

Organisational Justice and Employee Happiness

Dr. Priyanka Behrani

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, The M.S. University of Baroda, Baroda, Gujarat.

ABSTRACT

The success of the organization largely depends on the employees now. Economical change in India has led all organizations to consider humans (its employees) as their most essential resource. The present study focuses on the two variables Happiness and organisational justice. The objectives of the study were to explore the correlation between Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice i.e., Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice. To study the difference in male and female employees on Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice i.e., Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice. It was hypothesized that there will be positive significant correlations between the Happiness and two dimensions of Organisational Justice. The second hypothesis was that there will be no significant difference among males and females on the above variables. The third hypothesis was that there will be no significant difference among married and unmarried employees on the above variables. The tools used for the study were Oxford Happiness Questionnaire and Organizational Justice Scale which measures Distributive and Procedural justice developed by Price and Mueller (1986). The data was analyzed by SPSS version 23.00 where method of correlation and t-Tests were used for finding the results. There is no significant correlation between organisational justice and happiness. There is no significant difference between male employees and female employees and married employees and unmarried employees on happiness and organisational justice.

Key words: Organisational Justice, Happiness, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice.

INTRODUCTION

Work is one of the important aspects of people's lives. ^[1] People perform their work in exchange for either monetary (e.g. salary and benefits) or non-monetary rewards (e.g. psychological fulfillment from work). ^[2] The changing work environments (e.g. the increasing internationalization of business, new technology, and new organizational practices) lead to the changing nature of work. ^[3]

Happiness:

Happiness in the form of positive attitude, wellbeing and life satisfaction has been studied in psychological researches. Previous studies ^[4] have indicated that happy employees are productive employees. Conversely, unhappiness at the workplace reduces productivity. ^[5] The happiness

issues have been widely studied in various fields such as philosophy, religion, psychology, sociology, and economics. "Happiness" is related to an individual's subjective well-being ^[6,7] or life satisfaction. There is a close relationship between job and life satisfaction. ^[8] Job satisfaction affects life satisfaction while life satisfaction also affects job satisfaction. ^[8] Thus, happiness at the workplace refers to an individual's work and life satisfaction, or subjective well-being at the workplace. Though happiness at the workplace is important to both individuals and organizations, ^[9] the research on employee happiness in organizations is limited. ^[10] It should be investigated further in order to provide sufficient knowledge to academics, practitioners, and those who are interested

in the notion of happiness at the workplace.^[10]

Organisational Justice:

Homans (1961)^[11] first proposed the concept of organizational justice as distributive justice. Early studies on organizational justice were directed towards two broad issues: employees' perception of what they receive (outcomes) and the process which led to these outcomes (procedures).^[12] Distributive justice is a perception of fairness regarding resource allocation, based upon input and output considerations.^[13] It is largely based on work by Adams.^[14] Procedural justice emerged from the seminal work by.^[15] Procedures adopted should be fair in coming to any outcome,^[16] and employees should have some 'voice' and 'control' over the process.^[17] Organizational justice research addresses perceptions of fairness in organizational decisions and decision-making procedures. Organizational justice can be divided into fairness of outcomes namely distributive justice and fairness of processes namely procedural justice.

Distributive Justice:

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an individual receives from organization. Outcomes may be distributed on the basis of equality, need or contribution and individuals determine the fairness of distribution through comparison with others.

It is the impartiality of decision outcomes, and is compared by a perceived ratio of the input-output of others to oneself,^[14] or whether resource distribution matches suitable norms.^[16]

Procedural Justice:

Procedural justice is the fairness that is sensed by the employees in the decision-making processes. Procedures are seen to be fair when they encourage fair outcomes. When the individual faces outcomes that are not in consonance to his wishes or wants, here procedural justice can ease the effect of discontentment.^[15]

Interactional Justice:

The third type of Justice is interactional justice, which scholars have explained as a social aspect of procedural justice. It is defined as the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of organizational procedures.^[18] In general, interactional justice reflects concerns about the fairness of the non-procedurally dictated aspects of interaction.

Employees' perception of organizational justice is the individuals' evaluation of whether their organization treats its members fairly or unfairly. These perceptions are increasingly being viewed as having both a cognitive and an effective component.^[19,20] Organizational justice perceptions can influence a variety of workplace attitude and behaviors. Perceptions of unfair treatment lead to lower job performance,^[21] lower morale, high turnover,^[22] and greater retaliatory behavior toward the organization^[13] than perceptions of fair treatment. Perceptions of fair treatment, in contrast, breed higher satisfaction commitment, reduced intention to turn over, and increased helping behaviors in organizations.^[23,24,20,12] In the purview of the existing literature following objectives were framed for the study:

Objectives:

1. To explore the correlation between Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.
2. To study the difference between male employees and female employees in terms of Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.
3. To study the difference in single employees and married employees in terms of Happiness, and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.

Hypotheses:

1. There will be significant positive correlation among Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.
2. There will be no significant difference between male employees and female employees in terms of Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.
3. There will be no significant difference between married employees and unmarried employees in terms of Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice.

METHOD

Sample:

There were 302 participants out of which 195 were males and 107 were females. 204 were married and 98 were unmarried.

The data was collected from different organizations in and around Baroda, Gujarat. Different sectors that were included were Educational Sector 69, Manufacturing 128, service E commerce, Information technology 69 and BPO 36.

Tools: The tools used for this study were,

A. Happiness Scale:

The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire [25] was used for the study. The questionnaire was developed at Oxford University. This scale is an effective way to get the snapshot of current level of happiness. It can even be used to compare to happiness level at some point in the future by taking the survey again and it consists of 29 items.

B. Organizational Justice Scale:

Organizational Justice was assessed using the dimensions Distributive and Procedural justice.

Distributive justice was measured using the Distributive justice index developed by [26] Price and Mueller (1986). This scale

consists of 6 items ($\alpha=.91$) assessing the extent to which employees feel that rewards are fairly distributed according to work inputs and will be reported on a 5-point Likert scale (1=very unfairly to 5=fairly).

Procedural justice was assessed using the procedural justice scale. [27] The scale was developed in 2002. The measure consists of items that assess both supervisory focused and organizationally focused perceived fairness of formal organizational procedures. The reliability of this test is 0.91.

Procedure: Firstly, the tools were finalized and the permission was sort from the respective organisation after explaining the purpose and benefit of the study. The tools were in English so the participants who were who could understand English were included as a part of research. The data was collected from in and around Vadodara. Four sectors of manufacturing, service, Education and IT were included for the study. Finally the data was put through analysis for the results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study was designed to explore the correlation between Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice. To study the difference between male employees and female employees, single employees and married employees in terms of Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely, Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice. The data was analyzed in the light of hypothesis designed for the study and findings have been encapsulated further.

Table 1: Shows the correlation between Happiness and procedural justice and distributive justice

	Happiness	Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice
Happiness	1		
Distributive Justice	-0.060	1	
Procedural Justice	-.071	.349**	1

Table1 shows the Correlation between Happiness and two dimensions of Organizational Justice namely Distributive

Justice and Procedural Justice. Results indicate that there is no significant correlation between Happiness and Distributive Justice and also procedural Justice. Hypothesis 1 is rejected. This means that the happiness of the employees is not determined by their perception of organisation justice. This also implies that well designed systems that promote distributive justice and procedural justice

promote both, the organisation and employees, as employees feel satisfied for being treated fairly and the organisation will maintain control over the potential challenges from its employees, are not correlated. This finding is in contrast to the finding [28] where significant correlation between happiness and distributive justice and happiness and procedural justice was found.

Table 2: Shows mean shows the Mean, Standard Deviations and t scores of Happiness and organisational justice of male and female employees.

Variables	Male Employees Mean (SD)	Female Employees Mean (SD)	Df	T	Sig. (2 tailed)
Happiness	117.866 (17.85)	175.682 (11.70)	300	1.954**	0.000
Distributive Justice	20.165 (3.886)	19.55 (4.22)	300	1.271	0.481
Procedural Justice	13.513 (4.51)	13.664 (3.31)	300	.303	0.688

Table 2 displays the mean, standard Deviation and the t-scores of male employees and female employees. Here Hypothesis is rejected. There is significant difference between male employees and female employees on the Dimension of Happiness. ($t(300) = 1.954, p < 0.01$). Female employees reflect more Happiness than male employees in the organisation. Here null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted. The studies also have similar results. Studies [29] found that Women under 45 tend to be happier than

men; but older women are less happy as compared to men. A study found that women are happier than men in general. [30]

There is no significant difference between male employees and female employees on the dimension of the perceived Distributive justice and procedural justice. This finding is similar to the studies [31,32] where it was found that there is no significant relationship between gender and their perceptions of organizational justice.

Table 3: Shows mean shows the Mean, Standard Deviations and t scores of Happiness and organisational justice of married and single employees.

Variables	Married Employees Mean (SD)	Single Employees Mean (SD)	Df	t	Sig. (2 tailed)
Happiness	122.039 (16.26)	192.307 (123.07)	300	2.094*	0.037
Distributive Justice	20.098 (4.039)	19.625 (3.961)	300	0.952	0.342
Procedural Justice	14.009 (4.43)	12.611 (3.14)	300	2.767**	0.01

Table 3 displays the mean, standard Deviation and the t-scores of married employees and single employees. Here Hypothesis 3 is partially accepted and partially rejected. There is significant difference between married employees and single employees on the Dimension of Happiness. ($t(300) = 2.094, p < 0.05$). Single employees reflect more Happiness than

married employees in the organisation. This is in contrast to the results found across the world. [33] Married people are happier than non-married people.

There is no significant difference between married employees and single employees on the Dimension of Distributive justice which refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an individual receives

from organization. Here employees do not differ on perception with respect to married or single status.

There is significant difference between married employees and single employees on the Dimension of procedural Justice. ($t(300) = 2.767, p < 0.01$). Married employees reflect more procedural justice than single employees in the organisation. This indicates that married employees give more importance to Procedural justice which refers to participants' perceptions about the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process [34]. Procedural justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of process. Among the traditional principles of procedural justice are impartiality, voice or opportunity to be heard, and grounds for decisions. [35] Procedural issues such as neutrality of the process, [36] treatment of the participants, [17,18] and the trustworthiness of the decision making authority [37] are important to enhancing perceptions of procedural justice.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that in spite of lot of researches on the significant positive relationship between happiness and organisational justice, the present study found contradictory results. It did not show significant correlation between happiness and two dimensions of organisational justice namely distributive justice and procedural justice. The study also yielded other significant findings which was contradictory to the literature review that single employees are happier than married employees. There was no significant difference in male employees and female employees on the dimensions of distributive justice and procedural justice.

Limitations and recommendations:

An organization's real asset is its employees; they are the reason for competitive advantage in any industry. Satisfaction, commitment, performance and wellbeing of employees are the core concern for any organization.

Outlining limitations helps in understanding the study, in its entirety. The research had few limitations namely it was restricted to sample in Vadodara. Organizational justice studies have increased over the years. Its relationship with other variables has been studied extensively but this study managed to bring out its relationship with only a handful of variables with its limited time frame.

Scope for further research in justice studies has exciting prospects. Organization justice has wide contours and therefore, many directions are open for scholars. Specific organizations could be studied with different variables like job satisfaction and commitment to name a few.

REFERENCES

1. Dulk, L.D., Groeneveld, S. Ollier-Malaterre, A. and Valcour, M.(2013)National context in work-life research: A multi-level cross-national analysis of the adoption of workplace work-life arrangements in Europe. *European Management Journal*. 31(5), 478-494.
2. Stiglebauer, B., Selenko, E., Batinic, B., & Jodlbauer, S. (2012). On the link between job security and turnover intentions: moderated mediation by work involvement and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.17 (3):354-364.
3. Connell, J., Gough, R., McDonnell, A., & Burgess, J. (2014). Technology, work organization and job quality in the service sector: *An Introduction. Labour & Industry: A Journal of The Social And Economic Relations Of Work* .24, (1),1-8.
4. Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. 21,(1), 53-75.
5. Fereidouni, H.G., Najdi, Y. Amiri, R.E. (2013) "Do governance factors matter for happiness in the MENA region?", *International Journal of Social Economics*.40(12),1028-1040.

6. Angner, E., Hullett, S., & Allison, J. J. (2011). "I'll die with the hammer in my hand": John Henryism as a predictor of happiness. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. 32(3): 357-366.
7. Jiang, S., Lu, M., & Sato, H. (2012). Identity, inequality, and happiness: Evidence from urban China. *World Development*. 40,(6), 1190-1200.
8. Saari, L. M. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*. 43,395-407
9. Simonsohn, Uri., Nelson, L. D., & Simmons, J. P. (2014). P-curve: A key to the file-drawer. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 143, (2), 534 -547
10. Hosie, P., Willemyns, M., & Sevastos, P. (2012). The impact of happiness on managers' contextual and task performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. 50(3), 268-287.
11. Homans, G. C. (1961). Social Behavior: Its Elementary Process. Reviewed by Edmund Leach. *American Anthropologist*. 63,(6),1339-1341
12. Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. 317-372 New York: Wiley.
13. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*. 16,(2),399-432.
14. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 2: 267-299. New York: Academic Press.
15. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. A Book Review. *Duke Law Journal*. 1977,1289-1296.
16. Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 9: 91-131. New York: Academic Press.
17. Lind, E.A., and Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
18. Bies, R.J and Moag, J.S. (1986). International Justice: communication criteria of fairness. . In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*. 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
19. Bies, R.J. (1987). Beyond "voice": The influence of decision-maker justification and sincerity on procedural fairness judgments. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*. 17(1), 3-14
20. Folger, R.G., & Cropanzano, (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
21. Pfeffer, & Langton (1993). The effect of wage dispersion on satisfaction, productivity and working collaboratively: evidence from university faculty. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 38, (3). 382-407.
22. Pfeffer & Davis-Blake (1992). Salary dispersion, location in the salary distribution and turnover among college administrators. *ILR Review*. 45.
23. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 86, 278-321.
24. Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 386.
25. Argyle, M. & Hills P. (2001). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: a compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 33 1073-1082.
26. Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Handbook of Organisational measurement*. Marshfield, M.A: Pitman
27. Cropanzano, R. & Deborah R. (2002) The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 89, 925-946.
28. Jandaghi, G., Alimadadi, A., Fard, S.M.H. and Golverdi M. (2012). Relationship between organizational

- justice and staff happiness in the institutes of standard & industrial research of Qom province and jihad agricultural management in Qom city. *Elixir International journal, Human. Resource Management.*43.
29. Inglehart, R. (2002). Gender, aging, and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 43(3-5), 391-408.
30. Veira-Lima, Sabrina (2011). "A Cross-Country Investigation of the Determinants of the Happiness Gender Gap", Mimeo, University of Milan-Bicocca, Department of Economics, Milan, Italy
31. Alsalem, M., and Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employees Performance. *Aledari*, March, (108), 97-110.
32. Al-Zu'bi, H.A. (2010) A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management.*5, (12).
33. Graham, Carol, Chattopadhyay, S. and Picon, M.(2010b). Adapting to Adversity: Happiness and the 2009 Economic Crisis in the United States", *Social Research*, (77) .2.
34. Nabatchi, T., Bingham, L. B., and Good, D. H. (2007). Organizational Justice and Workplace Mediation: A Six Factor Model. *International Journal of Conflict Management.* 18, (2), 148-176.
35. Bayles, M.D. (1990). *Procedural Justice: Allocating to Individuals*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
36. Lind, E.A.& Tyler, T.R. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances In Experimental Social Psychology.* 25, 115-192
37. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and compliance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

How to cite this article: Behrani P. Organisational justice and employee happiness. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2017; 4(7):123-129.
