

# Dynamics of Organizational Justice: Perceptions of Diverse Human Resource across Various Sectors

**Harsh Vardhan Prashant\***

Senior Fellow, Organisational Behavior, Defence Institute of Psychological Research, DRDO Timarpur, Delhi, India.

## ARTICLE INFO

### \*Correspondence:

harshvardhanjmi@gmail.com

Senior Fellow,  
Organisational  
Behavior, Defence  
Institute of  
Psychological Research,  
DRDO Timarpur, Delhi,  
India.

### Dates:

Received: 02-05-2025

Accepted: 14-05-2025

Published: 30-06-2025

### Keywords:

Organisational Justice,  
Organisational Diversity,  
Diversity Management,  
Fairness

### How to Cite:

Prashant, H.V.  
(2025) Dynamics of  
Organizational Justice:  
Perceptions of Diverse  
Human Resource  
across Various Sectors.  
DME Journal of  
Management, 6(1), 51-56.  
doi: 10.53361/dmejm.  
v6i01.07

## Abstract

Empirical Evidences have profoundly highlighted the prominence of perceived justice & fairness by employees and its impact on various aspects of their organisational behavior with their citizenship behavior, work involvement and tendency to stay as few salient amongst them. In the current era of Globalization, Diversity Management has emerged an important domain of focus for the authority overseeing Human Resource of any organisation.

The objective of the present study was to study both these aspects and thus derive the relation on how a diverse human resource relates to perceptions of justice. The data in the study was collected through purposive sampling from 105 participants by administering the Organisational Justice Scale (Colquitt, 2001). The diversity in the data was introduced with factors demographic factors as age where it ranged from 21 to 60, gender & work experience. Other key features of data in this regard were that it was collected from both Public & Private organisations, and the sectors such as Manufacturing, Information Technology, Social Security, Banking & Finance, Hospitality and Education were included. The study which used descriptive statistics to analyse the data, found a high negative correlation of age with perception of Informational Justice, whereas low correlation was found with Distributive and Procedural Justice. The mean score of Procedural Justice was found to be higher amongst Private employees in comparison to Public whereas for Distributive Justice it was found to be higher among Public employees. Other major findings in terms of Descriptive Statistics were found while studying the data sector wise. The study suggests that in order to ascertain an effective and efficient diverse human resource at organisation, the management of fairness perception of employees is a key component to be kept in focus by the management.

## INTRODUCTION

A paradigm shift from Industrial Psychology to Organizational Psychology was based on the core discovery, that it is not just the employee who is responsible for their performance at their workplace but the employer and workplace conditions too influence their performance. Hence, when factors which are operational under the control of employer are modified, it is bound to affect the employee performance. Organizational Justice is one of the various concepts which explains the employer-employee interactions and its outcomes. The concept having its roots in equity theory (Adams, 1963) was further formalized

as Organizational Justice by Greenberg (1987) who conceptualized it as the fairness perceived by employees at their workplace. The practice of fairness by the employer is vested in the routine interactions and procedures which take place at any organization, be it formal or informal. It can thus be understood as the perceived parity in treatment by the employer when that employee compares it to what other same employees receive. The fundamental concept which rests behind it that any employee expects from their employer, a fair and same reward or punishment for a deed, irrespective of who has performed it.

Justice at workplace as a concept can be subdivided into concrete and abstract. When we talk about the actual concrete part, it goes to what can be reflected in numbers and may include salary, leaves or other allowances, such which are generally fair at organizations as parity has to be complied there for legislative reasons. However, when we shift to the abstract, this is the part which is of concern from the organizational behavior perspective. To understand better, Organizational Justice has been subdivided into three types

- **Distributive Justice:** It is concerned with the employees' perceived fairness in allocations at workplace for instance receiving equal outcome for same inputs given by employees.
- **Procedural Justice:** This form of justice is concerned with fairness observed in the process of allocations to employees or the degree of justice followed in routine organizational procedures. For example, justice while practicing reward or punishment procedures.
- **Interactional Justice:** This form of justice talks about fairness in interactions between employer and employee. Conceptually it is divided into two forms, first being interpersonal justice which is concerned with fairness in treating the employees with politeness, dignity and respect (Colquitt et al., 2001) and second being Informational Justice which is fair and equal access of information to employees at workplace, with the core idea behind is that such justice is achieved when no employee gets early access to information for a reason that they are informally special to supervisor.

With such illustrations, it can be clearly deduced how important role it can have in human resource management, and, this was highlighted in various studies over time. Among the various benefits of having fair management system, employee compliance is one of them as Greenberg (1994) in his field experiment on imposing smoking ban at workplace found that its compliance increased by implementing interactional justice. Not just for employees, but manager compliance with organizational strategies was also positively influenced by procedural and distributive justice (Leventhal, 1980). The significance of Justice can also be explained in studies which showed how it enhanced Organizational Commitment (Fischer & Smith, 2006; Saunders, 2003). A significant relation between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior was also found which is thus another reason why this concept should be paid attention (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Employee performance was also found to be positively related to perception of justice (Fernandes & Awalmeh, 2006).

While we look on the benefits of a fair system, doesn't mean that not following it shall lead to inactive state at workplace. Instead, studies found that an unfair system in terms of poor compliance of Procedural and Distributive justice were linked to absenteeism (Lam et al., 2002) while Gellatly (1995) found in his study that not following interactional justice was also a cause for it. As we here talk of interactions, which is a close relative to communication, Pinder and Harlos (2001) indicated through their study that injustice is the reason of employee silence at office. This can lead to a toxic environment at workplace leading to further non-recommended scenarios, even leading to workplace stress which was found to be an outcome of perceived injustice (Dbaibo et al., 2010). Dailey and Kirk (1992) also indicated a drastic affect of perceived injustice in procedures leads to turnover intentions.

As globalization is taking over, we have modern day organizations such as IT organizations, which are getting in touch with use of contemporary technology and modern management system. Among the latter lies human resource management. When we talk of human resource management, one

of the challenges they are tackling is management of a diverse human resource, which in other terms is diversity management. Employees from different age groups, generations, genders, locale, languages are to be clubbed together with a common vision and mission of their employer. Diversity Management by the organization is done through their various set administrative procedures, yet their can be unrest or perception of unfairness among employees which may not lead to healthy outcomes. The present study measures Organizational Justice on various demographic parameters to explore their relations

## METHODOLOGY

### Aim

To find the degree of perceived organizational justice among segregated categories of employees from various sectors and study the differences between them.

### Objectives

- To study Organizational Justice
- To study Organizational Justice among employees from various sectors
- To study the difference in perceived Organizational Justice among employees of various sectors

### Variable

Organizational Justice: It is the degree of fairness perceived by the Employees at their workplace. It is subdivided into three types:

- Distributive Justice: Fairness perceived in allocation
- Procedural Justice: Fairness perceived in process of distribution
- Interactional Justice: Fairness in interpersonal interactions and access to information at workplace.

### Sample Description

105 participants. Aged between 21 to 60 years. The data included 57 Males and 48 Females. Data was collected from organizations functioning in domains of Manufacturing (22 Samples), IT (19 Samples), Banking & Finance (23 Samples), Social Security (17 Samples) and Education (24 Samples). Data was collected both in Online (54 Samples) and Offline (51 Samples). In order to study the data on the parameter of age, it was categorized in four clusters with Cluster 1 being of participants from age 21 to 30 years (23 Samples), Cluster 2 of 31 to 40 years (38 Samples), Cluster 3 of 41 to 50 years (38 Samples) and Cluster 4 of 51 to 60 years (18 Samples)

### Sampling Technique

Purposive Sampling.

### Tool Used

Organizational Justice Scale (Colquitt, 2001): A 20 item, 5-point Likert Scale. It measures perceived Organizational Justice of the respondent in regard to their workplace. It has 4 items of Distributive Justice, 7 items of Procedural Justice and 9 items of Interactional Justice. The Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.96.

**Table 1:** Sector wise descriptives of the data

Dimensions (Score Range)	Manu.		IT		B & F		S S		Edu.	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
DJ (4-20)	13.6	4.2	14.7	4.6	13.2	5.3	13.9	4.5	14.0	4.9
PJ (7-35)	25.5	9.0	28.4	7.2	25.0	8.9	28.0	7.8	26.0	8.6
IPJ (4-20)	14.5	4.2	14.9	3.7	13.9	4.5	14.8	4.2	14.0	4.4
IFJ (5-25)	18.2	5.7	19.5	5.0	17.8	6.5	19.1	5.4	18.1	5.9
OJ (20-100)	71.8	19.4	77.5	16.7	69.6	22.1	75.8	17.2	72.1	21.0

Note: B & F = Banking & Finance; DJ = Distributive Justice; Edu. = Education; IFJ = Informational Justice; IPJ = Interpersonal Justice; IT = Information Technology; Manu. = Manufacturing, M = Mean; OJ = Organizational Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice, SS= Social Security, SD = Standard Deviation



**Table 2:** Gender wise Descriptives of the Data

Dimensions (Score range)	Male		Female	
	M	SD	M	SD
DJ (4-20)	14.0	4.8	13.8	4.6
PJ (7-35)	27.4	7.7	25.2	9.0
IPJ (4-20)	14.5	4.1	14.2	4.4
IFJ (5-25)	18.9	5.5	18.0	5.9
OJ (20-100)	74.7	18.6	71.2	20.5

Note: DJ = Distributive Justice; IFJ = Informational Justice; IPJ = Interpersonal Justice; M = Mean; OJ = Organizational Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; SD = Standard Deviation

**Table 3:** Age wise Descriptives of the Data

Dimensions (Score range)	Cluster 1 (21- 30 Y)		Cluster 2 (31-40 Y)		Cluster 3 (41-50 Y)		Cluster 4 (51-60 Y)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
DJ (4-20)	14.4	3.8	13.3	5.6	14.3	3.9	13.8	4.8
PJ (7-35)	26.5	8.7	26.7	8.3	25.6	8.1	26.8	9.1
IPJ (4-20)	14.6	3.1	13.7	4.3	15.8	4.3	13.1	4.5
IFJ (5-25)	18.9	4.5	18.3	6.6	18.5	4.6	18.3	6.6
OJ (20-100)	74.1	15.5	71.1	22.1	74.4	16.0	71.1	22.4

Note: DJ = Distributive Justice; IFJ = Informational Justice; IPJ = Interpersonal Justice; M = Mean; OJ = Organizational Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; SD = Standard Deviation; Y = Years

**Table 4:** Organization Type wise Descriptives of the Data

Dimensions (Score range)	Public		Private	
	M	SD	M	SD
DJ (4-20)	14.2	4.4	13.5	5.0
PJ (7-35)	25.1	8.0	27.4	8.7
IPJ (4-20)	14.6	4.1	13.9	4.3
IFJ (5-25)	18.7	5.4	18.2	6.1
OJ (20-100)	74.9	18.28	70.7	20.9

Note: DJ = Distributive Justice; IFJ = Informational Justice; IPJ = Interpersonal Justice; M = Mean; OJ = Organizational Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice; SD = Standard Deviation; Y = Years

**Table 5:** Correlation Coefficients (All at 0.01 level)

Dimensions	DJ	PJ	IPJ	IFJ	OJ
Age	.28	.19	.48	-.74	.61

Note: DJ = Distributive Justice; IFJ = Informational Justice; IPJ = Interpersonal Justice; OJ = Organizational Justice; PJ = Procedural Justice

## Statistics Used

Descriptive Statistics.

## Hypothesis

Employees of organizations following modern and contemporary management system as compared to conventional system will score higher on Organizational Justice.

## CONCLUSION

With the obtained results, as presented in Table, 1 it can be concluded that following a modern and contemporary management system is helpful in making employees perceive justice at their workplace. This is concluded as Information Technology (IT) sector which scored the highest mean Organizational Justice (OJ) score (Mean = 77.5) follows the most dynamic and contemporary organizational structure in essence. Moreover, towards diversity management, organizations need to pay attention to organizational justice also as seen in Table 2, mean OJ score of Males (M = 74.7) was higher than that of Females (M = 71.2). The age wise descriptives given in Table 3 also indicated towards the difference in perception of OJ by various age groups.

## DISCUSSION

As evident from the data sets, it can be drawn that organizational justice is a factor of concern in diversity management. When we talk about the primitive binary segregation of employees which is their gender, the study demonstrated that the mean scores of males on organizational justice and all its dimensions exceeded those of females. If we take it simply from the managerial perspective, then providing more fairness to female employees at workplace is the first solution on mind. However, if we broaden our perspective and form a premise that policies at any organization are providing a fair treatment but yet the perception of both the gender to a same fair treatment is varying, then in this case we have to take our reasoning to the psychological boat. We have to look for gender perceptual pattern for organizational justice and find if it is the reason for the difference. This again becomes a scope of further research.

Organizations in the current era also have employees coming from a wide range of age and different generations. This is another diversity which the management has to look upon. This study grouped four age clusters as already talked before. In general, all clusters scored near to each other on the dimensions of Organizational Justice. When age was correlated to the dimensions of Organizational Justice and it on whole, here the results drew attention. A low positive correlation was found between age and distributive justice and also likewise low positive between age and procedural justice. For the first relation, the reasoning may be drawn that new joiners are generally fresh to the policies of the organizations. They tend to perceive the system as fair and just as told to them in the manuals and prima facie introduction of employees. However, with growing age and experience, employees are exposed to various events, both good and bad. It is generally a human tendency to remember odd events longer than merry events. Owing to this, employees due to those unpleasant experiences which are related to justice, may start perceiving organizations as unfair. Same might be the reasoning for the relation this study got between age and procedural justice. Thus, for management, it is important that they pay special attention to

employees who are higher in numbers on experience or elder in age, as their work experience is also an important asset to the organization. Also, as Lind and Tyler (1988) suggested that providing employees control at workplace increase their perception of procedural justice, management can try this act too. Another relation which drew attention was the high negative correlation which was between age and informational justice. Possible explanation can be an increasing expectation of employee as they gain experience or they grow elder in age. This infers that even if they might be getting fair and equal concerned information, dissatisfaction might be present at their end they may feel that they are deserving of more information.

Perception of organizational justice, as talked here, yields variety of benefit to organizations both in terms of employee thoughts and behavioral outcomes with respect to their work. Human resource management of organizations thus have to focus on forming, establishing and maintaining an organizational system where employees from diverse domains perceive their organization and management as just and fair. The research which showed the perception of organizational justice and its relation to various diverse human resource categories broadens the arena of study in the area of organizational diversity management.

## LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE OF FURTHER RESEARCH

The research has limitations as:

- Due to time constraints, the study has taken a small sample size. If the sample size can be increased, it will be helpful in deducting more concrete outcome.
- The study included only five sectors. However, more sectors can be included to broaden the study of justice in remaining sectors.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Wage Inequities, Productivity and Work Quality. *Industrial Relations*, 3(1), 9–16.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-596.



- Dailey, R. C. & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45, 305-316.
- Dbaiho, D., Harb, C., & Van Meurs, N. (2010). Values and justice as predictors of perceived stress in Lebanese organisational settings. *Applied Psychology*, 59(4), 701-720.
- Fernandes, C. (2006). Impact of organisational justice in an expatriate work environment. *Management Research News*, 29(11), 701-712.
- Fischer, R., & Smith, P. B. (2006). Who Cares about Justice? The Moderating Effect of Values on the Link between Organisational Justice and Work Behaviour. *Applied Psychology*, 55(4), 541-562.
- Gellatly, I. R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 469-485.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organisational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 12, No 1, 9-22.
- Greenberg, J., (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288-197.
- Lam, S. S. K., Schaubroeck, J. & Aryee, S. (2002). Relationship between organizational justice and employee work outcomes: a cross-national study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 1-18.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In M. G. Gergen & R Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Lind, E. A., Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331-369.
- Saunders, M. N. K., & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organisational justice, trust and the management of change. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 360-375.