A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among teachers in Bandar Abbas middle school
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Abstract

The main purpose of this study is analysis of the correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction. This study also analyzes 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, which includes five dimensions: supervision, co-worker, pay, promotion and nature of job. It is essential that administrators and principals of educational institutions appreciate and understand factors that may influence teachers' job satisfaction. In the survey method which was utilized to study the relationships between two constructs, questionnaires were used for data gathering and 120 teachers participated in this study. Correlation coefficient and regression analysis was used to measure the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Findings indicated significant positive relationships between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Correlation analysis for the three components of organizational justice showed that two dimensions of organizational justice namely distributive and interactional justice had positive relations with four dimensions of job satisfaction namely supervision, co-worker, pay and promotion and they didn’t have correlation with nature of job as a dimension of job satisfaction. Procedural justice demonstrated a significant correlation for all dimensions of job satisfaction. Multiple regression revealed significant impact of distributive justice and interactional justice with job satisfaction.
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Introduction

Employee’s job satisfaction and organizational justice are considered to be key variables that had impact on the performance. When they are treated fairly in an organization they do their task better and feel satisfied, and conversely when employees feel that they had been unfairly treated, they respond low satisfaction. A number of studies have been conducted linking organizational justice to job satisfaction (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Cedwyn and Awamleh, 2006; Irving et al, 2004; shokerkon& neamei, 2003 and Imani, 2008). However, limited research has been conducted examining the effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction in our country (Iran) mainly, in educational environments. A review literature showed that only a research has been done in Iranian educational organization by Imani in exceptional children educational organization. This study was designed to assess the impact of organizational justice on teachers' job satisfaction in the Bandar Abbas middle schools.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice may be defined as the study of fairness at work (Byrne and Cropanzano, 2001). The first commonly accepted type of justice is referred to as distributive justice. Distributive justice considers the fairness of
the outcomes of a particular decision. Procedural justice, the second type, is generally defined as the fairness of the process that leads to the outcome. Mcfarlin and Sweeney (1992), and Sweeney and Mcfarlin (1993) supported two-factor model of organizational justice. In 1986, Bies and Moag proposed the third organizational justice dimension. It is often referred to as interactional justice. They defined interactional justice as the fairness of the interpersonal treatment that one receives at the hands of an authority figure. Cohen-Charash and Specter’s (2001) in their research supports the existence of three organizational justice dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, and international justice.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is one of the most widely studied and measured constructs in the organizational behaviour and management literature. Interest in job satisfaction proceeds from its relationships to other substantial organizational outcomes, including absenteeism, organizational commitment, turnover, and performance.

The theoretical definition of job satisfaction includes evaluative or expectancy components. For example, Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. Similarly, Mottaz (1988) regarded job satisfaction as an affective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation. It is widely accepted that job satisfaction is a function of work-related rewards and values (Vroom, 1964; Kalleberg, 1977).

Francies and Milbourn (1980) attempt to summarize the various definitions of job satisfaction as follows: generally, job satisfaction is the result of the individual’s perception of what is needed and what is received from different facets of the work situation. Based on above definition, different dimensions of job satisfaction have been identified. According to Ivencevich and Matteson (2005) and Toposky (2000) job satisfaction stems from various aspect of job such as pay, promotion opportunities, supervisors, and co-worker. Other dimension such as policies and procedures, work group affiliation, working conditions and fringe benefits were found to be part of the five core dimension. For purpose of this study, the five dimensions will be regarded as pay, job, promotion, supervisor and co-workers.

**Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction**

Numerous studies have been conducted to explain the importance of the allocation phenomenon (i.e., the distribution of positive and negative reinforcements) in organizations. For example, Lawler (1977) noted that the distribution of organizational rewards such as pay, promotion, status, performance evaluations, and job tenure can have powerful effects on job satisfaction, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness.

Folger and Konovsky (1989) found that perceptions of distributive 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 (Witt & Nye, 1992; Cedwyn and Awamleh, 2006; Irving et al, 2004; Shokerkon& Neamei, 2003 and Imani, 2006). Cedwyn and Awameleh (2006) studied organizational justice and job satisfaction in UAE. They found the positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction at P<0.001 and Multiple regression revealed significant impact of Distributive and International at p <0.001, conversely, procedural justice failed to show any significant relationship with job satisfaction. Irving et al (2004) found that the relation between procedural justice and job satisfaction was stronger for those who were low in negative affectivity than for those who were high in negative affectivity. Finding of Shokrkon and Neami (2003) and Imani (2006) studies showed that organizational justice and job satisfaction have positive correlation. And all components of organizational justice have positive correlation with job satisfaction. Witt and Nye (1992) in his study found significant positive correlation (r=0.23 to r=0.59) between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

The purpose of the study presented here was to examine the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. We hypothesized that more positive organizational justice would be associated with more positive attitudes toward job satisfaction. We also hypothesized that all dimensions of organizational justice would be associated with more positive attitudes toward all dimensions of job satisfaction.

**Methods**

**Participants**

This study analyses the impact of organizational justice as encompassed by three components, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on job satisfaction of teachers in middle school in Hormozgan Province of Iran. The population of this study consisted of 120 teachers who were teaching in schools. The sample was drawn from participants who are currently teaching in Bandar Abbas schools. The author, with his assistants compiled a list...
of secondary schools in two main districts in Bandar Abbas. A random sample of 12 schools from this list was selected, and then a random sample of the employees in each organization of the 12 organizations was drawn. Questionnaires were distributed manually among participants. The completion of these questionnaires was entirely voluntary and responses were anonymous.

Measurements

Distributive, procedural and interactional justice was measured by using the scales developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The items of this questionnaire were translated into Persian language and were distributed among some participants for adapting and fitting into the Iranian research context. The data gathering forms of this pilot study were analyzed and calculated utilizing Cronbach alpha coefficient. Based on the result some items were added, omitted or revised. The modified questionnaire was comprised 16 items using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. Distributive justice scale consisted of 5 items. Procedural justice scale consisted of 5 items and interactional scale consisted 6 items. The authors made an instrument to measure the job satisfaction. According to Ivancevich and Matteson (2005) job satisfaction have five dimensions, namely pay, Job (nature of work), promotion opportunities, supervisors, co-workers. The questionnaire made consisted of 22 items using a five - pint Likert-type scale ranging from 1= less extremely to 5= high extremely. The entire set of these scales was included in one questionnaire. The questionnaire included a total of 38 items written in Persian language, the internal consistency reliability of instruments were assessed by Cronbach Alpha. The results showed that the job satisfaction scale reliability estimated is 0.868. The internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) for, supervision, co-workers, pay, promotion and job subscales in this study are 0.887, 0.70, 0.771, 0.793, 0.703. The internal consistency for the overall organizational justice is 0.929 and for procedural justice 0.867 and interactional justice 0.854, distributive justice, 0.845. Correlation coefficient was used to determine if relationships existed between the organizational justice and job satisfaction for all the hypotheses presented. Pearson’s correlation measured the strength of the relationship. Simple regression and multi regression was used to assess the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction.

Results

As shown in Table 1, correlation analysis showed that ratings of higher levels of positive organizational justice would be associated with more positive attitudes toward job satisfaction(r=0.734, P<000). The correlation analysis for the three components of organizational justice showed that two components of organizational justice namely, distributive and interactional justice have positive relations. The four dimensions of job satisfaction namely supervision, co-worker, pay and promotion, and they didn’t have significant correlations with nature of job a dimension of job satisfaction. Distributive justice demonstrated significant correlations with four dimension of job satisfaction, namely supervision(r=0.741, P<001), co-worker(r=0.327, P<001), pay(r=0.523, P<001), and promotion(r=0.523, P<001). A positive relationship is also identified between interactional justice and four dimension of job satisfaction. These dimensions are supervision(r=0.765, p<001), co-worker(r=0.299, p<001), pay(r=0.372, p<001) and promotion(r=0.511, p<001). But procedural justice would be related to all dimensions of job satisfaction, as shown in table one. All correlation coefficient are significant at p<001. Specifically, interactional justice was significantly positively associated with scores on the job satisfaction and its sub-scales encompass of supervision, co-worker, pay, promotion, nature of job.

| Table 1: Pearson correlations analysis between organizational justice with job satisfaction and their dimension. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Distributive    | procedural      | interactional   | Organizational  |
| supervision     | .589**          | .741**          | .740**          | .765**          |
| co-worker       | .327**          | .253**          | .299**          | .327**          |
| pay             | .523**          | .346**          | .372**          | .465**          |
| promotion       | .523**          | .402**          | .445**          | .511**          |
| Nature of job   | .160            | .255**          | .147            | .209            |
| Job satisfaction| .668**          | .652**          | .654**          | .734**          |

**statistically significant at p<001. *statistically significant at p<0.05
Simple regression model for independent variable (organizational justice) and dependent variable (job satisfaction) showed that organizational justice have high and positive relation with job satisfaction, and $R$ and $R^2$ equal 0.734 and 0.539 and it means that 53.6 percent of total variance of job satisfaction was defined by organizational justice. Results of the first regression model are shown in Table 2 and the ANOV for simple model, as depicted in Table 3, indicated that The overall model is significant at $p < 0.001$.

**Table 2: simple regression model of organizational justice**

| Model | $R$ | $R^2$ | Adjusted $R^2$ | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|-------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 1     | 0.734$^a$ | 0.539 | 0.535 | 7.09724 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational justice

**Table 3: ANOVA of simple regression**

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | $F$ | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| Regression | 6937.542     | 1  | 6937.542    | 137.729 | .000$^a$ |
| Residual   | 5943.758     | 118| 50.371      |       |      |
| Total      | 12881.300    | 119|             |       |      |

a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational justice  
b. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction

The results of the stepwise regression analysis for component of organizational justice on job satisfaction are shown in table 4 and 5. According to data presented in table 4, two component selected by model accounted 53.6 percent of total variance of job satisfaction. Multiple regression revealed significant impact of Distributive justice and Interactional justice on job satisfaction at $p < 0.001$, conversely, Procedural failed to show any significant relationship with job satisfaction.

**Table 4: stepwise regression model of organizational justice**

| Model | $R$ | $R^2$ | Adjusted $R^2$ | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|-------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 1     | 0.668$^a$ | 0.446 | 0.441 | 7.77731 |
| 2     | 0.732$^b$ | 0.536 | 0.528 | 7.14763 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive justice  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive, interactional justice  
c. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction

**Table 5: ANOVA for Stepwise regression model of organizational justice**

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | $F$ | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| 1     | Regression | 5743.880 | 1  | 5743.880 | 94.961 | .000$^a$ |
| Residual   | 7137.420 | 118| 60.487      |       |      |
| Total      | 12881.300    | 119|             |       |      |
| 2     | Regression | 6903.925 | 2  | 3451.963 | 67.568 | .000$^p$ |
| Residual   | 5977.375 | 117| 51.089      |       |      |
| Total      | 12881.300    | 119|             |       |      |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive, interactional  
c. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction

**Discussion**

In general, the correlation data in conjunction with the results of the regression analysis indicate that organizational justice has high positive correlation with job satisfaction. Pearson correlation is significant at $p<0.001$ and equal 0.734. The simple regression for these two variables indicated the positive correlation between justice and job satisfaction. Our regression simple model is significant at $P<0.01$. The result of this study support findings which have been held by other theorist and practitioners stating that organizational justice is associated with job
satisfaction. (E.g. Cedwyn and Awamleh, 2006; Irving et al., 2004, Shokkerkon & Neamei, 2003 and Imani, 2006). These results are in line with the literature on job satisfaction and organizational justice. Moreover, the results suggest that the more perception fairly in organization, the more feeling toward job satisfaction. The correlation analysis of all dimensions of organizational with all dimensional of job satisfaction show that procedural justice have positive correlation with all dimension of job satisfaction meanly supervision, co-workers, pay, promotion and nature of job subscales. But distributive and interactional justice have positive relations with four dimensions of job satisfaction namely supervision, co-worker, pay and promotion and they didn’t have correlation with nature of job a dimension of job satisfaction. This result is consistent with previous studies that done by Shokkrkon and Neamie, 2003 and Imani, 2006. But it has a different finding and goes beyond previous studies by differentiating the correlation between component of organizational justice and component of job satisfaction. While most pervious studies mentioned that all component of organizational justice have positive correlation with all dimension of job satisfaction. In this research distributive and interactional justice isn’t significant correlation with nature of job a dimension of job satisfaction. The stepwise regression model of component of organizational justice on job satisfaction showed that two of three component accounted for 53, 6 percent of total variance of job satisfaction, but the procedural justice failed to show a significant correlation and it deleted from model. This finding supports the finding of Cedwyn and Awamleh, 2006. They find out that Multiple regressions revealed significant impact of Distributive and Interactional on job satisfaction and, conversely, Procedural failed to show any significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Conclusion

Findings of this study were in line with the literature on job satisfaction and organizational justice. Moreover, the result suggests that the more perception of fairness in organization, the more feeling of job satisfaction. This finding helps the administration of educational system to manage school better than before. If they didn’t have ability and authority to pay more to teachers and determine the promotion policy, they can behave fairly with teacher in school. This in turn can help to increase job satisfaction in school.

Finally, when teachers feel a just and fair behaviour and treatment from their management and sees that rewards are fairly distributed and procedures in their school are equitable, they feel more satisfy with their jobs and this create attachment to his work place and helps them to increase their performance.
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