Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and the Employees Job Satisfaction

Mifrah Sethi and Hina Iqbal
M.Phil. Scholar in Psychology, Islamia College, Peshawar

Mohammad Omer Rauf
MS Research Scholar

Abstract

The present aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and the job satisfaction of employees as human resource is one of the most significant component of any organization. Keeping in mind the limitations of time and resource constraints, the study was conducted in the specific context of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and was limited to the Faculty of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Islamia College (University) Peshawar. At present, 35% faculty members are involved in teaching at KPK Islamia College Peshawar which constitutes a population of size 478. In the present study, 81 respondents as sample from selected educational organizations. The collected data (using questionnaires) regarding different variables were analyzed by a statistical package for social sciences SPSS 20. In order to test that association between the Organizational justice and other factor, correlation and Simple Linear Regression test was applied at 5% level of significance. The results showed the significant Positive Relationship between Organizational justices with job satisfaction of employees. The results also suggest that Organizational Justice has significant impact on Job Satisfaction of the employees, the result supported our Hypotheses. On the basis of these results recommendations were made to help educational institutions in KPK, Pakistan.

Keywords: Perceived Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction

Organizations are the social systems where humans are an asset. Organizations need efficient and effective managers and employees to accomplish goals, because Organizations cannot be successful without their enduring efforts and commitment. Employee morale and satisfaction are the two most profound variables which affect the performance of an organization. Organizational justice is the study of the concerns about fairness in the workplace. Concerns about distribution of resources have to do with distributive justice, concerns about fairness of decision-making procedures have to do with procedural justice, and concerns regarding interpersonal treatment have to do with interactional justice. (Colquitt, J., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P, 2005). As organizational justice is a versatile concept, it covers everything from

system of payment to treatment by one's supervisor. Researchers of Organizational behavior identified three types of organizational justice that is distributive, procedural justice, interpersonal justice which is further divided into interactional and informational justice (Colquitt et al. 2005). Organizational justice has the potential to create powerful benefits for organizations and employees alike. These include greater trust and commitment, improved job performance, more helpful citizenship behavior, improved employees' satisfaction and diminish conflict. (Spector, 2001).

There are two sides to the justice coin. On the negative side, the absence of justice is likely to provide problems for organizations. There is strong evidence that justice can provoke retaliation, lower performance and harm morale (cohen-charash & spector, 2001; Colquitt et al; 2001; visuesuaran & ones, 2002).on the positive side justice can do more than forestall these unfortunate outcomes. Justice act as assort of buffer, allowing employees to maintain respect and trust for an organization even when things do not go as they have like (Brockner & wiesenfeld; 1996). It is inevitable in life that things will not always go our way. However, the negative effects of an unfortunate event are less severe if the organization is able to maintain procedural and interactional justice (Goldman, 2003; skarlicki & folger, 1997). Moreover, perceived unfairness leads to negative reactions such as withdrawal, absenteeism, theft, tardiness and resistance to change. Therefore, organizational justice is an important issue for both organizations and employees that requires valid and reliable measurement.

Organizational justice has been emerged as the hottest topic on the discussion boards for many years in Human resource management, organizational behavior and organizational psychology (Cropanzano, 1997; Colquitt, 2001 & Greenberg.J, 1990). Different type of justices has been taken as the variables for a longer period of time (Deutsch.M, 1975 & Adams, 1965); Organizational justice basically explains the fairness perceptions of individuals or of group and then their behavior can be observed according the treatment they receive from their organization (Deutsch.M, 1975; k., 1993).

Before 1975, organizational justice was primarily concerned with distributive justice. Conventionally, Adam (1965) with his equity theory did the groundwork for most distributive justice research (Bernerth, Feild, Giles, Cole, 2006). According to Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry (1980) and Thibaut & Walker (1975) research in organizational justice goes further than equity theory. They stated that individuals not only define justice in terms of distributive justice of inputs and outcomes but they also view justice in terms of the procedures which determine those outcomes, categorized as procedural justice. According to

Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler and Schminke (2001), individuals along with the economic importance of outcomes, also consider their socio emotional value. The socio emotional value focuses on the quality of the relationships among people, containing aspects of status and dignity. Bies & Moag (1986) came up with the concept interactional justice, which refers to the treatment that an employee receives in terms of explanations for decisions and the information with compassion and respect.

Innumerable literature in the organizational and industrial psychology has observed organizational justice as well as its related outcomes. In order to keep employees satisfied, committed, and loyal to the organization, it needs to be fair in its system of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. (Kumar, Bakhshi, and Rani, 2009). Meta-analytical research has shown that different dimensions of organizational justice are related to different outcomes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). For example, procedural justice is most closely related to job performance and counterproductive work behavior, distributive justice to pay satisfaction, interpersonal justice to supervisor satisfaction and leader member exchange, and informational justice to trust.

Statement of Problem

The study aims to investigate the relationship between perceived organizational justice and its relationship with employee's job satisfaction at work place. Keeping in mind the limitations of time and resource constraints, the study will be conducted in the specific context of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and will be limited to the Faculty of Islamia university.

Research Objectives

1. To determine the prevailing level of organizational justice as perceived by the employees of university.
2. To ascertain the level of job satisfaction amongst the employees of university.
3. To establish the relationship between the perceived level of organizational justice and the job satisfaction.

Significance of Research

There is pattern of research conducted so for on the Relationship between organizational justice and the employees job satisfaction. However, there is no research found on Islamia College Peshawar. Bring the pioneer Educational institute in the area and mother of all other universities, it is felt to measure the level of Organizational Justice and

the employee's job satisfaction at least on its century. The significance of the research may likely to have dimensions, such as:

- To facilitate management of Islamia College to know the prevailing position of this organizational justice as perceived by its employees and its negative and positive impact on the job satisfaction.
- It would add into the academic and administrative guidance for other educational institutions as its results will be facilitating guidance and abilities.

Review of Literature

"Organizational justice is concerned with the fair treatment of employees (Randeree, 2008). And the term was first coined by Greenberg (1987) which represents individual's perceptions and reactions to fairness towards the organization. Justice refers to an action or decision that is morally and ethically right. (Tabibnia Satpute, 2008). Justice can be linked to, religion, ethics, equity, and law. Justice or fairness in organizations may include issues associated with perceptions of fairness in pay, equal opportunities for promotion and employee selection processes (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008). Injustice examples maybe of unequal pay for and women doing the same job. Performance reviews conducted by a boss whom the employee had less contact, arbitrary dismissals etc. (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008).

The idea of organizational justice stems from equity theory(Adams, 1963, 1965), which posits that judgments of equity and inequity are derived from comparisons between one's self and others based on inputs and outcomes. According to Adams (1963) the inputs refer to what a person perceives to contribute (e.g., knowledge and effort) while outcomes are what an individual perceives to get out of an exchange relationship (e.g., pay and recognition). Comparison points against which these inputs and outcomes are judged may be internal (one's self at an earlier time) or external (other individuals).\

Components of Organizational Justice

Bies & Moag, 1986 three main components of organizational justice; distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Interactional justice further includes interpersonal and informational justice. Distributive justice is conceptualized as the fairness associated with decision outcomes and distribution of resources. The outcomes or resources distributed may be tangible (e.g., pay) or intangible (e.g., praise). Perceptions of distributive justice can be fostered when outcomes are perceived to be equally applied (Adams, 1965).Much of the research on distributive justice was derived from the works of Adams (1965).

Adams suggested that equity theory can determine the fairness of an outcome. Equity theory can be used to explain such employee behaviors caused by perceptions of unfairness (Adams, 1963, 1965). Equity theory asserts that employees compare their inputs and outcomes with the inputs and outcomes of relevant others. Inputs are what they invest into their job and outcomes are what they receive in return (McFarlin, & Sweeney, 1992).

The research on equity theory has been re-examined quite a lot of times. Most of this research has explored the employee attitudes to pay. For e.g., employees who feel that they are underpaid decrease the quality or quantity of their work, while those who feel that they are overpaid improve their work in terms of quality or quantity (Mowday, 1987). The "underpaid" hypothesis has received more research support than the "overpaid" hypothesis. Research on the latter hypothesis has been confined entirely to laboratory experiments (McFarlin, & Sweeney, 1992).

After ten years of Adams' (1965) study, Thibaut and Walker (1975) discovered a new dimension of organizational justice, namely procedural justice**.** Procedural justice focuses on the processes which are used to determine the outcomes. Procedural justice perceptions are universally recognized today, but Thibaut and Walker (1975) were the pioneers of these procedural influences. According to them if employees were given a chance to participate into the process used to reach outcomes then they might perceive the outcomes as fair. These findings gave way to a new dimension of organizational justice perceptions. Organizational justice found its way from a distributive view to a comprehensive, procedural view (Bernerth, Feild, Giles, Cole, 2006). There are many studies conducted about procedural justice that correlate with the students rating about fairness, biasness and grading. The fairness in procedural justice has been discussed by many authors (Tyler and Caine, 1981; Feldman, 1989; Rodabaugh and Kravitz, 1994). Tyler and Caine (1981), Rodabaugh and Kravitz (1994) and Ryer and Stone-Romero, (1996) have observed that the perceived fairness of teachers grading and classroom regulations strongly affect the student ratings about the teachers. It has been argued in Korsgaard et al. (2001) that procedural justice can be used as a better predictor of job performance as compared to distributive justice. In addition to that, procedural justice is considered significant specially for successfully implementing organizational changes.

Folger and Konovsky identified a major difference regarding justice in work organizations, stating that "distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employees receive; procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means

used to determine those amounts" (1989).Personal outcomes, such as satisfaction with pay can be predicted by distributive justice while procedural justice is related to evaluating trust and commitment in the supervisor therefore procedures are important predictor of outcomes than distributive justice (McFarlin, & Sweeney 1992). Another study was conducted by Azam Ismail et al (2009) is to investigate the mediating effect of distributive justice in the relationship between pay design issue and job satisfaction. The result confirms that relationship between pay design features significantly correlated with job satisfaction, the overall result confirms that distributive justice play important role in pay design models of the organizational sector.

Robert Folger and Mary A.Konovsky (1989) conducted a survey in order to find out the Impact of Distributive justice and Procedural justice on the employees on pay raises decisions. Results show that distributive justice accounted for more unique variance in pay satisfaction than did the procedural justice. But procedural justice accounted for more unique variance of other measures like attitude, trust, and job commitment of employees towards authorities and organizations. Tyler, Rasinski and McGraw (1985) also found that both procedural and distributive justice contributed significantly to variance in outcome satisfaction.

According to Bies (1986) there is another branch stemming from the tree of organizational justice labeled as interactional justice who focuses on employees' perceptions of the interpersonal behavior exercised during the representation of decisions and procedures. It involves various socially sensitive actions, such as when supervisors respond employees with dignity and respect (e.g., providing sufficient explanations for decisions, paying attention to an employee's concerns, and showing empathy for his predicament) (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Interactional justice may be the simplest of the three components. It refers to how one person treats another. A person is interactional just if he or she appropriately shares information and avoids rude or cruel remarks. In other words, there are two aspects of interactional justice (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). The first part, sometimes called informational justice refers to whether one is truthful and provides adequate justifications when things go badly. The second part, sometimes called interpersonal justice, refers to the respect and dignity with which one treats another. There are various studies which have taken the combined impact of distributive, procedural and interactive justice on organizational retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), organizational citizenship behavior(Moorman 1991), motivation (Latham and pinder 2005), organizational commitment (Kumar, Bakshi & Rani 2009), and job satisfaction (Al-Zubi, 2010), self-assessed

performance and job satisfaction in an expatriate environment (Fernandas and Awamleh, 2005).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is closely linked to that individual's behavior in the work place. It is the collection of feeling and beliefs that employees have about their current job. The degree of job satisfaction ranges from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. Employees have attitudes about various aspects of their jobs e.g. their work, their colleagues, supervisors or subordinates and their pay. The importance of job satisfaction specially emerges to surface when many negative consequences of job dissatisfaction come to mind such a disloyalty, increased absenteeism, low productivity, turnover and increased number of accidents etc. (Aziri, 2011).Therefore in order to be competitive in this global business environment companies must identify factors that affect job satisfaction and morale of their employees (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Job satisfaction is under the influence of a series of factors such as the nature of work, salary, growth opportunities, management, work groups and working conditions etc. (Aziri, 2011).

One particular factor which affects job satisfaction of employees is called organizational justice; which is concerned with the fair treatment of employees. Organizational justice refers to the overall fairness of the organization reward system and the perceived fairness of the actions of individuals responsible for implementing the rewards allocation system (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). According to Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Distributive justice is the degree to which rewards are allocated in an equitable manner and Procedural justice is the degree to which those affected by allocation decisions perceive them to have been made according to fair methods and guidelines. Locke and Lathan (1976) define job satisfaction as pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Many studies had conducted and have found that both distributive justice and procedural justice are strong predictors of job satisfaction. For instance, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) in their article titled "Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes" found that distributive justice and procedural justice were the powerful predictor of job satisfaction. Masterson et al (2000) also found that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice were positively correlated with job satisfaction. Hassan Ali Al-Zubi (2010), Sania Usmani and Dr Siraj Jamal, (2011) conducted the studies on relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Their findings showed significant association between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

Relationship between Job Satisfaction & Organizational Justice

Job satisfaction was found to be positively associated with overall perceptions of organizational justice such that greater perceived injustice results in lower levels of job satisfaction and greater perceptions of justice result in higher levels of job satisfaction (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). A basic element in employee's satisfaction and organizational productivity is organizational justice (Aydin & Kepenekci, 2008). A meta-analysis found that distributive justice is a crucial predictor of job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Another study was conducted by Rabia Aslam et al (2011) their aim to identify the relationship between organizational justice and work related behavior i-e job satisfaction. Their findings revealed that there was significant and positive relationship of organizational justice with overall job satisfaction, so organizational justice is a predictor of job satisfaction. Bakhshi et al. (2009) found that organizational justice has strong relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The study has explored this relationship on working employees of a medical college. They have used different surveys to collect the data. The results indicated that distributive justice was considerably more related to job satisfaction whereas procedural justice was found to be more related to organizational commitment. Furthermore, Fatt et al. (2010) and Gohar et al, (2010) found that distributive justice and procedural justice is strong predictors for employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation and turnover intentions. The sample was taken from managerial and non-managerial employees and data is collected through surveys. The results have showed that both distributive justice and procedural justice have significant relationship with an employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation and turnover intention. Therefore, it has been suggested that organizations should take a proactive approach for understanding the employee's perceptions of distributive and procedural justice.

No one can deny the importance of justice in organizations, so in this context this research study will focus on the linkage of organizational justices with employees' job satisfaction. Organization justice deals with procedural, distributive and interaction justice. To check the role of these justices on employees' job satisfaction will be the main focused area. In organizations, justices play important role while taking decisions regarding job roles allocations or while taking other necessary decisions regarding promotions or other benefits etc. in this perspective a lot of work has been done for the years, procedural justice deals with the fairness in procedures in the organization, this fairness is while taking decisions in the organizations.

Though a lot of work has been done in this in this area, but still I believe that issues that will be highlighted in this research study could be

beneficial in Pakistani organizational cultural perspective, although In Pakistani cultural it is really difficult to bring change because of some sort of rigidity.

Research Hypotheses

H-1   Higher the level of organizational justice the higher would be the employees' job satisfaction.

H-2   Organizational justice has no relationship with employees' job satisfaction.

H-3   There is a negative relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

H-4   Organizational justice leads to high institutional performance.

Research Methodology

This section describes various methods that were adopted to achieve the required objectives. It consists of the universe of the study, sampling plan, data analysis and scale whch we will use in this research study. The study is applied research and because of the type of data collection it is a Descriptive Correlation type. So therefore coefficient of Correlation and Simple Linear Regression will be used in Statistical analysis.

Universe of the study:

There are a various types of educational institutions which impart education at graduate and post graduate levels in District Peshawar. However, due to time and financial constraints the teaching staff working at Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Islamia College (University) Peshawar will be considering as universe of the study.

Sampling Plan

Sample Size:

35 % Sample size will be taken from Islamia College (university).

Sampling Technique:

Sampling is a technique of selecting a small representative part from the population, so that a study of the sample and an understanding of its properties or characteristics would make it possible to generalize such characteristics to the whole population. Use Stratified Random Sampling Technique.

Table. 1. Number of Sampled Respondents from the Selected University

Organization	Total staff	Sampled staff
Islamia College (University)	236	81
Academic Staff	147	43
	68	26
Administration	21	7
Total		76

Variables of the Study and their Measurement:

Organizational Justice: The variables used to access all three domains of organizational justice are Procedural justice, Distributive justice and Interactional justice. It's the self-develop questionnaire, using Five (5) point likert scale and responses were based on (strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree).

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was assessed by different determinants like Meaningfulness of work, Hygienic conditions, employee's attitude and percentage of presence level in organization. It's a self-develop questionnaire. The questions are related to the perception of employees towards their job were asked to measure the level of job satisfaction among them. The Five (5) point likert scale were used to evaluate the responses to each item (strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree), develop by Neihoff & Moorman (1993). Besides these, demographic questions such as age, gender, income, work experience and educational level were asked by the respondents to identify the characteristics of the sample respondents.

Results and Discussion

This chapter indicates the results of different attributes obtained by analyzing the collected data. It provides information about the respondent's perceptions regarding Organizational justice and job satisfaction. In addition Coorelation and Regression Analysis test has been applied to test the association of organizational justice with job satisfaction and other attributes. All these results are presented in separate sections.

Organizational Justice

The following table indicates the mean average score (MAS) of various statements of the Organizational justice. It is evident that in majority of the statements regarding organizational justice is higher than 3 indicating that employee's perception are favorable. Maximum MAS was observed regarding the understanding of job responsibilities (3.67) followed by expressing the views and feelings in the procedures describing organizational justice. Mean average score of 2.70 for the "supervisor heard employees concern" indicating the neutral attitude or

might be the reason of not able to express their views regarding the given statement of organizational justice. Almost similar results (MAS =2.76) were recorded regarding the reward and promotion policies describing organizational justice. The results further suggests that employees performance gives meaningful feedback (MAS = 3.41) as well as the task assigned to them by their supervisor helps them to grows professionally (MAS = 3.44).

Table 2. Organizational Justice MAS

Statement	Response					MAS
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
I have the clear understanding of my job responsibilities as these have been spelled out to me from the outset.	6 (8.0)	7 (9.3)	6 (8.0)	39 (52.0)	14 (18.7)	3.67
I have the clear understanding of my organizational goals and objectives as these have been spelled out to me right from the outset.	5 (6.7)	6 (8.0)	12 (16.0)	40 (53.3)	8 (10.7)	3.56
I consider my work load to be quite matching to my salary package.	5 (6.7)	22 (8.0)	12 (16.0)	34 (45.3)	2 (2.7)	3.08
My performance appraisal provides me meaning full feedback about	2 (2.7)	13 (17.3)	17 (22.7)	38 (50.7)	5 (6.7)	3.41

my job.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	MAS
My supervisor makes sure that all employees concern is heard before job decisions are made**.**	8 (10.7)	24 (32.0)	25 (33.3)	14 (18.7)	2 (2.7)	2.70
I involved in decisions that affect my organization**.**	6 (8.0)	27 (36.0)	16 (21.3)	20 (26.7)	4 (5.3)	2.85
I am satisfied by the leave policies of this organization.	5 (6.7)	17 (22.7)	17 (22.7)	32 (42.7)	4 (5.3)	3.17
I am satisfied by the promotion and reward policies of this organization.	12 (16.0)	25 (33.3)	13 (17.3)	19 (25.3)	6 (8.0)	2.76
The task assigned to me by my supervisor helps me grow professionally.	13 (17.3)	25 (33.3)	28 (37.3)	28 (37.3)	9 (12.0)	3.44
My supervisor consistently Rewards employees for good work.	4 (5.3)	32 (42.7)	16 21.3	20 (26.7)	3 (4.0)	2.81
Total						3.15

Note. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree; MAS = mean average score.

It also provides information about the various responses of the sampled respondents in terms of counts and percentages. Of the total, about 53.3% respondents showed agreement that they are able to express their views and feelings while implementing the procedures. Similarly, on the other hand, majority (50%) of the respondents showed their concern about the influence of those procedures. In addition, 52% of the total respondents were of the opinion that they have clear understandings of these procedures and responsibilities. However, the percent numbers of responses were not falling in favor of the remaining statements describing organizational justice.

Job Satisfaction

The mean average scores (MAS) of various statements of Different determinants regarding job satisfaction is displayed in Table. It shows that all the statements describing job satisfaction have MAS greater than 2 suggesting that employee's perception are favorable. Maximum MAS was recorded for the work place satisfaction (3.44) followed by the coworkers attitude in a current job. The Mean average score of 3.42 for the "Jealousy and rivalry among coworkers" indicate that maximum people feel jealousy with coworkers in their jobs. Furthermore employees show neutral satisfaction with hygienic conditions of the organization (2.95) and are proud to be a part of this organization (2.07). It is evident that employee's like their jobs having MAS of 2.71. Similarly, the MAS of 1.91 were recorded regarding the meaningfulness of work in the organization for enhancing the employee's satisfaction from their jobs. The results further suggest that the employees attitude among coworkers effect the job satisfaction level (MAS = 3.22).

Meaning Fullness of Work

Table 3. Meaning fullness of Work

Statement	Response					MAS
	1	2	3	4	5	
How meaningful is your work?	26 (34.7)	34 (45.3)	11 (14.7)	4 (5.3)	-	1.91
How often do you feel stressed at work?	6 (8.0)	16 (21.3)	28 (37.3)	19 (25.3)	6 (8.0)	3.04

Are you satisfied with how often you take part in problem solving?	12 (16)	29 (38.7)	26 (34.7)	6 (8)	2 (2.7)	2.43
Are you satisfied with how often you help others?	15 (20)	34 (45.3)	23 (30.7)	2 (2.7)	1 (1.3)	2.20
How proud do you feel to be employee of this organization?	29 (38.7)	24 (32)	15 (20)	2 (2.7)	5 (6.7)	2.07
Total						2.33

1 = Extremely Often, 2 = very often, 3 = moderately often, 4 = slightly often and 5 = not at all; MAS = mean average score

Hygiene Conditions

Table 4. HC

Statement	Response					MAS
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Social status	11 (15.1)	39 (53.4)	18 (24.7)	2 (2.7)	3 (4.1)	2.27
Job security, financial security, physical security.	8 (10.7)	40 (53.3)	18 (24)	4 (5.3)	5 (6.7)	2.44
Salary, basic & social needs and saving.	8 (10.7)	36 (48)	17 (22.7)	9 (12)	5 (6.7)	2.56
Fringe benefits	3 (4.3)	27 (38.6)	28 (40)	7 (10)	5 (7.1)	2.77
Work conditions	6 (8.1)	35 (47.3)	20 (27)	5 (6.8)	8 (10.8)	2.65
Organization promotion, leave and other policies	2 (2.7)	32 (43.2)	18 (24.3)	12 (16.2)	10 (13.5)	2.95
Interpersonal relations	4 (5.4)	42 (56.8)	20 (27)	5 (6.8)	3 (4.1)	2.47
Leadership attitude	5 (6.8)	35 (47.3)	21 (28.4)	5 (6.8)	8 (10.8)	2.68
Total						**2.60**

1 = ExtremelySatisfied, 2 = Fairly Satisfied, 3 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4 = Slightly Dissatisfied and 5 = Extremely Dissatisfied; MAS = mean average score.

Employee Attitude

*Table 5.*EA

Statement	Response					MAS
	1	2	3	4	5	
Are coworkers in a work place cooperating in order to help, develop and apply new ideas?	6 (8)	27 (36)	22 (29.3)	15 (20)	5 (6.7)	2.81
Frequencies of conflict and grimaces among coworkers.	2 (2.7)	7 (9.3)	31 (41.3)	26 (34.7)	9 (12)	3.44
How much jealousy or rivalry is there among coworkers?	3 (4)	8 (10.8)	29 (39.2)	23 (31.1)	11 (14.7)	3.42
Total						3.22

Note. 1 = Extremely Often, 2 = very often, 3 = moderately often, 4 = slightly often and 5 = not at all; MAS = mean average score.

This Table also provides information about the different responses on different determinants of the sampled respondents in terms of counts and percentages. It is evident that, 85% respondents showed that they are satisfied with their current jobs. Similarly, on the other hand, majority (45%) of the respondents showed satisfaction with their hygienic conditions of the organization. Additionally, 40% of the total respondents were satisfied with their coworker's attitude. Furthermore, 45% respondents were satisfied with their job security, 45% think there job is meaningful, 40% were not satisfied with the stressed conditions of the organization and 40% were satisfied and feel proud to be a part of that organizations. However, the remaining statements percent numbers of responses were not falling in favor of job satisfaction.

Correlation Analysis between Organizational Justice and Employee Job Satisfaction Subscales:

The data was tested on Pearson Coefficient of Correlation to estimate the significance and strength of linear relationship between OJ and JS subscales (MFOW: Meaningfulness of Work, HC: Hygiene Conditions, EA: Employee Attitude). Pearson correlation is a vital measure for determining usefulness of the model. The following table provides correlation analysis.

Table 6. Correlation Analysis

	OJ	MFOW	HC	EA
OJ	1	-.236*	-.426**	.167

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant correlation between OJ and JS subscales except EA. In each cell of the correlation matrix, Pearson's correlation coefficient shows the strengths of the relationship. The significance is shown through asterisks right next to the correlation coefficient. From the output, it can be seen that the correlation coefficient between OJ and MFOW is very low negative but significant. The correlation between OJ and HC is low negative but significant at .01 significance level. However the relationship between OJ and EA is also very low positive but insignificant. Overall the results indicate a significant positive relationship between OJ and JS.

Regression Analysis between OJ and JS Subscales:

In order to estimate the influence of OJ JS, Simple linear regression analysis was performed. The dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) was regressed on predicting variables of OJ. The independent variables significantly predict JS, F (1, 73) = 5.595, p < 0.05, which indicates that OJ has significant impact on JS.

These results clearly direct the affect, moreover, the R^2 = .071 depicts that the model explains 7.1% of the variance in JS. Following Table shows the summary of the findings.

Table 7. Regression Analysis

Regression Weights		SE		*t*	*p-value*	*Hypotheses Supported*
OJ JS	-.194	.082	-.267	-2.365	.021	Yes

OJ: Organizational Justice, JS: Job Satisfaction

Conclusion

The following main results were concluded from the given study.

1. The result of Pearson Correlation proved that there was a significant Positive correlation between Organizational Justice and employees Job Satisfaction.

2. The result of Simple Linear Regression Analysis proved that Organizational Justice has Significant Impact on Job Satisfaction.

3. Overall, organizational justice played a vital role in job satisfaction of the faculty members of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Islamia College University.

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz :(Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(12), 102-109.

Aslam, R, Shumaila, S, Sadaqat, S, Bilal. H, Intizar, M. (2012). Organizational Justice as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction among Teachers - A Case Study on University of the Punjab Hailey College of Commerce University of the Punjab, Lahore, Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Business Management, 28-29.

Aziri. B. (2011). Job Satisfaction: A literature Review. *Management Research and Practice. 3* (4), 77-86.

Bakhshi A, Kumar K and Rani E (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management, 4* (9), 145-154.

Bies, R. J. & Moag, J. S. (1986). 'Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness,' In Lewecki, R. J., Sheppard, B. H. & Bazerman M. H. (Eds.) Research On Negotiation In Organizations, 1, 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining attractiveness of decisions: The interactive effects of outcomes and processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 189–208.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunnelling through maze. In C. L. Cooper., & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,12, 317-372. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278-321.

Colquitt J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. (2005). What is organizational justice: An historical analysis.

Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J.A. (2004). Handbook of organizational justice 3-57. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of applied psychology, 86*(3), 425.

Fatt C.K, Sek Khin E.W and Heng TN (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction: The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 2* (1): 56-63

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*,115-130.

Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*: 55-71.

Greenberg, J. 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*, 399-432.

Goldman, B. M. (2003). The application of reference cognitions theory to legal-claiming by terminated workers: The role of organizational justice and anger. *Journal of Management, 29*, 705–728.

Latham, G.P., & Pinder, C.C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology, 5*, 485-516

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 626-637.

Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior, *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 527-556.

Rodabaugh, R. C. and D. A. Kravitz. 1994. Effects of procedural fairness on student judgments of professors. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 5*(2): 67-83.

Ryer, I. A. and E. F. Stone-Romero. 1996. Outcome levels, expected outcomes, and allocation procedures as predictors of consistency with justice rules, fairness perceptions and organizational behavior.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 434-443.

Thibaut. J. & Walker. L. 1975. Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ Erlhaum.

Tyler, T. R., & Came, A. (1981). The role of distributional and procedural fairness m the endorsement of formal leaders. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 642-655.