Vol 7, No 1, 2017

Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice and Organizational Politics as Correlates of Job Satisfaction in a sample of Academics from Awka City, Nigeria.

Okonkwo, Kizito Ifunanya
Ezeokana, Jude Obinna Ph.D
Nnedum, Obiajulu Anthony Ugochukwu Ph.D
Chine, Bernard Chukwukeluo Ph.D
Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Abah, Norbert Chijioke Ph.D
Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Mbanugo, Nnamdi Emmanuel
Department of Political Science, University of Abuja
Chukwura Daniel Junior Ph.D
Department of Public Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

This study, investigated the relationship between procedural justice, distributive justice organizational politics and job satisfaction. A total of 223 employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka served as participants in the study. Out of the 223 participants 115 (51.6%) were males while 108 (48.4%) were females. The ages of the participants ranged from 22 to 56 years with a mean age of 33.75 and standard deviation of 9.78. The participants were selected through stratified random sampling. Four instruments were used in the study. They include job satisfaction scale, organisational politics scale, procedural justice scale, and distributive justice scale. Pearson product moment correlation was used as statistical tool to test three hypotheses in the study. Hypothesis one which stated that there will be a significant relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction was accepted at r (223) = .16, P<.05. Hypothesis two which stated that there will be a significant relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction was accepted at r (223) = .21, P<.05. Hypothesis three which stated that there will be a significant relationship between organizational politics and job satisfaction was accepted at r (223) = .19, P<.05. Based on the theory of reciprocity, the researcher recommend that government and organizational agencies should device means of ameliorating organisational politics and moderating organizational justice with respect to job satisfaction of employees.

Keyword: ***Job Satisfaction, Organizational Politics, Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice***

Introduction

In the world of work, human resources are the most important and highly needed input for any organization to achieve success and viability. The extent to which this can be actualized depends primarily on job satisfaction of the workers. Ogunyemi (2007) submitted that no organization can achieve its objective without an adequate and effective work-force. Job satisfaction, an employee's overall sense of well-being at work (Ang, Van Dyne,& Begley, 2003) has attracted the attention of scholars for many years. It is an important antecedent of life satisfaction and happiness (Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Rode, 2004). As an indication of employee wellbeing, it refers to an affective feeling emanating from the perception of an individual that his/her current job allows for fulfilment of important job values (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart & Wright, 1994). Job satisfaction reflects an employee's perception rather than reality about certain aspects of the job, relative to his/her values. Job satisfaction is one of the most researched attitudes in the literature of industrial-organizational behaviour, public administration, psychology and sociological studies (Alotaibi, 2000; Parnell & Crandall, 2003).

Job satisfaction is certainly a vital component of the work environment to measure and monitor for any employer. Job satisfaction is essential for organizations interested in developing and retaining productive employees for organizational success (Siegel & Lane, 1974). It is defined by Locke (1976) as a pleasurable and positive emotional state caused by the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Such a definition suggests that job satisfaction contains an affective component (emotional state) and a non- affective or cognitive component (appraisal) (Organ, 1988b; Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

However, a variety of studies have recently pointed to organizational politics as an important antecedent of employees' job satisfaction and performance, both formal and informal (Adams, Ammeter, Treadway, Ferris, Hochwarter & Kolodinsky, 2002; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Kacmar & Baron, 1999; O'Connor & Morrison, 2001; Valle & Perrewe, 2000). Most of these studies, have relied on the definition of organizational politics as behaviour strategically designed to maximize self-interests and job satisfaction (Ferris, 1989; Vigodata-Gadot, 2006) and therefore in conflict with the collective organizational goals or the interests of other individuals. This perspective reflects a generally negative image of workplace politics in the eyes of most organization members. Although treated as separate constructs, several studies have also related organizational politics to the theory of fairness, equity, and justice in the workplace (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992, Vigoda-Gadot, 2003). Studies that developed the concept of organizational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cropan-zano & Kacmar, 1995; Dipboye & Foster, 2002; Fedor, 1998; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2006) found that workplace politics was perceived as self-serving behaviour by employees to achieve self-interests, advantages, and benefits at the expense of others and some-times contrary to the interests of the entire organization or work unit. This behaviour was frequently associated with manipulation, defamation, subversiveness, and illegitimate ways of over-using power to attain one's objectives (Kipnis, 1980). Ferris (1989) suggested that the concept of the perception of organizational politics. Moreover, Kacmar and Ferris (1991) and Ferris and Kacmar (1992) argued that the higher the perceptions of politics are in the eyes of an organization member, the lower in that person's eyes is the level of organisational justice and fairness.

Organisational justice is defined as the employees' perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from organizations (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Organisational justice is of two types: procedural and distributive justice. Distributive justice is seen as the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an employee receives from organization (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), while procedural justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions (Greenberg, 1990).

Much of the research on organizational justice has been conducted in controlled laboratory settings that are far removed from the organizational context (Barling & Phillips, 1993; Conlon, 1993; Conlon & Fasolo, 1990; Skitka, 1992). Thus, the real life validity of the results of these laboratory experiments may have questionable artificiality (Greenberg, 1987). In addition, there is dearth of empirical research in the Nigerian Universities concerning the consequences of procedural justice, distributive justice and organizational politics, which may have important impacts on employees' job satisfaction. The major aims of the study are determine the relationship between procedural justice, distributive justice, organisational politics and job satisfaction.

Theory and Hypotheses

Job satisfaction: The theoretical definition of job satisfaction includes evaluative or expectancy components. For Locke (1976), Mottaz (1988), Vroom, (1964), Kalleberg, (1977) job satisfaction is not only a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience; or an effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation; but is also a function of work-related rewards and values. Maslows' hierarchy of needs theory (1943)

hypothesized that within every human being there exists a hierarchy of five needs, which include psychological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory suggests that although no need is ever fully gratified, a substantially satisfied need no longer motivates. Locke's affect theory (1976) states that dissatisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work moderates how satisfied or dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are or are not met. When a person values a particular facet of a job, his/her satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to one who does not value a particular facet of the job. Judge's dispositional theory (1988) popularised by Jackson (2007) is a very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of dissatisfaction or satisfaction, regardless of one's job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction (krishon, Sandeep, and Singh 2010). A significant model that narrowed the scope of dispositional theory was the core self-evaluations model proposed by Judge (1998). He argued that there are four core self evaluations that determine ones disposition towards job satisfaction: self esteem, general self efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self esteem (the value one places on self) and general self-efficacy (the belief on ones competence) leads to higher job satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control (belief that one has control over his/her own life, as opposed to outside forces having control) leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, higher

levels of neuroticism lead to higher job dissatisfaction (Mount, Ilies and Johnson, 2006). Herzberg' Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959) states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are driven by different factors, -motivation and hygiene factors, respectively. An employee's motivation to work is continually related to job satisfaction of a subordinate. Motivation can be seen as an inner force that drives individuals to attain personal and organizational goals. Motivating factors are those aspects of the job that make people want to perform, and provide people with satisfaction, for example achievement in work, recognition, promotion opportunities. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job or the work carried out. Hygiene factors include aspects of the working environment such as pay, company policies, supervisory practices and other working conditions. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) proposed a two-factor theory in which job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by different factors. The two-factor theory emphasizes that employees have two types of needs: hygiene and motivation. Hygiene factors include interpersonal relations-supervision, supervision-technical, working conditions, pay, company policy, and administration. If hygiene factors are absent from the employees' work environment, workers' job dissatisfaction will result. The fulfilment of hygiene needs removes barriers to job satisfaction, but cannot in itself result in job satisfaction. In other words, the fulfilment of hygiene needs only prevents employees' job dissatisfaction. Motivational factors include achievement, responsibility, advancement, recognition, and the work itself. The fulfilment of motivator needs can promote employees' job satisfaction (Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, & Cotter, 2002; Herzberg et al., 1993).

Lawler Facet Theory (1973) proposed that the degree of job satisfaction experienced by an employee is decided by comparisons between expectations of rewards from the job facet and

perceptions of rewards received. Expectations of rewards were determined by perceptions of the individual's input into the job, the input and outcome of co-workers, and the demands of the job. Perception of actual rewards was determined by equity considerations, specifically compared to what others receive. In short, according to Lawler's facet theory (1973), job satisfaction results when the reward received is the same as the expected reward (Berry, 1998; Lawler, 1973; Lawler & Porter, 1967; Porter & Lawler, 1968).

Organizational Justice

In general, research about organizational justice has focused on two major issues: employees' responses to the outcomes they receive, and the means by which they obtain these outcomes, that is, the procedures used (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). In other words, theorists in the field of organizational justice have distinguished between conceptualizations of justice that deal with the content of fairness, or what the decisions are, which is termed distributive justice, and those that focus on the process of fairness, or how decisions are made, called procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990a). A great deal of research concerning justice has historically emphasized the distribution of payment and other work-related rewards derived from equity theory (Greenberg, 1987b). Although this outcome-oriented perspective explains how employees react to the nature, level, and distribution of organizational rewards, it ignores the procedures or means through which ends are established. Therefore, the research focus has recently shifted from distributive justice to procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990).

Initial research in the area of organizational justice was only concerned with notions of distributive justice, the notion that an individual's evaluations of allocation decisions are affected

not only by what the rewards are, but also by how they are made (Deutsch, 1975; Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Leventhal, 1976a, 1980). This idea has been referred to as procedural justice, the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions in the workplace (Greenberg, 1990). Research shows that procedures granting control over the process of outcome attainment are perceived as fairer than procedures that deny process control (Greenberg & Folger, 1983).

Indeed, rather than simply being a means used to achieve distributive justice, procedural justice has value in its own right. In other words, the procedures used to determine a particular outcome can be more important than an actual outcome itself (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Folger & Martin, 1986; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Martin & Nagao, 1989). Given that the distinction between distributive justice and procedural justice has been empirically established, there was a need to consider how these varieties of justice relate to various organizational variables (Greenberg, 1990).

A number of empirical studies have been conducted to investigate the predictive roles of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational outcomes. Overall, the results of these studies suggest that distributive justice and procedural justice may be predictive of different attitudes (Greenberg, 1990). In general, distributive justice may be a more important predictor of personal outcomes such as pay satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), whereas procedural justice may have strong effects on attitudes about institutions or authorities such as organizational commitment and trust in management (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Lind & Tyler, 1988; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Although individuals' reactions may differ depending on the extent to which they focus on outcomes or procedures, both procedural justice and distributive

justice contribute to individuals' perceptions of organizational fairness (Schminke, Ambrose, & Noel, 1997).

Adam's Equity Theory (1965) proposes that the major structural components of equity theory are inputs and outcomes. Inputs are described as what a person perceives as his or her contributions to the exchange, for which he or she expects a just return (Adams, 1965). Outcomes are described as the rewards an individual receives from the exchange, and can include such factors as intrinsic satisfaction (Cohen & Greenberg, 1982). Adams (1965) argued that social behaviour is affected by beliefs that the allocation of resources within a group should be equitable, that is, outcomes should be proportional to the contributions of group members. In other words, equity theory argues that people are satisfied when the ratios of their own inputs to outcomes (i.e., rewards) equal the ratios of inputs to outcomes in comparison to others. Perceived inequity through this comparison feels unpleasant, and motivates people to reduce their job satisfaction.

Empirically, Alexander and Ruderman (1987) examined the relationship between various procedural and distributive justice factors and six organizational variables: job satisfaction, evaluation of supervisor, conflict harmony, turnover intention, trust in management, and tension-stress using a multiple regression analysis. They confirmed that procedural fairness is associated with lower levels of conflict and disharmony in organizations. In addition, SekKhin (2010) carried a study to determine the impact of organizational justice as encompassed by two components, namely distributive justice and procedural justice on employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. The study revealed a positive and significant relationship showing that the foundation of an employee's job satisfaction and organizational

commitment is within the application of both distributive and procedural justice, and this supports a significant negative relationship to turnover intention. The study included the design and distribution of a self-administered questionnaire to 300 Malaysian employees working for small and middle size companies in the Malaysia, Klang Valley. The sample consisted of managerial and non-managerial employees who volunteered to participate in this study. The results supported the hypothesis that distributive and procedural justice has significant relationship with employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. The finding implied that the higher the level of employee's perception towards fairness to the means used to determine outcomes (procedural justice) and fairness of the outcomes employees receive (distributive justice) tended to increase the level of employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment while reduces turnover intention. Therefore, organizations that take a proactive approach to understand employee's perceptions of distributive and procedural justice, and provide appropriate working environment can potentially reap benefits including cost associated to employee retentions. Gbadamosi and Nwosu (2011) examined the effect of entrepreneurial intention, organizational justice, and job satisfaction on the organizational commitment of Babcock University Staff. Participants were 180 employees (male= 99, female= 81) randomly selected from 4 faculties and the registry unit of the University. Measures of entrepreneurial intention, organizational justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were administered on the sample. Three (3) research hypotheses were formulated and tested using t-test, Multiple Regression Analysis and correlation analysis. Findings revealed that job satisfaction and organizational justice are the potent predictors of organizational commitment

while entrepreneurial intentions will lead to turnover intentions among employees. Also, gender has no moderating effect on the relationship between the criterion and the independent variables. More so, Gbadamosi and Nwosu (2011) examined the prediction of organizational politics, turnover intention and organizational commitment on employees' efficiency and effectiveness in academia. It made use of 200 randomly selected employees of Babcock University Ilishan, Ilishan – Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria. The age range of the respondents was between 25 and 53 years with mean age of 36.1 and standard deviation of 3.01. The expost-facto research design was employed. Three standard instruments: Perception of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) by Kacmar and Carlson (1994); Organization Commitment Scale by Meyer and Allen (1991); Turnover Intention Scale by O Driscoll and Benhrs (1994) ; respondents' annual performance evaluation report were used in generating data for the study. Data Analysis involved the use of correlation and multiple regressions. The result indicated that the predictor variables combined and separately made significant contribution to the prediction of the criterion variable. Also, high and positive correlations were found between organizational politics and turnover intention, work efficiency and organizational commitment. On the basis of the findings, it was suggested that a happy employee is a better employee. Atabay, Gunay and Cangarli (2010) carried a study to examine (a) the mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX) in distributive justice-job satisfaction relationship and (b) the moderating role of perceptions of organizational politics in this mediation model. Sample of the study consisted of 1401 employees working in private business enterprises in Turkey. Results showed that (a) leader member exchange partially mediated distributive justice-job satisfaction relationship, and (b) perceptions of organizational politics moderated the mediation model. Specifically, leader member exchange mediated

distributive justice-job satisfaction relationship when perceptions of organizational politics is low but not when it is high. In summary, the findings demonstrated that leader member exchange and perceptions of organizational politics represent key mechanisms in determining how distributive justice is associated with job satisfaction.

Research Hypotheses

H1: There will be a significant relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction.

H2: There will be a significant relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction.

H3: There will be a significant relationship between organisational politics and job satisfaction.

METHOD

Participant

A total of 223 employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka served as respondents in the study. The participants were selected through stratified random sampling. This technique involves selection of participants from different offices in the university. The offices were selected via simple random method which involved writing the names of the departments in pieces of papers. After that the papers were folded and gathered in a cellophane bag. From the pool of the papers, three departments (accounting, security and admissions) with different offices were selected and used in the study. The participants were selected using the same simple random sampling. Out of the 223 participants 115 (51.6%) were males while 108 (48.4%) were females. The ages of the participants ranged from 22 to 56 years with a mean age of 33.75 and standard deviation of 9.78.

Instrument

Four instruments were used in the study. They include job satisfaction scale, organisational politics scale, procedural justice scale, and distributive justice scale.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured using five facet items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS; Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The JDS include a 14-item scale to measure five specific satisfactions; pay (2, 9), job security (1, 11), social (4, 7, 12), supervisory (5, 8, 14), and growth satisfaction (3, 6, 10, 13). The format for the facet items is a seven-point scale ranging from (1) "extremely dissatisfied" to (7) "extremely satisfied." Coefficient alpha from 6,930 employees working on 876 jobs in 56 organizations has reported highs ranging from .64 to .87 (Spector, 1994). In this study, JDS yielded alpha coefficient reliability of 0.76.

Distributive Justice: Perceptions of distributive justice were measured with the Distributive Justice Index, developed by Price and Mueller (1986). This five-item scale measures the degree to which rewards received by employees are perceived to be related to performance inputs. Each item asks for the degree to which the respondent believes that he or she is fairly rewarded on the basis of some comparison with responsibilities, education and training, effort, stresses and strains of job, and performance. All reliabilities reported have been above .90, and the scale has shown discriminant validity in relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Moorman, 1991). Items are re-worded to accommodate the use of a 7-point scale ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (7) "strongly agree." For example, "How fair has the company been in rewarding you when you consider the responsibilities you have?" was changed to "My supervisor has fairly rewarded me when I consider the responsibilities I have". The original scale was measured on a

five-point Likert-type scale from (1) "very unfair" to (5) "very fair." In this study, the 5-item distributive justice scale yielded an alpha coefficient reliability of 0.70.

Procedural Justice: Perceptions of procedural justice were measured using 15 items developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), because the scale consists of two factors: systematic and informational justice, that are consistent with taxonomy of procedural justice. Among the 15 items, six items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) measure the degree to which job decisions include mechanisms that ensure the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeals process, while nine items (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) measure the degree to which employees feel their needs are considered in, and adequate explanations are made for, job decisions. In other words, among the 15 items, six items were designed to measure the fairness of formal procedures (i.e., systematic justice) in the organization as revealed by procedures which promote consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. Nine items were designed to measure supervisor consideration of employee rights, treatment of employees with respect and kindness, and provision of explanations and justification for decisions (i.e., informational justice). Items for informational justice include questions that focus on the interpersonal behaviour of the supervisor. Overall, two factors of procedural justice will be measured: the fairness of the formal procedures used, and the fairness of the interactions that enacted those formal procedures. Moorman (1991), has reported reliabilities above .90, while in this study an alpha coefficient of 0.68 reliability index was obtained.

Organizational Politics: Organizational politics were measured using Kacmar and Carlson's (1994) Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) .The POPS examines the degree to which the respondents view their work environment as political, and therefore unjust and unfair.

The measure contain 12 parsimonious items measured on a five point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A higher score meant a stronger perception of organizational politics. Sample items were "favoritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here", "there is a group of people in my department who always get things their way because no one wants to challenge them". POPS has been used by many researchers and the instrument has reliability coefficient of.76 (Parker *et al*, 1995); .77 (Vigodo, 2000), and .83 (Vigoda – Gadot, 2006), while the this study an alpha coefficient of 0.94 reliability index was obtained.

Procedure

The researcher went to the school management to obtain permission to conduct the research. The nature of the research was also explained to the management. The permission was granted to the researcher to conduct the research. On the agreed date, the researcher went to the various offices and Departments to conduct the research. The offices and the departments were selected via stratified random sampling technique. This technique involves selection of participants from different offices in the university. The offices were selected via simple random method which involved writing the names of the departments in pieces of papers. After that the papers were folded and gathered in a cellophane bag. From the pool of the papers, three departments (accounting, security and admissions) with different offices were selected and used in the study. The participants were selected using the same simple random sampling. The questionnaire were administered to the selected participants. Due to the nature of their works, the participants were allowed to go home with the questionnaires and to return them the next day. They were also given instructions on how to respond to the items and they were advised to do so honestly. On

the agreed day, the researcher collected the questionnaires. On the whole, a total of 228 questionnaires were administered while 223 were collected and utilized in the study. The entire process took eight days.

Results

The study adopted a correlational design that employed a survey method. Pearson product moment correlation and multiple regressions were statistical tools employed for data analysis.

The analysis of data and presentation of results followed the order in which the hypotheses were tested.

Table 1: Correlation between procedural justice and job satisfaction

Variable	N	Mean	Std. D	r	p
Procedural justice	**223**	**42. 94**	**9.01**		
				.16	**.02**
Job Satisfaction	**223**	**42.93**	**9.33**		

From the table, procedural justice (M: 42.94, SD: 9.01) had significant positive correlation to job satisfaction (M: 42.93, SD: 9.33) at r (223) = .16, P<.05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 1 which states that there will be a significant positive relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction was accepted.

Table 2: Correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction

Variable	N	Mean	Std. D	r	p
Distributive justice	**223**	**15.23**	**4.29**		
				.21	**.00**
Job Satisfaction	**223**	**42.93**	**9.33**		

From the table, mean score of 15.23 and standard deviation of 4.29 distributive justice and mean score of 42.93 and standard deviation of 9.33 on job satisfaction observed. Distributive justice had significant positive correlation to job satisfaction. r (223)=.21, P<.05. Therefore, hypothesis two which stated that there will be a significant correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction was accepted.

Table 3: correlation between organizational politics and job satisfaction.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. D	r	p
Organizational Politics	**223**	**85.92**	**20.52**		
				.19	**.01**
Job Satisfaction	**223**	**42.93**	**9.33**		

From the table, mean score of 85.92 and standard deviation 20.52 on organizational politics and mean score of 42.93 and standard deviation of 9.33 on job satisfaction were observed. Organizational politics had a significant positive correlation to job satisfaction. r (223)= .19, P<.05. Therefore, hypothesis three which stated that there will be a significant relationship between organizational politics and job satisfaction was accepted.

Table 4: summary table of multiple regression analysis on organizational politics, procedural justice and distributive justice as predictors of job satisfaction

Variables:	N	Uβ	SE	β	t	p
Organizational politics	**223**	**.02**	**5.08**	**05**	**.51**	**.00**
Procedural justice	**223**	**.20**	**.07**	**.20**	**2.98**	**.00**
Distributive Justice	**223**	**.35**	**.23**	**.16**	**1.51**	**.04**
Organizational justics	**223**	**.08**	**.08**	**.09**	**1.13**	**.04**

N = number of participants, Uβ = understardized beta coefficient, SE = standardized Error t = t-tset score, p = probability value of significant

The result showed in the regression table showed that procedural justice is the most potent predictor of job satisfaction (β= .20; t= 2.98, P<.05) followed by distributive justice, (β= .16; t= 1.51, P<.05) and lastly by organizational politics (β= .05; t= .51, P<.05).

Discussion

In this study, three hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis which stated that there will be a significant relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction was confirmed. Also the second hypothesis which stated that there will be a significant correlation between distributive justice and job satisfaction was confirmed. The findings showed that the two dimensions of organizational justice are positively and significantly related to job satisfaction. The above findings are in line with that of SekKhin (2010). He carried out a study to determine the impact of organizational justice as encompassed by two components, namely distributive justice and procedural justice on employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. The study revealed a positive and significant relationship showing that the foundation of an employee's job satisfaction and organizational commitment is within the application of both distributive and procedural justice, and this supports a significant negative relationship to turnover intention. The results supported the hypothesis that distributive and procedural justice had significant relationship with employee's job satisfaction. Therefore, organizations that take a proactive approach to understand employee's perceptions of distributive and procedural justice, and provide appropriate working environment can potentially reap benefits including cost associated to employee retentions.

In addition, the third hypothesis which stated that there will be a significant relationship between organisational politics and job satisfaction was confirmed. This indicates that organizational politics is a predictor of job satisfaction. When people perceive their environment as highly politicized, they feel threatened. Thus, negative work attitudes such as turnover intentions (e.g., Miller et al., 2008; Poon, 2003), low worker satisfaction (e.g., Miller et al., 2008; Parker et al., 1995; Poon, 2003; Vigoda and Cohen, 2002; Witt et al., 2000) and low organizational commitment (e.g., Vigoda and Cohen, 2002; Witt, 1998) as well as occupational stress (e.g., Ferris et al., 1996; Harris and Kacmar, 2005; Poon, 2003) will arise.

Poon (2006) mentions the inverse relationship between justice and politics perceptions and states that people may not know whether their efforts will be evaluated fairly or not, or they are uncertain about the accuracy of reward system, when they perceive their environment as highly politicized. In addition to its role as an independent variable, the indirect (moderating) effects of POP have been examined in predictive models of employee attitudes. For example, it is found that POP weakens the relationship between trust-in supervisor and helping behaviours of employees to co-workers (Poon, 2006), and between the accountability and job satisfaction (Breaux et al., 2008).

In addition to the above discussion, apart from organizational politics and organizational justice, there are other factors that are related to job satisfaction. For instance Jackson (2007), in his theory, stated that dispositional factor can influence job satisfaction. The theory is a very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of dissatisfaction or satisfaction, regardless of one's job. This approach

became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction (Krishon, Sandeep, and Singh, 2010).

A significant model that narrowed the scope of dispositional theory was the core self-evaluations model proposed by Judge (1998). He argued that there are four core self-evaluations that determine ones disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self-esteem (the value one places on self) and general self-efficacy (the belief on one's competence) leads to higher job satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control (belief that one has control over his/her own life, as opposed to outside forces having control) leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, higher levels of neuroticism lead to higher job dissatisfaction (Mount, Ilies and Johnson, 2006). The factors should be taken into cognizance on the course of finding means of boasting University employees' job satisfaction.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the researcher concludes that organizational justice and politics are significant and positive predictors of job satisfaction among University employees. In addition, the researcher concludes that procedural justice is the most potent predictor of job satisfaction followed by distributive justice, and lastly by organizational politics.

Implication of the Study

The study implies that organizational managers and employers should not ignore the role of organizational justice and politics on job satisfaction of workers. The findings also implied that the higher the level of employee's perception towards fairness to the means used to determine

outcomes (procedural justice) and fairness of the outcomes employees receive (distributive justice) tended to increase the level of employees' job satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

The current study is designed to provide Nigerian University managements with insights into the formations of employees' justice perceptions, and with insights into how to manage employees using organizational justice to draw positive attitudinal and behavioural reactions from employees. The present study will help managers better understand how to retain valuable employees, and increase employees' satisfaction with their work.This study is of great significance for it will help to increase the volume of current literature in the area of organizational research, thereby making research easy for subsequent researchers in terms of having access to much needed literature. Also, the research will help to increase our understanding of the relationship between organisational politics, organisational justice and job satisfaction. Moreover, this study examines job satisfaction as a correlate of organizational justice and the impact of organizational justice on employees' attitudes and behaviour. An enhanced understanding of the antecedents of organizational justice will translate into an increased understanding of the organizational justice factors fundamental to work-related outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Recommendations of the Study

Having known the significant role of organizational justice and organizational politics on job satisfaction, more scientific investigations should be conducted to disclose most other variables

that are likely to contribute to employees' job satisfaction. Government and organizational agencies should device means of moderating organisational politics and justice with respect to job satisfaction of employees.

Limitation of Study

One of the limitations of this study is that the results cannot be generalized with full confidence. This is anchored on the premise that a limited number of respondents from a given organization in a given cultural setting (University) were utilized in the study. Again, some people were reluctant to participate in the survey research due to the nature of the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained much items. Based on the content, some that participated could not properly fill their questionnaires.

Suggestions for Further Studies

At this point, researchers should invest more effort in employing strategies to reasonably obtain participants. In doing this, a closely Knitted rapport should be created to enable participants to respond properly to instrument. However, extensive researches should be carried out to further x-ray the different factors influencing job satisfaction. In doing this, more literature will be made available for researchers to find it easy in sourcing for materials. Finally, government and affluent individual should support researchers by grants and sponsorship to assist future researchers in their financial entanglements.

REFERENCES

Adams, G. L., Ammeter, A. P., Treadway, D. C., Ferris, G. R., Hochwarter, W. A., & Kolodinsky, R.W. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics: Additional thoughts, reactions, and multi-level issues. *Research in Multi-Level Issues,1*, 287-294.

Akinsanya, R. (2010). Bank strategic responses and adaptation to change in Nigerian Business Environment. *Journal of social science* (2) 59-67.

Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behaviour. *Social Justice Research*, 1,(2), 177-198.

Alotaibi, A.G. (2001). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour: A study of public personnel in Kuwait. *Public personnel management*, 30 (3) 363-376.

Allen, N. and Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continence and normative commitment. *Journal of occupational psychology 63:1- 18.*

Alotaibi, G. (2000). *Antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour;* A study of public personnel in Kuwait. Public personnel magt., 30: 363-376.

Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K.M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and sup-port. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22*, 347-366.

Ang S, Van Dyne L, Begley TM (2003). *The employment relationships of foreign workers versus local employees:* A field study of organizational justice, job satisfaction, performance and OCB. J. Org.

Atabay G (2007). Psychological contract breach and organizational citizenship behaviour: exploring cognitive similarity and leader- member exchange as antecedents. Revised Business Research International Academic.

Atabay, G, Gunay, G & Cangarli, B.G (2010). Perception of organizational politics and LMX: Linkages in distributive justice and job satisfaction African .*Journal of Business Management Vol.* 4(14), pp. 3110-3121,

Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology, 127*, 649-656.

Baron RM, Kenny DA (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, 51:1173-1182.

Barshir, A. (2009). Organizational justive perveptions as predictor of job satisfaction and commitment *International journal of Business Mgt*, 4 (9) 145-154.

Bhal KT, Ansari MA (2007). Leader-member exchange-subordinate outcomes relationship: role of voice and justice. Leader. Org. Dev. J. 28(1):20-35.

Bies RJ, Moag JF (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria for fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard and M. H.

Bies, R. J., Shapiro, D. L., & Cummings, L. L. (1988). Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: Is it enough to say it's not my fault? *Communication Research, 15*, 381-399.

Blau P (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: Wiley.

Boswell W, Shipp AJ, Culbertson SS (2009). Changes in newcomer job satisfaction over time: examining the pattern of honeymoons and hangovers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94:844-858.

Brayfield, A.H, Rothe, HF (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied social psychology* 35(5): 307-311.

Breaux DM. Munyon TP, Hochwarter WA, Ferris GR (2009). Politics as a moderator of the accountability job satisfaction relationship: *Evidence across three studies, J Manage.* 35:307-326.

Burton JP, Sablynski CJ, Sekiguchi T (2008). Linking justice, performance, and citizenship via leader-member exchange. J. Bus. Psyc. 23:51-61.

Cammann C., Fichman M., Jenkins D., and Klesh, J. (1983), "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire", in S.E. Seashore (ed.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices*, New York: Wiley, pp. 71- 138.

Coetzee, M. (2005). *The fairness of affirmative actions: An organizational justice perspective.* Dissertation summated to the faculty Economics and Management Sciences in partial fulfilment of the require-ments of the degree of Doctor of philosophy in Human Resources Management at University of Preto-ria.

Cohen-Charash Y, Spector PE (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta analysis. Org. Behav. Hum. Dec. Process. 86:278-321.

Colquitt JA (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. J. App. Psyc., 86(3):386- 400.

Colquitt JA, Helen D, Mount MK (2001). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. J. App. Psyc. 86(3):386-400.

Colquitt JA, Scott BA, Judge TA, Shaw JC (2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. Org. Behav. Hum. Dec. Process, 100:110-127.

Conlon, D.E. (1993). Some test of self-interest and group value model of procedural justice. Evidence from organizational appeal procedure. *The academy of management Journal* 36 (5): 1109-1124.

Conlon, D.E. & Fasolo, P.M. (1990). Influence of speed of the third- party intervention and outcome on negotiator and constituent fairness judgements. The academy of management Journal 33 (4) 833-846.

Cropanzano, R, & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progressing organizational justice: Funneling through in the maze.

Cropanzano, R. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (1995). *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Cropanzano R, Prehar CA, Chen PY (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. Group Org. Manage., 27:324-351.

Demir, C. (2002). *Determining the level of job satisfaction of nurse working at Turkish military forces hospitals.*

Dipboye, R. L., & Foster, J. B. (2002). Multi-level theorizing about perceptions of organizational politics. *Research in Multi-Level Issues,1,* 255-270.

Erdogan B, Liden RC, Kraimer ML (2006). Justice and leader- member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academic Management Journal*, 49:395-406.

Fedor, A .(1998). An Emic Approach to understand culturally indigenous and Alien Human Resource Management Practices in Global Company, *Research and practice in Human Resource Management,* 13 (2), 31-48.

Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management,18*, 93-116.

Ferris GR, Frink D, Galang MC, Zhou J, Kacmar KM, Howard J (1996). Perceptions of organizational politics: Prediction, stress related. *African Journal of Business Management*. Implications, and outcomes. Hum. Relation., 49:233- 266.

Folger, R & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Folger R, Greenberg J (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personal systems. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds) Res. Person. Hum. Resour. Manage. 3:141-183. Greenwich, CT:JAI Press.

Fryxell GE, Gordon ME (1989). Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of satisfaction with union and management. Acad. Manage. J. 22:851-866.

Furnham *A.*, Petrides *K. V.*, Jackson *C. J,&* Cotter *T. (*2002*). Do* personality factors predict *job satisfaction*? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, 765-779. [10]

Gandz J, Murray VV (1980). The experience of workplace politics. Acad. Manage. J., 23:237-251.

Gbadamosi, L and Nwosu, C. (2011). *Entrepreneurial Intention, Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction as Determinants of Employees' Organizational Commitment:* Evidence from Babcock University Nigeria. Proceedings of Informing Science & IT Education Conference.

Gerhart B (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction? Implications for job design and other personnel programs. J. App. Psyc., 72(3):366-373.

Gerstner CR, Day DV (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader- member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. J. App. Psyc., 82(6):827-844.

Greenberg, J. (1987). *A taxonomy of organizational justice theory*. An academic directory.

Hackman R, Oldham JR (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. J. App. Psyc., 60(2):159-170.

Herzberg, F Mausner, B & Snyderman, B.B (1959). The motivation of work (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jackson, S. (2007). Dispositional theory of job satisfaction application and issues 423-451.

Judge, D.W (1998). *Fourth judicial District*. El paso County Judge.

Judge TA, Heller D, Mount MK (2002). Five factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A Meta analysis. J. App. Psyc., 8:530-541.

Kackmar, K.M & Baron, R.A. (1999). *Organizational politics:* The State of the field, links to related process, and agenda for future research: Jai press. Pp. 1-39.

Kacmar KM, Bozeman DP, Carlson DS, Anthony WP (1999). An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension. Hum. Relation., 52:383- 416.

Kacmar KM, Carlson DS (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. J. Manage., 23(5):627-658.

Kacmar, K.M & Ferris, G.R. (1991). Perceptions of organizational politics scale (POPS): *Development and construct validation. Educational and Psychological measurement* 51: 193-205.

Kalleberg, A.L (1977). Work values and Job rewords: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review* 42 (1); 124- 143.

Kipnis D, Schmidt SM, Wilkinson I (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Exploring in getting one's way. J. App. Psyc., 65:440-452

Krishnan, S Sandeep.K., & *Singh*, M. (*2010*). . Organizational Justice & *Job Satisfaction* in the Indian Academy of Management .

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice. New York: Plenum Press.

Locke, EA (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In. M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Ind. Org. Psyc. 1297-1349. Chicago: Wiley.

Maslow, A. (1943). *The dynamic of personality*: Psychological Review No 50 P. 514-539, 541-558.

McFarlin DB, Sweeney PD (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of job satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. Acad. Manage. J. 35:626-636.

Miller BK, Rutherford MA, Kolodinsky RW (2008). Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta analysis of outcomes. J. Bus. Psyc. 22:209-222.

Moorman RH (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? J. App. Psyc. 76:845-855.

Mottaz, R. (*1988*) *Job satisfaction* among public sector employees within South Africa,: *Research amongst nurses in the United States of. America* .

Mowday R.T, Steers R.M., and Porter L.W. (1979), "The measurement of organizational commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 224-247.

Mount, M. Illies, R & Johnson, E. (2006) Relationship of personality traits and counter productivity work behaviours. *The medicating effects of job satisfaction. Personal psychology*, 56, 591-622.

Nelson, M. (1999). *Pay me more*: An examination of faculty pay satisfaction. Atlonta.

Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993) Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(3), 527-556.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (1994). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin Inc.

North, N., Rasmusson, E., Hughes, F., & Finlayson, M. (2005). Turnover amongst nurses in New Zealand district health boards: A national survey of nursing turnover and turnover cost. *Journal of Employment Relation,* 30-49.

O'Connor, W. E., & Morrison, T. G. (2001). A comparison of situational and dispositional predictors of perceptions of organizational politics. *The Journal of Psychology, 135,* 301- 312.

Ogunyemi, A. O (2007). Perceived leadership style, motivation and training as predictors of workers' pro-ductivity in a manufacturing industry in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Ogun Journal of Counseling Studies, 1*(1), 76-83.

Olugbenga J. (2008). Coworkers' and Supervisor Interactional Justice: Correlates of Extension Personnel's Job Satisfaction, Distress, and Aggressive Behaviour.

Omoluabi, P. (1997*). Validation of job community scale in Nigeria Lagos: PPC Consultants.*

O'Relly, C and Chatman .J. (1986). The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction an commitment – *Journal of Applied psychology, 65, 55p- 565.*

Organ, D. (1988*). Organizational citizenship behaviour*: The solder syndrome. Loexington.

Parker CP, Dipboye RL, Jakson SL (1995). Perceptions of organizational politics: An investigation of antecedents and consequences. J. Manage. 21:891-912.

Parnell, J.A & Crandall, W. (2003). Propensity foe mparticipative decision-making, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and Intention to leave among Managers: Multinational Business Review, 11 (1): 45

Pfeffer, J. (1992), *Management with power.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Podsomott, P. & Mocken Zin, S. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour and the quantity and quality for work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psy. 82: 262-270.*

Poon JML (2006). Trust-in supervisor and helping coworkers: Moderating effect of perceived politics. J. Manage. Psyc. 21(6):518- 532.

Poon JML (2003). Situational antecedents and outcomes of organizational politics perceptions. J. Manage. Psyc. 18(2):138-155.

Preacher KJ, Rucker DD, Hayes AF (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypothesis: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. Multivariate. Behav. Res. 42(1):185-227.

Rain JS, Lane IM, Steiner DD (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. Hum. Relation, 44:287-307.

Robins, T. (1993). Government regulatory power over religious movements. *Journals for the scientific study of religion* 24: 237-251.

Rode JC (2004). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model. Hum. Relation, 57(9):1205- 1230.

Sahnawaz, M. G., & Juyal, R. C. (2006). Human resources management practices and organizational commitment in different organizations. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, *32*, 171-178.

SekKhin, E. (2010) *The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction*: Faculty of Business and Accountancy, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Shaw, S. *(*1999*).* J*ob satisfaction* and voluntary turnover in the. U.S. *Journal of organizational psychology*.

Siegel, L & Lane, I.M. (1974). Psychology in Industrial Organization. Home wood, iii; rd Irwin.

Spector, P. and Goh, P. (2001). Why negative affectivity should not be controlled in job stress research. Journal of organizational behaviour 21: 79-95.

Thibaut J, and L Walker. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A psychological analysis*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. American Journal of Economics and Business Administration 2(1): 56-63.

Valle, M., & Perrewe´, P. L. (2000). Do politics perceptions relate to political behaviours? Tests of an implicit assumption and expanded model. *Human Relations, 53*, 359-386.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2003). *Developments in organizational politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). *Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models.*

Vigoda E, Cohen A (2002). Influence tactics and perceptions of organizational politics: A longitudinal study. J. Bus. Res. 55:311-324.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: Wiley. 331p

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

Wiener, N. and verd, O. (1980). *Determinants old behavioural consequences of pay satisfaction personnel psychology* 33, 741-757.

Wright CW, Sablnski CJ (2008). Procedural justice, mood and prosocial personality Influence on organizational citizenship behaviour.