

# Investigation of Relationship between Organizational Justice Dimensions and Maintaining Expert Human Resources of Educational System in Hormozgan

Fariba Rooien<sup>\*</sup>, Serajedin Mohebbi and Hekmatolla Dastranj

Department of Business Management, Islamic Azad University, International Financial Trends, Qeshm Branch, Qeshm, Iran

*Received: April 14, 2014*

*Accepted: June 6, 2014*

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of organizational justice dimensions and maintaining expert human resources in educational system in Hormozgan. The population included the educational system managers, deputies and experts of Hormozgan Province in the educational year 2012-2013. From among them 250 people were selected randomly based on Morgan formula as sample volume. This is a descriptive research of correlational type and organizational justice questionnaire was used to collect data and his self-designed questionnaire was used to maintain the expert human resources. The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated using Cronbach's Alfa. Pearson's correlational coefficient and multiple regression coefficient were used to analyze the data. The results of Pearson test showed that there is a significant relationship between organizational justice dimensions and maintaining expert human resources. The results of the regression analysis showed that organizational justice can predict dependent variable changes and that interactional justice has the most power to predict changes of dependent variable.

**KEYWORDS:** Organizational Justice, Interactional Justice, Distributive Justice, Interactional Justice, Maintaining Expert Human Resources

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In current changing situation, expert human resources are a very important resource for organizations. In order to reach more efficiency and efficacy, and eventually achieving the predetermined goals, the organizations should pay enough attention to their human resources. Therefore, observing the justice is the key to the survival and stability of the organization and its employees' development. Tyler et al. [1] believe that feeling you are being treated fairly and like others leads to a sense of belonging and increases self-value. In contrast, if you feel that you are being treated unfairly, that might cause the sense of being distant from the group and reduce the self-value. From the point of view of modern management and age of learning organizations, emergence of an expert force is considered a toll. Educational system is one the biggest and widest systems in any society which determines its destiny in the long run. If educational system is well designed in terms of goals, structure and resources, it will guarantee its development in the long run and it will approach efficacy.

### Organizational Justice

Justice is one of the effective factors that keep people persistent in organizations. Generally it is culturally believed that decisions and results should be proportionate with individual merits or obtained characteristics instead of personal relationships or assigned characteristics. The law of equal opportunity is the result of such a thought line. Researches show that justice processes play an important role in the organizations. Because of the extensive results of observing justice, by investigating its effects at the beginning of the 1990, a new kind of empirical studies began on the organizational justice which led to the recognition of three justice kinds in organizations- that is, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice [2].

### Distributive Justice

Distributive justice refers to the results and outcomes being fair for employees. Homans [3] describes distributive justice as "justice in the distribution of rewards and costs among people". Adams [4] extended the concept of distributive justice and called it Equal Theory. This theory focuses on the way of rewarding people according to managers' and supervisors' unfair behaviors and interventions in the distribution of facilities and rewards.

### Procedural Justice

Procedural justice means the perceived justice from a process used for the detection of reward distribution. People can look beyond the short term results. Therefore, inappropriate results seem acceptable and it can be imagined that the process used is fair [5].

---

**\*Corresponding Author:** Fariba Rooien. Department of Business Management, Islamic Azad University, International Financial Trends, Qeshm Branch, Qeshm, Iran; Email: [rooien1392@gmail.com](mailto:rooien1392@gmail.com)

### Interactional Justice

This kind of justice is related to the aspects of communication process (such as politeness, honesty, and respect) between sender and receiver of justice. People are sensitive to the quality of encounter with them in their interactional relations as well as structural aspects of decision-making process [6].

### Maintaining Human Resources

The main goal of strategic management of human resources is creating strategic ability by guaranteeing and assuring that skilled, committed, and motivated employees are present in the organization. According to this, source-based human resources strategy becomes a competitive advantage when the organization has skilled human resources available to effectively activate its learned lessons faster than other competitors [7].

Yaghoubi et al. [8] in a study showed that there is a relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Rawls [9] found that when there is inequality in expectations, weak individuals might become worse. The organization should recognize sections in which unequal distributions takes place. Folger and Cropanzano [10] argued that distributive justice predicts satisfaction with outcomes (such as satisfaction with salary), while procedural justice will be effective on individual's evaluation from organization and supervisors (such as reliance on supervisor and organizational commitment). Moreover, if employees perceive organizational procedures fairly, they will probably become more faithful to the organization which is a sign of organizational justice. When arguing about the amount of justice observed in organizational procedures, Greenberg [5] consider the quality of interpersonal behavior of decision-makers with organization employees as a key factor. Masterson et al. [11] have stated that interactional justice predicts job performance compared to procedural justice.

**Major Hypothesis:** there is a positive and significant relationship between organizational justice dimensions and maintaining expert human resources.

**Minor Hypothesis:** 1. there is a positive and significant relationship between distributive justice and maintaining expert human resources. 2. There is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and maintaining expert human resources. 3. There is a positive and significant relationship between interactional justice and maintaining expert human resources.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

According to the subject matter and purposes of the research in this study we have used the descriptive correlation method. The population in this research includes all the managers, deputies and supervisors of educational system in Hormozgan in the educational year 2012-2013. The total number of people was 560, out of which 250 people were randomly selected to conduct the research. Moorman et al. [12] Questionnaire was used to measure organizational justice which was made up of three subscales and contains 19 items which are as follows:

- Descriptive justice which contains five items.
- Procedural justice which contains six items.
- Interactional justice which contains eight items.

In order to maintain the expert human resources, a questionnaire with 18 items was used.

The questionnaires were scored as (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) based on Likert scale. Reliability of this questionnaire was determined and confirmed by supervisors, advisors and related professors. Reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated by the use of Cronbach's alpha. Its total amount was (0.928) and for each of them it was: (descriptive, 0.601), (procedural, 0.857), (interactional, 0.914), and (maintaining expert human resources, 0.770). All dimensions were reliable.

The descriptive methods and statistical analysis of correlational coefficient and multiple regression were mostly used to analyze the data.

## 3. RESULTS

In the below table, R<sup>2</sup> shows that independent variables have been able to explain most of the variance of the dependent variable. The significant number F was calculated to be 0.001 which was lower than 0.05 and showed that this statistic is significant with the achieved amount of 108.081, which is an evidence for the power of three independent variables in explaining the dependent variable.

The first assumption: there is a positive and significant relationship between the distributive justice and maintaining expert human resources. As it is shown in table 1, analysis of the correlation between these two variables is indicative of a statistical relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.442$ ), in which the increase in the descriptive justice leads to the increase in maintaining expert human resources. Moreover, in table 2 it is shown that the descriptive justice variable with beta coefficient of 0.226 percent has a 22 percent power of predicting changes of the dependent variable.

Second assumption: there is a positive and significant relationship between the procedural justice and maintaining expert human resources. As it is shown in table 1, analysis of the correlation between these two variables indicates a positive statistical relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.621$ ) in which by an increase in the procedural justice, maintaining expert human resources increases, too. Furthermore, in table 2 it is shown that procedural justice with beta coefficient (0.120) has a 12 percent power of predicting the changes of the dependent variable.

The third assumption: there is a positive and significant relationship between the interactional justice and maintaining expert human resources. As can be seen in table 1, correlational analysis of these two variables shows a positive statistical relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.722$ ). Moreover, in table 2 it is shown that this variable with beta coefficient (0.633) has a 63 percent power of predicting the changes of the dependent variable.

**Table 1.** Correlation matrix between organizational justice dimensions and maintaining expert human resources

Variable	Maintaining human resources	Procedural justice	Interactional justice
Procedural justice	0.62*		
Interactional justice	0.72*	0.34*	
Distributive justice	0.44*	0.31*	0.32*

**Table 2.** Regression analysis, beta coefficient and significant level

Dependent variable	Independent variable	B	Beta	Sig.	Tolerance	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	F
Maintaining human resources	Distributive justice	0.207	0.226**	0.001	0.864	0.69	0.563	108.081
	Procedural justice	0.012	0.120**	0.050	0.352			
	Interactional justice	0.374	0.633**	0.001	0.403			

\*: Significant at the 0.01 level error      \*: Significant at the 0.05 level error

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this research it was observed that there is a positive and significant relationship between distributive justice and maintaining expert human resources in educational system of Hormozgan. The results were consistent with the studies of Agho et al. [13] and the relationship between income distribution and job satisfaction was 52 percent.

According to his studies, Wood [14] concluded that procedural justice is the best predictor of job satisfaction. Although the distributive justice is also effective, its effect is lower to that of the procedural justice. The current study confirmed that procedural justice is effective in maintaining expert human resources of educational system in Hormozgan; however, its effect is lower to that of distributive justice. About the third dimension of organizational justice according to the previous studies of Colquitt et al. [2], desertion has a negative relationship with all three dimensions of descriptive, procedural, and interactional justices. The results of this research show that interactional justice was effective in maintaining human resources of educational system in Hormozgan. Therefore, the managers and decision-makers of this organization should consider the comments of people about their job issues so as not to be faced with employees' resistance against accepting the decisions because everyone likes to contribute to decisions related to them. The second important thing to be noticed in the findings of the current research is that interactional justice with beta coefficient (0.633) has the most power to predict the changes of dependent variables. Therefore, the employees' need to be treated respectfully, generously, facing managers consideration towards employees and other organizational individuals with one another, and considering the fact that honest behavior is their primary concern shows that interactional justice is the most effective factor on stability of expert human resources in educational system of Hormozgan.

It is recommended that this research be conducted in governmental organizations and private companies as well. This will increase the generalizability of the results.

#### REFERENCES

1. Tyler, T. R., Lind, E. A., Ohbuchi, K. I., Sugawara, I., & Huo, Y. J. 1998. Conflict with outsiders: Disputing within and across boundaries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 137-146.
2. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C.O.L.H., & Yee Ng, K. 2001. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
3. Homans G.C. 1961. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
4. Adams, J.S. 1965. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
5. Greenberg, J. 1987a. Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
6. Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. 1986. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of Fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard and M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
7. Armstrong, M. 1987. A Case of the Emperor's New Clothes. *Personnel Management*, 19(8): 30-35.
8. Yaghoubi M. 2006. A Survey of relationship between Organization Commitment and Job Stress among the Hospital Managers of Medical Science University of Isfahan. Isfahan: HMERG.
9. Rawls, J. 1971) A Theory of justice Cambridge. MA: Harvard university press.
10. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. 1991. Organizational justice and human resource management. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

11. Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.S., & Taylor, M.S. 2000. Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-766.
12. Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. 1993. Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.
13. Agho, A.O, Mueller, C.W, & Price, J.L. 1993. Determinants of Employee Job Satisfaction, *Human Relations*, pp. 80-85.
14. Wood, S. 1999. Human Resource Management and Performance. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1: 367–413.