



ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES: DOES DOMINANT ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE MODERATE THE RELATIONSHIP? A STUDY ACROSS PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS.

Dr. Neha Jain

ABSTRACT This paper examines the moderating role of organizational culture on the relationship between organizational justice and outcome variables: job satisfaction, subjective well being and absenteeism. The sample consisted of 138 employees from private and public sector organizations. The organizations selected were perceived by employees to be high on autocratic culture. The analysis focused on measuring the differential effects of organizational justice on the three outcome variables as a function of the moderator variable which in this case was organizational culture. The results of multiple regression analysis showed significant moderating effects of autocratic culture on the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. For subjective well-being and absenteeism moderating effects of autocratic culture were not found to be significant. Analysis carried out across two sectors i.e. public and private sector organizations showed no differences.

KEYWORDS : organizational justice, organizational culture, moderator analysis

INTRODUCTION

In today's world of modernization and globalization, we are all trying to compete with each other in order to be successful and have a competitive advantage over others. The advent of globalization has fostered an open economy where a number of organizations are competing for the same edge and market share. This has led to a compelling need for innovative approaches to the solution of many problems involving human relationships in today's work environments. One result of this is that management today is sensitive to the smallest of details, both of the product and of the working conditions. Another impact of these changes is that the management today has recognized the importance of human resources and social interactions in the workplace. This has led to a focus on organizational justice issues as increasingly relevant and often hotly debatable in organizations today. Organizational justice concerns refer to how just the employees perceive the rewards they get from the organization, the organizational rules and regulations, procedures, supervisors and the working environment (Leventhal, 1980). Such concerns fall under three different kinds of justice concerns i.e. distributive justice (Adams, 1965), procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980) and interactional justice (Bies & Mong, 1986). The focus, in all these, is on justice as perceived by the employees. This perception might vary from individual to individual in the same organization as each individual might have different experiences in the organization. The way an individual perceives "justice" concerns has a deep impact on the way he/she performs and behaves in the organization.

Several studies in the past have demonstrated relationships between perceptions of justice and the outcome variables like employee's levels of job satisfaction, loyalty, commitment, employee citizenship behavior, absenteeism, turnover, well being and performance. The uniqueness of this research is the attempt to study (i) the role played by contextual factor in influencing the relationship between organizational justice and the three outcome variables and (ii) the role played by the nature of organization i.e. public and private sector.

There has been little work on contextual factors in organizations that influence justice perceptions. Contextual factors may play an important role in determining how the employees perceive justice concerns. Leventhal (1980) stated that under different contextual conditions procedural justice rules might be more or less important in an organization. The contextual factor taken for this study is organizational culture. Organizations differ in their culture. According to Schien(1993)culture refers to those basic assumptions, norms, values and policies followed in the organization that have over the years helped the organization in external adaptation and internal integration. Accordingly organizations differ in the kind of cultures they follow and the culture followed influences and shapes the thinking and behavior of its employees. Some organizations are role oriented, some are task oriented, some are people oriented and some could be technology oriented. The kind of culture followed in the organization influences the working patterns of employees and has a direct impact on employee's perception of various dynamics operating in the organization. For example if an organization follows a strict task oriented culture then promotion based on good performance rather than number of years of experience will not be perceived as unjust by other members of the organization. As an employee joins an

organization gradually he learns the implicit codes of conduct and the underlying assumptions on the basis of which the organization functions. Therefore the kind of culture followed in an organization becomes an important variable of study in order to understand the perception of employees towards the various organizational dynamics. This research proposes to examine the moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between organizational justice and the three outcome variables i.e. job satisfaction, subjective well being and absenteeism. All organizations differ in their culture and all cultures have certain inherent qualities, which may or may not be conducive to healthy organizational functioning. Therefore different organizational cultures would propagate different organizational norms, which would in turn directly effect the perceptions of the employees. In this research we examine the role of autocratic culture.

Organizations having autocratic culture have certain inherent features. The top management, tickles down strongly held values of self-interest, secrecy and competition. They make all the decisions. Coercion is considered as the best way of ensuring performance of the employees. In such organizations, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceptions of fairness are bound to be low. The core of this kind of organizational culture is power with a managerial orientation of authority. The employees on the other hand are oriented towards obedience and dependence on the boss. Such operational dynamics result in minimal performance by the employees.

The role played by the nature of the organization i.e. public vs. private sector has also been ascertained in this study. Both sectors have their unique set of functional features. Public sector organizations are characterized by low accountability, low productivity, low flexibility, poor customer orientation and slow decision-making. Public sector organizations are basically those organizations in which majority of the ownership is in the hands of the state. Management in these organizations is appointed by the state. The major orientation of these organizations is to cater to the social needs of the society. Public sector organizations are more power and role oriented. Here the power is more centralized in nature and lines of communication radiate out from this center and link sideways to the whole organization. These are strong dynamic organizations that are open to external demands. The functions in these organizations are delineated to the departments with specializations e.g. finance dept, HR dept etc. Work within these departments is based on proper procedures and everyone has a specified role to perform. The functioning of these organizations develops in stable environments and is based on predictability, standardization and consistency.

Private sector on the other hand operates under strong leadership where accountability and productivity both are high. These organizations have strong HR policies, developmental approach, specialized team functioning, strong customer relation orientation and high performance rules. Here the ownership lies in the private hands of individuals. Management may be either in the hands of the private owners or in the hands of groups. Management takes the vital decisions about key policies rules and regulations and these decisions may or may not have the voice of employee's representatives. These organizations are generally driven towards profit making. They are

more task and person oriented. Here the focus is on continuous solution to problems. Generally employees work in teams to achieve their targets and they are empowered with discretion and control over their work. These organizations are partly person oriented as there exists a concern for employee well being. It is clear from the above-mentioned differences that the nature of the organization itself provides a certain kind of working environment, which may influence justice perceptions.

Organizations in these two sectors are inherently different from each other. It would be worthwhile to examine if the relationship between perceived justice and outcomes would be different in the two sectors.

FACETS OF ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

Distributive justice is related to concerns regarding fair distribution of resources i.e. fair allocation of pay, rewards, promotions etc. (Deutsch, 1975; Homans, 1961; Leventhal, 1976). According to Adams (1965) equity theory, an employee compares the ratio of inputs to his outcomes with another person's input- outcome ratio. Input consists of education; hard work and skills an employee invests in the job and outcomes are in terms of pay, rewards, promotion, recognition etc. These comparisons are made vis-à-vis some comparison other or to ones own self in the past. In case of inequity an employee experiences distress and anger and is motivated to either leave the job or to attain equity either actually or psychologically. Leventhal (1976) shifted the focus of research to reward allocation situations. Along with equity other allocation norms were recognized as important. Deutsch (1975) showed the importance of equality and need as an allocation norm. Reis (1986) expanded the list by giving 17 distinct norms of distributive justice.

Procedural justice is related to fair process of decision-making in the organizations. (Leventhal, 1980). Research reveals that employees consider procedures that give them an opportunity to express their opinions (voice) as being fair in contrast to ones where they have no say. Leventhal (1980) identified six procedural rules that he thought important to evaluate procedural components. The procedures should be consistent across situations, they should be free from bias, they should be based on accurate information, they should have scope for corrections, they should be representative and they should adhere to ethical standards. Greenberg and Folger (1983) explained the effects of procedural justice in terms of "choice" and "voice". Folger (1979) coined the word "fair process effect" to explain how people get greater job satisfaction if they are given voice in decision-making. Folger and Konovsky (1989) linked procedural and distributive justice to job attitudes. Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) proposed a two factor model where they examined alternative models for procedural and distributive justice effects. Brockner and Wiesenfeld (1996) further reviewed procedural, distributive and interactional justice effects. Emphasis on procedural justice research has been on structural characteristics of decision making and little attention has been paid to the nature of interpersonal treatment people were meted out while working. This concern gave way to the third kind of justice concern called interactional justice.

Interactional justice refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment people receive in their workplace. Research in this field has focused on resolving the overlapping status of procedural and interactional justice (Bies, 2001; Bobocel & Holmvall, 2001). According to Bies and Moag (1986) interpersonal treatment should be based on truthfulness, which refers to employees being provided with realistic and accurate information, and further all individuals should be treated politely and respectfully and with dignity.

Later research in the field has focused on the distinct and interrelated nature of the facets of justice. Some researchers suggest a conceptually distinct position of the three facets whereas others suggest an interdependent relation between the three. A review of literature shows theoretical (Cropanzano, Mohler, Rupp & Schminke, 2001), operational (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), effectual (Ball, Trevino & Sins, 1994; Moorman, 1991) and antecedent (Colquitt, 2001; Greenberg, 1990) distinction between distributive and procedural justice. On the other hand research suggests that the two facets are not independent of each other. A Meta-analysis conducted, indicated a relationship of .57 and .77 for the two constructs (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, 2001).

Further justice research suggests a distinct relation between procedural

and interactional justice (Colquitt, 2001). This raises theoretical and conceptual issues. The present study throws light on the relationship between the various facets of justice and further investigates how they relate to the various outcomes, which are the focus of this study.

Organizational Justice And Behavioural Outcomes.

Three behavioral outcomes are the focus of the study: job satisfaction, absenteeism and subjective well-being. A brief discussion of the three outcomes follows: job satisfaction refers to one's feelings or state of mind regarding the nature of their work. Job satisfaction can be influenced by a number of factors, for example one's relations with one's supervisors, quality of the physical working environment, the perceived fairness of the decision making system of the organization etc. we postulate that perception of organizational justice will be positively related to satisfaction.

Absenteeism refers to how often employees take off from work. For the purpose of this study we propose that perceptions of organizational justice and absenteeism will be negatively correlated.

Third outcome variable in the study is subjective well being. This refers to independent feelings of an individual about a variety of life's concerns and an overall feeling about life in positive and negative terms (Nag pal & Sells, 1985). Several studies in the past have demonstrated a relationship between job characteristics and health (Bosma, Stansfeld & Marmat, 1998; Johnson, Steward, Hall, Fredlind & Theorell, 1996; Kivimaki, Vahtera, Pentti & Ferrie, 2000). Another longitudinal study was carried out to predict working conditions and three types of well being i.e. general well being, job related well-being and spill over from work to non work domains. Job control was found to predict spillover (Elfering, Grebner & Semmer, 2005). Bad working conditions and negative job characteristics have an adverse effect on an employee's health. A positive correlation between organizational justice and subjective well being is predicted.

HYPOTHESIS

The following hypothesis are proposed Hypothesis 1- Organizational justice will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and subjective well being and negatively correlated with absenteeism across both public and private sector organizations.

Hypothesis 2- Autocratic culture would moderate the relationship between organizational justice and the three outcome variables.

Hypothesis 3- Moderation effects would differ for public and private sector organizations.

METHOD

Sample

Participants – 138 employees from public (N=66) and private sector (N=72) organizations who rated autocratic culture as the dominant culture participated in the study. The age of the participants varied from 18 to 62 years. Informed consent was taken from them prior to the study.

MEASURES

The following measures were used in the study.

Organizational culture

Organizational culture was measured using Organizational Culture Profile (Pareek; 2002). The instrument measures 4 kinds of cultures i.e. autocratic or feudal, bureaucratic, technocratic and entrepreneurial cultures. There are 8 sets of statements, one for each culture. The respondent has to rank the four statements in each set in terms of its applicability to their own organization. E.g.

Set 1

- A. No consideration is given to values in this organization
- B. Values Are not shared in the organization
- C. Values are shared only at the top level
- D. Organizational values are widely shared in the organization

Organizational justice

Organizational justice was measured using a scale developed by the authors based on J.A.Colquitt's (2001) scale. Some of the items were adopted to suit the Indian organizations while others were added. The scale assessed three facets of justice – distributive justice (4 statements) cronbach alpha .75; procedural justice (8 statements)

cronbach alpha .80 and interactional justice (8 statements) cronbach alpha .78. Responses were taken on a 5 point rating scale ranging from strongly agree = 5 to strongly disagree = 1. The cronbach alpha for the full organizational justice scale was .90. Eg. Of the statements

- The salary given to me is appropriate for the work I do.
- I am able to influence the decision-making procedures in my organization.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using a scale designed by the authors. It had 5 items and the responses for all the items were taken on a likert type scale where 1 denoted “strongly disagree” and 5 “strongly agree”. Cronbach alpha for this measure was .60. Eg.

- I am satisfied with my job profile.
- I am satisfied with my other job related activities.

Absenteeism

Two statements were designed to measure the rate of absenteeism for the employees. The responses to both the statements were taken on a 5-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree”(1) to “strongly agree”(5). Cronbach alpha was .57. Eg.

- I often take a off from work.
- I don't mind coming for work on holiday's if required.

Subjective well being

Subjective well being inventory, which was a 3-point scale was measured using Nagpal and Sell(1985) subjective well being inventory. 22 statements were taken from the inventory. Cronbach alpha was .80. Eg.

- Do you feel your life is interesting?
- Do you think you have achieved the standard of living and the social status that you had expected?

RESULTS

Table 1 Correlations between organizational justice, facets of organizational justice and outcome variables for the total sample

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|------|---|
| 1.Organizational Justice | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2.Distributive Justice | .770** | 1 | | | | | |
| 3.Procedural Justice | .907** | .568** | 1 | | | | |
| 4.Interactional Justice | .899** | .587** | .701** | 1 | | | |
| 5.Absenteesim | .042 | .072 | .067 | -.020 | 1 | | |
| 6.Job Satisfaction | .621** | .603** | .510** | .541** | -.076 | 1 | |
| 7.Subjective well being | .137 | .095 | .114 | .142 | -.265** | .113 | 1 |

*p<.05. **p<.01

Correlational analysis was carried out to test the first hypothesis. The obtained results showed significant positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction (.621). Insignificant positive correlation was found between organizational justice and both absenteeism (.042) and subjective well being (.137). We had proposed a negative correlation between organizational justice and absenteeism but the obtained results are contrary to it. Organizational justice and its three facets i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional justice were all positively correlated to organizational justice.

Table 2 Correlation between organizational justice, facets of organizational justice and outcome variables in public sector organizations

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|---|
| 1.Organizational Justice | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2.Distributive Justice | .735** | 1 | | | | | |
| 3.Procedural Justice | .903** | .503** | 1 | | | | |
| 4.Interactional Justice | .900** | .555** | .703** | 1 | | | |
| 5.Absenteesim | .082 | .145 | .057 | .041 | 1 | | |
| 6.Job Satisfaction | .602** | .603** | .491** | .500** | .056 | 1 | |
| 7.Subjective well being | -.036 | -.118 | -.008 | -.002 | -.373** | -.084 | 1 |

*p<.05. **p<.01

This table shows the correlational values for public sector organizations. The obtained results show significant positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction (.602). Insignificant positive correlation was found between organizational justice and absenteeism and negative correlation was found between organizational justice and subjective well being. Here too all the three facets of organizational justice were positively correlated with organizational justice.

Table 3 Correlations between organizational justice, facets of organizational justice and outcome variables in private sector organizations

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---|
| 1.Organizational Justice | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2.Distributive Justice | .808** | 1 | | | | | |
| 3.Procedural Justice | .905** | .638** | 1 | | | | |
| 4.Interactional Justice | .897** | .609** | .688** | 1 | | | |
| 5.Absenteesim | .065 | .024 | .184 | -.050 | 1 | | |
| 6.Job Satisfaction | .656** | .601** | .553** | .587** | -.227 | 1 | |
| 7.Subjective well being | .237* | .255* | .156 | .233* | -.136 | .282* | 1 |

*p<.05. **p<.01

Table 3 shows correlational values for private sector organizations. The pattern of results is little different for these organizations. Results show a significant positive correlation between organizational justice and both job satisfaction (.656) and subjective well being (.237). The correlation between absenteeism and organizational justice is insignificant. Here too all the three facets of organizational justice were positively correlated with organizational justice.

Table 4 Multiple Regression analysis testing moderating effects of autocratic culture in the relationship between organizational justice and outcome variables: job satisfaction, absenteeism, subjective well being

| Variable | beta | r2 | adjusted r2 | F |
|---|---------|------|-------------|----------|
| Dependent variable: job satisfaction | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | .621** | .386 | .381 | 85.462** |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | .001 | .386 | .377 | 42.417** |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | 1.408** | .408 | .395 | 30.819** |
| Dependent variable: absenteeism | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | .042 | .002 | -.006 | .239 |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | -.131 | .016 | .002 | 1.125 |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | .579 | .020 | -.002 | .920 |
| Dependent variable: subjective well being | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | .137 | .019 | .012 | 2.609 |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | .099 | .027 | .013 | 1.885 |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | .001 | .027 | .005 | 1.248 |

OJ = organizational justice, AC = autocratic culture

*p<.05. **p<.0

So far we have explained organizational justice and the three outcome variables (1) in terms of their relation with each other, (2) in terms of their relation vis-à-vis the two sectors i.e. public vs. private. This table takes the analysis further, in order to test the 2nd hypothesis. Here we consider the variation in the relationship between organizational justice and the outcome variables under the influence of organizational culture. We had proposed that organizational culture in the form of autocratic culture would moderate the relationship between organizational justice and the outcome variables. To address this we carried out multiple regression analysis in three steps. The main effects of organizational justice and autocratic culture are calculated and finally the interaction between the independent and the moderator variable is regressed on the dependent variable. The significance and size of interaction in the last step are indicative of moderation effects.

The results in this table are indicated in three blocks, one block for each dependent variable. In step 1 in block 1, organizational justice is regressed on job satisfaction. Results indicated a significant and direct effect of perceived organizational justice on job satisfaction F = 85.462, R² = .386, p < .01. In step 2, the main effects of autocratic culture on job satisfaction were ascertained. Results indicated

significant effect of autocratic culture on job satisfaction $F = 42.417$, $R^2 = .386$, $p < .01$.

In step 3, however the actual moderation effect is tested. The addition of interaction term (organizational justice * autocratic culture) to the regression equation resulted in significant moderation effect $F = 30.819$, $R^2 = .40$, $p < .01$. the interaction effect increased the variance from 38% to 40%. This shows 40% of variance in the levels of job satisfaction is accounted for by the moderating variable autocratic culture.

In block 2 dependent variable is absenteeism. Here too the three steps are followed. The results show insignificant main and moderation effects for this dependent variable. Similar results are found for the dependent variable subjective well-being. Both the main and moderation effects are found to be insignificant.

Table 5 Multiple Regression analysis testing moderating effects of autocratic culture in the relationship between organizational justice and outcome variables for public sector organizations

| Variable | beta | r2 | adjusted r2 | F |
|---|---------|------|-------------|----------|
| Dependent variable: job satisfaction | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | .602** | .362 | .352 | 36.331** |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | .003 | .362 | .342 | 17.883** |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | 2.569** | .428 | .400 | 15.468** |
| Dependent variable: absenteeism | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | .082 | .007 | -.006 | .239 |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | -.180 | .033 | .002 | 1.125 |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | 1.000 | .043 | -.004 | .920 |
| Dependent variable: subjective well being | | | | |
| 1.Organizational Justice(OJ) | -.036 | .001 | -.014 | .082 |
| 2.Autocratic Culture (AC) | .157 | .021 | -.010 | .669 |
| 3.OJ, AC, OJ*AC | .056 | .021 | -.027 | .440 |

OJ = organizational justice, AC = autocratic culture
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

This table tests the moderation effects for all the three dependent variables across public sector organizations. Step 1 in block 1 shows significant and direct main effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction, $F = 36.331$, $R^2 = .362$, $p < .01$. in step 2 , the variance remains the same 36% and the results indicate significant main effects of autocratic culture on job satisfaction, $F = 17.883$, $R^2 = .362$, $p < .01$. step 3 tests the moderation effects. Results indicate significant interactional effects of perceived organizational justice * autocratic culture on job satisfaction, $F = 15.468$, $R^2 = .428$, $p < .01$. The variance here increases from previous 36% to 42%. For other two dependent variables i.e. absenteeism and subjective well being no significant main and moderation effects are found.

Table 6 Multiple Regression analysis testing moderating effects of autocratic culture in the relationship between organizational justice and outcome variables for private sector organizations

| Variable | beta | r2 | adjusted r2 | F |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------|-------------|----------|
| Dependent variable: job satisfaction | | | | |
| Step 1 Organizational | | | | |
| Justice(OJ) | 656** | 430 | 422 | 52.876** |
| Step 2 Autocratic | | | | |
| Culture(AC) | .036 | 432 | 415 | 26.194** |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| OJ, AC, OJ*AC | -.119 | 432 | 407 | 17.217** |
| Dependent variable: absenteeism | | | | |
| Step 1 Organizational | | | | |
| Justice(OJ) | .065 | .004 | -.010 | .299 |
| Step 2 Autocratic | | | | |
| Culture(AC) | -.035 | .005 | -.023 | .189 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| OJ, AC, OJ*AC | 9.676 | .009 | -.035 | .198 |
| Dependent variable: absenteeism | | | | |
| Step 1 Organizational | | | | |
| Justice(OJ) | .237* | .056 | .043 | 4.170* |
| Step 2 Autocratic | | | | |
| Culture(AC) | .061 | .060 | .033 | 2.194 |
| Step 3 | | | | |
| OJ, AC, OJ*AC | -.963 | .066 | .025 | 1.609 |

OJ = organizational justice, AC = autocratic culture

OJ = organizational justice, AC = autocratic culture
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

This table tests the moderating effects of autocratic culture in the relationship between organizational justice and the three outcome variables across private sector organizations. In step 1 and 2 of block 1 perceived organizational justice and autocratic culture is regressed on job satisfaction. The results indicate significant and direct main effects of both the variables on job satisfaction. For step 1 $F = 52.876$, $R^2 = .430$, $p < .01$ and for step 2 $F = 26.194$, $R^2 = .432$, $p < .01$. Step 3 shows significant moderation effects, $f = 17.217$, $R^2 = .432$, $p < .01$.

For the other two dependent variables no significant main and moderation effects are found.

DISCUSSION

Outcome has been studied in terms job satisfaction, absenteeism and subjective well being. The first hypothesis proposed a positive correlation between organizational justice and the two outcome variables i.e. job satisfaction and subjective well being, and a negative correlation between justice and absenteeism. The obtained results show a positive correlation between organizational justice and all the three outcome variables. Contrary to our hypothesis organizational justice and absenteeism are found to be positively correlated. For job satisfaction the results show that as perceptions of justice increases; the level of job satisfaction of employees increases as well. In case of both public and private sector organizations job satisfaction and organizational justice are found to be positively correlated. The findings fall in line with the earlier research in the area. Overall employees are satisfied and happy only if they perceive their work environment as being just and fair. Prior research done to study the role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Martin & Bennett, 1996) suggests that procedural justice is closely related to “ global” evaluations of systems and distributive justice is closely related to “ specific” personally relevant outcomes.

The same relationship holds true between organizational justice and subjective well-being (.137) for the total sample and the private sector organizations. A positive correlation is found between the two .This shows that as perceptions of organizational justice increases, an employee's subjective well being also increases. A longitudinal study was carried out to show that the extent to which people are treated with justice in workplaces independently predicts their health (Kivimaki,Pentti , Vahtera & Ferrie; 2000). Another study suggested that sleeping problems are one of the underlying factors causing the adverse health effects of low organizational justice at work (Elovainio, Kivimaki, Vahtera, Jarvinon & Virtanen; 2003). In case of public sector organizations a negative correlation is found between organizational justice and subjective well being. This kind of variation in the pattern of results could be due to certain inherent features of public sector organizations.

An insignificant positive correlation was found between organizational justice and absenteeism in contrast to the proposed negative one. No variations were found across public and private sector organizations. This shows that as perceptions of justice increases, rate of absenteeism of the employees also increases. This kind of a finding could be due to employees taking off from work for their personal reasons rather than professional ones. Past research in this field suggest contrary results. Jones and Skarlicki (2003) carried out a research to study the relationship between perceptions of fairness and voluntary turnover. Results of there study suggested that effect of distributive justice is stronger as compared to interactional justice.

The relationships between these variables would not remain the same when we throw light on the role of the variable called organizational culture. Here in our study we have taken into account the organizations having autocratic culture. Table 1 shows the relationship between autocratic culture and all the justice and the three outcome variables. Hypothesis 2 proposed that autocratic culture would moderate the relationship between organizational justice and the three outcome variables. Table 2 shows the results of multiple regression analysis carried out to test this hypothesis. Moderation effect for the dependent variable job satisfaction is found to be significant at .01 level. This suggests that the independent variable (organizational justice) would establish varying domain of maximal effectiveness in regards to the dependent variable (job satisfaction), under the influence of the moderator variable (autocratic culture). This further suggests that for

organizations with varying levels of autocratic culture, the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction would vary. Here it would suggest that the positivity between organizational justice and job satisfaction would be higher for low autocratic organizations than for high autocratic organizations. Moderating effects for the other two dependent variables are found to be insignificant. This suggests that autocratic culture does not moderate the relationship between organizational justice and subjective well being and absenteeism.

Third hypothesis of the study proposed that moderation effects would differ between public and private sector organizations. The obtained results showed no differences between the two sectors. The same moderation trend is followed across both the sectors. Moderation effects are found to be significant for the outcome variable job satisfaction across both the sectors. Here too moderation effects are insignificant for the outcome variable subjective well being and absenteeism.

REFERENCES.

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic press.
- Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 85-108). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bies, R.J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 85-108). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Blader, S.L., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 107-126.
- Bobocel, D.R., & Holmvall, C.M. (2001). Are interactional justice and procedural justice different? Framing the debate. In S. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (pp. 85-108). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bosma, H., Stansfeld, S.A., Marmot, M.G. (1998). Job control, personal characteristics and heart disease. *Occupational Health Psychology*, 402-409.
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B.M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 189-208.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of social issues*, 31, 137-149.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Virtanen, M., & Jarvinen, L.K. (2003). Sleeping problems and health behaviours as mediators between organizational justice and health. *Health psychology*, vol 22, no 3, pp 287-293.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of management journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkran, L. (1979). Effects of "voice" and peer opinions on responses to inequity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37, 2253-2261.
- Grebner, S., Semmer, N.K., & Elfering, A. (2005). Working conditions, well being and job related attitudes among call - center agents. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33, 425-435.
- Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P.B. Paulus (Eds), *Basic group processes* (pp. 235-256). New York: Springer - Verlag.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden costs of paycuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. (1993a). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Greenberg, J. & Colquitt, J.A. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*. New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Griffith, R.W., Hom, P.W., Gaertner, S. (2000). "A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 pp. 463-88.
- Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Johnson, J.V., Steward, W., Hall, E.M., Fredlind, P., Theorell, T. (1996). Long-term psychosocial work environment and cardiovascular mortality among Swedish men. *Am J Public Health*, 86: 324-331
- Jones, D.A., Skarlicki, D.P. (2003). The relationship between perceptions of fairness and voluntary turnover among retail employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1226-1243.
- Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Pentti, J., Ferrie, J.E. (2000). Factors underlying the effect of organizational downsizing on health of employees: longitudinal cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 971-975.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1976a). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 9, pp. 91-131). New York: Academic Press.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Leventhal, G.S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W.R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction* (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer - Verlag.
- Nagpal, R. and H. Sell (1985) *Subjective Well-being*. SEARO Regional Health Paper No. 7, New Delhi: WHO
- Pareek, U. (2002). *Training instruments in HRD and OD*. New Delhi, Tata McGraw Hill.
- Reis, H.T. (1986). Levels of interest in the study of interpersonal justice. In H.W. Bierhoff, R.L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds), *Justice in social relations* (pp. 187-226). New York: Plenum.
- Rupp, D.E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 925-946.
- Schein, E. (1993). Organizational culture and leadership. In J. Shafritz & J. Steven, (Eds.),

- Classics of organizational theory. Fortworth: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Sweeney, P.D., & McFarlin, D.B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational behaviour and Human decision processes*, 55, 23-40.