

# Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Satisfaction

*Shubham Hablani*

Student  
ITM, Gwalior

*Prashant Sharma*

Assistant Professor  
ITM, Gwalior

## ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to examine the Impact of Organizational justice (OJ) on Job Satisfaction (JS) in the RPO Industry. Organizational justice is of three types, Distributive justice and procedural justice are considered in this research. The employees of RPO industry were targeted and Questionnaire was used to conduct the research. Difference in job satisfaction was also examined on the basis of various demographic conditions. Multiple regression was run to check the impact of Organizational justice (OJ) on Job Satisfaction (JS). It was concluded that Distributive and procedural justice both have a positive impact on Job Satisfaction and there is no difference in Job Satisfaction on the basis of various demographic conditions.

***Key Words: Organizational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction.***

## INTRODUCTION

In today's scenario every organization wants to minimize its cost and maximize its profit. In this process companies nowadays are getting attracted to a new business model named RPO. RPO stands for Recruitment Process Outsourcing. It is a business model where an Organization outsources its function of recruitment to a third party it may be in whole or part.

The third party is accountable for placing the employees in that organization. It is said to reduce hiring time by 40% and it can save more than 50% cost incurred for the recruitment process. It measurably improves the quality of hiring, delivering a great return on investment. It also increases the reach of an organization to various parts of the country where they were unable to reach.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE (OJ)**

Organizational justice (OJ) may be defined as an employee's perception towards the fairness done by the organization for an employee and their behavioral reactions towards this perception.

Organizational justice (OJ) denotes the feelings of the employees and how sensitive they are to the organization. This is a perception from employee's side on organizations about their treatment of employees by superiors. It concerns with employee's perception of fairness within a Company.

If an employee's justice perception is increased, his individual performance will be affected positively. More perception of fairness in organization more feelings on job satisfaction (JS).

These perceptions include three separate factors, firstly just in the process of decision making, secondly, fairness in the distribution of resources and lastly rewards and fairness in the treatment of employees and sharing the information.

### **DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE**

The term fairness in the distribution is the allocation of resources and rewards in proportion to inputs. Work outcomes such as wages, job security, societal approval, career opportunities and promotions while work inputs such as education, experience, training and effort. Generally in every organization, the equity principle is upheld by using standardized HR policies, such as predefined salary bands, job grades and training. However, some occasions an employee feels that there has been unjust distribution of outcomes. The concept of equity may sometimes be revoked by equality that is everyone receives the same.

### **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

The term procedural justice means fairness in the decision making process. Fairness in the procedure is indispensable for maintaining institutional legitimacy. When decisions are made, employees are likely to receive some benefits. For example one may or may not be appreciated. Fair procedure leads to employees intellectual, involvement and emotional recognition. On the other hand, unjust procedure leads to distress and job dissatisfaction.

## **INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE**

Interactional justice is purely based on procedural justice. It is mainly focused on the actual eminence of interpersonal/supervisor treatment obtained by the employees in the organization, especially on decision making process.

## **JOB SATISFACTION (JS)**

Job Satisfaction (JS) is the feeling of an employee which comes to him/her at the end of a task performed. To the extent that a person's job fulfills his dominant needs and is consistent with his expectations and values, the job will be satisfying. The end feeling could be either positive or negative depending upon the need of the employee.

Job Satisfaction (JS) is different from motivation and morale. Motivation refers to the willingness to work. Whereas, Satisfaction implies a positive emotional state. Morale denotes a general attitude towards work and work environment. It can be termed as a group phenomenon whereas job satisfaction (JS) is an individual feeling. Job satisfaction (JS) may be considered a dimension of moral and morale could also be a source of satisfaction. Attitudes are predispositions that make the individual behave in a particular way. Job Satisfaction (JS), on the contrary is the end feeling which may influence subsequent behavior. Thus employee's general attitude towards his work is termed as Job satisfaction (JS).

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This review of literature is done to provide base to this study which examines the relationship between Organizational Justice (OJ) and Job Satisfaction (JS), it also helps in examine the various geographical factors with organizational justice and job satisfaction which provides a certain base to this study.

A study was done by **(Ali, 2010)** to depict the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) surrounded by three components: (Distributive justice, Procedural justice and Interactional justice) and Employees' perception of workplace Justice and job satisfaction (JS). The findings of the study showed that only one significant relationship existed between the age of respondents and their perception. It also suggested that there was a positive relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and Job Satisfaction (JS). Another study done by **(Eib, 2015)** to examine the interaction between Organizational justice (OJ) and Job

Characteristics with the alliance of work environment and employee health cross-sectionally and over time. The Result of the study was that the Organizational Justice (OJ) had significant impact on work environment and other job characteristics.

**(Choong Kwai Fatt, 2010)** This research examined the impact of organizational justice (OJ) surrounded by two components (distributive justice and procedural justice) on job satisfaction (JS), organizational commitment and turnover intention. The findings of the study showed that the higher the level of employee's perception towards fairness or justice the higher the level of his/her job satisfaction (JS) and vice versa.

**(Russell Cropanzano, 2007)** The study discusses the importance of organizational justice (OJ) at the workplace. It was found that the absence of Organizational justice (OJ) increases the problems for the organization and if it is present then can it allows management to take tough decisions easily.

**(Salehi, 2011)** This research was done to check the role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction (JS) and organizational commitment in organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. The result of this study showed that job satisfaction (JS) is directly correlated with procedural justice. In addition to this **(Tabancalib, 2012)** conducted a study in Istanbul on teachers of primary school to check the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS). It showed the same result and also displayed that distributive and interactional justices are also directly correlated to job satisfaction (JS).

**(Alomaim, 2011)** The research was conducted in Saudi Arabia to examine the influence of organizational justice (OJ) perceptions on job satisfaction (JS) of two groups (Saudi employees and foreign employees). The conclusion of the study was that the organizational justice (OJ) perceptions of both the groups were positively and significantly related to job satisfaction (JS). Another study done by **(Mifrah Sethi)** aimed to investigate the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS) in the city of Peshawar, Pakistan. The results were the same as in Saudi Arabia.

**(Hossein Zainalipour, 2010)** The main purpose of this study was to analyze the correlation between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS). The results of this research showed that procedural justice had more impact on job

satisfaction (JS) than distributive and interactional justice. Likewise another study by (**Arti Bakhshi, 2009**) explored the relationship organizational justice (OJ), job satisfaction (JS) and organizational commitment. It also displayed that procedural justice had more impact on job satisfaction (JS) than both the components of organizational justice (OJ). Addition to this, a research by (**Tanova, 2010**) in North Cyprus was also conducted to check the influence of organizational justice (OJ) of Hotel employees on various work related variables. It also displayed the same results as the above two studies.

A study was conducted by (**Mahmud Rahman, 2015**) in Bangladesh in a pharmaceutical company to examine the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS) and the results showed that distributive and interactional justice had a positive correlation with job satisfaction (JS) but procedural had a negative correlation. Likewise, a study was conducted by (**Roussel, 1999**) on Canadian managers it also stated that distributive justice is more predictor of job satisfaction (JS) than procedural justice. In addition to this, another study was conducted in the Philippines by (**Tan, 2016**) of the employees in a hotel setting. The results revealed that distributive and interactional justice positively affects employees' job satisfaction (JS), while procedural justice does not have a significant impact.

A study done by (**Marko Elovainio, 2002**) examined the justice of decision-making procedures and interpersonal relations as a psychosocial predictor of health. The study concluded that low organizational justice (OJ) is a risk to the health of employees. Likewise (**Rupp, 2003**) conducted research to check the importance of organizational justice (OJ) for employee motivation. The results also supported the research and showed that justice matters for the employees and can be treated as a motivational topic. In addition another study was done by (**Yadav, 2016**) to discuss the reasons why organizational justice (OJ) is critical for employees. The conclusion of the study was that organizational justice (OJ) has a positive correlation with turnover intention, job performance, trust and organizational citizenship.

(**Aziri, 2011**) This research was done to study about overall job satisfaction (JS). The researcher concluded that financial compensation had a great impact on overall job satisfaction (JS). In addition to this, another study was done by

(Porter) to check the impact of job performance on job satisfaction (JS) but the results showed that job satisfaction (JS) is created through job performance. Likewise, (Timothy A. Judge, 2001) studied the relationship between job satisfaction (JS) and job performance and concluded that they show a positive correlation.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- **Primary Objective:** To analyze the impact of Organizational justice (OJ) on Job satisfaction (JS) in Splash India Pvt. Ltd.
- **Secondary Objective:**
  - To measure the difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Age.
  - To measure the difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.
  - To measure the difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Income.
  - To measure the difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Education.
  - To measure the difference in job Satisfaction (JS) based on Experience.

### HYPOTHESES

**H01** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.

**Ha1** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.

**H02** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Age.

**Ha2** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Age.

**H03** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Education.

**Ha3** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Education.

**H04** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Experience.

**Ha4** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Experience.

**H05** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Income.

**Ha5** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Income.

**H06<sub>(a,b)</sub>** - There is no significant impact of Distributive Justice and Procedural justice on Job satisfaction (JS).

**Ha6<sub>(a,b)</sub>** - There is a significant impact of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice on Job satisfaction (JS).

### Research Model



#### TYPES OF RESEARCH DESIGN

- a) Causal Research
- b) Descriptive Research

#### POPULATION

The population in this study is the People working in RPO's and the HR department of companies.

#### SAMPLING UNIT

In this study one sample unit is one employee of the RPO and an employee of HR department of various companies.

#### SAMPLE FRAME

In this research my sample frame is RPO companies and HR departments of various companies.

#### TYPE OF SAMPLING METHOD

The method chosen here is both Probability and Non probability sampling which means Simple Random Sampling was used in Probability and Kind of non probability sampling used is Snowball sampling.

## **SAMPLE SIZE**

In this study sample size taken is 10 respondents to each question. This states that there should be 140 respondents (14\*10). During the course of study only 104 respondents responded positively.

## **DATA COLLECTION**

When some information is presented in a suitable manner so as to use it in a better way is known as data. The data is categorized in two parts: a) Primary data  
b) Secondary data.

- a) Primary data: The data collected personally from different modes is termed as primary data. It can also be called as first hand data. It can be collected through Questionnaire, personal interviews etc.
- b) Secondary data: The data which was collected by another person for some other purpose but is used by someone else for his purpose. It can also be called as second hand data. It can be collected through newspapers, journals, magazines, news channels etc.

The data collected in this study is both primary data and secondary data.

## **RESEARCH INSTRUMENT - QUESTIONNAIRE**

The details of the instruments are given below:

Variables	No. of Items	Source
Distributive Justice	5	Niehoff and Moorman(1993)
Procedural Justice	5	Niehoff and Moorman(1993)
Job satisfaction (JS)	4	Christou and Sigala(2008)

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

### **DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

In this study there are a total of 104 respondents and from which males are 54 and females are 50, 95 from the age group of 21-30 and 9 from the age group of 31-40, 65 among them were graduates, 37 were post graduates and 2 were PhD



holders, 32 respondents have an experience of less than 1 year, 61 have an experience between 1 to 5 years and 11 have experience of 5 to 10 years.

#### **DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE- RELIABILITY ANALYSIS**

<b>Reliability Statistics</b>		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.852	.849	5

#### **PROCEDURAL JUSTICE- RELIABILITY ANALYSIS**

<b>Reliability Statistics</b>		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.869	.868	5

#### **JOB SATISFACTION (JS)- RELIABILITY ANALYSIS**

<b>Reliability Statistics</b>		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.813	.817	4

**Result-** Five items are chosen to test the reliability of Distributive justice and Cronbach's Alpha is 0.849 and respectively five items are chosen to test the reliability of Procedural justice and Cronbach's Alpha is 0.868. Similarly Four items are chosen to test the reliability of Job Satisfaction (JS) and Cronbach's Alpha is 0.817. The internal reliabilities of all three measures are above 0.7, meeting the minimum threshold which indicates that all the items in each measure is internally consistent and are considered acceptable for test. Therefore, the study concludes that all the constructs are reliable.

**T-Test (Gender)**

**H01** - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.

**Ha1** - There is a difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OJ_MEAN	Female	50	3.5220	.67892	.09601
	Male	54	3.7296	.85795	.11675

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
OJ_MEAN	Equal variances assumed	6.575	.012	-1.361	102	.176	-.20763	.15252	-.51015	.09489
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.374	99.637	.173	-.20763	.15116	-.50754	.09228

**Result-** There is no significant difference in the scores for male (M= 3.52, SD=.678) and female (M=3.73, SD= .857) conditions; t(102), p=.176

**Interpretation-** The above results suggest that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of gender. So, H01 is not rejected.

**T-TEST (AGE)**

**H02** - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Age.

**Ha2** -There is a difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Age.

Group Statistics					
	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OJ_MEAN	21-30	95	3.6253	.79573	.08164
	31-40	9	3.6778	.63004	.21001

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
OJ_MEAN	Equal variances assumed	1.123	.292	-.192	102	.848	-.05251	.27343	-.59487	.48984
	Equal variances not assumed			-.233	10.580	.820	-.05251	.22532	-.55086	.44583

**Result-** There is no significant difference in the scores for age group 21-30 (M= 3.6253, SD= .79573) and age group 31-40 (M=3.6778, SD= .63004) conditions;  $t(102), p=.848$

**Interpretation-** The above results suggest that there is no significant difference in job Satisfaction (JS) on the basis of age. Therefore, the hypothesis  $H_{02}$  is not rejected.

#### ANOVA (EDUCATION)

**H03** - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Education.

**Ha3** - There is a difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Education.

Descriptives								
JS_MEAN								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Graduation	65	3.8269	.77551	.09619	3.6348	4.0191	2.00	5.00
Post Graduation	37	3.5811	.82717	.13599	3.3053	3.8569	1.00	5.00
Phd Holder	2	3.3750	.53033	.37500	-1.3898	8.1398	3.00	3.75
Total	104	3.7308	.79493	.07795	3.5762	3.8854	1.00	5.00

ANOVA					
JS_MEAN					
	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.683	2	.842	1.341	.266
Within Groups	63.403	101	.628		
Total	65.087	103			

**Result-** There is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of different education groups at  $P \leq 0.05$  level for three conditions. [ $F(2, 101) = 1.34, p = 0.266$ ].

**Interpretation** - It can be concluded that the mean values of different education groups is not significant at .05. So, the hypothesis  $H_{03}$  is not rejected.

#### ANOVA (EXPERIENCE)

**H04** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Experience

**Ha4** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Experience.

Descriptive								
JS_MEAN								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than 1 Year	32	3.5000	.86603	.15309	3.1878	3.8122	1.00	5.00
1-5 Years	61	3.8893	.74655	.09559	3.6981	4.0805	2.00	5.00
5-10 Years	11	3.5227	.68424	.20631	3.0630	3.9824	2.50	4.75
Total	104	3.7308	.79493	.07795	3.5762	3.8854	1.00	5.00

ANOVA					
JS_MEAN					
	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.714	2	1.857	3.056	.051
Within Groups	61.372	101	.608		
Total	65.087	103			

**Result-**There is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of different Experience groups at  $P \leq 0.05$  level for three conditions. [ $F(2, 101) = 3.056, p = 0.051$ ]

**Interpretation-** It can be concluded that the mean value of different experience groups is not significant at .05. So, the hypothesis  $H_{04}$  is not rejected.

#### ANOVA (INCOME)

**H<sub>05</sub>** - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Income

**H<sub>a5</sub>** - There is a difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Income.

Descriptive								
JS_MEAN								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than 2 Lakhs	26	3.4423	.69752	.13680	3.1606	3.7240	2.00	4.50
2-5 Lakhs	50	3.8500	.86603	.12247	3.6039	4.0961	1.00	5.00
5-10 Lakhs	24	3.7604	.74629	.15234	3.4453	4.0755	2.50	5.00
More Than 10 Lakhs	4	3.9375	.31458	.15729	3.4369	4.4381	3.50	4.25
Total	104	3.7308	.79493	.07795	3.5762	3.8854	1.00	5.00

ANOVA					
JS_MEAN					
	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.066	3	1.022	1.648	.183
Within Groups	62.020	100	.620		
Total	65.087	103			

**Result-**There is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of different income groups at  $P \leq 0.05$  level for three conditions. [ $F(3, 100) = 1.648, p = 0.183$ ]

**Interpretation-** It can be concluded that the mean values of different income groups are not significant at .05. So, the hypothesis  $H_{05}$  is not rejected.

**REGRESSION**

**H06(a,b)** - There is no significant impact of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice on Job satisfaction (JS).

**Ha6(a,b)** - There is a significant impact of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice on Job satisfaction (JS).

<b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b>				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.751 <sup>a</sup>	.565	.556	.52970
a. Predictors: (Constant), PJ_MEAN, DJ_MEAN				
b. Dependent Variable: JS_MEAN				

<b>ANOVA<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	36.748	2	18.374	65.487	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	28.338	101	.281		
	Total	65.087	103			
a. Dependent Variable: JS_MEAN						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PJ_MEAN, DJ_MEAN						

<b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.050	.249		4.216	.000
	DJ_MEAN	.551	.084	.600	6.581	.000
	PJ_MEAN	.190	.087	.199	2.183	.031
a. Dependent Variable: JS_MEAN						

**Result-** A multiple regression was run to predict impact of distributive justice and procedural justice on job satisfaction (JS). These variables statistically significantly predicted job satisfaction (JS),  $F(2, 101) = 65.487$ ,  $p \leq 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.565$ .

**Interpretation-** The result states that both distributive and procedural justice significantly impact job satisfaction (JS) with significance value 0.00 and 0.031 respectively.

### Summary statement of hypotheses and their results

Hypothesis Statement	P≤0.05	Results
<b>H01</b> - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Gender.	0.176	<b>Not Rejected</b>
<b>H02</b> - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Age.	0.848	<b>Not Rejected</b>
<b>H03</b> - There is no difference in Job Satisfaction (JS) based on Education.	0.266	<b>Not Rejected</b>
<b>H04</b> - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Experience.	0.051	<b>Not Rejected</b>
<b>H05</b> - There is no difference in Job satisfaction (JS) based on Income	0.183	<b>Not Rejected</b>
<b>H06<sub>(a,b)</sub></b> - There is no significant impact of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice on Job satisfaction (JS).	0.00 and 0.031	<b>Not Accepted</b>

### FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

This research examines the relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS) and checks the significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of gender, age, education, income and work experience.

The results indicated that distributive justice has significant impact on job satisfaction (JS) with  $p= 0.00$  and procedural justice also has significant impact on job satisfaction (JS) with  $p= 0.031$ . It shows that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of gender with  $p=0.176$ . It was also found that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of age with  $p=0.848$ . There was no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of education found during the course of study with  $p =0.266$ . It also shows that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of experience with  $p = 0.051$ . It was also found that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of income with  $p = 0.183$ .

It was founded that studies done by (Ali, 2010), (Choong Kwai Fatt, 2010), (Salehi, 2011), (Tabancalib, 2012) also displayed the same result that Organizational Justice (OJ) has a positive relationship with Job Satisfaction (JS).

### SUGGESTIONS

According to the results it is suggested that:

- The employees of RPO's and people working in HR departments should be examined regularly.

- Their expectations should be considered.
- There should not be any kind of biasness among the employees.
- The payment of wages should be fair as per designation and job roles and responsibilities.
- The workload should be distributed equally among the employees in the RPO or the HR department.
- The time schedule for the duty or office hours in the RPO or for the HR department should be fair.
- The work environment should be Employee Friendly.

## **CONCLUSION**

The results of the study concluded that:

- Distributive Justice has a significant impact on Job Satisfaction (JS).
- Procedural Justice has a significant impact on Job Satisfaction (JS).
- There is no difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of gender.
- There is no difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of age.
- There is no difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of education.
- There is no difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of experience.
- There is no difference in job satisfaction (JS) on the basis of level of income.

## **LIMITATIONS**

Limitations of this study are the small sample size and representativeness of the sample where non-probabilistic sampling method and convenience sampling were used. The geographical area was also a limitation as only a particular area and not to the whole of India.

As the study conducted on employees of RPO's and HR department of various companies where number of respondents as compared to number of questionnaires distributed was very less. Future research in this field can investigate how job satisfaction (JS) and organizational justice (OJ) are correlated.



## REFERENCES

- Aharon Tziner, L. O. (2011). This study therefore examines the connections between the macro concept of CSR and Job satisfaction (JS). 67-72.S
- Ali, H. (2010). The impact of organizational justice (OJ) on job satisfaction (JS). 1-11.
- Alomaim, A. M. (2011). Does Organizational justice (OJ) Influence Job satisfaction (JS) and Self-Perceived Performance in Saudi Arabia Work Environment? 1-12.
- Andrew Clark, A. O. (1996). Is job satisfaction (JS) U-shaped in age? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychol*, 57-81.
- Arti Bakhshi, K. K. (2009). Organizational justice (OJ) Perceptions as a Predictor of Job satisfaction (JS) and Organization Commitment. 145-154.
- aziri, B. (2011).job satisfaction (JS): a literature review. *Management research and practice* vol. 3, 77-86.
- Choong Kwai Fatt, E. W. (2010). The Impact of Organizational justice (OJ) on Employee's Job satisfaction (JS): The Malaysian Companies Perspectives. *American journal of economics and business administration*, 1-9.
- Christou and Sigala(2008)
- Eib, C. (2015). process of organizational justice (OJ). 1-111.
- Evangelos Christou, Marianna Sigala (2008). International CHRIE Conference, 1-570.
- Hossein Zainalipour, A. A. (2010). A relationship between organizational justice (OJ) and job satisfaction (JS). 1986-1990.
- Iaffaldano, M. T. (1983) job satisfaction (JS) and job performance: a Meta analysis. 1-104.
- Justice, O. (2012). Jason A. Colquitt. 526-547.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1997). Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job satisfaction (JS). *American Sociological Review* , 124-143.
- Locke, T. A. (2000). Personality and Job satisfaction (JS): The Mediating Role of Job Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 237-249.
- Lund, D. B. (2003). Organizational culture and Job satisfaction (JS). 219-237.

- Mahmud Rahman, M. H. (2015). Impact of Organizational justice (OJ) on Employee Job satisfaction (JS): An Empirical Investigation. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 162-171.
- Marko Elovainio, M. K. (2002). Organizational justice (OJ): Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health. 105-108.
- McDonald, T. L. (1982). Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction: An empirical Evaluation of their Interrelationship. *Human Relations* , 167-180.
- Mellon, N. S. (1980). Life and Job Satisfaction: Is the Job Central? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51-58.
- Mifrah Sethi, H. I. (n.d.). Relationship between Perceived Organizational justice (OJ) and the employees job satisfaction (JS). *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 100-117.
- Niehoff, Moorman. (1993). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior.
- Porter, E. E. (n.d.). The Effect of Performance on Job satisfaction (JS). *Symposium: Human Behavior in Organization*, 20-28.
- Rabia Imran, M. M. (2016). Impact of Organizational justice (OJ), Job Security and Job satisfaction (JS) on organizational productivity. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 840-846.
- Roussel, M. T. (1999). Modeling the Role of Organizational justice (OJ). 1-35.
- Rupp, R. C. (2003). An Overview of Organizational justice (OJ): Implications for Work Motivation . 1-25.
- Russell Cropanzano, D. E. (2007). The Management of Organizational justice (OJ). 1-16.
- Salehi, H. Z. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction (JS), and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. 1-10.
- Tabancalib, T. D. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice (OJ) perceptions and job satisfaction (JS) levels. 5777-5781.
- Tan, L. A. (2016). The Influence of Organizational justice (OJ) on Job satisfaction (JS) in a Hotel Setting. 17-29.
- Tanova, H. N. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction (JS) ,and organizational citizenship behavior in

the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33-41.

- Timothy A. Judge, C. J. (2001). The Job satisfaction (JS)-Job Performance Relationship:A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. 376-407.
- Watanabe, T. A. (1993). Another Look at the Job satisfaction (JS)-Life Satisfaction Relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 939-948.
- Yadav, L. K. (2016). Organizational justice (OJ): An Analysis of Approaches, Dimensions and Outcomes. 1-27.