CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The objectives of the present study were to: (a) determine the extent to which different dimensions of organisational justice influence job satisfaction and organisational commitment of employees in software profession in India, (b) analyse the moderating effect of employee’s affectivity, sense of control and forgiveness on the relationship between justice variables and job satisfaction / organisational commitment.

As hypothesised, the study found significant and positive relationship between all dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction as well as organisational commitment. In other words, for enhancing job satisfaction of employees, HR manager must strive toward improving perception of justice among employees. This finding is in line with findings of earlier researches. However, almost all of the earlier researches had restricted their focus to only two dimensions of justice (i.e., distributive and procedural justice) while studying the relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction (Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009; Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009; Lambert, 2003; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002; Colquitt et al., 2001, McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Relationship between interactional justice (i.e., informational & interpersonal justice) and job satisfaction has been studied much lesser (Vries & Naus, 2010). The present study revealed that the other two dimensions of organisational justice (i.e., informational and interactional justice) too strongly influence job satisfaction. The possible reason may be that when employees are treated well by their supervisor, norm of reciprocity suggests that employees feel obligated (toward his or her supervisor) to complete the tasks assigned to them by the supervisor. This enhances their performance resulting in increase in rewards commensurate with increased contribution as suggested by Vroom’s
expectancy theory. This increase in reward in turn enhances job satisfaction of employees (Berghe, 2011). In short, when employees are treated with dignity and respect, they reciprocate by raising their performance and become eligible for larger rewards which in turn results in job satisfaction.

This study also found that in software companies, procedural justice is better predictor of job satisfaction than distributive justice. Some of earlier researches (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) had found distributive justice to be better predictor of job satisfaction as these researchers reasoned that employees are mainly concerned with outcomes they receive and therefore they seek distributive justice. However there are other researchers (Lind & Tyler, 1998; Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Lissak et al., 1983) whose findings are in line with present study’s finding that procedural justice is better predictor of job satisfaction. The reason may be that in software companies, most of the tasks are group-tasks and therefore stress is on team work. In this context, an employee always strives to become a valuable member of her group, which is possible when she have the opportunity to participate in group activities, which in turn is ensured when procedurally fair norms, practices or policies are in place that allows the person to voice his opinions, ideas or concerns freely. In other words, Indian software professionals give more importance to fairness in procedures that allocate outcomes than outcomes itself. Those organizations that ignore procedural justice concern, runs the risk of endangering negative organizational outcomes of decisions, non-compliance with rules and procedures, and in some instances, lower satisfaction (Mashinchi, Yaghoubi, Ahmadi, Hadi, & Hamid, 2012).

Although not hypothesized, when SEM was used for checking hypothesis 2 in AMOS, it was found that informational justice is the most important
satisfaction among all four dimensions of justice. \( \beta \) for informational justice came out to be \( .43 \) while that of procedural, distributive and interpersonal justice was \( .39, .15 \) and \( .18 \) respectively (see fig 5.1). This finding is similar to the findings of Iqbal (2013) in Pakistani settings. He too found interactional justice to be better predictor of job satisfaction than distributive or procedural justice. There can be two reasons why informational justice came out to be the most important predictor of job satisfaction. First, a large majority of the sample of the present study consisted of highly educated persons. The nature of work in software is also somewhat dynamic. ‘Situational Leadership theory’ of Hersey and Blanchard suggests that software professionals should be provided with timely and adequate information relating to their job so that they can perform their job smoothly. So, performance of employees improves when there exists informational justice which in turn results in greater job satisfaction (Berghe, 2011). Secondly, when employees receive justifications from their supervisor as to why a decision was taken, they feel themselves as valued member of the organisation. As a result, there exists harmony in relationship between employees and supervisors which enhance level of job satisfaction in employees. So, informational justice will positively predict job satisfaction. So, it is an important lesson for HR manager that when they think of organisational justice they should not restrict themselves to distributive and procedural justice only but, also remember that interactional justice plays more important role.

Among demographic variables, only salary in hierarchical regression analysis (see table 5.3), and salary and tenure in SEM analysis (see fig 5.1) were found to be significantly associated with job satisfaction. As expected salary came out to be positively associated (\( \beta = .13 \)) with job satisfaction. Tenure, however, was found to be negatively associated (\( \beta = -.12 \)) with job satisfaction. The reason lies in Herzberg’s U shaped relationship between job satisfaction and tenure. He and his c
job satisfaction was high when people started their first job, but subsequently it declined after first year of work until their late twenties or early thirties. This decline in satisfaction at job was due to non fulfilment of high initial work expectations (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957). Since 95% of our respondents were quite young, between the age of 20 to 30 years, this negative relationship between job satisfaction and tenure was expected.

This study also tried to find out the relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment with the help of SEM in AMOS. It was found that of all dimensions of justice, only procedural and informational justice had significant effect on all dimensions of organisational commitment. Distributive justice did not have a significant effect on any of the components of organisational commitment, while interpersonal justice was found to be negatively related ($\beta = -.40$) to continuance commitment. This finding is in line with the study conducted by Haque (2010) which reported that 'procedural justice' has positive effect over 'affective commitment' but 'distributive justice' doesn't have. Also, Meta analysis study done by Meyer et al (2002) found that interactional justice (i.e., interpersonal and informational justice combined) is negatively correlated to continuance commitment. One possible explanation for why interpersonal justice can be negatively related to continuance commitment could be that in software sector in India, turnover rates among young professionals can go as high as 50 to 60% (Doh et al., 2008; Chiamsiri et al., 2005) with an industry average of 15% to 30% per year (Ribiero, 2011; Acharya & Mahanty, 2007). Better pay package offered by competing firms, career advancement ambitions, need to upgrade skill in new software and technology as software and technologies becoming obsolete very fast etc; are some of the reasons why employees are shifting to other companies. Companies are making efforts to retain their employees including treating their employee
respect. Thus, the finding of falling continuance commitment even when perception of interpersonal justice is increasing seems to be correct in light of above scenario.

As far as relationship between distributive justice and commitment is concerned, the finding is in line with that of Lambert (2003) and Martin and Bennett (1996) who found that organisational commitment is determined by procedural justice, not by distributive justice. Martin and Bennett (1996) argued that an individual may be dissatisfied with what was received, yet remain committed to an organization if the procedure which allocated such outcomes is perceived as being fair. In general, as scholars like Folger and Konovsky (1989), Greenberg (1987b) and Martin and Bennett (1996) believe that distributive justice affects only individual level attitudinal states, such as job satisfaction, while procedural justice affects both individual level attitudinal states (i.e., job satisfaction) and aggregate level attitudinal states, such as organizational commitment.

As hypothesised, the results (see table 5.5) also suggests that procedural justice emerged out to be the most important predictor of organisational commitment than any other dimensions of justice. This implies that HR managers should focus more on improving the perception of procedural justice if they want their employees to be more committed towards the organisation. The study also found informational justice to be significantly related to all components of organisational commitment. This is because informational justice entails provision of adequate information and explanations by decision makers, for example by offering a detailed account of final decisions made. This builds trust (Colquitt et al., 2001) and commitment among employees towards supervisor (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

The hypothesis that distributive justice would predict more variation in continuance commitment did not stand the test of current analysis.
distributive justice on continuance commitment was not significant at all. This is contrary to the findings of Dailey and Kirk (1992) who proposed that if employees perceive distributive injustice in terms of lower than expected outcomes then the benefits accruing from the organisation diminishes and they think of quitting the company, which indicates lower continuance commitment. However, as discussed earlier scholars like Lambert (2003) and Martin and Bennett (1996) who found that organisational commitment is not determined by distributive justice, as our findings suggest. However, the hypothesis that procedural justice would predict more variation in normative commitment than any other dimensions of justice was accepted. This is because fair procedures of allocating outcomes let employees feel that they will get fair share from the company (Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006) and their long term interest will be taken care of. So, they show greater loyalty (Cropanzano et.al, 2007) and develop a sense of obligation to their organization because of socialization experiences (Weiner, 1982) and need for reciprocity (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Moreover, procedural justice came out to be dominant predictor of affective commitment. Andrews, Kacmar, Blakely, and Bucklew (2008) also found similar result. While zero order correlation between distributive justice and affective commitment was found to be significant, distributive justice was found to be unrelated to affective commitment after controlling for age, gender and tenure. At the same time, procedural and informational justice was positively related to affective commitment after controlling for age, gender, and tenure.

This study finds negative affectivity being a stronger moderating variable than positive affectivity. Negative affectivity was found to be moderating relationship between (a) informational justice and job satisfaction, (b) informational justice and continuance commitment, (c) interpersonal justice and affective commitment, (d) procedural justice and job satisfaction, and (e) procedural justi
commitment. On the other hand, positive affectivity was found to be moderating relationship between only procedural justice and normative commitment.

As expected, positive affectivity was found to be strengthening the relationship between procedural justice and normative commitment (see fig 5.20). This is because people high in dispositional PA tend to be cheerful and energetic, and experience positive moods, such as pleasure or well-being, across a variety of situations, as compared to those low in PA who experience more sadness, melancholy, dullness, or lethargy (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). 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, (Clark & Watson, 1991; Watson et al., 1987; Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984). So, an individual who is high on positive affectivity trait, but reports a high level of procedural injustice, is more likely to be affected than one who is less positively disposed and hence normative commitment falls by greater amount than those who are low in positive affectivity trait. These individuals are likely to believe that the “grass is greener” elsewhere, amplifying the effects of injustice (Shaw, Duffy, Abdulla, & Singh, 2000). Conversely, low PA individuals would not react as strongly to organizational (in)justice as would high-PA individuals. Therefore, from the fig 5.20 we can see that the slope of the line representing normative commitment and procedural justice is steeper for individuals who are high on positive affectivity.

Negative affectivity, except in case of informational justice, was found to be dampening the relationships. In case of relationship between interpersonal justice and affective commitment, the reason may be that people high on NA are epitomized by subjective distress and unpleasurable engagements such as anger, hostility, demanding, distant, fear and anxiety, and low on NA by the absence of these feelings (Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, & Tellegen, 1999). George (1992) also argued that
are harder to like and have poorer relationships with supervisors than those who are low in NA. So, when they perceive interpersonal justice, their affective commitment (towards supervisor) do not increase (Andrews et al., 2008) as much as that of individuals who are low on negative affectivity trait because High NA people are apprehensive and kept on scanning the environment for potential threat. And therefore, slope of the line representing affective commitment and interpersonal justice is flatter for individuals who are high on negative affectivity which is shown in fig 5.12.

This argument can also be taken further to explain as to why negative affectivity dampens the relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction. As people with high dispositional NA tend to focus more on the negative aspects of themselves and life in general (Clark & Watson, 1991; Watson et al., 1987; Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984), their affective commitment (i.e., bonding or emotional attachment with the organisation) do not increase (Andrews et al., 2008) as much as that of individuals who are low on negative affectivity trait even when they perceive procedural justice. And therefore, slope of the line representing procedural justice and job satisfaction (see fig 5.14).

On the same line it can be explained as to why negative affectivity dampens the relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment. As people high on NA are subjectively distressed, they perform poorer at their job (Gillet, Vallerand, Marc-Andre´, Lafrenie`re, & Bureau, 2013). As such rewards received by people high on NA are lesser and therefore, benefits of staying with the company are lower vis a vis people who are low on NA trait. So, even when they perceive procedural justice, their continuance commitment does not increase (Andrews et al., 2008) as much as that of individuals who are low on negative affectivity trait. Therefore, slope of the line representing continuance commitment and procedural justice is (see
However, contrary to our expectation, negative affectivity was found to be strengthening relationships between (a) informational justice and job satisfaction, and (b) informational justice and continuance commitment. As far as relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction is concerned, there are two explanations. First, employees high on negative affectivity trait are more attentive to negative elements (Judge, 1993) of the job. So, when they perceive informational injustice their job satisfaction will fall more than those with low negative affectivity trait. As such, slope of the line representing information justice-job satisfaction relationship for people with high negative affectivity trait is steeper than that for people with low negative affectivity trait (see fig 5.4). This indicates negative affectivity strengthen the positive relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction. The second explanation has been taken from Necowitz and Roznowski (1994) research. Their studies showed that if task is not too complex or task conditions are not quite aversive then negative affectivity is a significant predictor of satisfaction. This is because people with high negative affectivity trait are more sensitive to threats and they may prepare well for such threats in advance (George & Zhou, 2002). Thus, if task is simple or task conditions are enjoyable, such person can perform better. As predicted by Vroom’s Expectancy Theory, better performance leads to rewards and, in turn, those rewards cause job satisfaction (Berghe & Hyung, 2011). These arguments can be seen in light of recent global economic meltdown of 2008 which continues to hit software companies even today. Adequate and timely justification by top management, for example, as to who will be fired and why during recession might have enabled people with high negative affectivity to prepare better for incoming threats and as such they might have perform harder to avoid firing and hence their performance and consequently job satisfaction could increase.
The reason as to why negative affectivity had strengthen informational justice and continuance commitment in this study is because people who are high on NA have poorer relationships with supervisors than those who are low in NA (George, 1992) and are very sensitive to negative elements (Judge, 1993) of the job. So, when people with high NA perceive informational injustice, their perception of benefit of staying with the company decline by more amount and therefore, their continuance commitment falls by larger amount than that of individuals who are low on negative affectivity trait. And therefore, slope of the line representing relationship between continuance commitment and informational justice is steeper for individuals who are high on negative affectivity (see fig 5.7).

Control is another variable which was found to have strong moderating effect. Lack of Control (LoC) moderated the relationships between (a) informational justice and job satisfaction, (b) interpersonal justice and job satisfaction, and (c) procedural justice and continuance commitment. Sense of Control (SoC) moderated relationships between (a) informational justice and affective commitment and (b) procedural justice and affective commitment.

Lack of control was found to dampen the relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction. This is because when employees receive timely and adequate information on the job, those who have higher degree of control experience less role ambiguity and therefore, are more focussed toward their work. They are able to utilise the available information more effectively, and hence tend to perform better (Singh & Rhoads, 1991). These people are more focussed toward their work and hence tend to perform better. As predicted by Vroom’s Expectancy Theory, better performance leads to rewards and, in turn, those rewards cause job satisfaction (Berghe & Hyung, 2011). In other words, employees who are higher in control trait
they perceive informational justice and hence, their job satisfaction is higher (see fig 5.5). Another reason has been noted in the study by Kasperson (1982) on hospital employees. The study revealed a high positive correlation between negative attitudes and external locus of control, which resulted in a low satisfaction level with the job. This implies that people with high lack of control experiences lower job satisfaction even when they perceive informational justice.

However, Lack of Control was found to strengthen the other two relationships. As far as interpersonal justice and job satisfaction is concerned, the reason as to why Lack of Control acted as a dampener is rooted in social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity. Because when people are not treated with dignity and respect (i.e., interpersonal injustice is received) in the organisation, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Thibuat & Kelley, 1959) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) suggest that they will show various workplace deviance (Holtz & Harold, 2009) which are harmful to their organization or individuals within their organization (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Dalal, 2005; O’Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). Moreover, it has been found that those who are high in lack of control trait show more work place deviance than those who are high in control trait (Griffin, O'Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998). Thus, those who are high in lack of control do not perform well at their job when they perceive interpersonal injustice (Nagami M, Tsutsumi A, Tsuchiya M, & Morimoto K, 2010) which leads to punishment or withholding of rewards (Vroom’s Expectancy theory) which in turn cause job satisfaction to decrease. Therefore, decline in satisfaction will be more for those who are high in lack of control than those who are low in lack of control when interpersonal injustice is perceived. In other words, the slope of the line representing relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal justice becomes steeper for people who are high in lack of control trait as shown in fig 5.11.
The same argument can be used to explain as to why lack of control dampens the relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment. When people who are high on Lack of Control perceive that procedures of allocating rewards are unfair, they will show more workplace deviance, which imply lower performance resulting in lower rewards or receipt of punishment. This lowered rewards or receipt of punishment increases the cost, or decreases the benefit, of staying in the company, thereby continuance commitment declines. The decline in continuance commitment will be more for those who are high in lack of control than those who rate higher in control when procedural injustice is perceived. In other words, the slope of the line representing relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment becomes steeper for people who are high in lack of control trait (see fig 5.16).

In case of informational justice and affective commitment, sense of control (SoC) strengthened the relationship while in case of procedural justice and affective commitment, it dampened the relationship. The reason as to why Sense of Control strengthens the relationship between informational justice and affective commitment lies in the fact that software professional are skilled and competent workers. Their work is also somewhat dynamic. As Hersey and Blanchard’s ‘Situational Leadership theory’ suggests the software professional should be provided with timely and adequate information relating to their job so that they can perform their job. So, on perception of informational justice, job performance of those who have high sense of control increases, which in turn lead to rise in affective commitment (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989). From the fig 5.6 we can see that the slope of the line representing relationship between informational justice and affective commitment becomes steeper for people who are high in sense of control trait.
The logic behind Sense of Control dampening the relationship between procedural justice and affective commitment is also quite simple. (See fig 5.15)

The lesson for HR managers is that both external (measured by lack of control in this study) and internal locus of control (measured by sense of control) is necessary for promoting job satisfaction and commitment as in some cases Lack of Control and in other cases Sense of Control strengthened the relationships between justice dimension and job satisfaction/commitment. So, a judicious mix of some external control in tandem with adequate autonomy to workers in required areas is the success mantra to boost relevant organizational behaviours and attitudes like job satisfaction and commitment.

This study also found negative association between sense of control and affective commitment which was contrary to our expectation. Many studies have shown positive association between sense of control and affective commitment (Coleman, Irving, & Cooper, 1999). Individual with high sense of control is highly involved in the organisational goals by himself, and therefore attachment and consequently affective commitment towards the company increases. However, result (table 5.9) shows that sense of control is negatively related to affective commitment. Hierarchal regression was run in SPSS to recheck this finding. In the first step when only sense of control was taken as independent variable, positive and significant relationship was found between sense of control and affective commitment, confirming the findings of earlier studies. However, when more variables were introduced as control variables in step 2 of the regression, negative and significant relationship was found between sense of control and affective commitment which confirmed author’s finding through SEM analysis in AMOS. The finding is what the author observes in reality in software companies. Software professional generally have higher sense of control because of their knowledge power. However, they seldom stay in the same company for a longer p
indicates that their affective commitment is low. There can be three reasons for higher turnover in these companies. First, software professionals, who are generally high on sense of control, can quickly become less committed if they sense that they are not being really listened to (Birchall & Simmons, 2004; Fulton, 1999). Secondly, software industries has seen a phenomenal rise in very short span of time in past two decades and as such, demands for software professionals increased many fold. Because of this spurt in demand for software professionals, there has been upward pressure on wages or salaries as companies try to woo more experienced and talented professionals in their own fold. Thirdly, Irving, Coleman, and Cooper, (1997) argued that internals (people with high sense of control) take more control over their choice of organizations than do externals, and thereby internals make better initial choices of organizations than externals do (people with low sense of control) and so, software professionals, who have higher sense of control, are more prone to switch companies more often. So, in context of software industries those who have lower sense of control will be more likely to stay in the same company which means their affective commitment will be higher. This is confirmed by the graph as line representing people with low sense of control is above line representing people with high sense of control. (see fig 5.15)

Further, moderating effect of forgiveness on the relationship of justice and attitudinal reactions was analysed. The moderator, forgiveness, was measured on three dimensions- forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations. It was found that except forgiveness of others, the other two dimensions of forgiveness dampened the relationships. Forgiveness of others strengthened relationships between (a) informational justice and job satisfaction and (b) procedural justice and continuance commitment. With respect to forgiveness of others strengthening relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction. The reason could be
transgression when a person receives informational injustice in her organisation. The transgressed person feels tension, anger etc, and develops negative thoughts. This reduces her job satisfaction. However, the reduction in job satisfaction will be more for the person who is low on the trait of forgiveness to others. A person, who is high on the trait of ‘forgiveness to others’ will be able to forgive the transgressor for his act, thereby freeing herself of negative thoughts and feelings. Therefore, her job satisfaction will not decline as much as that of person with low on the trait of ‘forgiveness to others’. Her job satisfaction, in fact, may increase as she has freed herself of negative thoughts and feelings (see fig 5.3).

Forgiveness of others also strengthens the relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment. This is because of similar reason as discussed above. When a person perceives that rules of allocating rewards in her organisation are not fair, she views it as an act of transgression by the company. The transgressed person feels tension, anger etc, and develops negative thoughts ((Barber, Maltby, & Macaskill, 2005; Malcolm & Greenberg, 2000; Enright & Coyle, 1998; Worthington, 1998)). Her performance dips (Madsen, Gygi, & Hammond, 2009) which in turn causes withholding of rewards as suggested by Vroom’s Expectancy theory. This reduces her benefits, or increases her cost of staying with the company. However, the reduction in continuance commitment will be more for the person who is low on forgiveness of others trait. On the other hand person, who is high on the trait of ‘forgiveness to others’ will be able to forgive the transgressor for his act, thereby freeing herself of negative thoughts and feelings. Therefore her performance improves which results in larger rewards. Therefore, her continuance commitment will not decline as much as that of person with low on the trait of ‘forgiveness of others’. Her commitment, in fact, may increase as she has freed herself of negative thoughts and feelings. (see fig 5.19).
The other two components of forgiveness dampened the relationships. Forgiveness of self dampened the relationship between (a) informational justice and continuance commitment, (b) interpersonal justice and job satisfaction, and (c) procedural justice and continuance commitment. The reason as to why forgiveness of self dampens the positive relationship between continuance commitment and informational justice is that when perception of informational injustice increases, continuance commitment declines less for people who are high on self-forgiveness trait than those who are low on self-forgiveness trait. Holmgren (1998) argues that in self-forgiveness, the offender recognizes his/her intrinsic worth and its independence from his/her wrongdoing. Forgiving one’s self clears the mind of the self-hatred and self-contempt that result from hurting another (Horsbrugh, 1974). People high on self-forgiveness trait are less neurotic, depressed, anxious, and hostile (Maltby, Macaskill, & Day, 2001; Coates, 1997; Mauger, Perry, Freeman, & Grove, 1992) and therefore when they perceive informational injustice, they do not feel as bad as compared to those who are low on self-forgiveness trait. Therefore, benefit of staying with the company do not fall as much or cost of staying with the company do not increases as much as that of people who are low on forgiveness of self trait. From the fig 5.8 we see that the slope of the line representing relationship between continuance commitment and informational justice becomes flatter for people who are high on self-forgiveness trait.

On the same line, it can be explained as to why forgiveness of self dampens the positive relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment. People who are high on self-forgiveness trait have clear their mind of the self-hatred and self-contempt that result from hurting another (Horsbrugh, 1974), they are expected to react (negatively) less to any unfairness in procedures (that allocates rewards) than those who are low on self-forgiveness trait. Therefore, benefit of staying with
not fall as much or cost of staying with the company do not increases as much as that of people who are low on forgiveness_self trait. As such, the slope of the line representing relationship between continuance commitment and procedural justice in fig 5.18 becomes flatter for people who are high on self-forgiveness trait.

Forgiveness of self also dampens the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction. This is because people high on forgiving oneself can form better interpersonal relationships with others (Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). As a result they are relatively better in forming harmonious interpersonal relationship at workplace. Since harmonious relationship with colleagues and supervisor is one of the components of multi-construct job satisfaction (Goris et al, 2000; Misener et al, 1996; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969), those who are high on forgiving of self trait are more satisfied at their job. Whereas, people who are low on self-forgiveness trait are highly prone to self-contempt, self-hatred (Horsbrugh, 1974), and guilt and shame (Strelan, 2007; Tangney, Boone, & Dearing, 2005) for any mistakes committed by them. These people are prone to anger, bitterness and are unhappy (Macaskill 2012). These negative feelings adversely affect interpersonal interactions and consequently job satisfaction. Therefore, when interpersonal injustice perceived increases, job satisfaction declines less for people who are high on self-forgiveness trait than those who are low on self-forgiveness trait. In other words, the slope of the line representing relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal justice becomes flatter for people who are high on self-forgiveness trait (see fig 5.10).

Forgiveness of situation dampened the relationship between (a) informational justice and continuance commitment, (b) procedural justice and job satisfaction, and (c) procedural justice and normative commitment. The reason as to why forgiveness of situation trait dampens the positive relationship between inform
continuance commitment is because when people who are high on forgiving situation face adverse situation like receipt of informational injustice, they are disposed to let go off the bad situation which according to them is not under their control. In this way they are able to ward off negative thoughts about their company (initiator of adverse situation). As such, the benefits and costs of leaving the company do not fall as much. Therefore, when perception of informational injustice increases, continuance commitment do not decline as much for people who are high on forgiveness of situation trait as for the people who are low on forgiveness of situation trait. So, the slope of line representing the relationship becomes flatter for people who are high on forgiveness of situation trait which is shown in fig 5.9.

The same explanation goes as to why forgiveness of situation dampens the positive relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction. People who are high in forgiving situation trait forgive and let go off the situation grappled with unfair procedures (i.e., procedural injustice) more easily than the people who are low in forgiveness of situation trait. This is because those who can forgive let go negative feelings and thoughts related to the transgression (McCullough, 2001) and so, they are able to maintain their job performance (Butler & Mullis, 2001) and consequently job satisfaction, as suggested by Vroom’s Expectancy theory. And as such, when procedural injustice is perceived, job satisfaction of people high on forgiveness of situation trait does not decline as much as that of people low in forgiveness of situation trait (see fig 5.13).

Forgiveness of situation dampens the positive relationship between procedural justice and normative commitment. People who are high on forgiving situation trait forgive and let go off the situation grappled with unfair procedures (i.e., procedural injustice) more easily than the people who are low in forgiveness of situation trait. When people forgive, their motivation to avoid or seek revenge disappear.
harmonious relationship with the transgressor (McCullough, Rachal, Sandage, Worthington Jr, Brown, & Hight, 1998; McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997), in this case superiors. Harmonious relationship with superiors translates into better treatment from superiors. Norm of reciprocity suggests that the well treated employee feel an obligation to stay in the company and therefore, normative commitment of the person who can forgive the transgressor (here the superior) does not fall as much as that of people who are low in forgiveness of situation trait.(see fig 5.21).

The study finds that control (both external and internal), forgiveness and affectivity also play an important role in moderating relationship between justice and organisationally relevant behaviours and attitudes like job satisfaction and commitment. These aspects are largely ignored by Indian managers. But given the increasing level of competition, employee retention has become all the more important. Employees are no longer motivated only by monetary rewards. These small steps like promoting the trait of forgiveness and positive affect among employees can yield big positive results in the long run.