2.1 Organizational Justice

Justice means absence of any “arbitrary” distinction between man and man in the social, economical, political or legal spheres. When justice is lacking, people feel discriminated which leads to disharmony and discontentment among various individuals and groups. In an organizational setting, justice plays a very important role as it is the fairness in policies and procedures of a company defines its relationship with its employee. This relationship, when it is characterized by fairness and mutual respect, is a source of morale and productive behaviour (Rosen, 1991). This thesis will be concentrating on justice in organizational setting, which is referred to as Organizational Justice by psychologists.

Organizational Justice is a term coined by Greenberg (1987a). Organizational justice is the psychology of justice applied to organizational setting (Sheppard, Lewicki, & Minton, 1993; Lind & Tyler, 1988). It refers to people’s perception of fairness of events in organizations (Greenberg, 1987a). Studies have shown that justice in organizational setting enhances commitment, lower turnover intentions and promote organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB) (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Owing to its beneficial effects, organizational justice has been the subject of wide research in the field of psychology and sociology (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 2001). The impact of justice or injustice in organization will be discussed later in this chapter.

There are broadly two approaches to the study of justice. One is prescriptive approach as followed by philosophers and other is descriptive approach as followed by managerial scientists. Under the prescriptive approach, attempt is to determine what
actions constitute truly just actions. In contrast, descriptive approach involves subjectivity wherein the attempt is to find out why some people view certain events as just while others may not. Thus, under descriptive approach, organizational justice involves personal evaluation about the ethical and moral standing of managerial conduct. In social sciences organization justice literatures is based mainly on descriptive approach (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Components of Justice:

There are three components of organizational justice –

a) **Distributive justice** (Adams, 1965)

b) **Procedural justice** (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975)

c) **Interactional justice** (Bies & Moag, 1986) which can be further subdivided into two parts - **Informational justice** and **Interpersonal justice** (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).

2.1.1 Distributive Justice

It refers to perception of fairness of decision outcomes or resource allocation (Saks, 2006). In other words, it pertains to people’s perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes (benefits or punishments) they receive. The concept is rooted in Adam’s theory of equity, according to which people are motivated to avoid tension that results from the states in which the ratio of one's own outcomes (i.e., rewards) to one's own inputs (i.e., contributions) is unequal to the corresponding ratio of a referent other. Therefore, if an employee perceives inequity or injustice, the tension exists and the employee is found to be less satisfied with the outcomes they perceive to be unfair (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The perceptions of distributive injustice result in poor performance (Pfeffer & Langton, 1993; Cowherd & Li...
symptoms (Cropanzano, Goldman, & Benson, 2005), high rates of withdrawal behaviour such as turnover and absenteeism (Schwarzald, Koslowsky, & Shalit, 1992; Hulin, 1991) and the organization becomes quite prone to disputes, mistrust, disrespect and other social problems (Suliman, 2007). This follows from the equity theory that people, if they perceive injustice, would withhold their inputs, thereby improving their ratio of output to input in order to equalize it with that of the referent other. It has also been argued that employee base their evaluation of fairness not wholly on what he or she receives but also on what they receive in relation to some standard or referent (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland (2007) argued that most of the manager assumes that justice to employee means that they receive a favourable outcome. This assumption is not valid. The manager should keep in her mind that there is stark difference between unfavourable outcome and unfair outcome (distributive injustice). An unfavourable outcome means an outcome which is not beneficial while an unfair outcome may be beneficial yet it may be lower than some referent. So, an outcome that makes an employee perceive distributive injustice may not be an unfavourable outcome; however it could be an unfair outcome - favourable yet the benefits received from the outcome could be lower than some standard.

Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) dealt with the concept of distributive justice from two perspectives - first, from the perspective of the person who receives the allocation and second, from the perspective of the person who makes the allocation. From the first perspective, distributive justice can be understood from the viewpoint of the person who is affected by the outcome. If the outcome is unfavourable or the benefits derived from it are lower than some standard, then the person experiences distributive injustice. From the other perspective, distributive justi
from the perspective of person who makes the allocation. If the person who makes allocation is partial, selfish or ignorant of some facts, then some of the employees may not be satisfied with the allocations they receive and will experience distributive injustice. Generally speaking, any impartial person who makes allocation, apply one of the three allocation rules to distributive justice which may sometimes be in conflict with each other. These are equality (to each the same), equity (to each in accordance with contributions), and need (to each in accordance with the most urgency). While it is most appropriate to apply equity rule in allocating economic benefits (i.e., those who perform better might earn more), equality rule should be applied in allocating socio-emotional benefits (Martin & Harder, 1994). It has been found that while equity rule (to determine compensation or wages) promote productivity, equality rule promote esprit de corps or harmony among employees (Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland, 2007). It has also been found that non-application of anyone rule in determining pay package tend to adversely affect the overall performance of the organization as a whole. Therefore it is advisable that all the three rules should be judiciously applied by employer while determining pay packages.

2.1.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the means by which outcomes are allocated. In other words, procedural justice means perceived fairness in the procedures that is used to determine outcome (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Thibaut and Walker (1975), one of the early researchers on procedural justice, found that the use of a fair procedure can increase the satisfaction without any increase in the benefits derived from the outcome received. This phenomenon is known as ‘fair process effect’ which suggests that even when resources are constant or shrinking, satisfaction might be increased if procedural justice prevails in the organization. They further suggest that:
perceived to be fair which provides people opportunity to ‘voice’ their opinion in the process that affects them. It is because voiced procedures are perceived to be fairer as it provides some control over outcomes (Cohen, 1989). In addition to this, Lind and Tyler (1988) gave another reason as to why opportunity to exercise voice raises perception of fairness - a procedure framed by taking into account voice of employees will be a procedure that, in most certainty, will promotes decent and humane treatment of one person by another thereby increasing the perception of fairness. Taking this understanding further, Lind & Tyler (1988) proposed two models of justice - ‘self interest model’ and ‘group interest model’. Self interest model believes that when a person exercises her voice in the work process, she can influence the outcomes in her favour. And as such the person will experience procedural justice. Group interest model assumes that man, as a social animal, value social participation, and therefore any procedure that provides opportunity to express voice is considered to be fair because they provide opportunities for group participation and "because the opportunity to exercise voice constitutes a visible marker of group membership". In organizational settings, ‘voice’ increases satisfaction, produces more positive judgments of decision makers and affects public conduct such as compliance, protest, etc.

However, contemporary researcher Leventhal (1980, 1976) proposed that a fair process involve more than opportunity to exercise voice. He listed six criteria for a procedure to consider as a fair procedure. That the procedure should be:

1) Applied consistently
2) Free from bias
3) Accurate
4) Correctable
5) Representative of all concerns
6) Based on prevailing ethical standards

Various researches in this area have shown that procedural justice can mitigate ill effects of unfavourable outcomes through ‘fair process effect’. Procedural injustice, on the other hand, produces intellectual and emotional indignation resulting in distrust and resentment. Perception of procedural justice not only extracts greater loyalty but also enhances willingness of an employee to contribute more for achievement of the organizational goals (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Moreover, fairness in decision making processes extract higher levels of organizational commitment (Tyler, 1991), greater trust in management (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994), lower turnover intentions (Dailey & Kirk, 1992), a lower likelihood of litigation (Bies & Tyler, 1993), more generous citizenship behaviors (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ & Moorman, 1993), and to some extent higher job performance (Lee, 1995; Gilliland, 1994; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Work by (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997) argued that people, generally, are more accepting of decisions that result from fair procedures than those that result from unfair procedures and cooperate more with authority figures. For example, people are more accepting of smoking bans (Greenberg, 1994), pay systems (Micheli, 1993) and disciplinary actions (Ball, Trevino & Sims, 1994). Moreover, procedural justice affects what employees believe about organization as a whole. In other words it seems to maintain legitimacy of an organization. If the processes in the organization are perceived as just, employees show greater loyalty and more willingness to work in organizational best interests. They are also less likely to betray the institution and its leader (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007).

Greenberg (1993) classified procedural justice in two types –

a) **Structural aspects of procedural justice**

b) **Social aspects of procedural justice**
From structural perspective, a procedure may be perceived as fair to the extent it is based on explicitly defined policies which are perceived to be distributively fair. Such policies may include opportunity to express voice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975); system of adequate notice, fair hearing and judgment based on evidence (Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll, 1995); two way communication and feedback (Gilliland, 1994) etc.

The work of Bies and his associates shifted the focus to social aspect of procedural justice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997) which is also known as ‘interactional justice’. This aspect of procedural justice focuses on impact of treatment of individual. Due to its growing importance in justice literature, interactional justice is discussed separately under separate section.

Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) talked about as to why fairness in procedures increases satisfaction with the help of two models - Instrumental model and Relational model. Instrumental model suggests that an employee may be ready to forgo short term economic benefits because of application of a fair procedure if existence of such a fair procedure guarantees some long term economic gains. Relational model believes that even if there are no economic considerations involved, procedural justice would still increase satisfaction to the extent that procedural justice enhances a person’s dignity and worth by addressing three relational concerns of that person –

a) Neutrality (person should believe that decision maker is free from bias and is open and honest)

b) Trust (person should believe that decision maker’s intend to act in fair manner)

Standing (which is conveyed by the decision maker to the person whether the person’s standing is high or low in the eyes of decision maker).
2.1.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is concerned with “the quality of interpersonal treatment that an employee receives while a procedure is being executed (Bies & Moag, 1986). In simplest form, it refers to how one person treats another (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Bies and Moag (1986) identify four criteria that reveal the quality of treatment –

(a) Appropriate justification of decisions (i.e., effort to explain the results of decisions)
(b) Honesty (i.e., avoidance of deception)
(c) Propriety (i.e., absence of prejudicial statements and inappropriate questions)
(d) Respect (i.e., sincere and deferential treatment of individuals as well as absence of personal attacks).

A just interaction involves adequate sharing of information and avoids rude or cruel remarks. Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) has put forward two types of interactional justice – informational justice (this dimension of interactional justice is similar to Bies and Moag’s (1986) concepts of justification and honesty) and interpersonal justice (this dimension of interactional justice is similar to Bies and Moag’s (1986) concepts of respect and propriety). Informational justice involves access to information regarding the reasons on how outcomes were determined. It also refers to whether one is truthful and provides adequate justifications when things go bad (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). Many studies have concluded that providing people with information justifying any negative outcomes increases the acceptance of those negative outcomes. Not only adequacy of information is needed to enhance acceptance of undesirable outcomes, but also the medium through
conveyed is also important. For example, Shapiro, Buttner, and Barry (1994) found that face to face verbal interaction have more impact on employees than interaction through written form. Interpersonal justice, on other hand, refers to respect and dignity with which one treats another. It has been found that a perception of fairness is enhanced when people are treated with respect and dignity (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

There is a debate whether procedural and interactional justice are two distinct construct or the two are same construct. Some of the scholars consider the two as distinct constructs (Bies, 2001; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). However, not all scholars consider interactional justice as a construct distinct from procedural justice. For example, Lind and Tyler (1988) viewed it as an integral part of procedural justice. Similarly, Brockner and Wiesenfeld (1996) viewed it as a substitute for procedural justice.

2.1.4 Relationship between Procedural and Distributive Justice

So far, in the discussion only separate effects of distributive and procedural justice have been talked about. However, the two dimension of justice may interact with each other producing some joint effects. This is because procedural justice may be related to distributive justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). In summary, distributive justice and procedural justice operate independently, as main effects and they also operate jointly as interacting effects (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The main effects are explained by the Two – Factor model. The Two – Factor model suggests that while distributive justice primarily influences one’s satisfaction with the outcome she receives, procedural justice primarily influences one’s attitude and behaviors (for e.g. one’s trust in management or loyalty to organization) that are relevant to the larger organization. On the other hand, the joint effects can be explained with the help of the Interaction model. Many researchers like Cropanzano and Folger
distributive and procedural justices interact with each other. This interaction can be explained in terms of either outcomes or procedures (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). For example, procedural justice is more strongly related to work attitudes (e.g. commitment) when outcomes are low than when they are high. In other words, procedural justice matters more when an employee perceives distributive injustice. Further, outcomes are more strongly related to work attitudes when procedures are unfair than when they are fair. For example, research undertaken by Daly and Geyer (1994) showed that the procedure by outcome interaction significantly predicted organizational commitment. Not only this, interactional justice also interact with these two types of justices (Cropanzano, Slaughter, & Bachiochi, 2005). The main benefit of interaction among these three components of justices is that the ill effects of injustice can be partially being mitigated if at least one component of justice is maintained. Presence of just environment is very necessary to maintain organizational efficiency.

Therefore, now turning the attention to impact of just or unjust treatment perceived by an employee in the organizational setting.

2.1.5 Impact of Organizational Justice

Researchers like Colquitt and his colleagues (2001) found that all three components of justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) builds trust in the management or employer. Similarly, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found out that an employee perceiving justice in work place will be more committed to their employer. Colquitt et al. (2001) also found that justice in work situation improves job performance. Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) further found that interactional justice fosters strong relationship between the leader and the subordinate which in turn motivated subordinate to perform better at job. Other studies have pointed out that justice fosters OCB (behavior that go beyond the call of duty lik
altruism etc) among employees (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). OCB will have spill over effect as justly treated employee will treat customer nicely thus leading to customer satisfaction and loyalty (Bowen, Gilliland & Folger, 1999). On the contrary, when employees perceive that they are being unfairly treated then they react by reducing their job performance (Cowherd & Levine, 1992), lowering their affective commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), showing some deviant behaviors (Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluk, 1999) thereby resulting in higher absenteeism and turnover rates (Hulin, 1991) and reduced citizenship behaviors (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Thus, by looking at beneficial impacts of justice and ill effects of injustice, it can be said that justice should be the core value of management of any organization as it defines organization’s relationship not only with its employees but also with customers. If justice is embedded in any managerial philosophy, policies and practices both employees and customers will be happy, thereby making the organization more efficient, effective and competitive.

Although the associations between justice perceptions and various work outcomes are well established in western literature, very few studies have examined the relationship of justice perceptions with work attitude and work behavior (like job satisfaction and organizational commitment) in Indian culture (Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009). This thesis is an attempt to study the impact that justice perceptions has on work attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) in Indian context.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important determinant of a person performance in workplace situation (Yang, Brown, & Byoongook Moon, 2011). As such, it is widely studied work outcome in organizational settings (Currivan, 2000). Job satisfaction is an
attitude that people have toward their jobs and the organization in which they work. It refers broadly to the degree to which people like their job (Spector, 1996). Job satisfaction can be defined as an employee’s affective response to his or her job, based on a comparison between actual outcomes with those that are expected, needed, wanted, desired, or perceived to be just and fair (Moshadeghrad, 2003; Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999; Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). In other words, job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. It is the result of employee’s perception of how well their job provides those things which are viewed as important. When an employee feels that he or she has betrayed via unfair organizational processes or outcomes, the job may look unsatisfying for him or her (Lambert, 2003). Most of the researchers view job satisfaction as a multifaceted construct (Lund, 2003) with different facet been used to define job satisfaction in different researches at different times. Till now no consensus exists among researchers regarding which particular facet can be best used to describe job satisfaction (Gruenberg, 1979). Some of the facets of job satisfaction are (a) satisfaction with work itself, (b) satisfaction with pay, (c) satisfaction with promotional opportunity, (d) satisfaction with work conditions, (e) satisfaction with supervision, (e) satisfaction with organizational practices, and (f) satisfaction with relationship with co-workers (Goris, Vaught, & Pettit, 2000; Misener, Haddock, Gleaton, & Ajamieh, 1996; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). For example an individual that has good relationship with her co-worker is more satisfied with her job (Yang, Brown, & Byoongook Moon, 2011). However, some of the researchers view job satisfaction as a global construct (Lambert, 2003; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). Also, job satisfaction expresses itself differently in different people, its intensity depends on many factor such as working environment, person’s need, expectations, and individual’s pe
Dormio, Galati, & Schiuma, 2012). There are various factors that affect job satisfaction. Factors such as role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload are associated with lower satisfaction regarding the job (Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Clarke, 2005, 2004; Lambert & Paoline, 2005). On the other hand, factors such as job autonomy, satisfaction with pay, integration, quality of supervision, training, equitable treatment and incentive program are associated with higher satisfaction regarding the job (Lambert et al., 2006; Griffin & Hepburn, 2005; Lambert & Paoline, 2005; Lambert et al., 2004; Griffin, 2001).

2.2.1 Benefits of Job Satisfaction

A more satisfied employee is an asset to his organization and as such the management of any organization should always be geared toward taking such steps as to increase the satisfaction of employees. A more satisfied employee is involved in more innovative activities for continuous betterment, exhibits loyalty and actively participates in decision making process of his organization (Kivimaki & Kalimo, 1994). It has also been found that job satisfaction is positively related to customer’s satisfaction (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Employees with higher satisfaction care more about quality of their work, are more committed and productive, and are less inclined to change their organization (Ishigaki, 2004). On the other hand, low job satisfaction results in undesirable consequences such as absenteeism, organizational inefficiency, counter-productive behavior and sabotage (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007).

2.3 Organizational justice and Job Satisfaction

Justice is an important predictor of workplace attitude and behaviour like job satisfaction. It has been found by many researchers that all components of justice have
a significant impact on job satisfaction but which one of them is more predictive of job satisfaction is not clear. Further, theories and empirical literatures are inconsistent as to why distributive and procedural justice affects job satisfaction (Clay-Warner, Reynolds, & Roman, 2005). There are three competing models which seek to explain the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. They are as under:-

(a) Personal Outcome Model : Distributive Justice and Job Satisfaction

According to this model, distributive justice is the key variable that predicts workplace attitudes like job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). This model believes that workers focus more on distributive fairness as they believe that fair distribution will result in favorable distribution. Individuals may desire fair procedures, but only because they expect fair procedure to produce fair distributions (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Thus, according to this model, procedural justice will have no or little effect on job satisfaction when controlling for distributive justice, but distributive justice will be a consistent and significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007) argued that if an employee is treated unfairly, then the probability that the job remains satisfying for him remain low and therefore predicted that distributive justice would have an impact on job satisfaction. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) found in their study of bank employees that both distributive and procedural justice were significant predictor of job satisfaction. However, distributive justice was more important predictor accounting for 5% of the variance while procedural justice accounted for only 1% of the variance. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) further showed that distributive justice is better predictor of personal outcomes such as job satisfaction while proce
predictor of organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment. Martin and Bennett (1996) also found in their study of financial services company that distributive justice was the stronger predictor of job satisfaction. Similarly, various research cited in Colquitt et al. (2001) found that distributive justice was a stronger predictor of satisfaction with pay and supervisory style than would be a procedural justice.

**Hypothesis 1:** Distributive justice will be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than procedural justice.

**(b) Group Value Model: Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction**

Contrary to the personal outcome model, the group value model posits that procedural justice is stronger and consistent predictor of job satisfaction and these effects will be independent of distributive justice. Inspired from social identity theory, Lind and Tyler (1998) argued that man as social animal desires and consequently, strive to become valued member of the group by actively participating in group activities. This participation in group activities is ensured when procedurally fair norms, practices or policies are in place that allows the person to voice her opinions, ideas or concerns freely. This participation in group activities increases self esteem of the person and she experience more satisfaction in her job. Thus, this model believes that people are more concerned with fair procedures and therefore, procedural justice is a strong predictor of job satisfaction.

The theory was corroborated by empirical finding of (Lissak, Mendes, & Lind, 1983) in their study of personnel from Canadian Armed Forces where it was found that procedural justice was more important predictor of job satisfaction than distributive justice. Similar result
Alexander and Ruderman (1987) in their study of government employees. Lambert (2003) too found that procedural justice had a larger magnitude of effect than distributive justice. Further, Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) found that procedural justice have a stronger association with job satisfaction than interpersonal justice. In one Indian study, Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009) found positive and significant association of distributive and procedural justice with job satisfaction as well as with organizational commitment of medical college employees of India. In educational context, research by Zaman, Ali and Ali (2010) and Fatt, Khin, and Heng, (2010) found similar results.

**Hypothesis 2:** Procedural justice will be at least as strong a predictor of job satisfaction as is distributive justice.

**(c) Psychological Contract Model**

This model posits that the effects of distributive and procedural justice on work attitudes like job satisfaction depends on how well the person is connected with his or her organization. People who have been victim of firing or downsizing are generally less connected with their organization because of breach of psychological contract between them and their organization. These loosely connected workers are less motivated to care about procedural justice than are strongly connected workers. On the other hand, Lind and Tyler (1988) argued that strongly connected workers seek out procedurally fair treatment as a way to confirm their position in their group, thereby boosting self-esteem. In short, downsized workers care less about procedural justice than those who have never experienced downsizing (Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt, & Roman, 2005).
Empirical studies by Clay-Warner et al. (2005), Brockner, Tyler, and Cooper-Schneider (1992), and Lind and Tyler (1990) lent support to this theory. Clay-Warner et al. (2005) found that distributive justice was a stronger predictor of organizational commitment among victims of downsizing than procedural justice, while procedural justice was a better predictor of organizational commitment among survivors of downsizing. Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment shared similar antecedents and therefore models that predict organizational commitment might also predict job satisfaction, particular with respect to justice variable.

2.4 Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction

Interactional justice comprises of interpersonal and informational justice and both forms of justice have different relationship with job satisfaction (Vries & Naus, 2010). According to ‘Fairness Heuristic theory’, people use readily available fairness information to guide their job attitudes and behaviors. Loi, Yang and Diefendorff (2009) posited that social form of justice (i.e. interpersonal and informational justice) have a direct influence on job satisfaction and the structural form of justice (i.e. distributive and procedural justice) may act only to enhance or constraint this influence. They further argued that distributive justice interacts with interpersonal justice because interpersonal justice represents social aspect of distributive justice. Similarly, procedural justice interacts with informational justice because informational justice represents social aspects of procedural justice. As a consequence, if distributive justice is low, people rely more on interpersonal justice so that interpersonal justice has more influence on job satisfaction in this scenario. Likewise, if procedural justice is low,
people rely more on informational justice so that in this scenario informational justice has more influence on job satisfaction. Loi et al. (2009) have found evidence that distributive justice moderates the relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction (see fig. 2.1). Similarly, procedural justice was also found to moderate the relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction (see fig.2.2).

Figure 2.1 Moderating effect of distributive justice on the relation between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction.
2.5 Organizational Commitment

The study of organizational commitment under the discipline of ‘organizational psychology’ and ‘organizational behaviour’ has grown in popularity over the last two decades (Chung, 2001). Such studies are warranted considering the fact that there exists positive linkage between organizational commitment and job performance (Brown, 1996). Organizational commitment is an indicator of bonding of an employee to his or her organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) defined organizational commitment as a behaviour that supports employees’ decision to be permanent member of the organization. A committed employee stays with the organization through thick and thin, attends work regularly, puts in full day, protects company’s assets and shares company’s goal (Allen & Meyer, 1997). Higher commitment of an employee to her organization shows stronger bond she has with her organization (Lambert et al., 1999).

Figure 2.2 Moderating effect of procedural justice on the relation between informational justice and job satisfaction
Higher levels of organizational commitment means more loyalty to the organization, stronger identification with the organization (i.e., the worker takes pride in his organization and internalizes the goals of the organization), and higher desire for involvement in the organization (i.e., greater willingness to make a personal effort for the sake of the organization) (Cook & Wall, 1980; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Based on different psychological states involved in this definition of organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) tried to compartmentalize organizational commitment into three components. They are: -

(a) Affective commitment
(b) Continuance commitment
(c) Normative commitment

But Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) evaluated organizational commitment on two different dimensions – (a) Behavioural commitment, and (b) Attitudinal commitment. In this study, commitment has been conceptualised into three components as proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991).

The explanation of affective, continuance and normative commitment was given by Meyer and Allen (1984). They posited that a person with ‘affective commitment’ is emotionally attached to the organization, internalizes the goal of the organization, strongly identifies with the organization, makes extra effort for the organization and hold strong desire to remain in the organization. Another kind of employee is the one who has ‘continuance commitment’. These people are less emotional and more calculative regarding costs and benefits (for e.g., pensions, working hours etc.) of being with the organization. Next is those kind of employees who have ‘normative commitment’. These people have some sort of feelings of obligation to stay with the organization.
Like job satisfaction, organizational commitment also positively and significantly relates to positive work behaviours and attitudes like extra work effort and innovativeness (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), creative performance (Rotondi, 1975), compliance with official rules and goals (Fox, 1982), receptivity to change and openness to innovation (Wycoff & Skogan, 1994; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1992), improved job performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989; Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984), increased organizational performance (Ostroff, 1992), worker productivity (Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980), extra role behaviours (Witt & Wilson, 1991; Katz & Kahn, 1978), and positive employee social responsibility (Witt, 1990; Bateman & Organ, 1983). Also, high levels of commitment reduce withdrawal behaviours like lateness and turnover (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Moreover, a low level of organizational commitment is associated with negative work behaviours and attitudes like include reduced job performance, theft, sabotage, absenteeism, early retirement, and turnover (Hulin, Roznowski, & Hachiya, 1985). Low commitment means the employee can leave the organization at the earliest available opportunity which in turn can lead to increase in employee turnover, lower performance and lower customer satisfaction, thereby adversely affecting efficiency and effectiveness of the organization (Yazicioğlu & Topaloğlu, 2009).

### 2.6 Organizational Justice and Commitment

Organizational justice has been found to affect a number of work related behaviours and attitudes including organizational commitment (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987). Several researches have shown that a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment exists (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993; Dailey & Kirk, 1992;
Kovnosky & Folger, 1987). Further, it has also been found that procedural justice is more strongly related to organizational commitment than distributive justice (Kovnosky & Cropanzano, 1991). Similarly, findings of Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) and McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) have also suggested that procedural justice has stronger influences on organizational commitment than other types of justice (Tyler, 1990). The reasons for predominant influence of procedural justice over organizational commitment is rooted in relational models of justice such as the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988), the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992) and group-engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2003). In summary, these models argue that use of fair procedures in determining outcomes (by allowing employees to express or voice their opinions) communicates to employees that they are valued and worthy members of the organization. This increases trust in the management regarding fair distribution of outcomes which lead to development of commitment and loyalty to the organization in the employees (Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002; Cropanzano & Schminke, 2001). However, there are some scholars like Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) who found that both distributive and procedural justice is important predictor of employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The findings of Pillai, Williams, and Tan, (2001) are more interesting. They found that procedural justice plays a more important role than distributive justice in predicting employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment in USA but the reverse hold true in India.

As discussed above, most of the studies while working on relationship between justice and commitment had restricted their focus on only two dimensions of justice i.e. distributive and procedural justice (e.g., Haque, Chawdhury & Ali, 2010; Ponnu & Chuah, 2010; Bakshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009; Loi, Hang-yue & Fol, 2006). There are few other studies which have taken organisational justice as
construct with interactional justice being the third dimension (Leow & Khong, 2009).

In this context, this study can be said to be unique in the sense that it had taken all the four dimensions of justice including interpersonal and informational justice while studying the relationship between organisational justice and commitment. Most of the studies have found distributive and procedural justice to be a significant predictor of commitment. Therefore, further research is required to establish the relationship of commitment with informational and interpersonal justice.

The study conducted by Haque et al. (2010) has found that 'procedural justice' has positive effect over 'affective commitment' but 'distributive justice' doesn't have. This finding points to importance of procedural justice to those employees who want to maintain long-term membership with the organization. Another recent study conducted by Gim and Mat Desa (2013) found that both distributive and procedural justice were significantly and positively related to affective commitment. This finding is in line with the meta-analysis by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, (2002) who found that all the three dimensions of justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) were strongly correlated with affective commitment. The meta-analysis also found normative commitment to be strongly and positively correlated with all forms of justice. However, continuance commitment was found to be weakly correlated with only interactional justice and that too came out to be negative; its correlation with other two dimensions of justice was insignificant.

2.7 Affectivity as a Moderator

All human beings have affectivity – the ability to feel emotions. In psychology, affect is an emotion or subjectively experienced feeling. Affectivity is a personality variable and has been conceptualised as a two dimensional construct – positive
affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) (Agho, 1993). Positive affectivity is defined as the degree to which an individual feels enthusiastic, active, and alert (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988a), is predisposed to be happy (Agho, 1993) and have overall sense of well-being and engagement with life (Fortunato & Stone-Romero, 1999); negative affectivity reflects an individual predisposition to experience discomfort (Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984), nervousness, tension and worry as well as negative emotionality (Fortunato & Stone-Romero, 1999). Evidence in the literature suggests that individuals with high disposition for PA tend to accentuate the positive aspects of themselves, others, and the world in general, whereas individuals with high disposition for NA tend to focus on the negative aspects of themselves and life in general (Clark & Watson, 1991; Watson, Pennebaker, & Folger, 1987; Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984). Moreover, people high in NA react more negatively to any given stressful situations, maintain higher baseline levels of stress, focus more on subjective experiences rather than on objective conditions, and manifest higher levels of physiological, psychological, and psychopathological symptoms (Watson & Clark, 1984) as compared to those who are low on NA. Compared to low PA individuals, high PA people tend (a) to experience higher levels of positive emotions and mood states; (b) to be pleasurably engaged, both in terms of interpersonal relations and achievement (Watson & Pennebaker, 1989; Tellegen, 1985, 1982); and (c) to report higher levels of energy, activity, enthusiasm, determination, and concentration (Watson Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; Watson, 1988; Costa & McCrae, 1980). Although seems to be related, the two are conceptually and empirically different and orthogonal dimensions (George, 1992; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; Watson, 1988; Diener & Emmons, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984).
Various researches have been undertaken to see the effect of PA and NA on organisationally relevant affective and behavioural variables. For example, NA has been found to be negatively related to job satisfaction (Fortunato & Williams, 2002; Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992; Chen & Spector, 1991; Levin & Stokes, 1989) and organisational commitment (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993). On the other hand, NA has found to be positively related to absenteeism (George, 1990), stressful life events (e.g., Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Payot, 1993; Brett, Brief, Burke, George, & Webster, 1990), job ambiguity and role conflict (Spector, Chen, & O’Connell, 2000; Heinisch & Jex, 1998), work overload (Heinisch & Jex, 1998), intentions to quit (Chen & Spector, 1991), and withdrawal behaviors (Necowitz & Roznowski, 1994). Similarly, research has shown that PA correlates positively with job satisfaction (e.g., Duffy, Ganster, & Shaw, 1998; Fortunato & Williams, 2002; Cropanzano et al., 1993; Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992), organizational commitment (Cropanzano et al., 1993), turnover (Cropanzano et al., 1993), positive life events (Magnus et al., 1993), positive mood states (Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991), and perceptions of autonomy and work-group adhesion (e.g., Agho et al., 1992).

Various researches suggest that NA and PA moderate various relationships of interest to social and organizational psychologists (Fortunato & Stone-Romero, 1999). There has been very few researches that studied moderating effect of affectivity in justice literature. It is expected that both NA and PA will have strong moderating effect. Neuro-imaging evidences reveals the activation of emotionally relevant brain structures when people make fairness and moral assessments (Moll, de Oliveira-Souza, Moll, Ignácio, Bramati, Caparelli-Dáquer, & Eslinger, 2005; Moll, de Oliveira-Souza, Eslinger, Bramati, Mourão-Miranda, Andreiuolo, & Pessoa, 200
2002; Greene, Sommerville, Nystrom, Darley, & Cohen, 2001). This indicates that presence or absence of justice in an organization does have influence on affectivity of workers which in turn have an impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Based on the argument of Judge (1993), it is proposed that injustice at work would be particularly damaging to high-PA individuals, since the dissatisfaction caused by injustice “is much more salient and generates more tension for generally happy individuals”. They argue that individuals high on PA believe that the “grass is greener” elsewhere, amplifying the effects of injustice. Conversely, individuals low on PA would not react as strongly to organizational (in)justice as would high-PA individuals. Obviously low-PA individuals would prefer to have fairness at work over unfair work environment, but their reactions to an unfair job are likely to be less intense than their high-PA counterparts. In line with the literature, it is expected that the relationship between justice and attitude reactions (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) is strengthened when the applicant is affectively aroused.

2.8 Forgiveness as Moderator

According to Follett (1918), men are gregarious in nature. In organizational settings, an individual will enter into various kinds of ‘reciprocal relationships’ with colleagues, subordinates, supervisors etc. McClelland (1965) said that the need for affiliation (nAff), i.e. the need to be a part of warm or close relationships, motivate a person to interact with others and to build harmonious interpersonal relationships. However, partners are bound to be imperfect and so are the relationships. Therefore, feeling of hurt or injury is inevitable in any relationship (Fincham, 2009). The offended partner may experience negative feelings like anger, disappointment, resentment,
neglect, hatred etc. (Fincham, 2009; Karremans, Lange, Ouwerkerk, & Kluwer, 2003). This in turn will affect organisationally relevant behaviours and actions.

American Psychological Association [APA] (2006) defines forgiveness as a voluntary or intentional process that involves a change in emotion and attitude regarding an transgressor. This process results into reduction in motivation to avoid contact with the transgressor as well as to seek revenge against him. Not only that the negative emotions, thoughts or motivations towards the transgressor are reduced, the act of forgiving also leads to increase in positive emotions and perspectives such as empathy, hope, compassion (Harris & Thoresen, 2005), benevolence, love and compassion (Fincham, 2009; McCullough, 2000). As such forgiving is pro-social as it generates strong motivation to maintain a positive relations with others, thereby promoting harmony in relationship (McCullough, 2000). All these factors, together, serve to promote harmony and continuity in interpersonal relationship (Fincham, 2009; Ceccarelli & Molinari, 2007; McCullough, 2000).

In the measurement of forgiveness, there are two types of forgiveness: - *trait forgiveness* (Thompson et al., 2005) – a tendency to be forgiving across situations, and *state forgiveness* (McCullough et al., 1998) – forgiveness to be offered in a particular transgression. In this study, focus is on dispositional forgiveness which is measured by Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS; Thompson et al., 2005). In this scale, three types of dispositional forgives is measured- (a) Forgiveness of self- how forgiving a person tends to be of oneself, (b) Forgiveness of others- how forgiving a person tends to be of other people or transgressors and (c) Forgiveness of situation- how forgiving a person tends to be of negative circumstances, events, or situations that are beyond anyone’s control (such as an illness or a natural disaster).
Many researchers have pointed out the importance of forgiveness in workplace environment too (Bottom, Gibson, Daniel, & Murningham, 2002; Cameron & Caza, 2002; Butler & Mullis, 2001; Kurzynski, 1998). According to Acquino, Grover, Goldman and Folger (2003), forgiveness should be an important concern for both organizational theorists and practicing managers because it is a way for individuals to repair damaged workplace relationships and overcome debilitating thoughts and emotions resulting from interpersonal injury (p.210). Injustice in organizations can be seen as an act of transgression. Transgressions are events that people perceive as violating their expectations and assumptions about how they, other people or the world “ought” to be (Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen, Billings, & Roberts, 2005). When people experience transgressions, they typically develop negative thoughts (“this has ruined my life”), feelings (e.g., anger), or behaviours (seeking revenge) related to the transgressor, transgression, or associated outcomes that reflect how they are responding (cognitively, affectively, or behaviourally) to the transgression. Since workplace injustice can be seen as a transgression and forgiveness is “a willingness to abandon one’s right to resentment, negative judgments, and indifferent behaviour toward one who unjustly hurt us, while fostering the undeserved qualities of compassion, generosity, and even love toward him or her” (Enright, Freedman, & Rique 1998, pp.46-47), it is likely that employee forgiveness will moderate the relationship between organizational injustice and attitudinal reactions. In particular, relative to the unforgiving counterpart, forgiving individual is expected more likely to maintain the organizational commitment and less likely to be unsatisfied by his job, in case he perceive injustice (a transgression).

2.9 Sense of Control as a Moderator
The concept of sense of control could be understood through two distinct but related frameworks – ‘self determination framework’ and ‘impact framework’ (Brockner, Spreitzer, Mishra, Hochwarter, Pepper, & Weinberg, 2004). Under the self determination framework, a person with high sense of control is initiator of her own behavior, while a person with low sense of control simply react to her environment and therefore her behavior is, at most times, simply a response to any external stimuli. In other words, a high sense of control would mean the person have high levels of discretion over inputs in their work activities.

On the other hand, under the impact framework, a person having high sense of control believes that her behavior strongly influence important outcomes (Rotter, 1966 as cited in Brockner et al., 2004). Here, the concept of sense of control is closely related with the concept of ‘locus of control’. Generally, people with internal locus of control (the person believes they can control their life) perceives high sense of control while people with external locus of control (meaning they believe that their decisions and life are controlled by environmental factors which they cannot influence) have lower sense of control (Jeanty, 2010). However, we don't actually need to be in control all of the time. What we really seek is a sense of control (Siegel, 2008). Various researchers have found that internal locus of control is negatively correlated with anxiety (Spector, 1982) and positively with achievement orientation (Hattrup, O’Connell, & Labrador, 2005). It has also been found that people with internal locus of control exhibit lesser stress, higher work motivation and are more likely to emerge as leaders than people with external sense of control (Spector, 1982). There are some other researches also which predict the relationship between locus of control and job performance. The findings of these researches is that people with high sense of control (i.e. those whose locus of control is internal) performed better on job, and showe
cooperation, self reliance and independence than people with lower sense of control (i.e. those whose locus of control is external) (Hough, 1992, Cravens & Worchel, 1977; Tseng, 1970). Thus, it can be concluded that people with high sense of control are more likely to exhibit OCB than those with lower sense of control (Blakely, Srivastava, & Moorman, 2005).

Some researchers have tried to link the concept of sense of control with the theory of motivation. One of them, Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, and Ryan (1991) believed that people with high sense of control are guided by *intrinsically motivated behavior* or self determined behavior. These people are engaged in those activities that interest them and out of their own volition and therefore are able to derive pleasure and satisfaction from their performance. On the other hand, those with low sense of control are guided by *extrinsically motivated behavior* or extrinsically guided behavior. These people do not perform out of their own volition or interest but they undertake any activity because they think that their performance is linked to some separable consequences (attainment of rewards or avoidance of punishment). For example, an extrinsically motivated employee will tend to bring out only her minimum effort merely to ensure that her job or position is secured. Thus, it can be said that extrinsically motivated behavior are instrumental in nature.

In the *Control theory*, Rotter (1966) argues that if a person believes that the outcome is dependent mostly on her own behavior and abilities (internal locus of control) then she actively engages herself in learning and problem solving in order to seek rewards and avoid punishments. In the long run, a personal history of meeting and solving problems improves one's conditions, skills, and self-assurance (Mirowsky & Ross, 1990). On the other hand, if she perceives that outcomes are ultimately determined by luck, fate, chance, powerful others, or unpredictable
external locus of control), then she is not so much interested in learning and problem solving, and passively accepts rewards or punishments that come along. Therefore, according to Control theory, sense of internal control is associated with decreased depression; a sense of external control is associated with increased depression (Benassi, Sweeney, & Dufour, 1988 as cited in Mirowsky & Ross, 1990) thereby impacting well being (Mirowsky & Ross, 1990). Moreover, lack of control (i.e. perceived powerlessness) results in anxiety, malaise, physical illness, alcoholism and death (Seeman & Lewis 1995; Mirowsky & Ross 1990, 1989; Rodin 1986; Seeman & Anderson 1983; Pearlin, Morton, Elizabeth, & Joseph, 1981; Wheaton 1980 as cited in Ross, 2000). However, Defense theory claims that a higher sense of control is not always beneficial. The habit of taking personal responsibility (by people with high sense of control) for undesirable conditions and events is harmful (Kadushin 1983; Kaplan, Robbins, & Martin, 1983) because it implies guilt or delusion (Wheaton, 1985) and therefore may not be emotionally healthy (Martin, Abramson, & Alloy, 1984).

Also, it has been found that Type A personalities, who are known for investing heavily in controlling their lives, are at greater risk of developing coronary heart disease (Lachman & Weaver, 1998). This view has also been supported by Thompson, Thomas, Rickabaugh, Tantamjarik, Otsuki, Pan, ... & Sinar, (1998) who suggested that since low income group do not have much opportunity to take control, it is possible that having a high sense of control would lead to disappointment and frustration.

Now the pertinent question is what are the conditions which influence control of a person in work situations. Ross and Reskin (1992) defines control at work in terms of three parameters – a) Control over one’s own work, b) Control over others, and c) Control over money.
a) **Control over one’s own work:** Creative (non-routine) and autonomous work increases a worker’s sense of control. A creative or non-routine work requires greater degree of skills, learning and problem-solving capabilities thereby increasing the control of worker over the work. Again autonomous work gives workers a higher degree of freedom to make their own work related decisions rather than solely relying on supervisor for this. Another literature highlights positive social interaction as an important factor which increases control over work by allowing workers to work as a team (Ross & Wright, 1988).

b) **Control over others:** It is measured by amount of authority to supervise others. It increases perceived control as it increases control over one’s own work (Link et al., 1993 as cited in Ross, 2000).

c) **Control over money:** It is measured as participation in monetary decision-making, including deciding the size of budgets and how they are spent.

There are good amount of literature that throws light on the relationship between perceived control and justice. People seek justice because it increases the certainty of future benefits they are likely to receive from the organization. Once sure of benefits one can receive and guided by economic interest, the employee puts in more efforts toward achievement of organizational goals, thereby increasing his control over the outcomes (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). In short, a just environment in work place situation will enable an employee to have greater sense of control. i.e.

**Justice → Sense of Control**

On the other hand, Brashear, Manolis, and Brooks (2005) believed that control over some processes and decisions allows employees to be more certain of the relationship between their efforts (inputs) and outcomes such as pay or promotion and
thus the employees will perceive more justice. In short, control over processes and decisions enhance perception of justice in an organizational setting. i.e.

Sense of Control \( \rightarrow \) Justice

1) Control and Distributive Justice: When an employee perceives fairness in benefits or outcomes he receives from the organization relative to the contribution he makes, he puts in more efforts toward fulfilment of organizational goals, thereby increasing his control over outcomes (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007). In other words, higher level of distributive justice will result into higher sense of control, i.e.

Distributive justice \( \rightarrow \) Sense of control

On the other hand, higher level of sense of control (in terms of process and decision control) improves the perception about distributive justice. When a worker has the power to make decision (decision control), she chooses favourable outcomes for herself thereby improving her perception of distributive justice. Even if she cannot make decisions on her own but if she is allowed to participate in decision making process (process control), her perception of distributive justice increases as she has the opportunity to present alternative outcomes favourable to her, thereby influencing the actual outcome (Brashear, Manolis, & Brooks, 2005). i.e.

Sense of control \( \rightarrow \) Distributive justice

2) Control and Procedural Justice: Procedural justice literatures overwhelmingly suggest that higher level of decision control (authority to make a decision) as well as process control (opportunity to influence the decision maker) improves worker perceptions of justice (Poole, 2007). This is because control over processes and decisions or opportunity to voice one’s opinion provide an individual an opportunity to influence outcomes in his or her own favour (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Tyler & Lind, 1992), thus that processes or decisions that is used to
is perceived to be fair. For example, budgetary participation enhances the perceptions of procedural justice as it enables managers to express their opinion, thereby increasing their sense of control (Langevin & Mandoza, 2010), i.e.

\[ \text{Procedural justice} \rightarrow \text{Sense of control} \]

3) **Control and Informational Justice**: Informational justice focuses on the information provided to people to convey as to why certain procedures were used or why outcomes were distributed in a certain way (Greenberg, 1990). Tyler (1994) in his paper point out Resource-based justice models suggest that people use information about procedures to make inferences about their longer term outcomes (Roberson & Stewart, 2010), thereby increasing the certainty about outcomes, which in turn, increases their sense of control over outcomes. Further, Brockner (2010) in his book suggested that if an employee is given information as to why unfavourable outcomes was received by him, then he will do things so as to increase the chance of getting favourable outcomes which in turn increases his sense of control over outcomes, i.e.

\[ \text{Informational justice} \rightarrow \text{Sense of control} \]

4) **Control and Interpersonal Justice**: Brockner (2010) in his book pointed out that when an employee is treated with dignity and politeness by decision makers in face of unfavorable outcomes, he feels less alienated. This enhances his ability to manage the threat and therefore his sense of control over outcomes increases, i.e.

\[ \text{Interpersonal justice} \rightarrow \text{Sense of control} \]

So, the significant expected relationship between justice and sense of control suggest that there might be a problem of multicollinearity when attitudinal reactions of an employee (i.e job satisfaction and organizational commitment) is regressed on justice while incorporating moderation effects of sense of control.
Again there is a vast amount of literature which suggests that there exists positive relationship between sense of control and organizational commitment. In a study of 412 nurses employed on contractual basis it was found that high job control and high perception of justice in decision making predicted sustained organizational commitment (Miettinen, 2008; Jalonen, Virtanen, Vahtera, Elovainio, & Kivimaki, 2006). Study by Coleman, Irving, & Cooper (1999) found that internal locus of control (i.e. high sense of control) is significantly related to affective commitment (it refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to identification with, and involvement in the organization) while external locus of control (low sense of control) is related to continuance commitment (it refers to awareness of costs associated with leaving the organization). Also, there are scores of literatures which shows positive relationship between sense of control and job satisfaction. The main reason why individuals with an internal locus of control are more satisfied with their jobs is their perceived ability to control situations (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998).

However, there is no literature that captures directly the moderation effect of sense of control on the relationship between attitudinal reactions (job satisfaction and organizational satisfaction) and justice. In this sense, this thesis is novel as it tries to look for that moderation effect if any. However, the logic suggests that sense of control should moderate the relationship between attitudinal reactions and justice. A high sense of control means that in the face of perceived injustice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment will not fall as much as what would have been, had there been no moderation effect of sense of control because the employee (with high sense of control) will expand her efforts in order to get more favorable outcomes as she blames her own behavior or abilities for unfavorable outcome and therefore actively engages in learning and problem solving for getting favorable reward. Conve
control means that in the face of perceived justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment will not increase as much as what would have been, had there been no moderation effect of sense of control as the employee will think that favorable outcomes she received is merely because of chance, luck, fate etc.

On the basis of reviewed literature following objectives and hypotheses were formulated.

2.10 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study are:

1. To examine the effect of organizational justice on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2. To examine the differential effects of distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment

3. To examine the moderating effect of employees’ personal attributes of ‘affectivity’, ‘forgiveness’, and ‘sense of control’ on the relationship of perceived organizational justice and job attitudes (i.e. job satisfaction and organizational commitment).

2.11 Hypotheses

On the basis of review of literature and objectives of the present investigation, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Organizational justice of all forms would positively correlate with employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2. Distributive justice would predict relatively more variation in employees’ job satisfaction in comparison to procedural justice.
3. Procedural justice in organization would predict relatively more variation in employees’ organizational commitment in comparison to other dimensions of organizational justice.

4. Distributive justice would significantly influence the development of continuance commitment among the employees.

5. Procedural justice would significantly influence the development of normative commitment among the employees.

6. Interactional justice would significantly influence the development of affective commitment among the employees.

7. Personal attributes of affectivity, forgiveness, and sense of control would positively moderate the relationship between perceived organizational justice and employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment.