509  | 0.004(S)  |
| Nature of job& Job Satisfaction             | Anova  | F= 5.600  | 0.004(S)  |
| No.of.years of service& Job Satisfaction    | Anova  | F= 3.908  | 0.004(S)  |

|  |        |          |          |
|--|--------|----------|----------|
| Monthly income& Job Satisfaction                 | Anova  | F= 9.374 | 0.000(S) |
| No.of.additional work incharge& Job Satisfaction | T-test | T= 3.409 | 0.001(S) |
| Hours spent on work & Job Satisfaction           | Anova  | F= 6.328 | 0.000(S) |

**NS- Not Significant**

**S - Significant at 0.05 level**

Table 4: Reveals that the demographic variable is significant with Job Satisfaction among the faculties.

### Hypothesis testing:

From the above tables it can be inferred that there is a significant influence of demographic variable namely Age, Gender, Marital status, Family type, Place of living, No. of. Dependents, Educational qualification, Designation, Nature of job, Monthly income, No. of. Years of service, Additional work in charge, Hours spent on work on the organizational justice of the respondents. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. The above table also reveals that there is a significant difference was found in Job Satisfaction based on the selected demographic variables. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. The table also reveals that a significant positive relationship was found between organizational justice and employee engagement. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted.

### Discussion

The study revealed that moderate organizational justice and High level of Job Satisfaction was found among the faculties in higher educational institutions. The result indicates that organizational justice and Job Satisfaction are positively related. That means when organizational justice increases Job Satisfaction of employees will also increases. It might be because if an organization give consideration and respect to an employee it will motivate them to trust the organization and feel the belongingness between the organization and employees will leads to satisfaction in their job what they are doing. Kivimaki and Kalimo (1994) found that the employees who are more satisfied in their work are more innovative, and showing their participation in supporting their organization in decision – making. In this present study it is revealed that organizational justice and employee engagement are positively correlated with each other. It is suggesting that if the Organization is justice to the employee then the employee feel that bonding and work with whole heartedly transform as satisfaction which results in working together to achieve organizational goal.

### Conclusion

The study concludes that Organizational justice and Job Satisfaction of the faculties working in higher educational institutions were found to be moderate. The Demographic variables Age, Gender, Marital status, Family type, Place of living, No. of. Dependents, Educational Qualification, Designation, Nature of job, Monthly income, No. of. Years of service, Additional work in charge, Hours spent on work had a significant influence over the Organizational justice and Job Satisfaction. The study also concludes that moderate level of Organizational justice will leads to high level of Job Satisfaction among the employees.

### Reference

1. Byrne and Cropanzano (2000) and Greenberg (1990). The relationship between organizational justice preceptiions levels of school and administration trust & Organizational citizenship behaviour. *Campus of Umuttepe* 41380.
2. Tahire & Mohyeldin, (2007), Does Organization Justice Influence the Organization Citizenship Behavior, Job Satisfaction & Organization Outcomes?, *A multifaceted review journal* ,Vol 11, Issue 1, Jan-Jun, 2020.

3. Alsalem and Alhaiani (2007) A study on Organizational Justice and job satisfaction. *International journal of Business and Management* .www.cesenet.org/ijbm.Vol 5,No 12,December 2010.
4. Moorman (1991) Impact of organizational justice on organizational effectiveness .www.iiste.org ISSN 222 – 6096, Vol 1, No 3, 2011.
5. Folger and Konovsky (1989), A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 5, No. 12; December 2010. ISSN 1833-3850 E-ISSN 1833-8119.
6. Witt & Nye (1992); Cedwyn and Awamleh (2006); Irving et al, (2004); Shokerkon & Neamei (2003) and Imani (2006), A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among teachers in Bandar Abbas middle school, Published by *Elsevier Ltd*. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.401. 2010.
7. Locke, (1969), Graduates' Perceived Levels of Job Satisfaction Associated with their Chosen Career Field, *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture (NACTA)*, Vol. 52, No. 3. September 2008. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4376604>.
8. Yang (2014). Effect of Transformational Leadership, Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction toward Life Satisfaction: Evidences from Indonesian Teachers. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology* Vol. 29, No. 03, (2020), pp. 5495 - 5503 5495 ISSN: 2005-4238.
9. Henne & Locke (1985), Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice as Predictors of Attitude Concerning Organizational Reform, *Master's Thesis*, Spring Term 2014.
10. Henne & Locke (1985), Job Satisfaction and Organizational Justice as Predictors of Attitude Concerning Organizational Reform, *Master's Thesis*, Spring Term 2014.