



**GNITED MINDS**  
Journals

*International Journal of  
Information Technology  
and Management*

*Vol. IX, Issue No. XIV,  
November-2015, ISSN  
2249-4510*

## **ANALYSIS ON IMPACT OF PROCEDURAL AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE TO THE ORGANIZATION**

AN  
INTERNATIONALLY  
INDEXED PEER  
REVIEWED &  
REFEREED JOURNAL

# Analysis on Impact of Procedural and Interactional Justice to the Organization

Ravi Tewari

Research Scholar, Jiwaji University, Gwalior, MP

**Abstract – Recent research data point out that workers react to the decisions that involve them and they are exaggerated by the processes which cause to these decisions. In other words, employees are concerned in technical justice and they try to appreciate the measures ending up the decisions made. Procedural justice is the observation of the processes which are used to establish the decisions. In short, it is about the perceptions of justice connected with the conclusion making processes. In this paper we discussed the impact of procedural and interactional justice towards the success for organization.**

**Keywords: Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Organization**

----- X -----

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Procedural justice includes the following key factors determined by a research of (Berneth el al., 2007):

- a. Requires consistency among individuals in a certain period of time
- b. Includes performance without prejudice,
- c. Uses true and relevant information,
- d. Permits corrective actions in case of conflicts among parties,
- e. Consistent with ethical standards and
- f. Considers the opinions of dependent parties.

Procedural Justice is defined as the justice of the processes that lead to outcomes. When persons feel that they have a voice in the procedure or that the process involves individuality such as constancy, accuracy, ethicality, and lack of bias then bureaucratic justice is enhanced. Procedural justice means the equivalent practices of managerial issues such as prevention of unfair wages, declaration to decisions, informational location [Colquitt and Chertkoff, 2002]. It focuses on the procedure of decision building and depends on the perceptions of the justice of the decision processes and the rate of intuition from allocation decisions made by guides with true methods.

## INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE:

A new type and form of justice is named interactional justice. The interactional justice, which is designed by (Bies and Moag 1986) and which is related with interpersonal interactions (Karriker and Williams, 2009) is a follow-up of procedural justice (Ganesh., 2008). According to [Moorman 1993] interactional justice is the communication flanked by the resource of allocation and the citizens who will be exaggerated by the allocation decisions; or is the technique of telling how to do and what to do to the people in result processes. The sensitivity of persons related to the excellence of interactive performance during the perform of procedures constitutes the interactional justice. Interactional Justice also refers to the management that an personality receives as decisions are complete and can be promoted by providing explanations for decisions and delivering the information with sensitivity and reverence. A construct validation study by [Colquitt 2001] suggests that interactional justice should be broken into two components: interpersonal and informational justice. Interpersonal justice refers to perceptions of deference and propriety in one's management while informational justice related to the sufficiency of the explanations known in terms of their suitability, specificity, and honesty.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURES:

As quoted by [Thomas, 1992] Organizational justice is an significant predictor of various outcomes and many studies tried to appreciate the association of these justice factors and outcomes. Many researchers studied the effects of distributive and procedural justice on approval [Colquitt et al., 2001]

“dissimilar justice proportions are reasonably to significantly related, they contribute incremental discrepancy explained in equality perceptions” Research conducted by **[Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001]** found distributive and technical justice are connected to pay contentment.

**[Karriker JH and Williams, 2009]** studied the association flanked by distributive justice and procedural justice on individual and organizational outcomes and establish that distributive justice is a major forecaster of two personal outcomes (pay satisfaction and job satisfaction) compared to technical justice. Distributive justice is also establish as a good intermediary flanked by personality pay approval and job satisfaction **[Folger, R. & Husted, W. B. 2004]**. A study conducted by **[David King, Karina Dyer 2011]** found distributive justice can be predicted by pay satisfaction. **Rezaiean in 2010** found a positive association flanked by organizational justice and job satisfaction. A Meta-analytic review conducted by **[Colquitt et al.2001]**, found distributive justice and technical justice has high correlations with job approval. In another study, distributive justice connecting to pay, remuneration, and rewards were found to be appreciably linked to job satisfaction and proceeds intentions.

#### IMPACT OF PROCEDURAL AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE TO THE ORGANIZATION:

Through the use of structural equation modeling, Sweeney and McFarlin found that distributive justice was related to outcomes that are person-level while procedural justice was related to organization-level outcomes. The accuracy of the two-factor model was challenged by studies that suggested a third factor (interactional justice) may be involved. Bies and Moag 1998 argue that interactional justice is distinct from technical justice because it signifies the social exchange constituent of the communication and the excellence of treatment whereas procedural justice represents the methods that were used to arrive at the decision outcomes. Normally researchers are in arrangement regarding the difference flanked by procedural and distributive justice but there is more disagreement over the dissimilarity flanked by interactional and procedural justice **[Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001]**. **[Colquitt 2001]** demonstrated that a four-factor model (including procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice) fit the data meaningfully better than a two or three factor model. Colquitt's construct validation study also showed that each of the four components have predictive validity for dissimilar key organizational outcomes. Another model of organizational justice suggested by Byrne 1999 and colleagues **[Byrne & Cropanzano, 2000]** suggested that organizational justice is a multi-foci construct, one where employees see justice as coming from a source - either the organization or their supervisor. Thus, rather than focus on justice as the three or four factor component model, Byrne

recommended that employees personify the organization and they distinguish flanked by whether they feel the organization or supervisor have treated them justly (interactional), use fair procedures (procedural), or allocate rewards or assignments impartially (distributive justice). A number of researchers used this model discovering the opportunity that justice is more than just 3 or 4 factors **[Karriker & Williams, 2009]**.

#### CONCLUSION:

Procedural justice is found to be a stronger predictor of turnover intention than distributive justice. It is found that procedural justice has more impact on withdrawal. Some existing studies indicated that Organizational justice is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. The four planned components are distributive, bureaucratic, interpersonal, and informational justice. It is found that the significance of affect and sensation in the evaluation of the fairness of a condition as well as one's performance and attitudinal reactions to the situation.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Colquitt, J. A., & J. M. Chertkoff. (2002). Explaining Injustice: The Interactive Effect of Explanation and Outcome on Fairness Perceptions and Task Motivation. *Journal of Management*, 28(5), 591-610.
2. Karriker JH and Williams ML (2009) Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour: A mediated multifoci model. *Journal of Management*.35 (1), 112-135.
3. Ganesh (2008) A study of extra role performance and team climate in software development project teams: The role of virtualness.
4. Moorman RH, Niehoff BP & Organ DW (1993) Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviours: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6: 209-225.
5. Thomas Davenport (1992) Process Innovation: Reengineering Work through Information Technology
6. Cohen-Charash, Y, Spector, PE.,(2001) The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
7. Folger, R. & Husted, W. B. (2004). Fairness and Transaction Costs: The Contribution of Organizational Justice Theory to an

Integrative Model of Economic Organization.  
Organization Science, Vol. 15, No. 6, pp. 719-729. Published by: INFORMS. Retrieved on September 3, 2012 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30034772>

8. David King, Karina Dyer: International Handbook on Proceeding of Intellect base International Consortium; Vol-20, 2011
9. Karriker JH and Williams ML (2009) Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour: A mediated multifoci model. Journal of Management.35 (1), 112-135.