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ABSTRACT

In an attempt to make South Africa a more just society after the first democratic elections on 27 April 1994, the South African society had to undergo a number of radical changes which impacted the social, economical, political and educational arena. These changes have influenced recruitment, retention and turnover. Changes at leadership levels in the private and public sphere coupled with a huge exodus of highly skilled professionals are evident as topics of equality and social justice appear at the top of company agendas.

Many proponents have conducted research on organisational justice and the fact that more than twenty five thousand articles have been published on job satisfaction attest to the importance of these two variables on organisational performance. In an article examining past, present and future states of organisational justice it is argued that organisational justice has the potential to explain many organisational behavioural outcome variables. An investigation of the relationship between organisational justice perceptions and work behavior found job satisfaction to be made up of a large fairness component. The rationale behind the support for the study is the argument that employees who perceive that they have been fairly treated is likely to hold positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes and their managers. If South African organisations wish to remain competitive then organisations need to understand how perceptions of justice influence attitudes and behaviour and consequently affect the success of the organisation.
Agricultural Colleges, a division of the Department of Agriculture are no exception. The Agricultural Colleges' primary aim is to provide training to its prospective communities, and is continuously being evaluated in terms of how well its academic employees achieve its vision, mission and goals. It is evident from responses to job advertisements, low morale and high turnover that most of the academic employees in Agricultural Colleges are dissatisfied with their jobs, pay, management and the institutions based on their current salary. Attracting, recruiting and retraining highly skilled, internationally marketable and mobile employees are critical factors in determining the present and future success in agricultural training in South Africa.

Limited research to examine the effects of organisational justice on organisational outcomes in an environment where the workforce consists of academics is the gap this research attempts to fill. This study is designed to assess the impact of organisational justice on job satisfaction of academic employees in agricultural colleges in South Africa. Also, to determine whether biographical values influence the relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction.

Seventy (70) respondents completed a biographical questionnaire as well as a Job Satisfaction Survey to identify their levels of job satisfaction. To ascertain the levels of organisational justice perceptions, respondents were asked to complete the Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire. Correlation analysis revealed there is a statistically significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice perceptions. This would seem to imply that if organisational justice
perceptions were to change, then job satisfaction would change accordingly. Findings also indicate that there is a significant difference in organisational justice perceptions and job satisfaction depending on their level of employment, with lower level employees being more negative with respect to both variables. The results of this study also indicate that the demographic variables of age and gender appear to be better predictors of job satisfaction and organisational justice perceptions for the younger group of employees compared with their older counterparts. While the results of the current study reveal interesting findings, the results need to be interpreted with caution due to the nature and size of the sample which impact on the generalisability of the findings.

KEY WORDS

Job Satisfaction, Organisational Justice, Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Fairness Perceptions, Equity Theory, Social Justice, Job Performance, Organisational Performance, Academic employees, Agricultural Colleges
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER 1
**INTRODUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Problem Formulation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Research Questions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Research Objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Research Hypotheses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Delimitations of the Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Outline of the Study</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER 2
**JOB SATISFACTION – A LITERATURE REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Introduction</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Job Satisfaction Defined</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Theories of Job satisfaction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Discrepancy Theories</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.2 Aldefer’s ERG Theory</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.3 Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.4 McClelland’s Theory of Needs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Equity Theory</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Value Theory</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Vroom’s Expectancy Theory</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Porter and Lawler’s Expectancy Theory</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Social Processing Model</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Goal- Setting Theory</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Evaluation of Job Satisfaction Theories</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Determinants of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1 Extrinsic Sources of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.2 Intrinsic Sources of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 The Influence of Demographic Variables</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 The Influence of Personality Characteristics</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Consequences of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Productivity</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16 Effects on Quality of Life</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17 Conclusion</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE – A LITERATURE REVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Introduction</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Organisational Justice Defined</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 Content and Process Conceptualisations of Organisational Justice</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.1 Reactive Content Theories</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.2 Proactive Content Theories</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.3 Reactive Process Theories</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.4 Proactive Process Theories</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Theories Underlying Distributive Justice</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 Equity Theory 89
3.3.2 Relative Deprivation 90
3.3.3 Referent Cognitions Theory 91
3.3.4 Distributive Justice Defined 92
3.4 Procedural Justice Defined 96
3.4.1 Theories Underlying Procedural Justice 97
3.4.1.1 Process Control and Decision Control 97
3.4.1.2 Self-Interest Model and Group-Interest Model of Procedural Justice 99
3.5 Interactional Justice 103
3.5.1 Interactional Justice Defined 106
3.5.2 Interpersonal and Informational Justice 108
3.6 Employees Behaviour in Response to Injustice 110
3.6.1 Naming 110
3.6.2 Blaming 111
3.7 Factors Influencing an Employees Need to Act on an Injustice 115
3.7.1 The Impact of the Injustice 115
3.7.2 Limiting Future Injustice 116
3.8 Factors Influencing the Choice of Action to Injustices 118
3.8.1 Level of Perceived Control 119
3.8.2 The Predisposition of the Unfairly Treated Employee 120
3.8.3 Clear Route for Action 120
3.8.4 Shared Perceptions with Others 121
3.9 Handling Employees Reactions to Injustice 121
3.9.1 Eliminate Gross Injustices

3.9.2 Provide Accessible and Effective Mechanisms for Responses to Injustices

3.9.3 Allow Employee Voice

3.10 Organisational Justice Explanations of Organisational Behaviours

3.10.1 Managerial Dispute Resolution

3.10.2 Survivors’ Reactions to Retrenchments

3.10.3 Gender Differences in the Equality-Pay Satisfaction Relationship

3.11 Justice Principles Associated with Fair Human Resource Practice

3.11.1 Hiring

3.11.2 Performance Appraisal

3.12 Job Satisfaction and Organisational Justice

3.12.1 Personal Outcomes Model

3.12.2 Group Value Model

3.13 Conclusion

CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Selection of the Sample

4.3 Procedure

4.4 Data Collection

4.4.1 Biographical Questionnaire

4.4.2 Job Satisfaction Questionnaire
4.4.2.1 Job Descriptive Index (JDI) 142
4.4.2.2 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) 143
4.4.2.3 Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) 143
4.4.2.4 Job-In-General Scale (JIG)) 143
4.4.2.5 Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) 144
  4.4.2.5.1 The Nature and Composition of the Job Satisfaction Survey 145
  4.4.2.5.2 Reliability of the Job Satisfaction Survey 146
    4.4.2.5.2.1 Internal Consistency Reliability 146
    4.4.2.5.2.2 Test-Retest Reliability 147
  4.4.2.5.3. Validity of the Job Satisfaction Survey 147
    4.4.2.5.3.1 Content Validity 147
    4.4.2.5.3.2 Criterion-Related Validity 148
  4.4.2.5.4 Rationale for the Inclusion of the Job satisfaction Survey 148
4.3.3 Organisational Justice Questionnaire 149
  4.4.3.1 Sweeny and McFarlin’s (1997) Distributive and Procedural Justice Questionnaire 150
  4.4.3.2 Joy and Witt’s (1992) Distributive and Procedural Justice Questionnaire 151
  4.4.3.3 Parker, Baltes and Christiansen’s (1997) Distributive and Procedural Justice Questionnaire 152
  4.4.3.4 Price and Mueller’s (1986) Distributive Justice Questionnaire 152
  4.4.3.5 McFarlin and Sweeny’s (1992) Procedural Justice Questionnaire 153
4.4.3.6 Moorman’s (1991) Procedural and Interactive Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.7 Folger and Konovsky’s (1989) Procedural Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.8 Daley and Geyer’s (1994) Procedural Fairness, Employee Voice and Justification

4.4.3.9 Farh, Earley and Lin’s (1997) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.10 Scarpello and Jones’s (1996) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.11 Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Distributive, Procedural and Interactive Questionnaire

4.4.3.11.1 The Nature and Composition of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.11.2 Reliability of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.11.3 Validity of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.4.3.11.4 Rationale for the Inclusion of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire

4.5 Statistical Methods

4.5.1 The Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

4.5.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

4.5.3 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

4.6 Ethical Issues

4.7 Research Hypotheses

4.8 Conclusion
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

5.1 Introduction 170

5.2 Descriptive Statistics 171

5.2.1 Results of the Biographical Questionnaire 171

5.2.1.1 Gender Distribution of Respondents 172

5.2.1.2 Age Distribution of Respondents 174

5.2.1.3 Years of Service /Tenure of Respondents 176

5.2.1.4 Marital Status of Respondents 178

5.2.1.5 Current Position/ Job Level of Respondents 179

5.2.1.6 Educational Level of Respondents 181

5.2.1.7 Salary Level of Respondents 182

5.2.2 Table Descriptive Statistics for the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) 183

5.2.3 Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) 184

5.3 Inferential Statistics 185

5.4 Reliability Analysis 199

5.5 Conclusion 200

5.5.1 Factors Affecting Employee Satisfaction 208

5.5.2 Correlates of Job Satisfaction 211

5.5.3 Organisational Justice in Pay and Employee Benefits and its Effects on Work Attitudes 212

5.5.4 The Consequences of Organisational Justice and Compensation Satisfaction 215

5.6 Recommendations 218
Reference List

Appendix 1 Letter to principals

Appendix 2 Letter to participants

Appendix 3 Questionnaire
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NUMBER</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.1 Comparison of the Maslow, Herzberg and ERG Theories</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1 Research Questions Relating to Reactive Content, Proactive Content, Reactive Process and Proactive Process</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1 Facets of the Job Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2 Subscale Contents for the Job Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Organisational Justice Scale</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.2 Descriptive Statistics for the dimensions of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.3 Intercorrelation of Job Satisfaction Dimensions</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.4 Intercorrelation Matrix Between Job Satisfaction and Organisational Justice Dimensions</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.5 Correlation Between Biographical Variables and Organisational Justice</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.6 Correlation Between Biographical Variables and Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.7 Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Regressing the Seven Demographic Variables Against Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.8 Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with Organisational Justice as the dependent variable</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.9 Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha for the Job Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire and the Organisational Justice Questionnaire</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE NUMBER</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1 Maslow’s Need’s Hierarchy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2 ERG Theory</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.3 Two-Factor Theory</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.4 McClelland’s Theory of Needs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.5 Equity Theory</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.6 Expectancy Theory</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.7 Goal setting Theory</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1 Organisational Justice</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.2 Behavioural Responses to Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.1 Gender Distribution of Respondents</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.2 Age Distribution of Respondents</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.3 Years of Service/Tenure of Respondents</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.4 Current Marital Status of Respondent</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.5 Job Level of Respondents</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.6 Education Level of Respondents</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.7 Salary Level of Respondents</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.8 Model Indicating Job Satisfaction-Organisational Justice Relationship</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND AIM OF THE RESEARCH

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The substantial amount of literature that has been dedicated to job satisfaction and organisational justice is testament to the importance of these two job-related attitudes (Clay-Warner, Reynolds & Roman, 2005; Moorman, 1991; Schappe, 1998; Tremblay, Sire & Balkin, 2000; Veeran & Katz, 2002). Fernandes and Awamleh (2005) stated that employee job performance and satisfaction are considered to be essential variables that impact the performance of organisations. It was further purported that organisations must strive to identify factors that influence the performance and job satisfaction of employees. One such factor is organisational justice which describes the individual employee’s or group’s perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organisation and their behavioural reactions to such perceptions (Greenberg, 1990b). The underlying assumption is that job satisfaction will contribute to the long-term success of an organisation, and that job satisfaction may be elicited by increasing organisational justice.

The fact that job satisfaction and organisational justice may have an impact on organisational performance necessitates that closer attention be paid to these variables.
1.2 PROBLEM FORMULATION

Following a literature survey it became clear that high levels of employee satisfaction and organisational justice prove to be beneficial to the effective functioning of organisations. Job satisfaction and organisational justice have been found to be related to such withdrawal behaviours as lateness, low levels of commitment, absenteeism, turnover and theft (Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Greenberg, 1990b; Hanisch & Hulin, 1991; Kalleberg, 1997; Schappe, 1998; Scott & Taylor, 1985; Siers, 2007). Furthermore, both these variables have been linked to increased productivity and organisational effectiveness (Bowen, Gilliland & Fogler, 1999; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Visser & Coetzee, 2005). Thus, it is believed that satisfied employees and employees who perceive that they have been fairly treated are more likely to remain with an organisation and perform at higher levels.

The relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice has particular implications for service organisations. In a study conducted in a service environment, it was found that employees’ satisfaction correlates significantly with customer satisfaction. Furthermore, if employees are fairly treated they are postulated to in turn treat their customers fairly (Bowen et al., 1999). In the same vain if employees in a service environment are treated fairly then it can be expected that the service delivery to clients/customers may improve, for example like in the case of agricultural colleges which operate in a service environment.
It has been established that organisational justice is a consistent and strong predictor of job satisfaction (Colquitt, 2001; Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Diekmann, Barsness & Sondak, 2004). It is less clear which component of organisational justice is central to this relationship. Understanding the connection between job satisfaction and organisational justice is important because it will determine the relative effects of organisational justice on work attitudes, and examine whether the relationship between various forms of justice and work attitudes vary depending on an employee’s workplace experience (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). Furthermore, it is essential to understand the role of organisational justice in shaping job satisfaction as a work attitude. This is necessary given the documented link between employee satisfaction and organisational outcomes (Clay-Warner et al., 2005).

The above taken into account, it may be said that a relationship between employee satisfaction and organisational justice could provide an important vehicle for influencing the behaviour of employees. That is, given its stronger impact on withdrawal, productivity and effort, organisational justice could be used to influence these behaviours by increasing the satisfaction of employees (Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summers, 1998; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Consequently, the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice has become of great importance to organisations, but it may be particularly imperative in the service environment. Given the important contribution that such a relationship may make to the objectives of an organisation, it becomes necessary that it is investigated. In acquiring a better understanding of the dynamics involved in this relationship, a clearer
picture may emerge as to how organisations might best be able to optimise the potential benefits that it offers (Bowen et al., 1999).

Literature further identifies a number of demographic characteristics that have an important influence on job satisfaction and organisational justice. These primarily include age, gender, tenure, educational level and salary level (Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Fernandez & Awamleh, 2006; Veeran & Katz, 2002). These variables have been theorised to and empirically shown to be significant predictors of both job satisfaction and organisational justice.

Consequently, the demographic variables of gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level have been included in this study for two reasons. Firstly, they have been included for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of the contributions made by them to the satisfaction and perception of fairness of employees in a service environment. Secondly, they have been included as variables so that an accurate picture can be arrived at regarding the unique contribution that the components of organisational justice make to the job satisfaction of employees in a service environment.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were developed with regard to the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice:
• To what extent does a relationship exist between job satisfaction and organisational justice in agricultural colleges in South Africa?

• To what extent do the demographic variables of gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction in agricultural colleges in South Africa?

• To what extent do the demographic variables of gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level significantly explain the variance in organisational justice in agricultural colleges in South Africa?

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Based on the research questions stated above, the research objectives of the study can be formulated as follow:

• To investigate the relationship between organisational justice components such as distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice to job satisfaction.

• To determine whether there are differences in job satisfaction based on biographical characteristics.

• To determine whether there are differences in organisational justice based on biographical characteristics.
1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1:
There is no statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2:
There is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

Hypothesis 3:
There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job/level, educational level and salary level) and organisational justice.

Hypothesis 4:
There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job/level, educational level and salary level) and job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 5:

The biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level, and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6:

The biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level, and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in organisational justice.

Hypothesis 7:

The 9 facets of job satisfaction as measured by the job satisfaction survey will significantly explain the variance in organisational justice, above and beyond that explained by the demographic variables.

1.6 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A primary limitation of the study relates to the confinement of the sample to academic employees at the various agricultural colleges only. Thus, the results cannot be
extrapolated to the general population in the agricultural colleges or academics in other academic institutions. This study therefore lacks external validity.

Another limitation of the study was related to the use of a non-probability sampling design. The results could be biased due to an over-representation of respondents from certain groups which has an effect on the generalisability of the findings.

The study was restricted to a limited range of variables. This was unavoidable in terms of the practical restrictions of performing a single research project. A significant number of variables were considered, for example selection, turnover, commitment and organisational citizenship. However, job satisfaction and organisational justice were selected after a review of the literature as there appears to be a continued scientific interest in the empirical relationship between these two variables.

The administration of the questionnaire was not under the direct control of the researcher. The survey was conducted in areas outside of the Western Cape. A quantitative cross-sectional survey design was employed to collect data from the sample. It is possible that qualitative techniques (focus groups, interviews) could also have been employed to enhance the quality of the insight into the variables under investigation. Alternatively, the method of triangulation (combining quantitative and qualitative approaches) could have been utilised.
1.7 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The approach to the present investigation can be broadly divided into two categories. That is, a survey of the relevant literature and an empirical study. Chapters two and three constitute detailed literature reviews with regards to the two variables under investigation, while the empirical section of the study is addressed in chapters four and five.

Chapter two provides a comprehensive discussion of job satisfaction. Specific attention is devoted to the definition of job satisfaction, the various theories pertaining to satisfaction, the identified intrinsic and extrinsic correlates of this attitude, as well as the consequences thereof.

Chapter three provides a detailed discussion pertaining to organisational justice. The chapter specifically focuses on the definition of the construct, the components of the construct, as well as the consequences of organisational justice. The chapter concludes with an in-depth discussion pertaining to the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

The empirical section of the study is addressed in chapters four and five. Chapter four provides an outline of the research methodology employed in the investigation of the proposed problem. Aspects of this chapter were selecting the sample, the manner in
which the data was collected, as well as the statistical techniques employed in testing the research hypotheses. To this end, attention is specifically devoted to the measuring instruments relevant to the study, namely a biographical questionnaire, the Job Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire (JSS) and the Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire (OJQ). The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, multiple regression analysis and hierarchical regression analysis were used to analyse the data. Chapter four concludes with a delineation of the research hypotheses which were subjected to statistical testing.

The study concludes with chapter five which outlines the results obtained in the study and provides a discussion of these results. Conclusions are drawn based on the obtained results and the possible practical implications of the research findings are pointed out. Finally, some suggestions and recommendations are made that may be of value in future research.
CHAPTER 2

JOB SATISFACTION - A LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is commonly accepted that job satisfaction is one of the most widely researched variables in the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology (Aamodt, 1999; Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Clay-Warner et al., 2005; Coetzee, 2004; Fernandes & Awamleh, 2005; Hendrix, et al., 1998; Howard, 1999; Kallenberg, 1997; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Schappe, 1998; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004; Tremblay et al., 2000; Veeran & Katz, 2002; Visser & Coetzee, 2005). The reason for the considerable attention that has been paid to job satisfaction may be sought in at least four factors.

Firstly, in a competitive market where optimal performance is required for survival, employee job satisfaction becomes a critical issue with which management continues to struggle. Although there are varying results across investigations regarding the casual relationship between job satisfaction and performance, there is general agreement that some job satisfaction factors do influence the amount of satisfaction that employees derive and ultimately, their job performance (Chambers, 1999; Schleicher, Watt & Greguras, 2004).
The second reason for the interest in job satisfaction rests on the fact that strong correlations between job satisfaction and withdrawal behaviours such as turnover, absenteeism, psychological distress and tardiness appear in previous studies (Clay-Warner, et al., 2005; Lease, 1998; Organ, 1991; Price & Mueller, 1981; Scott & Taylor, 1985; Swanepoel, Erasmus, van Wyk, & Schenk, 1998).

Thirdly, Kreitner and Kinicki (1992) reveal the extent that job satisfaction has on employees working in organisations and the humanitarian concern for the psychological experiences that employees have during their working lives. Job satisfaction has been linked to both the physical and mental well-being of employees (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Landy, 1989; Vecchio, 1998). Locke (1976) and Hoole and Vermeulen (2003), highlight the most common consequences of job satisfaction in terms of its effects on physical health, longevity, mental health, the impact it has on interaction between employees and the feelings of employees toward their jobs and their social lives. As pointed out by Sousa-Poza (2000a), job satisfaction is one of the three most important predictors of overall well being. This alone provides quite a strong case for the importance of studying job satisfaction.

Another good reason for the study of job satisfaction can be found in the strong shift that is occurring from manufacturing to service industries in the majority of countries. As pointed out by Sousa-Poza (2000a), a direct and strong positive relationship has been shown to exist between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction in service organisations. In light of the above, it becomes obvious that no organisation can afford to
ignore the importance of job satisfaction. The key to an organisation’s long-term survival and growth rests primarily on the effective utilisation of its human resources as pointed out by Boshoff and Mels (1995). Job satisfaction can play an active role in the optimisation of this important resource.

In an attempt to study job satisfaction theoretically, this chapter considers the following aspects of job satisfaction: Firstly the various approaches to the definition of job satisfaction are discussed. Secondly, attention is paid to the various theories of job satisfaction, and finally, both the determinants and the consequences of satisfaction are examined.

2.2. JOB SATISFACTION DEFINED

Job satisfaction is generally regarded as an employee’s perception of, and attitude towards the job and job situation. Aamodt (1999) simply defines job satisfaction as the attitude employees have towards their jobs. Furthermore, Greenberg and Baron (2000) view job satisfaction as an employees’ positive or negative attitude toward their jobs. According to Hirschfeld (2000), job satisfaction is described as the extent to which people like their jobs. Moorhead and Griffen (1998) elaborate on these definitions by stating that job satisfaction refers specifically to a positive attitude held by employees, while job dissatisfaction results when this attitude is negative. Dipboye, Smith and Howell (1994), also regard job satisfaction as an attitude and further state that this
attitude remains relatively constant and is formed primarily by interpersonal and social processes in the working environment.

The majority of definitions of job satisfaction provided in the literature identify three major dimensions of job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992). Firstly, that job satisfaction may be regarded as an emotional or affective response. Kreitner and Kinicki (1992, p. 58) define job satisfaction as “an affective or emotional response towards various facets of one’s job.” McCormick and Ilgen (1985) also employ this definition. Lock and Sweiger (1979) define job satisfaction as the positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. Williams and Hazer (1986) define job satisfaction similarly. These authors maintain that job satisfaction entails the affective orientation of employees to the work, roles and characteristics of their jobs. Saal and Knight (1988) hold a similar view, and also consider job satisfaction to be an emotional, affective or evaluative response.

Larwood (1984) and Milkovich and Boudreau (1991) also define job satisfaction in terms of an affective reaction to the job, but elaborate further by stating that job satisfaction can be regarded as entailing the extent to which employees find pleasure in their job experiences. Locke and Sweiger (1979) support this by defining job satisfaction as the positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience.

Job satisfaction is also defined primarily in terms of equity. Authors that define job satisfaction in this manner consider satisfaction to be determined primarily by the employees’ comparison to actual outcomes with the required outcomes or by how well
outcomes meet or exceed expectations (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992; Hirschfeld, 2000; Locke, 1976; Luthans, 1992).

Camp (1994), for example, defines job satisfaction with references to the needs and values of employees and the extent to which these needs and values are satisfied in the workplace. Klein and Ritti (1987) employ a similar definition and consider job satisfaction to be a positive feeling towards a job that arises as a result of fulfilled expectations. Robbins (1998, p. 25) is also of the opinion that job satisfaction is an attitude towards one’s job and further states that it is “the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive.”

Such definitions assume that both the needs of the individual as well as the characteristics of the job remain relatively stable (Camp, 1994). Yet other definitions of job satisfaction emphasize its multifaceted nature. Some authors define job satisfaction in terms of several related attitudes (Luthans, 1992). That is, they describe the complex nature of job satisfaction by taking into account that job satisfaction is not a univariate construct, but that it is conceptualised as being multidimensional and consists of a number of distinct, relatively independent components (Saal & Knight, 1988; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist 1967).

One such definition is that offered by McCormick and Ilgen (1985, p. 309). These authors define job satisfaction as “a specific subset of attitudes held by organisation members.” Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) hold a similar view by defining job
satisfaction as the extent to which employees have a positive affective orientation towards particular facets of their jobs.

Smith et al. (1969) further identified five facets that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people experience affective responses:

- **The work itself.** This refers to the extent to which the job provides the employee with opportunities for learning, challenging tasks, and responsibility.
- **Pay.** Pay refers to the amount of financial compensation that an individual receives as well as the extent to which such compensation is perceived to be equitable.
- **Opportunities for promotion.** This refers to the employee’s chances for advancement in the organisational hierarchy.
- **Supervision.** This facet incorporates the ability of the employee’s superior to provide technical assistance and support.
- **Co-workers.** This involves the degree to which fellow employees are technically competent and socially supportive (Luthans, 1992; Smith et al., 1969).

Cranny et al. (1992) however, propose a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction that takes the above mentioned dimensions of this attitude into account. According to Cranny et al. (1992), job satisfaction is a combination of affective and cognitive reactions to the differential perceptions of what employees want to receive compared with what they actually receive.
It is primarily the definitions by Luthans (1992), Smith et al. (1969) and Cranny et al. (1992) that will be operationalised in this study.

2.3 THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

In order to understand job satisfaction, it is important to understand what motivates people at work. Over the years researchers have devised a number of theoretical approaches to explain the causes and effects of job satisfaction. The theories attempting to explain job satisfaction are numerous and are generally concerned with motivation (Saal & Knight, 1988). The theories most frequently addressed in the literature, are as follows (Aamodt, 1999; Grobler, Wärnich, Carrell, Elbert & Hatfield, 2006; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Saal & Knight, 1988; Smith & Cronje, 1992; Smither, 1988; Staw, 1995).

2.3.1 DISCREPANCY THEORIES

According to Aamodt (1999), discrepancy theories postulate that employees’ satisfaction with a job is determined by the discrepancy between what they want, value, and expect and what the job actually provides. Employees are unlikely to experience satisfaction where discrepancies exist between what they want and what the job provides. Theories that focus on employee needs and values include Maslow’s needs hierarchy, Alderfer’s ERG theory, Herzberg’s two-factor theory and McClelland’s needs theory.
2.3.1.1 MASLOW'S NEEDS HIERARCHY

Maslow (1954) holds that employees will only experience job satisfaction if certain needs are met. Figure 2.1 represents Maslow’s five types of needs which are arranged hierarchical. This theory implies that lower-level needs must be satisfied before an employee will become concerned with the next level of needs (Aamodt, 1999; Maslow, 1954).

Figure 2.1: Maslow’s need’s hierarchy
Source: Robbins (2001)

The five major needs can be briefly described as follows:
Physiological needs. This is the basic need known as the biological needs such as the need for water, food, rest, exercise and sex. Once these needs are met, they are argued to no longer influence behaviour. An example of this would be trade unions negotiating for their members for better wages, thus ensuring that the members basic needs are met (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992).

Safety needs. Once the first need is satisfied, then the safety or security needs become a motivational factor. This level of needs include the need for job security, insurance, medical aid, the need to be protected against physical and emotional harm, salary increases and other benefits (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992). Veeran and Katz (2002) put forward Begley and Czajka’s (1993) proposition that while organisational change may be accompanied by a sense of belonging and security during times of change, it may buffer the negative impact of change on employees outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Social needs. The third level comprises of social needs. This third level is activated once the second level of needs has been adequately met. At this level, employees desire social relationships inside and outside the organisation. Peer-group acceptance within the workforce is an important psychological need for employees. Managers can play an important role by encouraging people to interact with one another and make sure that the social needs of subordinates are met (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992).
Ego and esteem needs. Once employees have formed friendships within the organisation and feel part of a peer group, the need for self-esteem takes precedence. Factors such as job title, status items within the organisation, such as parking spaces or office size and level of responsibility become important to the employee. Managers and supervisors can play an active role in satisfying the needs of their employees by recognising and rewarding high achievers for good performance (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992).

Finally, the highest level is self-actualisation. At this level employees seek a fulfilling, useful life in the organisation and society. Employees seek to satisfy this need of self-actualisation by challenging and creative jobs. Maslow contents that employees will climb the ladder of need fulfillment until they become self-actualised (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992).

Maslow’s theory is based on two assumptions; that is: people always want more and people arranged their needs in order of importance (Grobler et al., 2006). Maslow asserts that any need that is not fulfilled will motivate the employee to continually strive to fulfill that need, and that need will become a motivational factor (Grobler et al., 2006; Smith & Cronje, 1992). Saal and Knight (1988), however, point out that because the fulfillment of one level of needs activates the next level, the employee will always have an active need, making long term job satisfaction unlikely in terms of this theory.
2.3.1.2 ALDEFER'S ERG THEORY

In response to the technical problems experienced with Maslow’s needs hierarchy, Aldefer (1972) developed a theory that has only three levels (Aamodt, 1999). Figure 2.2 illustrates the ERG theory. The three levels are existence, relatedness and growth (Aldefer, 1972).

The ERG theory is concerned with providing employees with their basic existence requirements and it subsumes the employees’ physiological and safety needs. Relatedness is the desire to keep good interpersonal relationships, which Maslow labeled social and esteem needs. Growth needs are an intrinsic desire for personal development based on the self-actualisation needs of Maslow (Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003).
Alderfer (1972) further holds that progression from the lower to higher level needs is not fixed, and that an employee may skip levels. The theory also provides an explanation as to why a higher level need does not always become a priority once a lower level need has been satisfied. According to Aldefer (1972) advancement to the next level is not always possible because of factors such as company policy. Consequently, the employee becomes frustrated and attaches priority to the previous level of needs.

2.3.1.3 HERZBERG’ TWO-FACTOR THEORY

Figure 2.3 represents the two factor theory schematically. Herzberg applied his theory specifically to the workplace and job design. According to Grobler et al. (2006), Herzberg (1966) proposes that job satisfaction is dependant upon a certain set of conditions while job dissatisfaction results from an entirely different set of conditions. The theory therefore implies that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exist on a continuum extending from satisfaction to dissatisfaction. Rather, two independent continua exist, one running from satisfaction to neutral and another that that runs from neutral to dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Staw, 1995).
According to the two-factor theory job related factors can be divided into two categories, motivators and hygiene factors (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966).

Hygiene factors refer to those elements that result from but do not involve the job itself (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966). Herzberg (1966) identified the following hygiene factors:

- Supervision,
- Interpersonal relations,
- Physical working conditions,
- Salary,
• Company policies and administrative practices,
• Benefits, and
• Job security.

Motivators, on the other hand, refer to job elements that do concern the actual job tasks and duties (Aamodt, 1999; Herzberg, 1966). Motivators include the following (Herzberg, 1966; Saal & Knight, 1988):

• Achievement,
• Recognition,
• Work itself,
• Responsibility, and
• Advancement.

Herzberg (1966) maintains that hygiene factors are necessary but not sufficient for job satisfaction. Grobler et al. (2006) assert that the more resources are poured down the drain (for example by increasing fringe benefits), the more resources will be required in the future, because with hygiene factors, ever-increasing amounts are needed to produce the same effect. Grobler et al. (2006) affirm that this argument makes sense when considering how salary issues never appear to be resolved, for example, workers discontentment over wages after concluding salary negotiations. According to Grobler et al. (2006), motivators are intrinsic in nature and represent the content of the job. They suggest that no one can give another person the satisfaction that comes from
accomplishing a challenging job. The central tenet of Herzberg’s theory is that motivators, when present at high levels contribute to job satisfaction. Likewise, hygiene factors contribute to dissatisfaction when absent (Grobler et al., 2006).

Grobler et al. (2006) recommend that managers should consider the following questions:

- Are attempts to use money to motivate employees effective?, and
- Are organisations’ precious resources effectively used when they are bumped into hygiene factors such as fancy lounges for breaks, expensive office furniture or business travel.

The two-factor theory has important implications for managing organisations. Managers should focus their attention on factors known to promote job satisfaction such as opportunities for personal growth. Several organisations have realised that satisfaction within their workforces is enhanced when they provide opportunities for their employees to develop their repertoire of professional skills on the job (Greenberg & Baron 2008). For example, in one study, front-line service workers at a group of hotels were hired to perform a wide variety of tasks. This job enrichment process, allowed the front line workers to develop many of their talents thereby adding to their level of job satisfaction (Greenberg & Baron 2008).

Research has, however, lent very little support to this theory and has serious doubts concerning its validity (Aamodt, 1999; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Staw, 1995). Table
2.1 provides a comparison of the Maslow, Herzberg and ERG theories. Despite their differences, the theories intersect at several points. Both the need hierarchy and the ERG theory determined a hierarchy of needs, whereas the dual structure theory proposed two distinct continuums for two needs categories (Aamodt, 1999).

The hygiene factors described by the dual structure theory correspond closely to the lower level three levels of the need hierarchy. Pay and working conditions correspond to physiological needs, job security and company policies correspond to security needs and supervision and interpersonal relations correspond to belongingness needs. The dual structure motivational factors parallel the top two levels of the need hierarchy. For example, recognition is comparable to esteem, achievement, the work itself, responsibility and advancement and growth might be categorised as part of the self actualisation process (Aamodt, 1999).

There are noticeable similarities between Maslow’s need hierarchy and Alderfer’s ERG theory. The existence needs in the ERG theory correspond to the psychological and physical security needs in the hierarchical perspective. The relatedness needs intersect with the interpersonal security needs, the belongingness needs and the need for respect from others in the need hierarchy. Conclusively, the growth needs correspond to Maslow’s self esteem and self actualisation needs (Aamodt, 1999).

The independent individual needs can also be correlated with the need theories. The need for affiliation is analogous to relatedness needs in the ERG theory, belongingness needs
in the need hierarchy and interpersonal relations in the dual structure theory. The need for
power overlaps with the ERG theory’s relatedness and growth needs, the need for
achievement parallels ERG’s growth needs and the need hierarchy’s self-actualisation
needs. Unfortunately, despite the many conceptual similarities among the need theories,
the theories share an inherent weakness. They do a satisfactory job of describing the
factors that motivate behaviour, but they convey very little about the actual process of
motivation (Aamodt, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASLOW</th>
<th>ALDERFER</th>
<th>HERZBERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualisation</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Motivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Hygiene Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Existence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Comparison of the Maslow, Herzberg, and ERG theories
Source: Aamodt (1999)

2.3.1.4 MCCLELLAND’S THEORY OF NEEDS

Each theory previously discussed theory describes interrelated sets of important
individual needs. Several other needs have been identified which are not allied with any
single integrated theoretical perspectives as identified in Figure 2.4.
According to McClelland (1961) employees differ in terms of their needs for achievement, affiliation, and power. Employees who have a strong need for achievement desire jobs that are challenging and over which they can exert control. These employees are most likely to be satisfied when they are solving problems and accomplishing job tasks successfully (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961; Saal & Knight, 1988). In contrast, employees low in the need for achievement are likely to be more satisfied in jobs that involve little challenge and have a high probability for success (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961).

Employees who are high in the need for affiliation prefer working with and helping other
people (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961). Employees high in this need will be most satisfied by maintaining social relationships with their co-workers (Saal & Knight, 1988).

Finally, employees who have a high need for power have a desire to influence others as opposed to simply being successful (Aamodt, 1999; McClelland, 1961). According to McClelland (1961), fulfilment of these needs will result in job satisfaction. McClelland’s achievement motivation theory proposes that employees with a high need for achievement are often the top performers in an organisation and frequently demonstrate the following characteristics (Nel, Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sono & Werner, 2004):

- They set challenging and attainable goals,
- They require regular and immediate feedback,
- They take calculated risks,
- They are problem solvers,
- They seek autonomy and freedom, and
- They perceive money as an indication of their success rather than for its material value only.

Nel et al. (2004) perceived the level of need achievement among members of a specific population as important to the economic success of that specific population. They alleged that it is a need that can be learned and have positive implications for a country such as South Africa in which entrepreneurship is encouraged. McClelland postulated that top managers should have a high need for power combined with a low need for affiliation.
Furthermore, that top managers should have a high need for achievement (Nel et al., 2004).

2.4 EQUITY THEORY

Equity theory, developed by Adams (1963) and Adams (1965) proposes that the level of job satisfaction experienced by employees is related to how fairly they perceive that they are being treated in comparison to others. Three components are involved in the perception of fairness (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965). They are:

- Inputs refer to those personal variables that employees put into their jobs. Examples include time, effort, experience, education and competence (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965; Robbins, 2005).

- Outputs which are those elements that employees receive from their jobs, such as pay, benefits, responsibility, and challenge (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965).

- Input/Output ratio, which according to Adams (1965), employees subconsciously calculate their input/output ratio by dividing output value by input value. Employees will then compare this ratio with the input/output ratio computed for other employees and work experiences. The theory holds that if their ratios are similar to those of others, employees will experience satisfaction. However, should the ratios be lower than those of other employees, employees will become dissatisfied and will be motivated to restore equity (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965; Staw, 1995).
Figure 2.5 demonstrates Adams’s (1965) analysis that employees may attempt to bring about greater equity in a variety of ways as. Employees may attempt to increase outputs by, for example, requesting greater responsibility, or they may reduce their inputs. A less probable approach that an employee may employ involves changing the ratio’s of other employee’s input by encouraging the employee to work harder (Aamodt, 1999; Adams, 1965).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio Comparison *</th>
<th>Employee’s Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes A &lt; Inputs A</td>
<td>Inequity (Under-Rewarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes A = Inputs A</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes A &gt; Inputs A</td>
<td>Inequity (Over-Rewarded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where A is the employee, and B is a relevant other or referent.

Figure 2.5: Equity theory
Source: Robbins (2001)

According to Greenberg and Baron (2008), the equity theory has three important implications for managers namely:

- Avoid underpayment,
- Avoid overpayment, and
• Be open and honest with employees.

Because, equity deals with perceptions of fairness or unfairness, it is reasonable to expect that inequitable states may be redressed by merely altering one’s thinking about circumstances (Grobler et al., 2006). The equity theorem has been extensively researched. The theory is difficult to implement in practice (Aamodt, 1999).

2.5 VALUE THEORY

The value theory focuses at a broader perspective at the questions of what makes people satisfied. The theory suggests that almost any factor can be a source of job satisfaction as long as it is something that people value (Grobler et al., 2006).

According to Grobler et al. (2006), the less people have of some aspect of the job, for example pay, learning, opportunities, relative to the amount they desire, the more dissatisfied they will be especially for those facets of the job that are highly valued. The value theory focuses on discrepancies between what employees have and what they want. Employees in organisations hold different value systems, therefore based on this theory, their satisfaction levels will also differ (Anderson, Ones, Sinangil & Viswesvaran, 2001). Organisations sometimes go through great pains to find out how to satisfy their employees. With this in mind, a growing number of organisations, particularly big ones, survey their employees periodically (Grobler et al., 2006). An example of this is FedEx.
which relies on information gained from surveys to identify sources of dissatisfaction and possible remedies (Grobler et al., 2006).

2.6 VROOM’S EXPECTANCY THEORY

The expectancy theory takes a broader view than just focusing on employees’ needs traits and skills or social comparisons. It considers the role of motivation in the overall work environment (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

Vroom (1967) explains in Figure 2.6 that employees will exert a high effort level if they believe that there is a reasonable probability that their effort will lead to the attainment of organisational goals and that the attainment of the organisational goal will become an instrument through which the employee will attain personal goals (Nel et al., 2004).
The key components of the expectancy theory are valence, expectancy, and instrumentality.

- According to Nel et al. (2004), valence refers to how attractive a specific outcome is to an employee. For example, if employees believe that hard work will lead to good performance and that they will be rewarded according to their performance. They may still be poorly motivated if the reward have low valence to the employee. Greenberg and Baron (2008) assert that it is important that in today’s competitive market employers go to great lengths to attract and retain the best employees by giving them the rewards that they value greatly.
Expectancy refers to an employee’s belief that a certain effort will lead to a certain performance level. For example, if a reward is offered to employees to achieve a bonus for outstanding work in a given timeframe, and the employees desire the reward (positive valence) and believe that it is an unrealistic goal and it cannot be attained, employees might not exert the effort. Likewise, if they believe that they will be successful at achieving the desired goal in the required timeframe, they might exert greater effort (Nel et al., 2004). Nel et al. (2004) cited Kreitner and Kinicki (2001) by asserting that the following factors influence a person’s expectancy perceptions:

- Self esteem,
- Self-efficacy,
- Previous success at the task or a similar task,
- Support form others (supervisor, subordinates, colleagues),
- Access to relevant information, and
- Sufficient material and equipment.

Instrumentality is the perception that performance will lead to the desired outcome. According to Nel et al. (2004), and Greenberg and Baron (2008), performance is instrumental when it leads to a specific outcome or outcomes. Level outcomes are performance related and level outcomes are need related. Employees do not normally receive rewards for their efforts, but for achieving actual results. For example, the more time an employee spends at work to get a promotion (high performance) the less time the
employee will have for their family. The less time the employee spends working for a promotion (low performance) the more time the employee will have the family.

The expectancy theory advocates that motivation is a multiplicative function of all three components. That means that higher levels of motivation will be a consequence when expectancy, instrumentality and valence are all high than when they are low. The multiplicative assumption of the theory also implies that if any one of these three components is zero, it can be expected that the overall level of motivation will be zero. For example, if an employee believes that their effort will result in performance, which will result in reward, motivation will be zero if the valence of the reward the employee expects to receive is zero (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

2.7 PORTER AND LAWLER’S EXPECTANCY THEORY

Lyman Porter and Edward Lawler extended Vroom’s theory into an expectancy model of motivation (Nel et al., 2004). This model attempted to:

- Identify the origin of people’s valences and expectancies,
- Link effort with performance and job satisfaction,
- Identify factors other than effort that influence performance, and
- Emphasise the importance of equitable rewards.
According to Nel et al. (2004), the value of rewards is similar to valence in Vroom’s theory. Employees desire a combination of outcomes or rewards for the efforts they put into their jobs. The perceived effort-reward probability is the extent to which employees believe that their effort will lead to the reward. Both the desirability of the reward and the perceived probability that the effort will lead to the reward impact on the effort the person will put into their job.

Satisfaction is influenced by both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards are self-granted and consist of intangibles such as a sense of accomplishment and achievement. Extrinsic rewards include bonuses, public recognition, awards and acceptance. Job satisfaction is influenced by employees’ perception of the equity of rewards given. Employees expect rewards that are not only equitable to their own inputs, but also equitable to the rewards that other employees with similar inputs receive. If employees experience inequity they will direct their behaviour towards creating equity (Nel et al., 2004).

Nel et al. (2004) referenced Lawler’s (1996) “line of sight” indicating the extent to which employees see that the extrinsic rewards they receive are a consequence of their performance. In organisations, the emphasis is less on individual pay for performance and more on gain sharing, profit sharing, and stock ownership which is linked to performance. Intrinsic rewards can influence the likelihood of these rewards being tied to performance by addressing job design. The complexity of the task, how challenging it is
and the kind of feedback employees receive about their work have a big influence on intrinsic rewards (Nel, et al., 2004).

Nel et al. (2004) recommend how managers can enhance the effort-performance expectancies by helping employees accomplish their performance goals by specifically:

- Communicating with individual employees or employee groups to determine what personal goals or rewards they value,
- Linking rewards to performance goals,
- Training and guiding employees to appropriate required performance levels,
- Making individual employees and groups of employees responsible for goal attainment,
- Providing equitable rewards, and
- Fostering a positive environment for intrinsic rewards through job design.

2.8 SOCIAL PROCESSING MODEL

This theory is based on the idea that employee attitudes towards their jobs are based on information they obtain from other employees. This approach specifies that people adopt attitudes and behaviours in keeping with the cues provided by others with whom they come into contact. The social information processing model is important insofar as it suggests that job satisfaction can be affected by other employees with whom employees
come into contact. It suggests that job satisfaction can be affected by such subtle things as the offhanded comments made by others (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

2.9 GOAL-SETTING THEORY

Goal-setting theory postulates that just as employees are motivated to satisfy their needs on the job they are also motivated to strive for and to attain goals (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

![Goal-Setting Theory](image.png)

Figure 2.7: Goal setting theory
Source: Robbins (2001)

This theory claims in Figure 2.7 that an assigned goal influences employees’ belief about being able to perform the task in question and their personal goals. Both of these factors
influence performance. The goal serves as a motivator to employees because it causes employees to compare their present capacity to perform with that required to succeed at the goal. When employees believe that they will not succeed they will feel dissatisfied and will work harder to attain goals that are possible to achieve. When employees succeed they feel competent and successful (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). The model also proposes that assigned goals will lead to the acceptance of these goals as personal goals (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). Finally the model suggests that beliefs about self-efficacy and goal commitment influence task performance (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

2.10 EVALUATION OF JOB SATISFACTION THEORIES

As identified by McCormick and Ilgen (1985), there is a relative dearth of comparative research on the different job satisfaction theories. Despite the limited empirical support enjoyed by the discrepancy theories, they do appear to explain more variance in job satisfaction than the other theories (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Saal & Knight, 1988).

McCormick and Ilgen (1985), however, maintain that the equity theory appears to influence job satisfaction over and above the influence exercised by the discrepancy theories. In fact, in work settings in which social comparisons are prominent, equity and social learning theories may dominate (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985).

Furthermore, it is possible that the development of work attitudes, such as job satisfaction is influenced by such multiplicity of personal and situational variables that a single theory
is unlikely to provide a complete explanation. A combination of perspectives may ultimately provide the most accurate picture of job satisfaction (Saal & Knight, 1988).

2.11 DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Staw (1995) argues that organisations can only increase job satisfaction and reap the subsequent benefits thereof if the factors causing and influencing this attitude can be identified. Research indicates that satisfaction is a function of both the person and the environment in which the individual operates. Accordingly, the determinants of job satisfaction can be divided primarily into extrinsic and intrinsic sources of satisfaction (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Vecchio, 1998).

The extrinsic dimensions of satisfaction include the work, working conditions, pay, supervision, participation in decision making and co-worker relations. The intrinsic dimensions comprises of opportunities for promotion and feelings of recognition since these factors have symbolic or psychological meaning for the individual. It should noted that since these sources originate from the employee’s environment, they might also be viewed as extrinsic sources of satisfaction. They may therefore be said to serve a dual purpose (Staw, 1995). In addition to extrinsic and intrinsic sources of satisfaction, researchers have also identified a number of demographic variables that have been found to exert an important influence on job satisfaction (Robbins, 2001; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988).
2.11.1 EXTRINSIC SOURCES OF JOB SATISFACTION

According to Vecchio (1988), extrinsic sources of satisfaction originate from outside the individual, that is, they originate from the environment. The frequency and magnitude of extrinsic sources of satisfaction are predominantly determined by conditions and forces that are beyond the control of the employee. The following factors constitute external sources of satisfaction:

2.11.1.1 THE WORK ITSELF

The nature of the work performed by employees has a significant impact on their level of job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992). According to Luthans (1992), employees derive satisfaction from work that is interesting and challenging, and a job that provides them with status. Aamodt (1999) is also of the opinion that job satisfaction is influenced by opportunities for challenge and growth as well as by the opportunity to accept responsibility. The authority to assume responsibility and to make decisions concerning their work leads to higher satisfaction in employees.

Landy (1989) shares this view and maintains that mentally challenging work that the employee can accomplish is satisfying. Research indicates that employees prefer jobs that provide them with opportunities to use their skills and abilities and that offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback regarding performance (Larwood, 1984; Luthans,

Job challenge, as a predictor of job satisfaction, is extensively researched. A study by Jinnett and Alexander (1999) suggests that challenging work may actually produce satisfied employees. This finding is supported by Gunter and Furnham (1996) who argue that challenge is likely to be a more important determinant of job satisfaction than are gender, age, salary, or work history.

Landy (1989) further argues that work that is personally interesting to the employee is likely to contribute to job satisfaction. This view is shared by Aamodt (1999), who contends that employees who find their work interesting are more satisfied and motivated than are employees who do not.

Closely related to the above-mentioned variables are task variety and skill variety. Existing research suggests that these factors may facilitate job satisfaction (Eby, Freeman, Rush, & Lance, 1999). Findings by Lambert, Hogan and Barton A Lubbock (2001) indicate that employees generally appear to be more satisfied with jobs that provide them with variety rather than repetition. A study by Ting (1997) further shows skill variety to have strong effects on job satisfaction. The greater the variety of skills that employees are able to utilize in their jobs, the higher their level of satisfaction. In addition to the above, Landy (1989) is of the opinion that the physical demands inherent
in the job are also likely to have an impact on the employee’s level of job satisfaction. In other words, work that is physically or emotionally exhausting is less likely to produce satisfaction.

Judge, Bono and Locke (2000, p. 237), on the other hand, argue that it is possible that “employees with positive self-evaluations may see their jobs as more challenging simply because they are predisposed to perceive all aspects of their jobs positively.” This implies that the individual’s own sense of challenge may impact on job satisfaction. In such a case, however, challenge represents an intrinsic source of job satisfaction (Vecchio, 1988).

2.11.1.2 WORKING CONDITIONS

Working conditions are another factor that have a moderate impact on the employee’s job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992). According to Robbins (1998), working conditions refer to such aspects of the work situation as temperature, ventilation, lighting, and noise.

Landy (1989) is of the opinion that satisfaction is determined in part by the match between the working conditions of employees and their physical needs. According to Robbins (1998), employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and for facilitating good job performance. Studies have demonstrated that employees prefer physical surroundings that are not uncomfortable or dangerous.
Furthermore, temperature, light, noise, and other environmental factors should not be at either extreme (Robbins, 1998). Luthans (1992) holds that under such conditions employees will find it easier to perform their tasks.

Furthermore, research indicates that employees prefer to work relatively close to home, in clean and modern facilities, and to have adequate tools and equipment at their disposal (Robbins, 1998; Visser, 1990). Literature, however, indicates that employees seldom give much consideration to their working conditions, and in fact, often take them for granted (Luthans, 1992; Visser, 1990; Vorster, 1992). Indeed, working conditions are only likely to have a significant impact on job satisfaction when:

- The working conditions are either extremely good or extremely poor (Luthans, 1992; Vorster, 1992), and when
- Employees have some or other frame of reference or standards, which enable them to judge their present circumstances (Vorster, 1992). According to Visser (1990), such standards may become available when the working conditions change over a period of time. Such as, when employees move from one building into another or when the employee changes jobs.

Additionally, numerous authors are in agreement concerning the fact that employee complaints regarding working conditions are, more often than not, actually manifestations of other underlying problems (Luthans, 1992; Visser, 1990; Vorster,
According to Visser (1990), women are prone to attach greater importance to their working conditions than is the case with male employees. Moreover, the number of hours worked by employees is also an important factor. Satisfied employees are inclined to complain that they do not have sufficient time to perform all their duties. In contrast, dissatisfied employees are likely to want their workday done with as soon as possible.

2.11.1.3 PAY

Another factor that is likely to play an important role in the satisfaction of employees is pay (Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992). Research consistently supports a positive relationship between satisfaction with pay and overall job satisfaction. Research by Cramer (1993) and Money and Graham (1999), revealed salary to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Furthermore, in a study involving federal government employees, Ting (1997) found pay satisfaction to have significant effects on increasing the satisfaction of employees at all levels. This author is, in fact, of the opinion that pay satisfaction is one of the most important predictors of job satisfaction. Lambert et al. (2001) also found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction.
Such findings are largely consistent with the idea that most employees are socialised in a society where money, benefits, and security are generally sought after and are often used to gauge the importance or the worth of a person. Thus, the greater the financial reward, the less worry employees have concerning their financial state, thereby enhancing their impression of their self-worth to the organisation (Lambert et al., 2001).

Several other authors, however, maintain that the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount that is paid, but rather, the perception of fairness (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998). According to Robbins (1998), employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, based on job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result.

The above-stated view has been supported in a number of studies. Gunter and Furnham (1996), for example, found employee perceptions concerning the equity with which the organisation rewards its employees to be better predictors of job satisfaction than is the case with gender, age, or actual salary. Similarly, Miceli, Jung, Near, and Greenberger (1991), validated a causal pathway leading from fairness of the pay system to improved job satisfaction. In fact, in a study by Sousa-Poza (2000a), perceived income, that is, whether the respondent considered his income high or not, was found to have the third largest effect on the job satisfaction of male employees.
Salary level may be valued less for its actual amount than for the status and prestige inherent therein. Pay is therefore also instrumental in providing for upper-level need satisfaction (Luthans, 1992; Smither, 1988; Vorster, 1992). Visser (1990) supports this view and states that money may serve as a symbol of achievement, recognition and status, as well as a means of acquiring luxuries. For certain employees’ money may also provide security or imply greater freedom (Visser, 1990). In this sense, a high salary holds intrinsic or psychological value for the employee.

Smither (1988) further points out that the satisfying effect of pay is likely to vary in relation to different situations. Tolbert and Moen (1998), for instance, found age to be a mediating variable between salary and job satisfaction. Younger workers were significantly more likely to rank a high salary as an important job characteristic. Furthermore, Oshagbemi (1997) suggests that the extent to which employees are satisfied with their pay may be strongly related to the size of the family and lifestyles.

Another aspect of compensation that is important is fringe benefits. Benefits, however, do not have a strong influence on job satisfaction for most employees (Landy, 1989; Luthans, 1992). According to Luthans (1992), the reason for the weak link between fringe benefits and satisfaction may be sought primarily in the fact that the majority of employees are unaware of how much they are receiving in the form of benefits. Furthermore, employees tend to undervalue such benefits because their practical value cannot be seen.
Therefore, the safest generalisation that can be made with regards to pay is that it represents different things to different employees, and is certainly not the most important motivator for many employees. While a few employees are in a position to ignore the financial aspects of a job, most employees appear to select their occupations based on the work itself, rather than the financial rewards thereof (Smither, 1988).

2.11.1.4 SUPERVISION

The literature identify that the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship will have a significant positive influence on the employee’s overall level of job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999; Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Robbins, 1998).

Studies have shown that employees are likely to have high levels of job satisfaction if supervisors provide them with support and co-operation in completing their tasks (Ting, 1997). Similar results were reported by Billingsley and Cross (1992) as well as Cramer (1993). These researchers generally hold that dissatisfaction with management supervision is a significant predictor of job dissatisfaction. The above findings are further supported by Staudt (1997) in a study involving social workers. Respondents who reported satisfaction with supervision were also more likely to be satisfied with their jobs in general.
A number of supervisory antecedents have been found to exert a particularly salient influence on job satisfaction (Boshoff & Mels, 1995; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985). These include leadership style, technical adequacy, consideration, initiating structure, participation in decision-making, autonomy, performance feedback and communication.

Supervisory consideration refers to leader behaviours that are concerned with promoting the comfort and well-being of subordinates. It concerns the degree to which managers are supportive, friendly, considerate, consult with employees and recognise their contribution (Boshoff & Mels, 1995).

Previous studies have made a strong case for the use of supportive behaviours by supervisors (Chieffo, 1991; Packard & Kauppi, 1999). The general argument is that democratic leadership styles, which are high in consideration, are consistently associated with higher levels of employee satisfaction. The results of a study by Packard and Kauppi (1999), for example, indicate that subordinates with autocratic supervisors experience significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than do those with democratic leaders. Boshoff and Mels (1995) also reported consideration to be positively associated with job satisfaction. Results from a similar study by Pool (1997) concur with this view.

According to Boshoff and Mels (1995), initiating structure refers to leader behaviours that clearly define the roles of the supervisor and subordinates. By initiating structure the supervisor strictly directs subordinates, clarifies their roles, co-ordinates, solves
problems, criticises, and pressurises them to perform. Initiating structure therefore closely resembles task-oriented behaviour.

Previous studies are inconsistent regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and initiating structure. Boshoff and Mels (1995) argue that initiating structure has a significant positive influence on satisfaction. Pool (1997) on the other hand reports an inverse relationship between initiating structure behaviour and employee satisfaction, suggesting that supervisors who use an initiating structure style will see a decrease in their employees’ level of job satisfaction.

It is suggested by Howell and Dorfman (1986), that initiating structure is likely to have differential effects on professional and non-professional employees. Professionals are likely to resent what they perceive to be interference from formal leaders, while non-professionals tend to be more positively inclined towards initiation of structure.

Participation in decision-making entails the degree to which employees are able to influence decisions about their jobs (Boshoff & Mels, 1995). Boshoff and Mels (1995) and Locke and Schweiger (1979) found participation in decision-making to be a particularly important cause of job satisfaction. Results from a study by Chieffò (1991) support this view. Luthans (1992) too is of the opinion that supervisors who allow their employees to participate in decisions that affect their own jobs will, in doing so, stimulate higher levels of employee satisfaction. Moreover, Luthans (1992) maintains that a
participative climate created by the supervisor will have a more substantial impact on job satisfaction than will participation in a specific decision.

According to Boshoff and Mels (1995), performance feedback refers to a superior’s communication to a subordinate regarding the quality of job performance. Researchers generally agree that performance feedback is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992). Pool (1997) found that employees who receive feedback concerning accomplishments demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction than do employees who are not provided with such feedback. Boshoff and Mels (1995) reported similar findings.

The latter authors maintain that feedback is positively associated with job satisfaction mainly because employees who are properly informed concerning their supervisor’s evaluation of their performance are more likely to hold realistic expectations regarding remuneration and promotion possibilities. Communication is the degree to which management communicates with subordinates and the extent to which employees perceive that they are being properly informed with regards to the aspects of the job that affect them (Boshoff & Mels, 1995).

In a study by Miles, Patrick, and King (1996) superior-subordinate communication demonstrated significant predictive power in predicting job satisfaction, irrespective of job level. It is suggested that such communication reduces role ambiguity and role conflict, which in turn facilitates job satisfaction. Managers are thus well advised to consider communication practices as part of any effort to improve the job satisfaction of
employees. Luthans (1992) supports this view, but is also of the opinion that communication with employees should extend beyond the official level to include communication of a more personal nature as well.

Autonomy implies that employees experience a certain amount of freedom in their jobs, including freedom of choice in decision-making, freedom of expression in work, and freedom from close supervision. Taber and Alliger (1995) point out that a task that is not closely supervised will give the employee a sense of autonomy and personal accomplishment. Consequently, it is held that freedom from supervision is positively correlated with job satisfaction. A study by Lambert et al. (2001) however, contradicts this view. The results of this study indicate that autonomy has an insignificant impact on job satisfaction. Lambert et al. (2001) are therefore of the opinion that the literature has overemphasized the role of autonomy in determining job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction research therefore generally supports relationship-oriented leadership styles that are characterised by supervisory consideration, participation in decision-making, performance feedback and communication.

### 2.11.1.5 CO-WORKER RELATIONS

Co-worker relations include all interpersonal relations, both positive and negative, that occur within the work situation. It may include among others, the competence,
friendliness, helpfulness, and co-operation of fellow employees (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985).

According to Hodson (1997), such social relations constitute an important part of the “social climate” within the workplace and provide a setting within which employees can experience meaning and identity. Luthans (1992) further holds that the work group serves as a source of support, comfort, advice and assistance.

Therefore, for most employees, work also fulfils the need for social interaction. Consequently, it is not surprising that the literature consistently indicates that having friendly and supportive colleagues lead to increased job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Robbins, 1998). Landy (1989) is further of the opinion that employees will be satisfied with colleagues who are inclined to see matters in much the same way as they themselves do.

Research continues to lend support to the important role that co-workers play in either facilitating or hampering satisfaction within the organisation (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999). In one such a study, for example, results indicate that co-worker conflict is associated negatively with job satisfaction, while co-worker solidarity generates high levels of this attitude (Hodson, 1997). These findings are substantiated by Ting (1997) who argues further that this association is likely to gain in importance as the tasks performed by employees become increasingly interrelated.
Moreover, Ducharme and Martin (2000) point out that co-worker relations are a source of both affective and instrumental support, and that these prove beneficial in counterbalancing a relative lack of intrinsic or extrinsic rewards that the employee may be deriving from work. Workplace relationships may, however, also represent a source of satisfaction in and of themselves and may contribute directly to the employee’s overall level of job satisfaction (Ducharme & Martin, 2000). Luthans (1992), however, contends that satisfactory co-worker relations are not essential to job satisfaction, but that in the presence of extremely strained relationships, job satisfaction is more than likely to suffer.

Nevertheless, the growing body of literature on the subject seems to indicate that co-worker relations are taking on an ever-increasing role, not just in the realms of productivity, but also in determining the experience of work and its meaning (Hodson, 1997). These findings strengthen the argument that organisations should engage in the integration of employees so as to create group cohesion among employees and departments within the organisation (Lambert et al., 2001).

### 2.11.2 INTRINSIC SOURCES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Intrinsic sources of job satisfaction primarily originate from within the individual and are essentially self-administered (Vecchio, 1988). These sources are generally intangible and have intrinsic and psychological value because of what they symbolise. According to Vecchio (1988), intrinsic sources of job satisfaction include opportunities for promotion and feelings of recognition since these factors have symbolic or psychological meaning.
for the individual. It should be noted that these sources originate largely from the employees’ environment and they might be viewed as extrinsic sources of satisfaction. In fact, they may therefore be said to have a dual purpose.

2.11.2.1 OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

The employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Vecchio, 1988). This pertains to the fact that promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility and increased social status (Robbins, 1998).

According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), employees’ satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors including the probability that the employee will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Visser (1990) adds to this by stating that satisfaction pertaining to promotion can also be regarded as a function of the employee’s needs and the relative importance that the employee attaches to promotion.

Similarly, as is the case with pay, employees seek promotion policies that are equitable. If promotion decisions are perceived as being fair, employees are likely to derive satisfaction from their jobs (Robbins, 1998). Aamodt (1999) shares this view.
As pointed out by Visser (1990), however, perceived equity is not the only factor that will have a bearing on satisfaction. It is possible that the employee may be satisfied with the company’s promotion policy, yet be dissatisfied with the opportunities for promotion. Visser (1990) indicates that such an individual’s standards for promotion will depend chiefly on personal and career aspirations. Moreover, not all employees wish to be promoted. The reason therefore is related to the fact that promotion entails greater responsibility and tasks of a more complex nature, for which the employees may consider themselves unprepared. It may therefore also happen that employees consider the promotion policy as unfair, but since they have no desire to be promoted, they may still be satisfied.

According to Visser (1990), an employee’s need for promotion will depend largely on the following factors:

- The need for psychological growth, which is made possible by greater responsibility,
- The need for equity, where promotion is deserved,
- The need or desire for a higher income, and
- The desire for increased social status.

Nonetheless, opportunities for promotion appear to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). In a study by Jayaratne and Chess (1984, as cited in Staudt, 1997), the opportunity for promotion was found to be the best and only
common predictor of job satisfaction in child welfare, community mental health and family services agencies.

Luthans (1992) further maintains that promotions may take a variety of different forms and are generally accompanied by different rewards. The author points out, for example, that employees who are promoted on the basis of seniority often experience job satisfaction, but less so than is the case with employees promoted on the basis of performance. Promotional opportunities therefore have differential effects on job satisfaction and it is essential that this be taken into account in cases where promotion policies are designed to enhance employee satisfaction.

2.11.2.2 RECOGNITION

Recognition chiefly pertains to an expression of acknowledgement, appreciation and approval of services, deeds and achievements (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2000). The literature consistently indicates that employee satisfaction is positively influenced by the extent to which employees receive recognition for their efforts (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2000; Gunter & Furnham, 1996; Robbins, 1998; Vecchio, 1988).

Arnolds and Boshoff (2000) and Visser (1990) hold that the positive relationship between satisfaction and recognition can be attributed to the fact that recognition is a potent satisfier of esteem needs. Visser (1990) further elaborates by stating that a positive self-concept is to a large extent dependent on the approval of others. In this sense recognition
plays an important role in contributing to the employee’s self-image and, in so doing, also leads to higher job satisfaction. Consequently, it may be deduced that employees with a poor self-concept are more likely to be dependent upon recognition, and that their job satisfaction is more likely to be profoundly affected by it. By the same token, it follows that cultural socialization dictates that women are inclined to be more sensitive to the receipt of recognition from others (Visser, 1990).

Further support for the positive association between recognition and satisfaction was found in a study by Fako (2000) in which a moderate positive relationship was found between the satisfaction experienced by nurses and the extent to which their efforts were recognised by supervisors. Moreover, the study suggests that recognition may influence satisfaction by playing an instrumental role in offsetting the adverse effects of work overload and stress.

The above views are supported by Vorster (1992) who regards recognition as a necessary precondition for raising the job satisfaction of employees. It is held that such recognition may be attained by recognising employee contributions, taking employee suggestions into account, and inculcating an understanding amongst managers that the company is dependent upon the employee for organisational goal attainment.
2.12 THE INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

A number of demographic variables have been identified as possible predictors of job satisfaction. Research Bedeian and Armenakis (1981) and Glisson and Durick, 1998 indicates that these variables influence satisfaction in one way or another and are therefore often included in job satisfaction models. These demographic variables include, age, gender, tenure, level of education, job level, and marital status.

2.12.1 AGE

Research has consistently found age to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Chambers, 1999; Cramer, 1993; Robbins, 2001; Staw, 1995; Tolbert & Moen, 1998). While studies have yielded mixed evidence in certain cases, the overwhelming body of research suggests a positive association, that is, older employees tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996; Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cramer, 1993; Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Larwood, 1984; Loscocco, 1990; Saal & Knight, 1988).

The positive correlation between age and satisfaction was also reported in a study by Oshagbemi (1997) involving 554 university teachers. Academics below the age of 35 years reported the lowest levels of satisfaction, followed by academics between the ages of 35 and 44 years. Academics above 55 years reported being the most satisfied with their jobs. Ting (1997), however, found age to only have significant effects on the job
satisfaction of employees at lower job levels. Numerous explanations may be presented for the positive association between employee age and satisfaction:

- Prestige and confidence are likely to increase with age, as a result older employees are more likely to report high levels of job satisfaction,
- Younger employees are likely to hold higher expectations that may remain unfulfilled, as jobs prove insufficiently challenging or meaningful,
- Young college or university graduates may, in certain cases, be overqualified for their jobs,
- Young employees may, in sharp contrast to what they previously experienced at home or in school, have insufficient control or authority over their work,
- Older employees are more likely to have found jobs with which they are content; and
- Instead of focusing only on employment for overall satisfaction, other factors, such as, family, friends, and involvement in civic organisations, are likely to take on a greater role as employees age (Hellman, 1997; Lambert, et al., 2001; Luthans, 1992).

In a correlation analysis involving age and the separate subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Chambers (1999) found significant positive relationships between age and the work, co-worker, pay and supervision subscales. However, a significant inverse relationship was reported between the promotions subscale and age, indicating that older employees were less satisfied with their opportunities for promotion than were their younger counterparts. Moreover, Tolbert and Moen (1998) found that younger employees were significantly more likely to rank income and promotion opportunities as
important job characteristics. Older employees attached a higher value to achieving a
sense of accomplishment from a job.

While the majority of researchers are in agreement regarding a positive relationship
between job satisfaction and age, certain studies have suggested a curvilinear relationship
between these two variables, that is, high satisfaction among young and old employees
and low satisfaction among middle-aged employees (Staw, 1995). Robbins (2001)
suggests that this inconsistency may be due to the fact that studies have been intermixing
professional and non-professional employees. When the two types are separated,
satisfaction tends to continuously increase among professionals as they age, while it
drops among non-professionals during middle age and then rises again in the later years.

2.11.3.2 GENDER

Considering the increase in the number of women in the workforce, gender differences in
job satisfaction warrant attention. This conclusion has particular bearing on the service
industry where the high percentage of women have shown to be particularly affected by
job satisfaction (Sousa-Poza, 2000b). However, the literature on the impact of gender on
job satisfaction has been inconsistent, with some studies finding that females have lower
job satisfaction than males, others finding that males have lower job satisfaction and
numerous others finding no gender differences.
According to Coward, Hogan, Duncan, Horne, Hiker, and Felsen (1995, as cited in Jinnett & Alexander, 1999), female employees demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction than their male counterparts across most work settings. Indeed, a number of studies involving several different populations support this argument (Lambert et al., 2001; Loscocco, 1990; Ma & MacMillan, 1999).

According to Loscocco (1990), women most value the type of job rewards that are more readily available from their jobs, such as relationships with co-workers. Consequently, they will be more easily satisfied than men who desire the less available autonomy and financial rewards. The same author also suggests that women may lower their job expectations because they are well aware of labour market realities. A further explanation for the higher levels of job satisfaction among women is offered by Lambert et al., (2001). According to these authors men are more likely to stay in a job where they are not satisfied because they are socialized to view themselves as the primary breadwinner. The same socialisation process stresses that for women, family and children should take priority over work satisfaction.

In contrast to the above view, researchers such as Miller and Wheeler (1992, as cited in Lim, Teo & Thayer 1998), maintain that women are inclined to be less satisfied in their jobs because they tend to hold positions at a lower level in the organisational hierarchy where pay and promotion prospects are less attractive. The same argument is presented by Lim et al. (1998) who found that female police officers experience lower levels of job satisfaction than do male police officers. The findings of the latter study must, however,
be generalised with caution. Women who are employed in male dominated professions are likely to experience different work-related attitudes as compared to their male counterparts since they may have to do without same-sex role models or established norms.

Numerous studies across a variety of occupational settings have, however, found no significant gender differences in job satisfaction, despite the fact that women on average have inferior jobs in terms of pay, status, level of authority, and opportunities for promotion (Hull, 1999; Jones et al., 2000; Rout, 1999). Various theories have emerged to account for what has often been referred to as the “paradox of the contented working woman”. One of the most popular explanations is that men and women attach value to different aspects of the job. In addition to placing greater emphasis on co-worker relations, women are also more inclined to assign priority to work that provides them with a sense of accomplishment (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). Furthermore, women may compare themselves only with other women or with women who stay at home rather than with all other employees (Hull, 1999).

Saal and Knight (1988), as well as Scandura and Lankau (1997), substantiate the above-mentioned studies and indicate that gender differences in job satisfaction disappear when differences in perceived job characteristics, age, tenure, education, income and occupational level are controlled.
2.11.3.3 JOB LEVEL

According to Oshagbemi (1997) relatively few studies have been designed to investigate the nature of the relationship between job level and corresponding levels of satisfaction. However, Miles et al. (1996) found job level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. These researchers examined job level as a structural determinant of role behaviour and suggest that job level moderates the communication-job satisfaction relationship.

Several other researchers have also found support for a positive association between job level and satisfaction. Results from a study by Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, and Smith (1998) revealed a consistent and significant positive relationship between these two variables. Furthermore, Oshagbemi (1997) demonstrated that the job satisfaction of academics increases progressively with each higher rank. Smither (1988) and Vecchio (1988) also support this view and state that job satisfaction tends to be lowest among employees who are employed in jobs that are characterized by hot or dangerous conditions.

Robie et al., (1998) maintain that the positive correlation between rank and satisfaction may be attributed to the fact that higher-level jobs tend to be more complex and have better working conditions, pay, promotion prospects, supervision, autonomy, and responsibility. Vorster (1992) presents a similar argument. The evidence from the literature seems to suggest, therefore, that job level is a reliable predictor of job
satisfaction with employees at higher ranks being generally more satisfied with their jobs than employees at lower levels are.

2.12.4 TENURE

Tenure refers to the length of time for which the individual has worked for the organisation (Lim et al., 1998). Extant research indicates that tenure is likely to have an impact on job satisfaction (Jones et al., 2000; Saal & Knight, 1988). In fact, the literature overwhelmingly indicates that a positive correlation exists between tenure and job satisfaction, that is, employees with longer tenure are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs than employees with shorter tenure (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999; Jones et al., 2000; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988). Robbins (2001, p.36) shares this view, but states further that “when age and tenure are treated separately, tenure appears to be a more consistent and stable predictor of job satisfaction than is chronological age.”

Moreover, a study by Chambers (1999) established that employees with longer tenure were more satisfied with their work itself as well as their level of pay. From this it might be concluded that satisfaction increases with time and that those benefits that increase in time, such as security and experience are likely to have an important influence on employee satisfaction.

On the other hand, Lambert et al. (2001) argue that an inverse relationship exists between tenure and job satisfaction. The reason the literature is both inconsistent and inconclusive
in this regard may be because the relationship between these variables depends on the specific organisation and how tenure is viewed. In some organisations senior employees are highly respected, while high tenure is viewed as a liability in other organisations (Lambert et al., 2001).

2.12.5 LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Studies investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and educational level have produced mixed results (Camp, 1994; Loscocco, 1990; Ting, 1997; Vorster, 1992). Certain authors maintain that the relationship between education and job satisfaction is positive in nature (Larwood, 1984; Saal & Knight, 1988; Vorster, 1992). Vorster (1992) found this association to be largely indirect, that is, the higher an individual’s qualifications, the higher that individual’s job level and, consequently, so too the employee’s degree of satisfaction.

On the other hand, Lambert et al. (2001) found education to have no significant effect on job satisfaction. The authors explain these results by stating that the study considered a number of different occupations, and educational levels are likely to differ by occupation and organisation. Yet, other studies have supported the idea that no significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and education. Ting (1997) found education to have no effect on the satisfaction of federal government employees. Similarly, Rogers (1991) failed to find support for a link between the satisfaction and educational level of correctional service employees.
In a study by Loscocco (1990), however, education was found to exert a significant negative impact on the job satisfaction of women, but not on that of men. This could be explained by the fact that the educational experience is different for women than it is for men, thereby raising the job expectations of women to a greater extent. If these job expectations are not fulfilled, job satisfaction will be impacted negatively.

Recent studies suggest, however, that educational level is positively related to job satisfaction, subject to a successful match being made between the individual’s work and qualifications (Battu, Belfield, & Sloane, 1999; Jones et al., 2000). This implies that better educated employees are only likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction when the duties performed by them are in line with their level of education.

2.12.6 MARITAL STATUS

Research has consistently indicated that married employees are more satisfied with their jobs than are their unmarried co-workers (Chambers, 1999; Loscocco, 1990; Mehrabian, 1998; Robbins, 2001). More specifically, Chambers (1999) found being married to be significantly correlated with increased satisfaction in the pay, work, supervision, and co-worker subscales of the JDI.

Loscocco (1990) suggests that married men and women are more satisfied with their jobs than their single counterparts, presumably because marriage increases responsibilities and limits alternatives. Moreover, Vorster (1992) argues that employees’ personal lives are
narrowly integrated with their work lives. As a result an employee’s dissatisfaction at work may at times be due more to personal problems than the characteristics of the job itself. This position is also held by Mehrabian (1998). However, the question of causation remains unclear, since it is possible that satisfied employees are more likely to be married (Robbins, 2001).

2.13 THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

There appears to be some consistency in job satisfaction across time and jobs. As such, the individual-difference approach postulates that a series of personality variables are related to employees’ job satisfaction (Aamodt, 1999; Naumann, 1993). According to Judge et al. (2000) job satisfaction is determined, in part, by core self-evaluations. These authors define core self-evaluations as “fundamental assessments that individuals make about themselves and their self-worth.” (Judge et al., 2000, p. 237). Incorporated into this concept are four dispositional traits: employees’ outlook on life (affectivity), view of their self-worth (self-esteem), ability to master their environment (self-efficacy), and their ability to control their environment (external vs. internal locus of control (Aamodt, 1999; Judge et al., 2000).

Judge et al. (2000) maintain that employees who are prone to be satisfied with their jobs tend to have high self-esteem, high self-efficacy, high positive affectivity, and an internal locus of control. Furthermore, a study by Lim et al., (1998) revealed that employees with an internal locus of control reported significantly higher mean scores on job satisfaction.
The influence of personality variables on job satisfaction has, however, remained largely unexplored by researchers. Consequently, more research is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn (Aamodt, 1999; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992).

2.14 CONSEQUENCES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Human resource professionals are concerned with job satisfaction primarily because of the positive effects that it is expected to have on work behaviours. This is evidenced by the substantial amount of time spent by researchers in investigating the relationships between satisfaction and withdrawal, and between satisfaction and performance (Saal & Knight, 1988).

2.14.1 WITHDRAWAL BEHAVIOURS

According to Saal and Knight (1988, p. 313) withdrawal is a “general term used to refer to behaviors by which workers remove themselves, either temporarily or permanently, from their jobs or workplaces.” Three forms of withdrawal have generally been linked to job satisfaction namely tardiness, absenteeism, and turnover.

2.14.1.1 TARDINESS

While it cannot be assumed that chronic tardiness is invariably due to dissatisfaction, certain forms of employee tardiness, such as that caused by lingering in the parking lot or
restroom, may be attributed to low levels of satisfaction (Vecchio, 1988). Smither (1988) further points out that tardiness has been described as a precursor to absenteeism, while absenteeism has in turn been viewed as a precursor and an alternative to turnover. The author states that “the tardy employee will eventually become absent more frequently, and these absences will eventually lead to turnover” (Smither, 1988, p. 317).

However, research has largely focused on the relationships between job satisfaction and absenteeism, and between satisfaction and turnover. Consequently, little evidence exists to support the relationship between job satisfaction and tardiness.

2.14.1.2 ABSENTEEISM

Studies have consistently demonstrated an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Luthans, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Saal & Knight, 1988; Scott & Taylor, 1985). However, researchers appear to be in disagreement concerning the strength of this relationship. Luthans (1992) and Moorhead and Griffen (1992) are of the opinion that a relatively strong relationship exists between these variables. This view is supported by Organ (1991) who maintains that job satisfaction should be an important focus of any organisation that wishes to reduce absenteeism.

The above argument has, however, been refuted by a number of researchers who state that the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism is generally weak. In such a
case, managers should not expect to realise any significant decrease in absenteeism by increasing the satisfaction of employees (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Smither, 1988). Saal and Knight (1988), report correlations between satisfaction, as measured by the JDI, and absence that ranges from -.09 to .08.

One of the reasons offered for the poor relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism is that conditions other than those that influence satisfaction influence absenteeism (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985). This view is shared by Luthans (1992) who is of the opinion that moderating variables, such as the degree to which people feel that their jobs are important, are likely to play a role. Employees who consider their jobs to be important are unlikely to have high rates of absenteeism.

Vecchio (1988), however, indicates that it is important to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary absenteeism. Staw (1995) expects satisfaction to affect only voluntary absences; therefore, satisfaction can never be strongly related to a measure of overall absence. In fact, those studies that have separated voluntary absences from overall absences have found that voluntary absence rates are more closely correlated with satisfaction than are overall absence rates (Staw, 1995). Given the aforementioned, it might therefore be concluded that while high job satisfaction will not necessarily result in low absenteeism, low job satisfaction is likely to bring about high absenteeism (Luthans, 1992).
2.14.1.3 TURNOVER

Research has shown, with a reasonable degree of consistency, that dissatisfied employees are more likely to quit their jobs (Hanish & Hulin, 1991; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Organ, 1991; Robbins, 2001; Smither, 1988; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988). In fact, Robbins (2001) argues that the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover is stronger than the correlation between satisfaction and absenteeism.

While certain researchers maintain that a direct relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover (Clugston, 2000; Lambert et al., 2001), a growing body of literature suggests that the relationship is neither simple nor direct (Saal & Knight, 1988; Somers, 1996). Camp (1994), for example, found that job satisfaction exerts an insignificant direct influence on turnover.

Studies generally indicate that dissatisfaction leads to turnover intent, which in turn is the direct precursor to actual turnover (Jinnett & Alexander, 1999; Morrison, 1997; Pasewark & Strawser, 1996; Quarles, 1994; Saal & Knight, 1988). In a study by Hellman (1997) it was implied that every unit of decrease in job satisfaction reflects approximately a one-half standard deviation increase in intent to leave. It is further maintained by Smither (1988) that such turnover intent is the best predictor of actual turnover.
The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is further complicated by the presence of moderating variables such as labour market conditions, expectations about alternative job opportunities, the length of tenure with the organisation and organisational commitment (Lim et al., 1998; Robbins, 2001). Of these variables the most salient influence is exercised by the availability of alternative employment opportunities (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Vecchio, 1988). This is substantiated by Staw (1995, p. 94), who states that “Even if an employee is very dissatisfied with his job, he is not likely to leave unless more attractive alternatives are available.”

As in the case of absenteeism, job satisfaction will not, in and of itself, keep turnover low. On the other hand, however, if there is considerable job dissatisfaction, high turnover is likely to be evidenced (Luthans, 1992). It would therefore be accurate to say that job satisfaction is an important consideration in employee turnover.

### 2.15 PRODUCTIVITY

One of the biggest controversies in organisational behaviour centres on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity (Saari & Judge, 2004). Early research (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985) concluded that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance was trivial, but this was contradicted (Isen & Baron, 1991; Moorman, 1993). Despite a strong association found by some researchers, available evidence suggests that the relationship between satisfaction and productivity is a weak one (Klein & Ritti, 1984; Organ, 1991, Vecchio, 1988).
In response to these contradictory findings, it was argued that it cannot be assumed that satisfied employees will be more productive, nor can it be assumed that job satisfaction is the result of good performance (Bassett, 1994).

Several explanations have been forwarded as to why some studies have found a significant relationship between satisfaction and performance. The first is that the relationship itself is rather weak. A meta-analysis by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) indicated that the average correlation between performance and satisfaction is only .15.

Moreover, it is suggested by MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1998) that the findings are indeterminate because some researchers have controlled for common antecedents of satisfaction and performance while others have not. Robbins (1998), on the other hand, is of the opinion that the discrepancy may be accounted for by the presence of moderator variables, that is, the introduction of moderator variables is inclined to improve the relationship.

Saal and Knight (1988) support the view held by Robbins (1998) and state that the relationship between satisfaction and performance is likely to be influenced by the manner in which rewards are distributed in the organisation. When rewards are based on performance, the satisfaction-performance correlation is stronger. Furthermore, it has been suggested by Fisher (1980, as cited in Morrison, 1997) that stronger correlations between performance and satisfaction may result with the use of more specific measures for each of these constructs.
Another point of contention concerns the causal relationship between satisfaction and performance. According to Staw (1995), research suggests that the relationship between the two variables is probably due to performance indirectly causing satisfaction. In this sense job satisfaction becomes an incentive associated with the outcomes of job performance.

Researchers have also argued that satisfaction and performance influence each other (Vecchio, 1988). According to this viewpoint, the relationship between satisfaction and performance is largely indirect. Satisfaction may, for example, indirectly influence performance through the belief that performance will be equitably rewarded.

Yet, other researchers have argued that satisfaction exerts an influence on productivity (Klein & Ritti, 1984). To date, however, empirical support for this perspective has been scant. Robbins (2001), however, suggests that the reason for the lack of support for the satisfaction-causes-productivity thesis may be that studies have focused on employees rather than the organisation and that individual-level measures do no take all the interactions and complexities in the work process into account.

It appears as if the nature of the relationship between satisfaction and performance is still in doubt and that it warrants further testing. Nevertheless, Vecchio (1988) suggests that managers should strive to create linkages between satisfaction and performance by offering attractive and equitable rewards that are tied to performance.
2.16 EFFECTS ON QUALITY OF LIFE

In addition to organisational performance objectives, there are also important humanitarian reasons for enhancing the satisfaction of employees.

Satisfaction at work carries over to the employee’s life outside the workplace. Consequently, job satisfaction has been found to have a positive effect on the individual’s satisfaction with life in general (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998).

Furthermore, the physical and mental well-being of employees appear to be related to job satisfaction. Although the evidence is strictly correlational in nature, highly satisfied employees tend to have better physical and mental health records (Luthans, 1992; Vecchio, 1988). More specifically, serious job dissatisfaction, as manifested in stress, may give rise to a multiplicity of physiological disorders, including headaches, ulcers, arterial disease, and heart disease (Robbins, 1998; Vecchio, 1988).

Finally, Coster (1992) proposes that work can have an important effect on the total quality of life of employees’ behaviour like absenteeism, complaints and grievances, labour unrest and termination of employment. In light of this, job satisfaction in and of itself, warrants the attention of management.
2.17 CONCLUSION

The chapter clarifies that job satisfaction not only affects employees well-being and quality of life, but also has an important impact on organisational effectiveness and productivity. Furthermore, research indicates that job satisfaction can contribute not only to productive output, but to organisational maintenance objectives as well.

Employees decisions about whether they will go to work on any given day and whether they will quit are affected by their level of job satisfaction. In addition, absenteeism interrupts scheduling, while the costs of recruiting and training replacement employees are phenomenal. Because satisfaction is manageable and influences absenteeism and turnover, organisations can control such withdrawal behaviours (Staw, 1995).

The literature suggests that by keeping employee satisfaction high an organisation may be able to enhance the job performance of its workforce and harvest the consequent benefits thereof (Keitner & Keinicki, 1992). Service organisations in particular, stand to be advantaged from high levels of job satisfaction among employees. Research has demonstrated that job satisfaction plays an important role in such organisations, in that an increase in satisfaction of employees may directly raise the satisfaction of customers as well (Bowen et al., 1999; Sousa-Poza, 2000a).
In conclusion it may be said that when the potential benefits and consequences of employee satisfaction are taken into account, organisations cannot within the context of continued growth and survival afford to ignore job satisfaction.
CHAPTER THREE

ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE – A LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 INTRODUCTION

According to Bowen et al. (1999), perceived fairness is one of the only ways that employees can evaluate human resource practices. Although human resource practices are guided by technical, financial, legal and strategic concerns, most employees do not have the information or expertise to evaluate practices from these perspectives. It is pointed out by Coetzee (2004) that human resource managers must attend to the personal needs and concerns of the employees they are managing by recognising the importance of human social interaction as a basic requirement for the effective functioning of organisations. One concept which is fundamental to human social interaction is justice. Fairness issues invade organisational life in many ways. Whether the social exchange is a promotion decision, the assignment of tasks, the allocation of rewards or any other type of social exchange the matter of fairness is bound to arise. In an attempt to describe and explain the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace, a field of study known as organisational justice has emerged (Greenberg, 1987a).

One of the main reasons why organisational justice has been one of the most popular research subjects in Industrial Psychology, Human Resource Management and
Organisational Behaviour is its positive correlation with many organisational behaviour outcome variables (Greenberg, 1990b; McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). Employees who perceive that they have been treated fairly are more likely to hold positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes and their supervisors (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1990b; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Empirical evidence found job satisfaction to be significantly correlated with organisational justice perceptions (Moorman, 1991). It is further maintained in the literature that organisational justice is a consistent predictor of job satisfaction (Colquitt & Colon, 2001). Folger and Cropanzano (1998) further indicate that injustice may result in negative consequences such as reduced job performance (Greenberg, 1987b; Pfeffer & Langton, 1993), reduced cooperation with co-workers (Pfeffer & Langton, 1993), lower work quality (Cowherd & Levine 1992) and theft (Greenberg 1990a). In light of the above, it is obvious that once managers understand how perceptions of organisational justice are related to these variables can organisations manage employees’ perceptions of fairness across human resource management decisions. This study focuses on organisational justice in an attempt to shape job satisfaction which is an important work attitude that impacts the performance of organisations.

With the aim of discussing organisational justice from a theoretical standpoint, the following aspects are addressed in this chapter: Firstly, the definition of organisational justice receives attention. Secondly, the content and process conceptualisations of organisational justice are discussed. Thirdly, the theories underlying distributive justice are presented, which is followed by a definition of distributive justice. Fourthly,
procedural justice is defined and the theories underlying procedural justice are discussed. Fifthly, the theories underlying interactional justice are discussed and a definition of interactional justice is provided.

3.2 ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE DEFINED

Similar to other constructs in organisational research, organisational justice has been defined in various ways:

Organisational justice has generally been defined in terms of the just and fair manner in which organisations treat their employees (Greenberg 1990b). Moorman (1991, p. 845) is also of the opinion that organisational justice is the term used to describe the “role of fairness as it relates directly to the workplace”. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) consider organisational justice perceptions to refer to the employees perceptions of how fair organisational actions are towards them. Bowen et al. (1999) are of the opinion that although the issue of fairness applies to most organisations, service organisations must be particularly concerned because of the impact on customers because services are performers rather than objects and they are difficult to evaluate prior to purchase. Customers must buy the service to actually experience it. Thus, they must trust a service company to deliver on its promises and conduct itself honourably.

According to Coetzee (2004), organisational justice refers to the decisions organisations make, the procedures they use in making decision and the interpersonal treatment
employees receive. Bowen et al. (1999) have suggested that organisational justice is
demonstrated through congruence between employees’ perception of an organisation’s
fairness and human resource decisions. Employees judge the fairness of an organisation
by the human resource decisions made in recruitment, performance appraisal and reward
systems. For example, employees’ judge the fairness of their performance appraisal
ratings, the rewards tied to those ratings, the consistency and appropriateness of the
appraisal process, and the explanations and feedback that accompany the communication
of performance ratings. Similarly, Alexander and Ruderman (1987) define organisational
justice by the processes by which employees determine whether or not they have been
treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which these perceptions influence other
outcomes.

3.2.1 CONTENT AND PROCESS CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF
ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

Greenberg (1990b) has distinguished between conceptualisations of justice that focus on
content and process. This taxonomy was a result of combining two conceptually
independent dimensions: a reactive-proactive dimension and a process-content
dimension.

• Reactive-proactive dimension. This reactive theory of justice focuses on people’s
attempts either to escape from or to avoid perceived unfair states. By contrast,
proactive theories focus on behaviours designed to encourage justice.
• Process-content dimension. A process approach to justice focuses on the way in which outcomes are determined. This orientation focuses on the fairness of the methods and procedures used to make and implement organisational decisions. In contrast, content approaches are concerned with the fairness of the resulting decisions or outcomes.

By combining the two dimensions in various ways a taxonomy of four theories were developed (Greenberg 1990b). Table 3.1 summarises the research question related to each type to theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF THEORY</th>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive content</td>
<td>How do workers react to inequitable payments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive content</td>
<td>How do workers attempt to create fair payments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive process</td>
<td>How do workers react to unfair policies or procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive process</td>
<td>How do workers attempt to create fair polices or procedures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Research questions related to reactive content, proactive content, reactive process and the proactive process.
Source: Greenberg (1996)
3.2.1.1 REACTIVE CONTENT THEORIES

The reactive content theories focus on how employees respond to unfair decisions. These decisions state that employees will respond to unfair relationships by displaying certain negative emotions such as resentment, anger, dissatisfaction and disappointment (Folger, 1984, cited in Coetzee, 2004). In an attempt to redress the experienced inequality, employees will seek restitution in retaliatory behaviour or restore psychological equity by justifying or resigning from the organisation.

3.2.1.2 PROACTIVE CONTENT THEORIES

Proactive content theories focus on how people attempt to create fair decisions. Employees attempt to make fair allocation decisions by applying several possible allocation rules to the situations they confront (Leventhal, 1980). For example, in situations where harmony between group members is important, a supervisor will probably reward by following the equality norm, by dividing rewards equally. The justice motive theory recognises that justice is the pre-eminent concern of human beings, and proposes that rewards are allocated according to circumstances (Lerner, 1982, cited in Coetzee, 2004). Supervisors and managers make use of the following four principles when making allocation decisions:

- Competition. This refers to allocations based on the outcome of performance,
- Parity. This principle considers equal allocations,
• Equity. Denotes allocations based on contributions and

• Marxian justice. Identifies allocations based on needs.

3.2.1.3 REACTIVE PROCESS THEORIES

The reactive process theories focus on how people react to unfair procedures, policies and processes used in making a decision. According to Thibault and Walker (1978), the amount of control people have over decisions and processes influence their perceptions of fairness. There are two types of controls, of which process control refers to the degree of control employees have over the procedures or information used to make a decision. Decision control refers to the degree of control employees have over directly determining outcomes. Research has found that procedures that offer process control are perceived to be fairer and enhance the acceptance of even unfavourable decisions (Greenberg, 1987b).

3.2.1.4 PROACTIVE PROCESS THEORIES

According to Greenberg (1996), the proactive process theories are concerned with the allocation of procedures and seek to determine what procedures employees will use to achieve justice. The allocation preference theory proposes that employees hold expectancies that certain procedures will be differentially instrumental in meeting their goals. For procedures to be regarded as instrumental in attaining justice, they need to meet the following criteria:
- Allow opportunities to select the decision maker,
- Follow consistent rules,
- Make use of accurate information,
- Identify the structure of decision making power,
- Employ safeguards against bias,
- Allow for appeals to be heard,
- Provide opportunities for correcting procedures and
- Meet moral and ethical standards.

Notably there has been a shift in organisational justice which identifies that interest in reactive and content theories has waned. Two shifts have occurred. Firstly there has been a shift from reactive to proactive and secondly, a shift from content to process (Greenberg, 1996).

Judgments about fairness are made by means of a simple, straightforward process. Sheppard, Lewicki and Minton (1992, as cited in Coetzee, 2004) maintain that judging the decision, action or procedure requires evaluating it against two principles which they identify as balance and correctness.

- Comparisons of balance are made when an employee compares what they have received to someone else, while comparing the value of their inputs. This form of justice is referred to as distributive justice (Greenberg, 1986a).
• The correctness principle of justice means that employees will consider decisions fair as long as they are fair and consistently applied (Greenberg, 1986a).

The perceived justice of some decision or action is made by deciding whether the decision or action appears to be distributively and procedurally fair.

Related to the concepts of balance and correctness, theorists have distinguished between conceptualisations of justice and focus on content, the fairness of the outcome or decision referred to as distributive justice and those that focus on processes, the fairness of the methods and procedures used to determine the decision or outcome referred to as procedural justice (Bowen et al., 1999; Greenberg, 1987a). As research expanded, a third type of justice which focused on the quality of the interpersonal treatment people received referred to as interactional justice, was identified (Leventhal, 1980; Thibault & Walker, 1975). According to Coetzee (2004), since distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice play a role in an individual’s perception of the fairness of treatment, they all form part of organisational justice. Figure 3.1 illustrates the various types of justice and their interrelatedness. Each of these types of justice will be discussed in order to link fairness of employee’s perceptions to job satisfaction.
3.3 THEORIES UNDERLYING DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

3.3.1 EQUITY THEORY

Adam’s (1963, 1965) equity theory has been the focus by organisational scientists interested in the issues of justice. This theory claims that people compare the ratios of
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Figure 3.1: Organisational justice
Source: Adapted from Greenberg (1990b)
their own work outcomes (rewards) to the perceived work inputs (contributions) with corresponding ratios of comparison which in this situation is a co-worker (Adams, 1965). If the ratios are unequal, the employee whose ratio is higher is theorised to be inequitably overpaid and to feel guilty, whereas the employee whose ratio is lower is theorised to be inequitably underpaid and to feel angry. This theory postulates that equal ratios yield equitable states and associated with feelings of satisfaction. Employees are theorised to adjust their own or their comparison with another employee’s actual or perceived inputs or outcomes in order to change unpleasant inequitable states to more pleasant and equitable ones. The theory proposed that comparatively low rewards would produce dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction would then motivate employees to address the discrepancy between their ratio and that of their co-worker.

3.3.2 RELATIVE DEPRIVATION

According to Crosby, Burtis, Censor and MacKethan (1986, p. 268), “the theory of relative deprivation states that deprivations are experienced relative to a social standard rather than simply as a function of a person’s objective conditions”. Furthermore, Reis (1986, p. 199) expands this description by stating that “relative deprivation may or may not be justified” and “supports the contention that the desire for justice and the desire for specific outcomes are conceptually distinct.” In citing Crosby (1976) and Runciman (1966), Martin (1986) says that researchers argue that feelings of deprivation are generally caused by unexpected injustices. Another viewpoint is that feelings of deprivation are stronger when injustice is expected to persist indefinitely. The relative
deprivation theory states that feelings of injustice prevail when rewards are distributed in a way that induces unfavourable comparisons. These comparisons result in feelings of deprivation that manifest in perceptions of unfairness (Bartol, Smith, Durham & Poon, 2001).

3.3.3 REFERENT COGNITIONS THEORY

According to Folger (1986, p. 147), the referent cognitions theory “involves psychology of what might have been”. It has been offered as an approach that promises to integrate the concepts of distributive and procedural justice. The theory expands upon equity theory’s attempt to explain reactions to inequitable work outcomes. It distinguishes between two types of reactions: resentment reactions (theorised to result from beliefs about procedures that could be used to attain outcomes) and reactions to dissatisfaction and satisfaction (theorised to result for the relative outcomes themselves). Folger (1986) distinguishes between high and low referent outcomes and high and low likelihood subjects. A high referent outcome is a more favourable state than reality. High likelihood subjects are less resentful than low-likelihood subjects. The referent cognitions theory defines the basis for resentment as consisting of the comparison between reality (what happened) and an alternative imaginable referent state (what might have happened instead). The referent cognitions theory defies injustice in terms of events and circumstances that lead to the outcome also called instrumentalities.
3.3.4 DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE DEFINED

Distributive justice refers to fairness in the allocation of a set of outcomes to the defined circle of recipients. Distributive justice is said to exist when employees expectations are congruent with outcomes received (Adams, 1965). The primary concern explains how employees react to the amount and form of compensation they receive. It has been demonstrated that distributive justice perceptions have an influence over attitudes towards the results of decisions (Bowen, et al., 1999; Schappe, 1998; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Research on organisational justice in the United States context has shown that distributive justices are related to a wide variety of individual and organisational outcomes (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). Cook and Hegvedt (1986, p. 22) suggests that “Injustice, in other words, is the violation of the normative standard. Less powerful actors may recognise this violation when the legitimised distribution is disrupted in a way that serves the interest of the powerful, or when they realise the bias inherent in the existing system.” The lack of distributive justice can cause employees to lower their job performance, cooperate less with their co-workers, engage in stealing and experience stress (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). On the other hand, fair treatment can influence organisational variables such as job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), organisational citizenship behaviour (Morrison, 1997) and reduce employee theft (Greenberg, 1990a). It was found that distributive justice was the more important predictor of job satisfaction than procedural justice (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). According to Coetzee (2004), managers should pay
close attention to justice violations in the workplace because these may give rise to employees’ lawsuits which, if successful could bring about various remedies.

According to Leventhal (1976), employees use three major rules to determine outcome justice: the equity rule, the equality rule and the need rule. The purpose of outcomes or decisions based on the equity rule is to achieve productivity and a high level of performance. The equity rule is used when the aim is to preserve social harmony, the needs rule is applied when the objective is to foster personal welfare and the equality rule suggests that equal opportunity is given to receive the reward. Because distributive justice focuses on outcome fairness, Adams’ (1963) equity theory has been used to operationlise the construct (Törnblom, 1990). “According to the equity theory perceptions of distributive justice arise from comparisons for work outcomes, given inputs against certain referent others, and the comparison concept used by the employee” (Hendrix et al. 1998, p. 612).

Soon after the publication of Adams’ (1963) theory, several empirical studies were conducted that tested various aspects thereof. Typically these studies hired experimental subjects to work on a clerical task after leading them to believe that similarly qualified others were being paid more or less than themselves for doing the same work, that is they were either underpaid or overpaid (Andrews, 1967; Garland, 1973; Pritchard, Dunnette & Jorgenson, 1972). In keeping with equity theory predictions, these studies generally found that workers lowered their performance when they were underpaid and raised their performance when they were overpaid (Adams & Freedman, 1976).
Despite these successes, several early tests of equity theory were criticised on the grounds that some of the inequity inductions used were confounded in various ways for example, by challenging subjects’ self-esteem, or by threatening their job security (Lawler, 1968; Pitchard, 1969). Despite these challenges, convincing rebuttals by Adams (1968) in conjunction with other supportive tests of the theory using unconfounded procedures for example, Garland (1973), have led reviewers to conclude that the evidence for equity theory is generally quite strong (Greenberg, 1982; Mowday, 1967).

Of the conceptual variants of equity theory that emerged, one approach that promised to be especially applicable to the study of organisational processes was its proactive counterpart (Leventhal 1976, 1980). Leventhal and his associates researched the conditions under which people proactively employed various justice norms (Greenberg & Leventhal 1976). They reported that people believe that the maintenance of social harmony is promoted through the use of equal reward allocations, whereas, the maximisation of performance is promoted through the use of equal reward allocation. Moreover, the maximisation of performance is promoted by systems, for example, pay for performance plans (Henneman, 1990) that allocate outcomes equitably, in proportion to relative performance (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal 1976). Research highlighted that certain goals are believed to be facilitated by certain norms of justice relevant to organisational behaviour insofar as it helps predict and explain administrative allocation decisions such as pay raises and budget allocations (Freedman & Montanari, 1980).
Together, Adam’s reactive approach and Leventhal’s proactive approach are referred to as conceptualisations of distributive justice (Cohen, 1987; Törnblom, 1990). Both focus on the fairness of outcome distributions. Despite the potential insight into organisational processes derived from both reactive and proactive approaches to distributive justice by the early 1980’s these conceptualisations began to fall into disfavour (Locke & Henne, 1986). One source of frustration was equity theory’s lack of specificity regarding what reactions to inequity would occur (Furby, 1986). At the same time organisational scientists such as Heneman (1985) and Mahoney (1983) began to raise questions about justice in various organisational milieus that were not adequately addressed by prevailing theories of justice. Specifically, questions of how pay plans were administered and what grievance-resolution practices were followed in organisations prompted concerns about fairness that were more process orientated. These questions dealt with how decisions were made as opposed to what those decisions were. In attempting to address such questions, theorists Folger and Greenberg (1985), Greenberg and Folger (1983) and Tyler (1987a) focused their attention on matters of procedural justice.

Distributive justice principles characterise what pay outcome is seen as fair. The outcome could be a pay level, a pay range, a merit increase or any other compensation or reward outcome. The primary justice principle is equity which can be divided into external equity, internal equity and individual equity. In this situation, external equity involves employees comparing pay with employees in similar jobs at different organisations. Internal equity is based on comparing one’s pay with pay of different jobs or jobs at different levels in the same organisation. With individual equity, employees compare
their pay with other employees that are at same level in the organisation. It is difficult to maintain all three types of equity and employees will often perceive some violation of distributive justice. Bowen et al., (1999) are of the opinion that adequate procedural and interactional justice can offset distributive justice.

3.4 PROCEDURAL JUSTICE DEFINED

Folger and Cropanzano (1998, p. 26) define procedural justice as the “fairness issues concerning the methods, mechanism and processes used to determine outcomes”. Bowen et al. (1991) agree that procedural justice principles include consistent application of standards and soliciting input from employees. Greenberg (1990b) purports that while distributive justice focuses on the fairness of outcomes, procedural justice addresses the fairness of procedures used to achieve those outcomes. Leventhal’s (1980) theory of procedural justice focussed on six criteria that a procedure should meet if it is to be perceived as fair:

- Procedures should be applied consistently across people and time,
- Procedures should be free of bias, for example, ensuring that a third party has no vested interest in a particular settlement,
- Procedures should ensure that accurate information is collected and used in making decisions,
- Procedures should have some mechanism to correct flawed or inaccurate decisions,
• Procedures should conform to personal or prevailing standards of ethics or morality and procedures should ensure that the opinions of various groups affected by the decision have been taken into account.

In view of the above, Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980), Brockner and Wiesenfeld (1996) and Gilland and Paddock (2005) support the notion that procedures are perceived as fair if decisions are made consistently, without self-interest and on the basis of accurate information, if there are opportunities to correct the decision and to appeal the outcome arrived at using the procedures, if the decisions represent the interest of all the parties concerned, follow moral and ethical standards and if they set ground rules for evaluation and decision making.

3.4.1 THEORIES UNDERLYING PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

3.4.1.1 PROCESS CONTROL AND DECISION CONTROL

Although Thibault and Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice, their work focussed primarily on dispute reactions to legal procedures. Leventhal (1980) and Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) can be credited with extending the notion of procedural justice into nonlegal contexts such as organisational settings. According to these authors, employees judge the fairness of procedures used to make decisions, referred to as process control and the amount of control they have over influencing the decision. Employees want procedures that allow them to feel that they have participated
in developing a decision that will affect them. It has been argued that process control could enhance procedural justice because it satisfies a desire to have the employee’s view considered, even if being heard fails to influence the decision maker as envisaged (Tyler, Rasinski & Spodick, 1985). According to Tyler (1987a, p. 333), employees seek control over processes because they are concerned with their own outcomes. The opportunity to exercise “voice” over procedures has been explained as enhancing perceptions of procedural justice because it may lead to equitable outcomes (Thibault & Walker, 1978).

It has been argued that the desire to influence procedures is a part of the belief that such control could yield favourable outcomes (Greenberg & Folger, 1983). This idea forms the basis for the group value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989), which specifies that employees value long term relationships with groups and this leads them to procedures that promote group solidarity. The group-value model explains the value expressive effects of process control (Tyler, 1989). Group identity and group procedures govern the functioning of groups. Employees consider procedures that allow them to express their opinions to be fair, for they can participate in group processes as valuable group members, even if it does not produce favourable outcomes.

Associated to Thibault and Walker’s (1975) study on the importance of process and decision control for fairness perceptions, Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) identified seven components of procedures that lead to justice achievement:

- The selection of decision makers,
- Setting ground rules for evaluating rewards,
• Methods for collecting information,
• Procedures for defining the decision process,
• Safeguards against abuse of power,
• Procedures for appeals, and
• The availability of change mechanism to alter an unfair decision.

According to these authors, the fairness of procedures is evaluated by applying the following six justice rules. Procedures are evaluated as fair to the degree that they:

• Suppress bias,
• Create consistent allocations,
• Rely on accurate information,
• Are correctable,
• Represent the concerns of all recipients, and
• Are based on moral and ethical standards.

3.4.1.2 SELF-INTEREST MODEL AND GROUP-INTEREST MODEL OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

Lind and Tyler (1988) developed the self-interest model and the group-value models of procedural justice. The group-value model is interchangeably referred to as the relational model. The self-interest model, implies that employees seek control over processes because they are concerned with their own outcomes. In this regard, the opportunity to
exercise voice over procedures has been described as enhancing perceptions of procedural justice because it may lead to equitable outcomes (Thibault & Walker 1978) or because it enhances control over desired outcomes (Brett 1986). According to Coetzee (2004), the group-value model explains the value-expressive effects of process control. Employees consider procedures that allow them to express their opinions to be fair, for they can participate in group processes as valuable group members. Group identity and group procedures are two elements that direct the functioning of groups. Clay-Warner et al. (2005), employing the group-value model assert that procedural justice is a more important predictor of job satisfaction than distributive justice. Employees consider procedures that allow them to express their opinions “voice” to be fair, for they can participate in group processes as valuable group members (Coetzee, 2004). Even if “voice” does not enable a favourable outcome, it enhances perceived procedural justice because its value-expressive function confirms the value of group participation and group membership status.

Consistent with the self-interest model, Greenberg (1986b) found that employees believe that the outcomes resulting from unfair procedures are themselves unfair, but only when those outcomes are trivial. More beneficial outcomes were believed to be fair regardless of the fairness of the procedure. Furthermore, low outcomes aroused concern over the unfair procedures used to attain them. Just as procedures were accepted when outcomes were positive in Greenberg’s (1987b) study, simulated legal research found that process control did little to enhance satisfaction when innocent verdicts were delivered (LaTour,
1978). Such evidence supports the self-interest model because it suggests that concerns about procedures are dictated primarily by effects.

McFarlin and Sweeny (1992) in support of the self-interest model found in their study of 675 bank employees, that both procedural and distributive justice were significantly related to job satisfaction. Nevertheless, as they hypothesised, distributive justice was the more important predictor accounting for five percent of the unique variance and procedural justice accounted for only one percent. Martin and Bennett (1996) replicated these findings in their study of a financial services organisation and found that distributive justice was the stronger predictor of four forms of facet-specific job satisfaction, such as satisfaction with working conditions. Clay-Warner et al. (2005) support the group-value model more than the self-interest model by showing that procedural justice is a more important predictor of job satisfaction than is distributive justice.

According to Tyler and Lind (1992), three relational concerns with the authority affect procedural justice. They are trust, neutrality and standing.

- Trustworthiness can be measured by rating the manager’s fairness and ethicality. It is concerned that if the manager behaves fairly and considers the need and view of the employee then the manager can be trusted. It involves beliefs about the manager’s intentions,
• Neutrality can be determined in terms of the manager’s unbiased decision making in the use of facts, and

• Standing refers to status recognition that is indicated to employees by a manager who treats them with dignity, politeness and respect for their rights.

Hence, by examining the procedures a manager uses, employees can judge whether they will be treated fairly with regard to the manager’s relational concerns of trust, neutrality and standing.

According to Skarlicki and Folger (1997), the positive consequences of procedural justice include organisational commitment, intent to stay with the organisation, organisational citizenship, trust in supervisor, satisfaction with decisions made, work effort and performance. Hendrix, et al., (1998) suggests that procedural and distributive justice perceptions were associated with increased intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Furthermore, procedural justice perceptions were positively related to perceptions of group work performance. Furthermore, Dipboye and de Pontbraide (1981) found that employees’ reactions to their evaluation systems were positively related to the opportunities they believed they had to express their own viewpoints.

Procedural justice in rewards comprises a number of principles. The consistency principle suggests that allocation procedures should be consistent across people and time, at least over the short term. Related to this, the bias suppression principle prescribes that self-
interest and personal bias be kept out of the reward allocation process. The accuracy principle suggests that the reward allocation decision should be based on accurate and factual information. Salary surveys and other compensation-benchmark information and job evaluations can promote perceptions of accuracy. In the event that pay problems are uncovered, employees would like to see that the system is correctable. As with performance appraisal, the opportunity to appeal a compensation decision can promote procedural justice and pay satisfaction. Furthermore, organisations can offer employees the opportunity to impact the decision process.

As research has extended the original conceptualisations of procedural justice, it has become apparent that perceptions of procedural justice are influenced by factors that go beyond the formal procedures used to resolve disputes or allocate rewards. It has been demonstrated that judgements of procedural justice are influenced by two important factors, namely, the interpersonal treatment people receive from decision makers and the adequacy with which formal decision making procedures are explained (Bies & Moag, 1986).

3.5 INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE

As research expanded the original conceptualisations of procedural justice, it became clear that perceptions of procedural justice are influenced by factors that go beyond the formal procedures used to resolve disputes or allocate rewards (Bies, 1987; Greenberg, 1990b). This was supported by Cropanzano and Randall (1993, p. 165, as cited in
Coetzee, 2004) that “fair allocation of available resources in accordance with established procedures is not all there is to perceptions of organisational justice”.

It has been explained by Bies and Moag (1986) and Tyler and Bies (1989) that judgements of procedural justice are influenced by two important factors, namely, the interpersonal treatment employees receive from decision makers and the adequacy with which formal decision making procedures are explained. Several studies provide evidence that employees consider the nature of their treatment by others as a determinant of fairness. While Bies and Moag (1986) consider interactional justice to be a distinct and intermediate step between the enactment of organisational procedures and the resulting outcome, many theorist on organisational behaviour have not reached consensus on whether interactional justice forms part of procedural justice or whether it should be regarded as a third type of justice.

Bies and Moag (1986) inform that interactional justice describes the employees concerns about the quality of interpersonal treatment they receive during the enactment of organisational procedures. Folger and Cropanzano (1998) consider a decision making process to consists of both the formal structural component represented by Leventhal et al. (1980) six justice rules and the informal interactions between the decision makers and the recipients that represent interactional justice.

Folger and Cropanzo (1998) therefore consider that interactional justice should form part of procedural justice. Bies and Moag (1986) maintain that interactional justice can be
distinguished from procedural because procedures refer to the structural quality of the decision process and interactional justice refers to the social exchange between two parties. Schappe (1995) too is of the opinion that interpersonal elements, rather than the structural attributes of procedures, distinguish interactional from procedural justice judgements.

Studies provide compelling evidence that people consider the nature of theory treatment by others a determinant of fairness. Bies (1986) asked Master of Business Administration students to list the criteria they would use to evaluate the fairness of corporate recruiting procedures. It was established that various expressions of interpersonal treatment such as honest, courtesy, timely feedback and respect for rights were identified along with more formal procedural justice considerations.

In a follow-up study with a group of Master of Business Administration students who were asked to describe instances of fair and unfair treatment they received during the course of employment interviews, the same four elements of interpersonal treatment were again reported (Bies, 1986). Concerns about the quality of interpersonal treatment received were expressed regardless of the outcome of the interview.

The above findings suggest that interpersonal treatment is considered an important aspect of fair treatment of the outcomes resulting from that treatment. Similar conclusions may be drawn from research on citizens’ reactions to their dealings with the police and courts. This study found that perceptions of honesty and ethical appropriateness such as
politeness and respect for rights were perceived as being among the most important
determinants of the fairness of the treatment they received. Similar factors were identified
in Lewicki’s (1989) study of Master of Business Administration students’ assessment of
fairness of their treatment by instructors. Ethical treatment has shown to be a key
determinant of fairness across a wide variety of settings (Barrett-Howard & Tyler, 1986).

3.5.1 INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE DEFINED

Bies and Moag (1986, p. 44) define the term interactional justice “which refers to
people’s sensitivity to the quality of interpersonal treatment they receive during the
enactment of organisational procedures” and identify the following four attributes of
interpersonally fair procedures:

- Truthfulness,
- Respect,
- Propriety of questions, and
- Justification.

Truthfulness, respect and propriety of questions deal with the nature of the
communication while it is occurring. Justification deals with removing the
discontentment following an unfair procedure (Bies & Moag, 1986).
Truthfulness comprises of two components, namely, deception and candidness. Employees dislike being deceived and expect to be treated in a forthright manner. Organisations should therefore provide employees with realistic and accurate information (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Employees expect to be treated politely and respectfully. This means that insults or discourteous behaviour should be avoided under any circumstances (Bies & Moag, 1986).

The propriety of questions refers to two components, namely, questions should not be considered improper by their very nature, and they should not involve prejudicial statements (Bies & Moag, 1986).

The justification attribute comes into play following negative outcomes or unfair treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986). It may be possible to correct an injustice with an adequate justification. Bies and Shapiro (1988) suggests that a sense of anger over injustice can be reduced or eliminated by providing the fairly treated individual with social support such as an explanation or apology.

Interactional justice has come to be seen as consisting of two components. They are interpersonal treatment and informational justice (Greenberg, 1990b). Interpersonal justice focuses on the degree to which employees are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by authority or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining
outcomes. Informational justice focuses on the explanations provided to employees that convey information about why the procedures were used in a certain way, or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion.

Similarly, Greenberg (1996) and Hemingway and Conte (2003) are of the opinion that interpersonal fairness refers to people’s sensitivity to the quality of the interpersonal treatment that they think they receive and the extent to which the decision-maker shows respect for the rights of the parties affected by the decision.

Researchers have focused on the effects of interpersonal (Griffeth, Vecchio & Logan, 1989) and intrapersonal (Huseman, Hatfield & Miles, 1987) moderators of equity reactions. Cross-sectional studies reported that employees were more uncomfortable being overpaid relative to another to whom they were attracted (that is, someone who was attitudinally similar to themselves) than someone to whom they were not attracted. Findings such as these qualify the equity theory.

3.5.2 INTERPERSONAL AND INFORMATIONAL JUSTICE

Interactional justice includes two subtypes, namely, interpersonal and informational fairness (Gilliland & Paddock, 2005; Hemingway & Conte, 2003). According to Colquitt (2001), informational fairness includes providing adequate information and explaining the procedures followed in implementing organisational policies.
Although some researchers have stopped separating procedural and interactional justice, the general perspective is that organisations should see justice in a broader social context. Both formal procedures and the social side of organisational justice are important in predicting work outcomes and understanding organisational behaviour.

Interactional justice can promote a fair compensation system by ensuring that distributive and procedural justice is intact. Communication by the organisations executives can explain the reasons for certain pay differentials (inequities), or the reasons for changes (for example, reductions) in pay rates. This emphasis on communication stands in contrast to conventional policies of pay secrecy (Bowen et al., 1999).

In addition to the theoretical explanations underlying the explanations of the various concepts of organisational justice and descriptions of the various concepts of organisational justice, researchers have also identified a number of employee responses to injustices, factors that influence the degree to which employees feel a need to act on an injustice, factors that influence employees’ choice of action to injustices, handling employees reactions to injustices, justice explanations to explain organisational behaviours, justice principles associated with fair human resource management and interpersonal and individual-level determinants of reactions to inequality.
3.6 EMPLOYEES’ BEHAVIOUR IN RESPONSE TO INJUSTICE

Dailey and Delaney (1992), Siers (2007) and Williams, Pitre and Zainuba (2002) have conducted research to determine the relationships among work attitudes and job withdrawal intentions and behaviours. Bowen et al. (1999) and Hendrix et al. (1998) have shown that the injustice experience is hurtful to employees and harmful to the organisation. Perceived injustice results in affective and behavioural responses. The target of these responses often depends on the perceived source of the injustice. Responses to distributive injustices are directed toward correcting the perceived outcome inequality while responses to interpersonal and informational injustices are focused toward the organisational representative that perpetrated the injustice (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001; Greenberg, 1990b; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). Cognition of this should alert organisations to reduce injustices and prepare written guidelines, procedures and policies to make decisions and engender fairness. Felstiner, Abel and Sarat (1992, as cited in Coetzee, 2004) described the sequence of activities followed by employees when they perceive an injustice as the naming and blaming process.

3.6.1 NAMING

Naming refers to the initial identification of a fair or unfair outcome, procedure or system. Employees regard an action, procedure or system to be unfair only if their attention is drawn to it. One way of perpetrating an injustice with impunity is either to hide it, or direct employees attention away from it (Felstiner et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee,
For example, organisations may maintain strict secrecy about certain matters in order to protect policies from public scrutiny that might stimulate accusations of perceived injustice regarding matters such as pay systems, budget allocations and affirmative action appointments.

The degree of perceived injustice is of importance in determining how an employee will respond to the injustice. According to Folger (1984, cited in Coetzee, 2004), the degree of perceived injustice is determined by employees’ ability to envision alternatives to the unjust condition. One way of limiting employees sense of injustice would therefore include keeping them ignorant of alternatives. According to Coetzee (2005), many action groups have built their business around their ability to help employees identify and label perceived injustices such as discrimination, abuse, exploitation or unfair treatment. Once identified, these groups assist to transform the perceived injustice into a grievance by attributing blame.

3.6.2 BLAMING

Although employees try to resolve problems without knowing their cause, employees usually attempt to determine what or who is to blame for the injustice so that they can focus their effort on the agent of the problem. The process of allocating blame progresses from determining cause to determining responsibility to determining blame. Without knowing who or what caused injustice, employees cannot decide blame (Felstiner et al., cited in Coetzee, 20004).
Injustices can be attributed to three distinct entities, namely, the person, the procedure or the system. An outcome may be considered to be unfair because an unfair decision was made. Similarly, the procedure determining the outcome or the system may have been unfair. It is not always obvious which component is truly responsible for the injustice. According to Crosby (1984), employees tend not to blame the systems for two reasons, namely, firstly because employees do not have sufficient information to question that system, and secondly most employees do not wish to question the system.

Another complication of attributing blame concerns the data employees use to form judgment (Felstiner et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004). A prime role is to determine where employees or their environment are most to blame. In the context of judgments about injustices, established criteria exits for evaluating the fairness of a procedure and a system. Firstly, information about the employee in terms of intelligence, rationality and consistency is used to make judgments about the probability that the employees’ environment is to blame. Secondly, information about the environment is used to determine whether the employee is to blame. When an injustice occurs and the procedures and system seem fair, logic suggests that the actor who produced the injustice is to blame.

Another factor in attributing blame is that employees have strong prior beliefs about likely sources of injustices (Felstiner et al., 1992, as cited in Coetzee, 2004). These prior beliefs vary as a function of social class, cultural background, socioeconomic status and individual personality. If, for example, a black employee believes that the organisation is
not committed to their development and progression, they might not continue with their studies because they do not expect good results to be equitably rewarded.

Sometimes it is not possible to attribute blame because no real injustice has occurred. In such situations, predicting the employee’s allocation of blame is difficult because there are no clear indicators of blame. The more difficult it is to attribute blame, the more hostile, alienated and disaffected an employee may become. According to Sheppard, Lewicki and Minton (1992, as cited in Coetzee, 2004), the above mentioned principles in attributing blame have the following allegations for the organisation:

- The cause if injustice at any level may be diagnostic of potential injustice at other levels,
- If a procedure is fair then an employee is likely to receive the blame,
- Employees will continue to blame that element to which they usually attribute blame,
- Although blame for injustices can be widely shared, it rarely is. Employees tend to concentrate blame in a single, favourite source and
- Employees tend not to blame systems, and if they do, this will happen only after explanations of “employees” and “procedures” have been proven to be inadequate.

Once the target of blame has been determined, an employee must decide how much responsibility and blame to attribute to that target. According to Sheppard (1983), it is suggested that employees base their judgments on three criteria:
• Was the perceived injustice intentional?
• Could the injustice and its consequences have been controlled? and
• Did the employee provide any excuse or justification for his or her actions?

According to Bies (1987), excuses and mitigating circumstances can be used to pre-empt blame for unjust acts. Employees can provide explanations for potentially unfair behaviour or procedures before they occur and mitigate others’ responses to the injustice. Sheppard and Lewicki (1987) provide explanations used by organisations to soften the impact of an injustice to include the following:

• “We didn’t really have any choice.”
• “You would have made the same decision had you been in my shoes.”
• “The policy on appointments is very prescriptive.”
• “The system wasn’t designed to handle problems like this.” and
• “If we look at this problem from a different perspective, the decision is completely reasonable.”

Organisations can also provide an apology to justify injustices. An apology plays a similar role to an excuse, but assumes a different form. An apology involves the acceptance of blame, the acknowledgement of wrongdoing, and the implication that the behavioural or procedural elements that caused the problem will not occur again.
3.7 FACTORS INFLUENCING AN EMPLOYEE’S NEED TO ACT ON AN INJUSTICE

A number of factors influence the degree to which employees feel a need to act on an injustice. This is evidenced by the substantial amount of time spent by researchers in investigating the relationships between satisfaction and withdrawal, and between satisfaction and performance (Saal & Knight, 1988).

The two most important factors that influence employees need to act on an injustice are, the impact of the injustice on the perceiver and the level of concern for limiting future injustice.

3.7.1 THE IMPACT OF THE INJUSTICE

According to Coetzee (2004), the need to punish the cause of an injustice is a function of both the perceived magnitude of the injustice and the degree to which employees hold a particular person responsible for creating the injustice. The perceived magnitude of injustice is the function of the discrepancy from the relevant standards of fairness held for behaviour in that situation, and the level of discrepancy from the best envisioned alternative to the current situation. For example, if a manager uses his or her influence to ensure that a family member receives a promotion while employees are not informed about the vacancy or afforded the opportunity to apply, unfairly treated employees will act on the injustice because:
• A gross injustice has occurred (magnitude),
• The manager can be held responsible for the injustice (person responsible), and
• There is clear deviation from procedures (discrepancy for standards).

3.7.2 LIMITING FUTURE INJUSTICES

Coetzee (2004) informs that the second factor driving the need to respond is a function of the perceived probability that the injustice will persist into the future if left unattended. The decision to respond depends on the probability that a person will be able to bring about changes.

Employees can pursue a number of alternative courses of action to deal with the injustice. Sheppard et al., (1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004) are of the opinion that employees deal with injustices in four ways. Firstly, employees live with the injustice and continue as if nothing has happened. Secondly, employees can change their behaviour to remove the injustice. Thirdly, employees can rationalise the injustice by renaming, removing or defining it and fourthly employees can decide to resign or request a transfer to avoid confronting continued injustice.

Rusbult, Zembrodt and Gunn (1982, cited in Coetzee, 2004) recommend a two-dimensional model of behavioural responses to dissatisfaction. They are of the opinion that behaviour can be located along a dimension of positive to negative and active to
passive. Based on these two dimensions four quadrants of behaviour are identified as demonstrated in Figure 3.2.

Hirschman (1970) suggests “voice” as an alternative response to injustice. He argues that a primary factor determining whether exit or “voice” is chosen are the employees degree of loyalty to the organisation. He explains that loyal employees either rationalise and cope with the injustice, or attempt to change the organisation and remove the injustice.

Knowledge of the determinants of the responses to injustices is necessary if managers are to develop functioning organisations. Successful organisations are interested in not only minimising the number of incidents of perceived injustice, but also to create the
mechanisms to direct the perceived injustices into channels that will effectively manage and deal with the responses injustices engenders (Rusbult et al., 1982, cited in Coetzee, 2004).

With reference to Figure 3.2, organisations will benefit from employees who deal with injustices actively and positively. This will enable the organisation to review its practices and prevent future problems. Furthermore, by affording employees the opportunity to raise their concerns, by responding to their inputs and by providing them with explanations and feedback, the value of employees is recognised. This may lead to committed and loyal employees. Conversely, employees who respond to perceived injustices passively and negatively are harmful to the organisation. They respond to their dissatisfaction by engaging in withdrawal behaviour and make no attempt to contribute to the success of the organization (Coetzee, 2004).

3.8 FACTORS INFLUENCING THE CHOICE OF ACTION TO INJUSTICES

According to Coetzee (2004), when employees experience an injustice and have to choose what to do, they base their decision on the cost and the benefits of a response. The cost of a response could include the creation of conflict, victimisation, resentment, loss of reputation, emotional costs of action, lost opportunities, a sense of failure and strained interpersonal relationships. The benefits of a response could include the system, procedures and practices or a decision being reversed. An employee will choose the alternative that maximises the value of the action. According to Sheppard et al. (1992,
cited in Coetzee, 2004), several aspects of the employee and the situation have an influence on the probable success of each course of action taken by the employee. They are:

- The degree to which an employee feels that he or she has control over the factors necessary to take effective action,
- The degree to which an employee believes his or her personality and values are consistent with a particular course of action,
- The degree to which a clear route for action is available and visible, and
- The degree to which others agree with and support the employee’s opinion about the existence of an injustice and how to proceed.

3.8.1 LEVEL OF PERCEIVED CONTROL

The degree to which employees will respond is related to the level to which employees feel that they have control over the cause of the injustice. According to Sheppard et al. (1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004), perceived lack of control comes from three main sources. Firstly, it is related to the employees’ general sense of perceived efficacy. Some employees feel that they can effect or get things done more than others. Secondly, perceived control is related to real and perceived power. If employees think that they do not have the resources, information, status or support that is necessary to influence the cause of an injustice, they will not act to rectify the injustice. Thirdly, the perceived
control is related to the degree to which an employees feel that they understand the cause of the injustice (Sheppard et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004).

3.8.2 THE PREDISPOSITION OF THE UNFAIRLY TREATED EMPLOYEE

The likelihood of an employee actively responding to an injustice is also affected by the qualities of the unfairly treated employee. Employees who feel that they are competent are more likely to act than those who feel that they are incompetent. Individual differences in the tendency to approach or avoid a situation is also influences an employee’s degree of active coping behaviour. Employees who have an approach orientation actively strive to cope with their problem. Those with an avoidance orientation actively strive to deny it and denigrate themselves. Furthermore, past feelings of injustice can accumulate to influence an employee’s current action. Employees who have experienced persistent injustices from a particular source will be more likely to act on that injustice (Sheppard et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004).

3.8.3 CLEAR ROUTE FOR ACTION

One reason for employees not acting on an injustice is that there are no obvious way to respond. For example, the increasing number of complaints and grievances lodged during the past few years. Grievance procedures provide employees with information and the means to address any injustices. They are therefore more likely to act on an injustice (Sheppard et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004).
3.8.4 SHARED PERCEPTIONS WITH OTHERS

Because perceptions of justice are not an objective reality, but a social judgement, employees are likely to seek information of their opinion before deciding on a course of action. When employees discover that other employees disagree with their opinion, they will become less certain about the judgment and less likely to act on it (Sheppard et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004).

3.9 HANDLING EMPLOYEES REACTIONS TO INJUSTICES

According to Coetzee (2004), employees who experience an injustice are likely to act irrationally and emotionally when no avenue exists for reducing the injustice or when the chosen action has not solved the injustice, or when feelings from the existing injustice are managed without taking the future into consideration and when the unfairly treated employee is too angry to react rationally. Organisations can do many things to channel reactions to injustice into forms that are less emotion driven and easier for the organisation to manage. Organisations should consider the following options to manage employees’ feelings about perceived injustices.

3.9.1 ELIMINATE GROSS INJUSTICES

Organisations should avoid engaging in gross injustices. Although it is impossible to eliminate all forms of injustices, and there are many criteria for determining justice,
injustices that do exist should be reasonable in scale (Sheppard et al., 1992 cited in Coetzee, 2004).

3.9.2 PROVIDE ACCESSIBLE AND EFFECTIVE MECHANISMS FOR RESPONSES TO INJUSTICES

Providing a controlled, accessible, responsive, non-retributive means of allowing employees to vent their ill-will and receive some reasonable response from the organisation can serve to avoid more harmful emotional responses and reduce the perceived need for further action. A mechanism that organisations can use to assure procedural fairness is to afford employees the opportunity to be heard in the organisation. This opportunity for employees to express feelings and opinions is known as “voice” (Sheppard et al., 1992, cited in Coetzee, 2004).

3.9.3 ALLOW EMPLOYEE “VOICE”

According to Sheppard et al. (1992 cited in Coetzee, 2004), “voice” serves two critical roles in assuring procedural fairness. It serves a preventative role and a remedial role. Preventative “voice” is the process whereby organisations create mechanisms that permit employees to express their views about policies, procedures or key decisions in organisational governance and management. By providing opportunities for input by those influenced by a decision, the organisation will likely be seen as more fair. Remedial
voice mechanisms afford employees the opportunity to express concerns about a decision that has already been made. This form of “voice” consists of efforts by employees to question organisational practices for the purpose of gaining more information about them, challenging them or attempting to change them.

Remedial “voice” serves a number of functions. Its primary function is to reduce the level of dissatisfaction and distress in the employee experiencing an injustice. It also provides diagnostic feedback to the organisation by indicating that some policy or practice is not working. By identifying and notifying management of injustices, it enables the organisation to correct it and make changes as necessary. In addition, “voice” creates the opportunity for a new level of knowledge and understanding about the areas in which problems may be encountered in the future. This information enables the manager to design and implement future policies and practices so that justice concerns will not be raised. Coetzee (2004) posits that the fair treatment of employees is important for the following reasons:

- Improve performance effectiveness,
- To enhance the sense of organisational commitment, and
- To sustain individual dignity and humanness.

Closely related to these three reasons are the functions of “voice” systems which include the following:
• Assuring employees’ fair treatment,
• Providing a context in which unfair treatment can be appealed,
• Improving the organisation’s effectiveness, and
• Sustaining employee loyalty and commitment.

The first two functions meet the dignity and humaneness goal, the third function meet the performance effectiveness goal and the fourth function meet the commitment goal. It can be concluded that a “voice” system has a direct influence on the perceived fairness of an organization (Coetzee, 2004).

3.10 ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE EXPLANATIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOURS

An important benefit of organisational justice conceptualisations is that they may be used to explain a wide variety of organisational behaviours. Three areas in which researchers have been most active in applying justice-based explanations to organisational phenomena are, managerial dispute-resolution, survivors’ reactions to retrenchments, and sex differences in the equity-pay satisfaction relationship.

3.10.1 MANAGERIAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Although interest in procedural justice developed out of concern over third party dispute resolution in legal settings, the dispute resolution processes followed in organisational
settings are likely to be different than those used in courts (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Thibault & Walker, 1975). Unlike judges, managers follow no prescribed guidelines, they are often involved in a dispute and mangers usually have an ongoing relationship with the disputing parties (Kolb, 1986). According to Sheppard (1983), it has been found that managers tend to resolve disputes differently than judges. They tend to use fewer threats to encourage resolution (Sheppard, 1983). They may advise parties, encourage collaborative problem solving, or change the reporting relationships between the parties as to avoid conflict (Kolb, 1986).

3.10.2 SURVIVORS’ REACTIONS TO RETRENCHMENTS

When employees are retrenched, survivors are in a good position to judge the fairness of the retrenchments, both distributively (that is who is retrenched) and procedurally (that is how the retrenchment decisions was made).

Participants in one laboratory experiment witnessed one of their co-workers being retrenched for no justifiable reason and without receiving any compensation for the work performed to that point. Relative to their retrenched colleagues, the survivers were hypothesised to feel overpaid. Consistent with the equity theory predictions, the survivors reported feeling guiltier and worked harder when no retrenchments occurred, (that is when they were overpaid, as opposed to equitably paid (Brockner & Greenberg, 1989).
Since, it has been found that it is not the retrenchment, but the injustice it may create that influences. Brockner, Grover, Reed, DeWitt and O’Malley (1987) found that the act of compensating victims for their work before they were retrenched effectively eliminated feelings of overpayment inequity, thus resulting in no differences in the reactions of the survivours.

3.10.3 GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE EQUITY-PAY SATISFACTION RELATIONSHIP

Berkowitz, Fraser, Treasure and Cochran (1978) established that the perceived fairness of pay is strongly related to pay satisfaction. It was found in a study of pay perceptions and satisfaction among a random sample of employed men, that the more strongly they believed their pay was fair, the more satisfied they were with their earnings. Pay equity was a stronger predictor of pay satisfaction than was the magnitude of the material benefits received. The idea that the perceived fairness of one’s pay is a better predictor of pay satisfaction than the absolute amount of pay received is in keeping with evidence highlighting that the concepts of pay fairness and pay satisfaction are strongly related (Scarpello & Jones, 1996).

These findings are complicated by additional research showing that gender differences moderate the pay-equity-satisfaction relationship (Greenberg & McCarty, 1990). Specifically, although both sexes tend to be dissatisfied with inequitable pay, it has been found that women tend to be less dissatisfied (that is more accepting of inequitable pay)
than men (Brockner & Adsit, 1986). This is consistent with findings that people tend to believe that women are less deserving than men performing the same jobs (Jackson & Grabski, 1986).

Many aspects of the gender-based gap are amenable to analysis from an organisational justice perspective (Greenberg & McCarty, 1990). Particular insight may be derived from the focus on the choice of a comparison standard highlighted by the concept of relative deprivation (Crosby, 1984). This concept recognises that feelings of satisfaction are likely to depend on the choice of referent comparison. The concept of relative deprivation has been used to explain the high levels of job and pay satisfaction among females who are paid less than men for doing the same work (Steel & Lovrich, 1987).

In a study where the levels of job satisfaction expressed by male and females matched with respect to occupational levels it was found that women were paid less than men holding jobs of equal prestige, but that they felt no personal deprivation with the pay they received (Crosby, 1982).

According to Major and Konar (1984), women expect to be paid less than men. This, because they compare themselves to other women who are also underpaid (Major & Forcy, 1985). Such a selective exposure serves to maintain lower expectations, thereby, explaining the tendency for women not to feel relatively deprived. Part of the explanation premises upon the fact that prevailing social norms tend to serve as referents from which claims of entitlement are made (Willis, 1981). Undervaluing the worth of “women’s
work” has been empirically demonstrated (Major & Forcey, 1985). Such norms dictate socially acceptable behaviour and it is not surprising that women have to accept as fair the lower pay they receive.

3.11 JUSTICE PRINCIPLES ASSOCIATED WITH FAIR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Fairness and justice can be associated with every human resource practice, from recruiting, hiring and training to labour relations, compensating and terminating of employees. According to Bowen et al. (1999), three of the most important human resource management practices in terms of fairness are hiring, performance appraisal and compensation or reward systems.

3.11.1 HIRING

The hiring process represents the first contact the future employee has with an organisation. Initial impressions of the organisation and the way it treats employees are formed during the hiring stage. This concept also applies to organisations and the fairness with which they treat job applicants.

Distributive justice considers two basic principles, that is, the accuracy of evaluations and appropriateness of the hiring decision. Applicants judge whether their skills and abilities were judged accurately by the selection procedures. This evaluation reflects applicants’
self-perceived qualifications. Distributive justice also arises from an evaluation of the hiring decision and whether the most qualified person was hired. With this principle, applicants compare their qualifications with the perceived competition. Successful applicants can also feel that they were unfairly treated by the hiring decision (Bowen et al., 1999).

Procedural justice is determined by four principles:

- Job relatedness identifies the extent to which selection procedures appear job-relevant. Some selection procedures, for example, personality tests composed of abstract preferences and beliefs may appear unrelated to any job, while some selection procedures may seem related to some jobs but not to others, for example, a physical test is related to a fireman’s job, but not a bank teller’s job.
- According to Bowen et al., (1999), applicants also prefer selection procedures that allow an opportunity to perform or to demonstrate their abilities and experiences. A selection process for a customer service centre job that is based solely on a writing test may not provide applicants the opportunity to demonstrate their interpersonal skills.
- Consistency in terms of standardisation of the selection process, as well as the equal treatment for different job applicants provides a greater sense of procedural justice.
- Finally, procedural justice is undermined by the existence of personal biases or the prejudices on the part of the interviewers. To the extent to which these biases are suppressed, procedural justice is enhanced (Bowen et al., 1999).
Interactional justice is associated with communication and interpersonal treatment. The hiring process creates uncertainty and applicants look for information to reduce this uncertainty. Information on the selection process provided in advance will help reduce this uncertainty. Communication is also important after the selection process because applicants want feedback information in a timely manner. Applicants are less likely to accept a job offer as the time lag between interviewing and the extension of an offer increases. Furthermore, along the lines of communication, applicants expect honesty from the recruiting organisation, for example, candidness impresses applicants, while deception violates interactional justice. Applications appreciate the opportunity for two-way communication, for example, they want to be able to ask questions. Interactional justice also involves how applicants were treated. This reflects the need for professionalism and respect in all interactions with the applicant.

3.11.2 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Bowen et al. (1999) have identified specific distributive, procedural and interactional justice principles that foster perceived fairness. Distributive justice has three related principles. Firstly, ratings should meet employees’ expectations. Secondly, outcomes should be based on ratings such as merit increases or disciplinary action and thirdly, they should meet employees’ expectations. If employees know what ratings to expect and outcomes are systematically linked to those ratings, then employees will know what outcomes to expect.
Procedural justice principles include consistent application of standards and soliciting input from employees. Consistency can be achieved through standardisation performance appraisal procedures and formal training of supervisors. Soliciting input from employees is important from the development of the evaluation standards, the information gathering and rating process to providing feedback. Procedural justice principles ensure that the rater is familiar with the employee being evaluated and ensure the rater’s personal biases are suppressed and that it does not enter the evaluation process. In addition to standardising procedures and training of managers, familiarity can be enhanced by having managers regularly observe and keep performance diaries on their employees. Furthermore, the opportunity for reconsideration or the chance to appeal an evaluation decision is an important procedural justice principle (Bowen et al., 1999).

Interactional justice of performance appraisal describes communication and interpersonal treatment. It is essential that performance standards are communicated to employees and adequate notice is given of the performance appraisal process. This suggests that it is important for employees to know how and when they will be evaluated. Similarly, timely feedback is critical to the appraisal process.

3.12 JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

Pillai, Williams and Tan, (2001) referred to organisational justice as universal across cultures, but that it may be manifested in different ways. For example, equity stands out
as a principle that is cherished in capitalist systems and is based on enlightened individual self-interest. Equality, on the other hand may be the norm in socialist systems that are designed to minimise injustices of industrial capitalism (Pepitone & L’ Armand, 1997).

Job satisfaction reflects the response to the job or certain aspects of it. As such, day-to-day events in the workplace may affect job satisfaction. However, such transitory events should not cause employees to re-evaluate their jobs and relationship with the organisation (Pillai et al., 2001).

Researchers have devoted considerable time and attention to the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice. The reason for this focus is related primarily to the influence that these attitudes have on individual and organisational outcomes. Both job satisfaction and organisational justice have been shown to be positively related to personal and organisational performance (Mc Farlin & Sweeny, 1992). Distributive injustice and procedural injustice are positively related to job dissatisfaction (Dailey & Delaney, 1992). Strong correlations were found between interactional justice and job satisfaction (Veeran & Katz, 2002). Research has shown that if employees have a perception of unfair interpersonal treatment they may react with moral outrage to the extent that they may engage in sabotage or theft (Bies, 1987).

The vast majority of research investigating this relationship points rather overwhelmingly to a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice (Colquitt & Colon, 2001; Moorman, 1991). While research generally supports a positive association between organisation justice components and job satisfaction, the casual ordering
between the dimensions of organisational justice and job satisfaction variables remains both controversial and contradictory. The following models have to a greater or lesser extent received empirical support.

### 3.12.1 PERSONAL OUTCOMES MODEL

According to the personal outcomes model, distributive justice is the key antecedent regarding workplace attitudes such as job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). This model assumes that employees focus upon distributive justice fairness to maximise their personal outcomes because they believe that fair contributions will result in favourable distributions. Employees may desire fair procedures, but only because they expect fair procedures to produce fair distributions (Thibault & Walker, 1975). Therefore, according to this model, procedural justice will have little or no effect on job satisfaction when controlling for distributive justice, but distributive justice will be a consistently significant predictor of job satisfaction.

### 3.12.2 GROUP–VALUE MODEL

In contrast to the personal outcomes model, the group value model predicts that procedural justice will be a consistently important antecedent of job satisfaction and that these effects will be independent of distributive justice. Since, the group-value model asserts that employees value fair procedures for the identity-relevant information that such procedures provide (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992).
Drawing from the social identity theory, Lind and Tyler (1988) argue that individuals gain a portion of their self-esteem from knowledge that they are valued members of valued groups. Specifically, procedurally fair treatment by group authorities conveys respect which increase self esteem. Furthermore, because employees see authorities as reflective of general norms and values of the group, they gain self-esteem from belonging to a group whose authorities practice procedural justice (Tyler 1987a). Thus, the group value-model suggests that employees are concerned about fair procedures above and beyond the instrumental effects that fair procedures have on their outcomes.

The psychological contract model extends the group value approach to suggest that the relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction may not be as straightforward as some researchers propose. The effects of procedural and distributive justice on work attitudes may depend upon the relationships employees have with their organisations (Clay-Warner et al., 2005).

Interpersonal justice is acknowledged as a social determinant of fairness perceptions in the group theory approach (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The contention is that employees’ value their membership of a social group since such membership is psychologically rewarding. According to Tyler (1989), employees are concerned about their long-term social relationships with authorities and the organisation. It is further postulated that individuals are concerned with three specific interpersonal issues namely, evidence about their social standing, the neutrality of decision-making and trust in the third party (Tyler, 1989). The
group-value theory argues that inclusion in decision making is valued by employees because they expect organisations to use neutral decision making procedures enacted by trustworthy authorities to enact fair procedures and to treat them with dignity, respect and politeness so that they can benefit fairly from the membership of the organisation and have their suggestions acknowledged.

It is evident from the literature that organisational justice perceptions are crucial in shaping the employee’s experience of the workplace.

3.13 CONCLUSION

Both the extent and the quality of the link between the organisation and the employee are of central importance to organisational outcomes (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). From the perspective of the employee, Hendrix et al. (1998) found that positive procedural and distributive justice perceptions were associated with increased intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work group performance. Furthermore, organisational justice is likely to increase employees’ perceived obligations to the employer, affect their attitudes and their behaviours (Rousseau, 1989). From the perspective of the organisation, the results of a meta-analytical review of one hundred and eighty three justice studies illustrate the overall and unique relationships among distributive, procedural and interactional justice on several organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, evaluation of authority, organisational citizenship behaviour, withdrawal and performance (Colquitt & Conlon, 2001).
It is probably the organisation itself that stands to benefit most of having a satisfied workforce. Organisations need to avoid the excessive costs associated with high rates of absenteeism, turnover and theft as a result of employees’ perceptions of organisational injustices (Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). One way to avoid such behaviour is to increase organisational justice which will enhance employees’ job satisfaction.

Furthermore, although research has produced mixed results on which dimension of organisational justice impacts job satisfaction, it nevertheless appears as though the correlation between job satisfaction and different dimensions of organisational justice does exist (Schappe, 1998; Veeran & Katz, 2002). If this is indeed the case, it may be said that no organisation can afford to ignore the impact of organisational justice on job satisfaction on its workforce.

In sum, therefore, it is necessary that the concepts involved in organisational justice be understood so as to optimise the benefits for all parties concerned.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter presents an outline of the research methodology employed in the investigation of the proposed problem.

The section first addresses the selection of the sample, including the manner in which the respondents were selected and the rationale for the approach followed. Thereafter, a detailed exposition of the measuring instruments used in the study is provided. A comprehensive discussion of the statistical methods employed in the analysis of the data is also included. The chapter concludes with the delineation of the research hypotheses.

4.2 SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

Welman, Kruger and Mitchel (2005, p. 52) define a population as “the study object and consists of individuals, groups, organisations, human products and events, or the conditions to which they are exposed.” According to Cooper and Schindler (2003, p. 179), “the basic idea of sampling is by selecting some elements in a population, we may draw conclusions about the entire population.” In order for the research results to be generalisable, a sample which is representative of the population is selected. Thus, the
study of the sample and understanding of its properties or characteristics would make it possible for the researcher to generalise such properties or characteristics to the population elements. Furthermore, Bless and Higson-Smith (1995, p. 86) recognise the main advantages of sampling as:

- Gathering data on a sample is less time-consuming,
- It is less costly. In addition to this, populations to be studied may be spread over a large geographical area, resulting in high travel expenses, and
- Sampling is a practical way of collecting data when the population is extremely large, which might make a study of all its elements impossible.

For the purposes of the present study, the population comprised of academics at agricultural colleges in South Africa who were available to participate. The size of the total population was approximately one hundred and thirty five (135) academic employees.

In drawing the sample, it was decided to make use of a non-probability sampling design in the form of convenience sampling. Non-probability sampling implies that the elements in the population have no probabilities attached to their being selected as sample objects (Sekaran, 2003; Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999; Welman et.al., 2005). Convenience sampling, as a form of non-probability sampling, involves taking all cases on hand until the sample reaches the desired size (Bless et al., 1995). The design was primarily selected due to the advantages attached to its use. Convenience sampling is relatively
uncomplicated, inexpensive, not time consuming and is free of the statistical complexity inherent in probability sampling methods (Bailey, 1987; Huysamen, 1994; Sekaran, 2000; Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999).

In deciding on the size of the sample to be drawn, the following issues were borne in mind. Firstly, the sample had to be representative of the population of interest, and had to be large enough to allow for precision, confidence and generalisability in the research findings. Furthermore, since multivariate data analysis, in the form of multiple regression analysis was to be implemented in the study, it was necessary that the sample be several times as large as the number of variables involved (Sekaran, 2003). It was further identified by Sekaran (2000) that sample sizes of between thirty and five hundred subjects are appropriate for most research.

4.3 PROCEDURE

Permission was obtained from the Chairperson of the Association of Principals for Agricultural Colleges (APAC) in South Africa. In addition, the principal at the respective colleges’ permission was acquired and they assisted with the handing out and collection of the questionnaires, thereby ensuring appropriate return rates. Questionnaires were distributed to the total population of approximately one hundred and thirty five (135). Participants were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality from the outset, as they did not need to provide their names or identification numbers. Subjects were selected
irrespective of gender, age, years of service, marital status, position/job level, educational level and salary level. Each respondent returned the completed questionnaire via mail to the researcher.

Of the total of one hundred and thirty five (135) academics that were targeted, seventy (70) questionnaires were returned. Consequently, a response rate of fifty two percent (52%) may be considered to be high since the response rate generally obtained with the use of mail questionnaires is almost always low. In fact, Sekaran (2000) states that a response rate of thirty percent (30%) may be regarded as being acceptable.

The eventual convenience sample of seventy (70) subjects meets the previously stated requirements. That is, the sample size is between thirty and five hundred, is large enough to be representative of the population of one hundred and thirty five employees, and is several times larger than the number of variables included in the study. The sample was therefore considered suitable for the purposes of the present research investigation.

4.4 DATA COLLECTION

In order to test the research hypotheses, data with respect to each variable in the hypotheses had to be obtained. For this purpose three self-administered questionnaires were handed-out.
Once permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Chairperson of APAC the researcher contacted each of the principals telephonically at the respective colleges in the selected sample, explaining the purpose of the research, and to request permission to administer the survey to their academic employees. This was followed with a letter to confirm the purpose of the study. The principals agreed, and three self administered questionnaires were handed-out and subsequently administered to the respondents. Cover letters were affixed to the questionnaires which fully explained the nature of the study, as well as assuring respondents of the confidentiality of any information provided. In addition, respondents were advised with detailed instructions as to how questionnaires were to be completed and returned. The rationale behind providing clear instructions and assuring confidentiality of information is based on the fact that this significantly reduces the likelihood of obtaining biased responses (Sekaran, 2003).

Mailed questionnaires were considered to be the most efficient means of data collection since the sample was widely dispersed geographically. Such a procedure deemed suitable since the information was to be obtained simply through the use of structured questions. Collecting the data in this way also has a number of advantages. It allows for the convenient analysis of the obtained data, is relatively inexpensive and is generally less time consuming (Sekaran, 2003).

The measuring instruments used in this study are discussed in the sections that follow.
4.4.1 BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

For the purposes of the study, data had to be obtained from each respondent with regards to the seven demographic variables of gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level with the organisation in question. This data was collected with the aid of a self-administered biographical questionnaire.

4.4.2 JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Job satisfaction is mostly assessed by asking people how they feel about their jobs. This either is administered through a questionnaire or an interview. There are a few measures of satisfaction that are widely used in research, although the Job Satisfaction Survey was utilised in the current research. This will be briefly discussed.

4.4.2.1 JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (JDI)

The most popular measure of job satisfaction is the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). It measures five dimensions of job satisfaction, namely, pay, work, promotion, supervision and co-workers. According to Cooper and Locke (2000, p. 172), “the JDI is reliable and has an impressive array of validation evidence behind it.”
4.4.2.2 MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (MSQ)

Another popular job satisfaction scale is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Spector, 1997, 2000). Robbins (2005) informs that the MSQ has the advantage of versatility in that long and short forms are available. In addition, it makes provision for faceted as well as overall measures. The long form contains 100 items and the short form contains 20 items measuring different facets of job satisfaction (Spector, 1997).

4.4.2.3 JOB DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY (JDS)

The Job Diagnostic Survey was developed to study the effects of job characteristics on people (Hackman & Oldham, 1975 quoted by Spector, 1997; 2000). The JDS includes several areas of job satisfaction, such as growth, pay, security, social, supervisor as well as global satisfaction.

4.4.2.4. JOB-IN-GENERAL SCALE (JIG)

The Job-In General scale has been designed to measure overall job satisfaction rather than facets. According to Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson & Paul (1989), overall job satisfaction is not the sum of individual facets, it should rather be managed by using a general scale like the JIG. Cooper and Locke (2000, p. 172) further asserts that “faceted and global measures do not measure the same construct.”
4.4.2.5 JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS)

The Job Satisfaction Survey is another common measure of job satisfaction and it was used in the present study to collect data on the job satisfaction levels of participants. The Job Satisfaction Survey has been tested for reliability and validity across different studies (Spector, 1997). It assesses nine facets of job satisfaction as well as overall satisfaction. The nine facets are listed in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay</td>
<td>Satisfaction with pay and pay raises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion</td>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervision</td>
<td>Satisfaction with immediate supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fringe benefits</td>
<td>Satisfaction with fringe benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contingent rewards</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards (not necessarily monetary) for good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Operating conditions</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Co-Workers</td>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nature of work</td>
<td>Satisfaction with type of work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communication</td>
<td>Satisfaction with communication within the organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Facets of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Source: Spector, 1997, p. 8)
4.4.2.5.1 THE NATURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Each of the nine facets of the Job Satisfaction Survey is scored by combining responses to the four items, which amounts to a total number of 36 items. Some of the items need to be reversed scored. Table 4.2 identifies which items go into which facet, the “r” indicating which items need to be reverse-scored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>Item number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1, 10r, 19r, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2r, 11, 20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3, 12r, 21r, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>4r, 13, 22, 29r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>5, 14r, 23r, 32r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>6r, 15, 24r, 31r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>7, 16r, 25, 34r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>8r, 17, 27, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9, 18r, 26r, 36r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Subscale contents for the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Source: Spector, 1997, p. 9)

The Job Satisfaction Survey uses a Likert-type scale with six response alternatives for each item, ranging from “Disagree very much” (weighted 1) to “Agree very much” (weighted 6). To reverse the scoring, the items indicated with “r” above are renumbered
from 6 to 1 rather than 1 to 6 (Spector, 1997). Each of the nine facets or subscales can produce a separate facet score and the total of all items produces a total score.

4.4.2.5.2 RELIABILITY OF THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Reliability describes the consistency of measures (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995). Thus, an instrument which produces different scores every time it is used has low reliability. According to Spector (1997), there are two types of reliability estimates that are important when evaluating a scale. This, Spector (1997) refers to as internal consistency and test-retest reliability which is explained below.

4.4.2.5.2.1 INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITY

Internal consistency implies to whether items are consistent across different constructs. (Cresswell, 2003; Welman et al., 2005). It considers how well items of a scale relate to one another. The Job Satisfaction Survey has been tested for internal consistency reliability and coefficient alphas ranging from .60 for the co-worker subscales to .91 for the total scale have been reported. According to Spector (1997, p.12), “the widely accepted minimum standard for internal consistency is .70.”
4.4.2.5.2 TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY

Test –retest reliability refers to “the stability of a scale over time” (Spector, 1997, p.12). This denotes that if the same test is being administered on a second occasions to the same representative sample from the population, over a period of time, and it yields the same results, it is considered to have test-retest reliability. The Job Satisfaction Survey has yielded test-retest reliability ranging from .37 to .74 (Spector, 1997).

4.4.2.5.3 VALIDITY OF THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Validity refers to whether the measuring instrument measures what it is supposed to (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995; Welman et al., 2005), or whether the measure reflects the phenomenon the researcher claims to be investigating. Validity can be assessed in different ways: content validity, construct validity and criterion-related validity (Cresswell, 2003).

4.4.2.5.3.1 CONTENT VALIDITY

Content validity of a measuring instrument represents the extent to which the items measure the content they were intended to measure (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). It should therefore provide adequate coverage of the questions guiding the research. The Job Satisfaction Survey measures job satisfaction, using different subscales, it therefore is considered to have content validity.
4.4.2.5.3.2 CRITERION–RELATED VALIDITY

Criterion-related validity represents the extent to which measures can successfully predict an outcome and how well they correlate with other instruments (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). Spector (1997, p. 12), reports that “the JSS subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers and the nature of work correlate well with corresponding subscales of the JDI.” These correlations ranged from .61 for co-workers to .80 for supervision.

4.4.2.5.4 RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION OF THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

The rationale for the inclusion of the Job Satisfaction Survey in the present study is based on a number of factors. These include the following:

• The Job Satisfaction Survey was used in the present study because Spector (1985, cited in Fields, 2002) originally developed the Job Satisfaction Survey to originally assess job satisfaction in human service, nonprofit and public organisations.

• Furthermore, the Job Satisfaction Survey has been proven to be a reliable and valid instrument (Spector, 1997). Koeske, Kirk, Koeske and Rauktis (1994, cited in Egan & Kadushan, 2004) in addition indicate that the Job Satisfaction Survey has been examined for construct validity and reliability with good results in previous research.
Since the Job Satisfaction Survey measures different facets of job satisfaction it has been widely referred to in literature.

The scale is intended for specific areas of satisfaction rather than merely global satisfaction. Different areas of job satisfaction must be independently measured if any significant understanding of the construct is to be achieved (Spector, 1997).

The questionnaire uses a shorter form compared to the popular Job Descriptive Index, which consists of 72 items. The items in the Job Satisfaction Survey are fairly easy to understand. The shorter form of the questionnaire and its simplicity were considered appropriate for the present study since the questionnaire could be completed easily and quickly by academics who work under tremendous work pressure and time constraints.

**4.4.3 ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE**

In most situations when employees perceive a fair outcome, they are likely to assume that fair procedures led to that outcome. However, when employees perceive a lack of congruence between perceived procedural and distributive justice, they tend to experience a cognitive inconsistency that tends to produce some sort of stress. However, the correlation between measures of distributive and procedural justice is often large enough to question whether they are distinct constructs. Generally, distributive and procedural justice are measured separately because there are good theoretical reasons to evaluate them on separate grounds and because exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses show they are empirically distinct (Sweeny & McFarlin, 1997). There are
numerous alternative views about critical components of procedural justice. There is a variety in alternative measures for procedural justice and process fairness. One frequently included dimension is voice. Voice allows employees affected by the decision to present information relevant to it. The extent to which a decision maker acknowledges and shows consideration of employees is part of employees’ perception to fairness. Therefore, both the presence of procedures and the quality and nature of the interactions between employees and supervisors and employees and managers are often incorporated into measures of procedural justice. That is, measures of procedural justice will often include a separate measure of voice referred to as interactive justice (Fields, 2002).

There are several alternative approaches to assessing employees’ perceptions of distributive, procedural and interactional justice from an overall organisational viewpoint. A few widely used measures of organisational justice used in research that will be briefly discussed. Specific attention will be given to Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) questionnaire as it was used to gather data for the present study.

4.4.3.1 SWEENY AND MCFARLIN’S (1997) DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

The procedural subscale uses thirteen items to assess the fairness of procedures within an organisation. These items include procedures relevant to assessing and communicating performance feedback, solving work-related problems and promotion success. Eleven items describe employee perceptions of an organisation’s fairness in distributing rewards
such as pay raises, promotions, performance ratings and general recognition. According to Fields (2002), this questionnaire yields reliability insofar as the coefficient alpha for procedural justice was .84 and the alpha for distributive justice was .81. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that distributive and procedural justice were empirically distinct. In addition, in terms of validity that distributive justice and procedural justice correlated positively with employee pay level, intention to stay in a job, job satisfaction, supervisor’s evaluations or the employee and organisational commitment. Procedural justice also related positively with tenure and being male (Sweeny & McFarlin, 1997).

4.4.3.2 JOY AND WITT’S (1992) DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

The distributive and procedural justice questionnaire developed by Joy and Witt (1992) can be regarded as parsimonious in that it uses only three items to assess distributive and procedural justice. According to Fields (2002), the procedural measure focuses on the extent to which employees believe they have a voice in negotiating their job assignment, job duties and performance appraisal results. The distributive justice measure focuses on the fairness in the decisions made by the organisation concerning job assignments, job duties and performance appraisals.
4.4.3.3 PARKER, BALTES AND CHRISTIANSEN’S (1997) DISTRIBUTIVE AND PROCEDURAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure uses three items to assess employee perceptions of fairness in the allocation of rewards and recognition as an indicator of distributive justice. Four items are used to assess employee perceptions of the extent to which employees have input and involvement in decisions as an indicator of the “voice” and “choice” aspects of procedural justice. The measure assesses judgments about the organisation in general, rather than policies or practices in a specific area (Parker, Baltes & Christensen, 1997).

4.4.3.4 PRICE AND MUELLER’S (1986) DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Another popular organisational justice scale is the Price and Mueller (1986) organisational justice scale. The items in this questionnaire inquire from workers to indicate the extent to which they have been fairly rewarded in view of their responsibilities, experience, job stress, effort and performance (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Rewards in the index are broadly defined with money, praise and recognition, for example, (Fields, 2002, p. 173) “To what extent are you fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities that you have?”. Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = rewards are not distributed at all fairly and 5 = rewards are very fairly distributed.
4.4.3.5 MCFARLIN AND SWEENY’S (1992) PROCEDURAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure uses similar items and response format to the distributive justice index to describe employee perceptions of procedural justice. Procedural justice is an assessment of the fairness of the means used to determine employee rewards. The measure asks employees about the fairness of procedures used to communicate performance feedback, determine pay raises, evaluate performance, determine who is promoted (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992) Aquino, Lewis and Bradfield (1999) added another two items asking about the fairness of procedures used to terminate or discipline employees and the fairness of procedures used to express grievances.

4.4.3.6 MOORMAN’S (1991) PROCEDURAL AND INTERACTIVE JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure assesses the extent to which formal procedures are established that ensure fairness and the nature of the interactions that supervisors and managers have with employees in implementing procedures (Fields, 2002). The formal procedures items describe the degree to which fair procedures are established in the organisation and the interactive items describe the perceptions that the interactions that accompanied an organisation’s formal procedures are fair and considerate (Moorman, 1991). The Coefficient alpha for the formal procedures subscale was .94, for the interactive justice subscale it ranged from .93 to .94 (Moorman, 1991). The coefficient alpha for the
combined procedural and interactive justice measure ranged from .95 to .96 (Skarlicki & Latham, 1996).

4.4.3.7 FOLGER AND KONOFSKY’S (1989) PROCEDURAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure contains twenty three items designed to describe procedural justice in performance appraisals and pay rise decisions, eleven items describe the effectiveness of the feedback an employee receives, six items describes the extent of planning that went into a performance appraisal and pay rise decision, five items describe the extent to which an employee had recourse after a pay rise decision and one item describes the degree to which a supervisor observed the employee’s performance (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

4.4.3.8 DALY AND GEYER’S (1994) PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS, EMPLOYEE VOICE AND JUSTIFICATION

According to Fields (2002), this scale was developed to measure those attributes relating to an organisation’s decision to relocate an employment location. It assesses the extent to which employees were able or invited to express their views and concerns prior to a final decision being made and describe the extent to which management provided adequate justification for the decision.
4.4.3.9 FARH, EARLEY AND LIN’S (1997) ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure was designed to assess employees’ perception about both the formal procedures and informal interactions in an organisation concerning pay decisions. It comprises of a subscale for participation, appeal mechanism and interactive justice. Participation describes the extent formal procedures are present that ensure employees have input into pay and performance appraisal decisions. Appeal mechanism describes the extent to which there are formal appeal procedures available and implementation hereof in the organisation. Interactive justice is based on previous evidence suggesting that actions taken by supervisors and managers as they implement procedures and explain decisions are indicators to employees that procedural justice exists (Fields, 2002).

4.4.3.10 SCARPELLO AND JONES’S (1996) ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure uses fifteen items to describe the fairness of procedures used for pay determination. Six items describe methods used for job evaluation and establishing criteria for pay raises, three items describe pay communication four items describe performance appraisal items and two items describe appeal items.
4.4.3.11 NIEHOFF AND MOORMAN’S 1993 DISTRIBUTIVE, PROCEDURAL AND INTERACTIVE JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE


4.4.3.11.1 THE NATURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE NIEHOFF AND MOORMAN’S (1993) ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

This measure describes organisational justice in three categories, namely, a distributive justice subscale, a procedural justice subscale and an interactive justice subscale (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).
A distributive justice subscale, which comprises of five items, describes the extent to which employees believe that their work outcomes such as rewards and recognition are fair. These outcomes include pay level, work schedule, workload and job responsibilities (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

A procedural justice subscale, which comprises of six items, describes the extent to which formal procedures exist and whether these procedures are implemented in a way that takes employees’ needs into consideration. The formal procedures cover the degree to which job decisions are based on complete and unbiased information and that employees have opportunities to ask questions and challenge decisions (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

An interactive (interactional) justice subscale, which comprises of nine items, consists of the extent to which employees perceive that their needs are taken into account in making job decisions and that employees are provided with adequate explanations when decisions are finalised (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). This scale was based on one used by Moorman (1991).

The entire set of these scales was included in one questionnaire. They all used a unified 7-point Likert scale (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).
4.4.3.11.2 RELIABILITY OF THE NIEHOFF AND MOORMAN’S (1993) ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Interactional justice which measures the degree to which employees felt their needs were considered in and adequate explanations were made for job decisions was based on the one used by Moorman (1991) and had reported reliabilities above .90 for all three dimensions.

The Niehoff and Moorman (1993) measure have a reported coefficient alpha for distributive justice which ranged from .72 to .74 (Aquino et al., 1999; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). The Coefficient alpha for formal procedures was .85 and the alpha for interactive justice was .92. (Aquino et al., 1999; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). A 12-point item measure combining items for formal procedures and interactive justice had a coefficient alpha of .98 (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998). Fernandes and Awamleh’s (2005) study which analysed the impact of organisational justice on self assessed performance and job satisfaction in an expatriate environment reported reliabilities using this measure as follows: The Distributive justice scale showed a reliability if .78, Procedural justice .87 and Interactional justice .91.
Niehoff and Moorman (1993) reported that formal procedures correlated positively with distributive and interactive justice. Distributive justice and interactive justice correlated positively with the five organisational citizenship behaviours namely: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Furthermore, that procedural justice and interactive justice related positively with supervisor observations of employees work and interactive justice correlated favourably with formal meetings (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). In Moorman et al.’s (1998) review, procedural justice correlated positively with perceived organisational support, interpersonal helping, personal industry and loyal boosterism for an organisation. Aquino et al., (1999) and Niehoff and Moorman (1993) examined the measures with confirmatory factor analysis and found that distributive, procedural and interactive justices were empirically distinct. Distributive justice also correlated negatively with deviant behaviours toward other employees and employee negative effect (Aquino et al., 1999).
4.4.3.11.4 RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION OF THE NIEHOFF AND MOORMAN’S (1993) ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE

The rationale for the use of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) measure is based on the following factors:

- The rationale for the use of the Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) questionnaire is that it is a reliable and valid instrument for the measurement of the perceptions of organisational justice (Fields, 2002).
- The seven-point Likert type scale was used to assess all three forms of organisational justice relevant to this study. The scale consisted of one dimension measuring perceptions of distributive justice and two dimensions measuring perceptions of procedural justice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).
- Furthermore the measure operationalises the definition of organisational justice employed in this study, making it the logical instrument to use.
- This scale was based one used by Moorman (1991) and had reported reliabilities above .90 for all three dimensions (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

The Biographical Questionnaire, Job Satisfaction Survey and Niehoff and Moorman’s (1993) Organisational Justice Questionnaire consisted of a total of 63 items written in English, which is the language all subjects used to respond in. The questionnaire set is provided in the Appendix.
4.5 STATISTICAL METHODS

For the purposes of testing the research hypotheses, a number of statistical techniques were employed. These included the product moment correlation coefficient, multiple regression analysis, and hierarchical multiple regression analysis. These methods are discussed in the sections that follow.

4.5.1 THE PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

For the purposes of determining whether a statistical significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and organisational justice, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used.

The computation formula for the product moment correlation coefficient is as follows (Zellar & Carmines, 1978, p. 141):

\[
r = \frac{N \sum x y - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}
\]
The product moment correlation coefficient was the appropriate technique for the use in this study since it is an index that is used to detect the linear relationship that exists between two variables (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989; Mason & Bramble, 1989; Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1999; Sekaran 2003). Two important pieces of information can be derived from the coefficient.

The first is the direction of the relationship between variables. A positive coefficient indicates that the two variables vary in the same direction, that is, the higher the scores in the one variable, the higher the scores in the other variable. When a perfect positive correlation exists between the variables, the value of the coefficient is +1.00. A negative coefficient, on the other hand, indicates that the two variables vary in opposite directions. As the one variable increases, so the other decreases. A perfect negative relationship between the variables will, thus, be indicated by a correlation coefficient of -1.00 (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989; Mason & Bramble, 1989).

The second piece of information that can be gained from the Pearson correlation coefficient is the strength of the relationship between the two variables. Value close to zero indicate a weak linear relationship. The strength of the relationship increases as the value of the coefficient \( r \) moves towards either -1.00 or +1.00. If \( r \) is close to +1.00, it indicates a strong, positive linear correlation (Viljoen & Van der Merwe, 2000).
Therefore, the product moment correlation coefficient is suitable for the purposes of the present study because the study attempted to describe the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

4.5.2 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

In determining the extent to which the seven demographic variables of gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level explain the variance in job satisfaction, multiple regression was employed. The same process was followed in determining the extent to which these five variables explain the variance in organisational justice.

Hair, Babin, Money and Samouel (2003, p. 290) state that “regression analysis is perhaps the most widely applied data technique for measuring linear relationships between two or more variables.” Multiple regression, is also known as general linear modeling, is a multivariate statistical technique that is used for studying the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables (Allsion, 1999; Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995).

Hair et al., (1995) inform that the objective of multiple regression analysis is to predict the changes in the dependent variable in response to changes in more that one independent variable. In this way, multiple regression provides a means of objectively analysing the magnitude and direction of each independent variable’s relationship to the
dependent variable. The relative importance of each predictor is determined. In addition to their individual contribution to the variance in the dependent variable, multiple regression also allows for the determination of the collective contribution of the independent variables (Hair et al., 1995).

Sekaran (2003) indicates that multiple regression analysis is specifically designed for separating the effects of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable when the independent variables not only simultaneously influence the dependent variable, but are also intercorrelated with one another. Hence, in determining the degree to which the independent variables explain the variance in the dependent variable, the independent variables are jointly regressed against the dependent variable (Sekaran, 2000).

For the purposes of multiple regression analysis in this investigation, the seven demographic variables of gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level represent the independent variables, while job satisfaction and organisational justice, independently, represented the single dependent variables. The independent variables were, therefore, jointly regressed against the dependent variable.

Multiple regression analysis was suitable for use in this investigation since it provides an indication of the extent to which the variance in a single dependent variable (Job satisfaction and organisational justice) was explained by seven independent variables.
(gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level), which not only influence the independent variable simultaneously, but are also likely to be interrelated with one another.

**4.5.3 HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

In order to investigate the extent to which the facets of job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey, significantly explain the variance in organisational justice, above and beyond that explained by the demographic variables of gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level a hierarchical regression was performed.

The purpose of hierarchical regression analysis is to estimate the extent to which a set of variables significantly add to the variance explained in the dependent variable, above and beyond that explained by another set of variables (Sekaran, 2003). It is for this reason that hierarchical regression represents a useful strategy for controlling variables (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989; Luthans, Baack & Taylor, 1987). According to Keppel and Zedeck (1989), the theoretical model dictates the order in which the variables are entered into the regression equation. Where hierarchical regression is used for the purpose of controlling variables, the logical ordering is to first enter those variables that the researcher wishes to control.
The seven demographic variables (gender, age, years of service, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) have been shown to impact on organisational justice necessitating that they be controlled to gain insight into the influence of job satisfaction on organisational justice. To achieve such control these variables were entered into the regression equation first. Next, with the demographic data entered, the dimension of job satisfaction measured by the J.S.S was entered. These comprised of: satisfaction with pay and pay rises, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, satisfaction with immediate supervisor, satisfaction with fringe benefits, satisfaction with rewards, satisfaction with rules and procedures, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with type of work done, satisfaction with communication within the organisation.

Entering the data in this hierarchical manner makes it possible to determine the unique contribution in variance that the facets of job satisfaction make to organisational justice, above the variance accounted for by the demographic variables. It was for this purpose of gaining this information that hierarchical regression analysis was considered a suitable statistical technique for use in this study.

4.6 ETHICAL ISSUES

As earlier discussed, prior to conducting the research at agricultural colleges, permission was obtained from the chairperson of APAC and principals at the respective agricultural colleges where the research was being undertaken. In an undertaking agreed by the
chairperson of APAC, at which consent for participation was granted, the identification of the agricultural colleges throughout South Africa was obtained. In addition, the principals at the various colleges were also contacted to gain their permission to conduct the research at their colleges. Subjects were informed that their participation was voluntary, that confidentiality would be guaranteed and that the purpose of the questionnaire was to assess the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

4.7 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Following a thorough literature survey, the following hypotheses were developed for testing:

**Hypothesis 1:**
There is no statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2:**
There is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.
Hypothesis 3:

There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary) and organisational justice.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5:

The biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6:

The biographical variables (age, gender, current marital status, educational level, tenure, current position/job level and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in organisational justice.
Hypothesis 7:

The 9 facets of job satisfaction as measured by the job satisfaction survey will significantly explain the variance in organisational justice, above and beyond that explained by the demographic variables.

4.8 CONCLUSION

In summary, the research methodology utilised in the present study was addressed in this chapter. More specifically, the selection of the sample, the measuring instruments used and the rationale for their inclusion, as well as the statistical methods employed in testing the research hypotheses were discussed. Finally, the chapter was concluded with an outline of the research hypotheses that were subjected to statistical testing. The next chapter focuses on the results and findings in the empirical analysis with specific reference to the testing of the hypotheses of the present study.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The current chapter concludes the research investigation by outlining the results obtained in the study and providing a detailed discussion of these results.

The descriptive statistics computed for the study are presented first in an outline of the characteristics of the sample with regards to the variables included in the study. Thereafter, the analyses of the constructs relevant to the study, that is job satisfaction and organisational justice are presented with the aid of inferential statistical procedures. The chapter concludes by providing some suggestions and recommendations that may prove fruitful in future research projects of a similar nature.

The information provided and discussed in the previous chapters will serve as a background against which the contents of this chapter will be presented and interpreted.
5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The descriptive statistics calculated for the sample are provided in the sections that follow. That is, the data pertaining to the variables included in the study, as collected by the three measuring instruments employment, are summarised by means of a graphic representation and the calculation of descriptive measures. In this manner, the properties of the observed data clearly emerge and an overall picture thereof is obtained.

5.2.1. RESULTS OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

This section outlines the descriptive statistics calculated on the basis of the variables included in the biographical questionnaire. The demographic variables that receive attention are:

- Gender,
- Age,
- Years of service/Tenure,
- Current marital status,
- Current position/job level,
- Educational level and
- Salary level.
Descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and percentages are subsequently presented graphically for each of the above-mentioned variables.

5.2.1.1 GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

Figure 5.1 presents a graphical representation of the gender distribution of the selected sample.

![Figure 5.1: Gender distribution of respondents](image-url)
As can be seen from Figure 5.1, the majority of the respondents are male. More specifically, (n=46) or 66% of the subjects are male, while only (n=24), or 34% are female.

The large difference in gender representation may reflect true differences in the population. That is, it is possible that there are a greater number of males in the workforce of the organisation under investigation. However, female subjects may also have been under-represented as a consequence of the sampling designed employed.

The subjects’ responses as regards their age are presented graphically in Figure 5.2.
5.2.1.2 AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

From the frequency distribution presented in Figure 5.2 it may be deduced that a total of 25 of the cases in the sample are between the ages 41 to 50 years of age. It can thus be seen that the majority of the individuals in the sample (36%) fall into the age category 41-50. This is followed by the 51 to 60 year age category into which (n=19) of the
respondents fall, that is 27% of the subjects, while only 4 respondents (6%) were older than 60.

The results thus suggest a relatively old sample of subjects, from which may be deduced that the organisation in question employs an older workforce. However, it has to be borne in mind that the sample was selected in accordance with a non-probability sampling procedure. Consequently, the possibility cannot be excluded that the other age categories are under-represented as a result of selection bias.
5.2.1.3. YEARS OF SERVICE/TENURE OF RESPONDENTS

Figure 5.3: Years of service/Tenure of respondents

Figure 5.3 indicates that 34% have served more than between 6 and 10 years in the organisation in question. Seven (7) respondents have worked for the organisation for fewer than five years, and another nine (9) employees have worked for the organisation
for more than 20 years. Sixteen (16) participants (23%) indicated that they have been
employed in the organisation for between 11 and 15 years.

Given that approximately 90% of the respondents have served in the organisation for a
period longer than 6 years, while only 10% have served less than 5 years, it may be
concluded that the sample represents a relatively tenured group of employees.
In terms of Figure 5.4, the majority of the sample subjects (n=39) or 56% are married, with 20% being single (n=14) and a further 17% (n=12) being divorced. Five respondents (n=7%) were also widowed.
Figure 5.5 indicates that 45% of the sample is employed in Lecturer positions within the organisation, 24% are in senior lecturer positions, 6% are technical support advisors, while 3% were heads of department.
The fact that the majority of the sample subjects fill non-managerial positions probably reflects true differences in the organisation with regards to the distribution of employees on the basis of job level. However, the non-probability sampling method used may also have resulted in a larger number of the questionnaires being completed by non-managerial employees. Therefore, the possibility that some of the other categories have been under-represented as a result of the sampling design used.
Figure 5.6 indicates that 46% (n=32) of the sample have at least an Honours degree, while 30% (n=21) hold Masters qualifications. While 6% of the sample (n=4) hold Doctorate degrees, a further 4% (n=3) hold a 3-year diploma.
Figure 5.7 indicates that 40% (n=28) are on level 8 of the salary scale, while 23% (n=16) are on level 9. A further 8 respondents are on level 10 of the salary scale, and only 3% of the respondents (n=2) are on salary level 12.
5.2.2 TABLE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE

Respondents were required to respond on an itemised rating scale, ranging from a high score of 6 to a low score of 1, to indicate their perceptions regarding the dimensions of the distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

Descriptive statistics in the form of arithmetic means and standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for the respondents, were computed for the Organisational Justice Scale and are presented in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisational Justice</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Organisational Justice Scale

Table 5.1 presents the results of the descriptive analysis of the Organisational Justice Scale. The results reflect that most respondents rated all dimensions of the scale as not being fair (mean = 65.23, s = 3.42), distributive justice was low (mean = 14.43, s = 4.56), procedural justice was perceived to be low (mean = 15.65, s = 4.56) and interactional justice was somewhat higher, although still low (mean = 17.13, s = 2.94).
Table 5.2 indicates that the arithmetic mean for the total job satisfaction of the sample is 93.5 with a standard deviation of 16.2. Based on the fact that an average level of job satisfaction would be represented by a mean of approximately 136.5, it may be concluded that the overall job satisfaction of the sample is relatively average. The standard deviation for the overall level of job satisfaction is also not high, indicating that most respondents are close to the mean on this dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CASES (N)</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Descriptive statistics for the dimensions of job satisfaction

With respect to the dimensions of job satisfaction assessed by the Job Satisfaction Survey, Table 5.2. indicates that the arithmetic means for the pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, communication, and total job satisfaction.
work and communication vary from a mean of 9.3 to 18.9. When measured against the table norms for the Job Satisfaction Survey conducted by Spector (1997), it can be seen that the employees at the organisation where the current research was undertaken, indicated average to below average levels of job satisfaction with the various dimensions assessed by the Job Satisfaction Survey. While the mean values obtained indicated that most employees experienced average to above average satisfaction with communication, nature of work, supervision, coworkers and operating procedures, the remaining dimensions (pay, promotion, benefits and contingent rewards) were experienced as less satisfactory.

Moreover, it may be concluded from Table 5.2 that respondents are most satisfied with the nature of their work, followed by supervision they receive, communication and operating procedures. They appear, however, to be least satisfied with their compensation and with their opportunities for promotion. The standard deviations for all the dimensions of the Job Satisfaction Survey are relatively low, indicating similarity in responses obtained on the Job Satisfaction Survey from the sample.

5.3 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

In the sections that follow the results of the inferential statistics employed in the study are presented. For the purposes of testing the stated research hypotheses, Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated, and multiple regression and hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed. With the aid of these statistical techniques
conclusion are drawn with regards to the population from which the sample was taken and decisions are made with respect to the research hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1:**

There is no statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Table 5.3: Intercorrelation of job satisfaction dimensions

In order to determine whether there are significant relationships between the dimensions of job satisfaction, Pearson’s product moment correlation was computed. The results indicated in Table 5.3 indicates that the correlation coefficients for the relationships between job satisfaction and its dimensions are direct, linear and positive ranging from
moderate to high correlation coefficients. Significant correlations were shown to exist between coworkers and job satisfaction ($r = .343, p < 0.05$), and between communication and job satisfaction ($r = .41, p < 0.01$), suggesting that higher values of both of these dimensions translate into higher levels of job satisfaction. The converse is also true, however, with lower values on the dimensions corresponding to lower levels of job satisfaction.

The results indicate that there are statistically significant relationships between pay and job satisfaction ($r = .768, p < 0.01$), benefits and job satisfaction ($r = .832, p < 0.01$), supervision and job satisfaction ($r = .720, p < 0.01$), operating procedures and job satisfaction ($r = .704, p < 0.01$), contingent rewards and job satisfaction ($r = .682, p < 0.01$), nature of work and job satisfaction ($r = .634, p < 0.01$) and for promotion and job satisfaction ($r = .603, p < 0.01$). The moderate to high correlations between these dimensions and job satisfaction suggest that the higher their relationship with job satisfaction, the more satisfied employees would be.

**Hypothesis 2:**

There is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Justice</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisational Justice</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

** p < 0.01

Table 5.4: Intercorrelation matrix between job satisfaction and organisational justice dimensions

The results indicate that there is an inverse relationship between all the dimensions of the organisational justice scale and job satisfaction. There is a statistically significant relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction \((r = .54, p < 0.01)\), while for the procedural justice-job satisfaction relationship \((r = .49, p < 0.01)\) and for the interactional justice-job satisfaction relationship \((r = .34, p < 0.05)\). There is also a significant relationship between overall organisational justice perceptions and job satisfaction \((r = .64, p < 0.01)\).

**Hypothesis 3:**

There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job/level, educational level and salary level) and organisational justice.
Table 5.5: Correlation between biographical variables and organisational justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographic Variables</th>
<th>Organisational Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01

The results in Table 5.5 indicate that there is a statically significant relationship between tenure and organisational justice ($r = .46, p < 0.01$), age and organisational justice ($r = .29, p < 0.01$) as well as between gender and organisational justice ($r = .43, p < 0.01$). Respondents’ salaries’ also revealed a significant relationship with organisational justice ($r = .32, p < 0.01$). Moreover, the job level also showed a significant correlation with organisational justice ($r = .26, p < 0.05$).

However, there was no statistically significant relationship between organisational justice and marital status and education, respectively.
Hypothesis 4:

There is no statistically significant relationship between the biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) and job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Variables</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01

Table 5.6: Correlation between biographical variables and Job satisfaction

Results depicted in Table 5.6 indicate that there is also a statistically significant relationship between the tenure of respondents and job satisfaction (r = .54, p < 0.01), between gender of respondents and job satisfaction (r = .38, p < 0.01). Similarly, there is a significant relationship between age and job satisfaction (r = .27, p < 0.01), job level and job satisfaction (r = .45, p < 0.01) and between salary and job satisfaction (r = .52, p
< 0.01). There was also a statistically significant relationship between education and job satisfaction (r = .21, p < 0.05).

There was no statistically significant relationship between marital status and job satisfaction (r = .18, p > 0.05).

**Hypothesis 5:**

The biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction.
From Table 5.7 it can be seen that the multiple correlation among the seven demographic variables and job satisfaction is 0.37651, as indicated by Multiple R. Furthermore, given the R Square value of 0.14176, it may be deduced that only 14.176% of the variance in job satisfaction can be accounted for by these six demographic variables. The F-statistic of 4.06328 at 6 and 63 degrees of freedom is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. On the basis hereof, it may be concluded that the seven demographic variables of gender, age, tenure, marital status, education, salary and job level together significantly explain 14.176% of the variance in job satisfaction. **In effect, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected,** and it is accepted that the seven demographic variables significantly explain the
variance in job satisfaction. It should be noted, however, that the variance accounted for by these six variables is relatively small, with the remaining 85.824% of the variance being explained by factors other than those considered.

Furthermore, it may be seen from Table 5.7 that when the other variables are controlled, seven of the demographic variables are significant. With a Beta-value of -0.301364, job level reaches statistical significance at the 0.01 level, and is the best predictor of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the Beta-value of -0.259733 obtained for tenure is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Consequently, tenure, too, is a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Moreover, the fact that both job level and tenure carry negative Beta weights suggests that inverse relationships exist between these two variables and job satisfaction, with employees at higher job levels and more tenured employees experiencing lower levels of satisfaction.

Table 5.7 further shows that neither age, gender and salary were found to be statistically significant at even the 0.05 level. Moreover, it further appears as though marital status, with an obtained Beta-value of only -0.032971, is the poorest predictor of job satisfaction. On the basis hereof, it may thus be concluded that while job level, tenure, age, gender and salary are significant predictors of job satisfaction, marital status and education do not predict job satisfaction based on the sample of employees.
For the purposes of determining the extent to which the seven demographic variables of gender, age, tenure, marital status, dependents and job level explain the variance in the job satisfaction of employees, multiple regression analysis was performed.

**Hypothesis 6:**

The biographical variables (gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level) will not statistically significantly explain the variance in organisational justice.
Table 5.8: Results of multiple regression analysis regressing the seven demographic variables against organisational justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.079274</td>
<td>-0.777</td>
<td>0.4385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.085750</td>
<td>-0.857</td>
<td>0.3930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>-0.105214</td>
<td>-1.120</td>
<td>0.2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>-0.006946</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.9485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.029132</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>0.6345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-0.043652</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.7877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-0.034724</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>0.3562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of Table 5.8, it can be seen that the correlation of the seven demographic variables, after all the intercorrelations among the five variables are taken into account, is 0.14235, as represented by Multiple R. Furthermore, the R Square value of 0.02026 suggests that only 2.026% of the variance in organisational justice can be attributed to the five demographic variables. However, Table 5.8 further shows that the F-statistic of 0.50881 at 6 and 63 degrees of freedom fails to reach statistical significance at even the 0.05 level. Consequently, the results indicate that the seven demographic variables of gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level do not significantly explain the variance in organisational justice. In effect therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.
Hypothesis 7:

The 9 facets of job satisfaction as measured by the job satisfaction survey will significantly explain the variance in organisational justice, above and beyond that explained by the demographic variables.
Table 5.8: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis with organisational justice as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sig T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sig T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>- 0.079274</td>
<td>- 0.777</td>
<td>0.4385</td>
<td>- 0.122733</td>
<td>- 1.189</td>
<td>0.2369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>- 0.085750</td>
<td>- 0.857</td>
<td>0.3930</td>
<td>- 0.058191</td>
<td>- 0.579</td>
<td>0.5634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>- 0.105214</td>
<td>- 1.120</td>
<td>0.2647</td>
<td>- 0.090471</td>
<td>- 0.940</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>- 0.006946</td>
<td>- 0.065</td>
<td>0.9485</td>
<td>0.046273</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.6769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>- 0.029132</td>
<td>- 0.270</td>
<td>0.6345</td>
<td>0.038377</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.7312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>- 0.034264</td>
<td>- 0.730</td>
<td>0.7877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>- 0.045274</td>
<td>- 0.298</td>
<td>0.3562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>0.02026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>0.50881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign F</strong></td>
<td>0.7692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.314646</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>0.0111*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.097598</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.0372*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>- 0.108069</td>
<td>- 0.856</td>
<td>0.0393*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>- 0.018323</td>
<td>- 0.159</td>
<td>0.8738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>- 0.105464</td>
<td>- 0.134</td>
<td>0.4557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>- 0.322466</td>
<td>- 0.658</td>
<td>0.3427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>- 0.137446</td>
<td>- 0.749</td>
<td>0.4326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>- 0.109895</td>
<td>- 0.449</td>
<td>0.6657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 5.8, the first step in the regression involved entering the data for the demographic variables into the regression equation. This constituted a test of the hypothesis that the demographic variables of gender, age, years of service/tenure, current marital status, current position/job level, educational level and salary level will not significantly explain the variance in organisational justice.

With the demographic data entered into the regression equation, the scores for the nine Job Satisfaction Survey subscales were entered in the second step. This thus becomes a test of the hypothesis that the nine facets of the Job Satisfaction Survey will not significantly explain the variance in organisational justice over and above that explained by the seven demographic variables. As can be seen from Table 5.8, when the job satisfaction data was added, the amount of explained variance increased to 8.367% ($R^2 = 0.08367$). It can thus be seen that the amount of variance in organisational justice that is explained by the nine facets of job satisfaction, beyond that explained by the five demographic variables, is 6.341% ($\Delta R^2 = 0.06341$).

However, Table 5.8 further shows that the F-statistic of 1.06835 at 10 and 117 degrees of freedom fails to reach statistical significance at even the 0.05 level. Consequently, entering the data for the nine facet measures of job satisfaction did not result in a significant amount of the variance in organisational justice being explained by the variables entered into the regression equation. Therefore, having controlled for the seven demographic variables, it is concluded that the nine dimensions of job satisfaction do not
have a direct effect on organisational justice independent of the variance accounted for by these demographics. **In effect, therefore, the null hypothesis is substantiated.**

### 5.4 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Cronbach’s Alpha is viewed as an index of reliability associated with the variation accounted for by the true score of the underlying construct (Cronbach, 1951). Alpha coefficients range in value from 0 to 1 and may be used to describe the reliability of factors extracted from dichotomous and or multi-point formatted questionnaires or scales. However, there is no lower limit to the coefficient, however, the closer Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is to 1, the greater the internal consistency of the items of the scale (Cronbach, 1951).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of cases</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of items</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.9:** Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the job satisfaction survey questionnaire and the organisational justice questionnaire

According to research, such a score can be regarded as excellent in terms of the reliability of the instrument. Rosnow and Rosenthal (1999) argue that coefficients above 0.8 can be
considered to be good indicators of the reliability of an instrument. Hence with the current study, this was exceeded, indicating a high degree or reliability.

5.5 CONCLUSION

Job satisfaction and organisational justice have been found to be inversely related to such withdrawal behaviours as lateness, absenteeism, job insecurity, propensity to turnover, turnover, theft, (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Greenberg, 1990b; Hanish & Hulin, 1991; Hendrix et al., 1999; Siers, 2007) and positively associated with productivity and organisational effectiveness (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2005; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Robbins, 2005; Staw, 1995).

Moreover, from the perspective of service organisations, the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice is especially important. Studies in a variety of service companies found that satisfied employees exerted more effort towards satisfying the needs of customers (Bowen et al., 1999). The study further suggested that higher organisational justice may be elicited by increasing the level of job satisfaction experienced by employees.

When the above factors are taken into account, it becomes clear that where organisational justice could be used to raise the job satisfaction of employees, organisations stand to derive significant benefits. This is particularly true within a service environment. In light hereof, the present study aimed at investigating the nature of the relationship between job
satisfaction and organisational justice in an attempt to arrive at some conclusion as to how this relationship may best be utilised to maximise the potential benefits that it offers.

With the aid of multiple regression analysis, the present study demonstrated that the seven demographic variables considered explain a significant amount of the variance in job satisfaction. The findings therefore support those of Jones et al. (2000) and Williams and Hazer (1986). However, when considered individually, only five of these variables, gender, age, years of service/tenure, salary and job level were found to be significant predictors of employee satisfaction.

The fact that years of service/tenure was found to account for a significant amount of the variance in job satisfaction, lends some support to the view held by Robbins (1998) that when controlling for age, years of service/tenure appears to be a more stable predictor of job satisfaction. However, the present findings suggest that more tenured employees generally reported lower levels of satisfaction. These results are inconsistent with extant research, which overwhelmingly indicates that a positive correlation exists between years of service/tenure and job satisfaction (Jinnet & Alexander, 1999; Jones et al., 2000; Staw, 1995; Vecchio, 1988). However, the results do support the findings by Lambert et al. (2001), who argue that an inverse relationship exists between years of service/tenure and job satisfaction. Moreover, the inconsistency may be explained by the fact that the relationship between these variables depends on the specific organisation and how years of service/tenure is viewed. In some organisations, senior employees are highly
respected, while high years of service/tenure is viewed as a liability in other organisations (Lambert et al., 2001).

The present study further supported the findings of Miles et al. (1996) that job level explains a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction. However, the results question the findings of Robie et al. (1998) and Oshagbemi (1997) who maintain that job satisfaction increases with job level.

While a number of researchers maintain that gender accounts for differences in the satisfaction of male and female employees, the present study also found gender was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. While the under-representation of female employees, who constituted only 34% of the sample, may have distorted results in this regard, a potential explanation for the findings may have be found in the research by Saal and Knight (1988) and Scandura and Lankau (1997) who suggest that gender differences in job satisfaction disappear when differences in perceived job characteristics, age, tenure, education, income and occupational level are controlled.

Further, the present study failed to find support for education as a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Studies investigating the nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and educational level have reported mixed results (Camp, 1994; Loscocco, 1990; Ting, 1997; Vorster, 1992). Numerous explanations may be posited for the present findings. As argued by Ting (1997) and Rogers (1991), it may be possible that no
significant relationship exists between satisfaction and educational level, hence the inability of education to predict satisfaction. Weidmer (2006) found that education levels have nothing to do with whether employees thought they were paid enough, or overall job satisfaction. Also, the fact that education was found to predict an insignificant amount of the variance in satisfaction may be due to the fact that an individual’s qualification are not directly associated with satisfaction but, as argued by Vorster (1992), influences this variable indirectly.

Unlike the case with job satisfaction, inferential statistics show that the demographic variables of age, gender, level of education, job level, length of service/tenure, salary and marital status cannot significantly explain the variance in organisational justice. This finding is contrary to the suggestion of Scarpello and Jones (1996) and Sweeny and McFarlin (1997) that biographical variables moderate the relationship between justice perceptions regarding pay, work attitudes and behaviours. Moreover, when the predictive power of the individual variables is considered none of the demographics significantly explain the variance in organisational justice. This supports the results of Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) that indicate that the biographical variables did not alter the significance levels for organisational justice measures.

Furthermore, contrary to the findings of the present study that gender does not influence organisational justice, Berkowitz et al. (1987) found that the more strongly men believed that their pay was fair, the more satisfied they were with their earnings. This was complicated by research showing that gender differences moderate the pay equity-
satisfaction relationship. It was too found that women tend to be less dissatisfied with their earnings than men (Brockner & Adsit, 1986).

In investigating the relationship that exists between job satisfaction and organisational justice, the results emanating from the research indicate there is a statistical significant relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice. This finding supports the view in organisational justice literature that organisational justice is an important predictor of job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992). Research in this area accepts that organisational justice dimensions give rise to both affective and behavioural responses (Fernandes & Awamleh, 2005). This gives support of the two factor theory advanced by Herzberg (1966). The two factor theory states that extrinsic awards such as pay, benefits, working conditions or company policies do not motivate employees unless it brings performance to an acceptable level. Intrinsic awards such as responsibility, growth and opportunities motivate an employee to high levels of performance. The theory advances that hygiene factors which include mainly financial compensation represent the minimum expectations from the job, and their absence will cause dissatisfaction irrespective of other factors.

The findings support the view that pay satisfaction is linked to distributive justice perceptions (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Martin & Bennett, 1996). Williams (1995) found a positive relationship between benefit standard comparisons and benefit satisfaction. Employees who rated their current level of benefit coverage as being better than the coverage of others were more satisfied. Martin and Bennett (1996) observed a significant
causal link between distributive justice and benefit satisfaction. Folger and Konovsky (1989) also found a link between satisfaction and the existence of an appeal process in the determination of pay increases. However, Martin and Bennett (1996) found a weak relationship between procedural justice regarding pay and pay satisfaction. The possibility of appealing pay-related decisions and constancy in the application of pay policies were positively linked to employee benefit satisfaction (Mulvey, 1992). Tremblay’s et al. (2000) study established a link between the level of involvement in decisions (procedural justice) and benefit satisfaction and that employee benefit satisfaction was based more on an accurate benefit communication program (interpersonal justice) than in involvement in decisions and the choice of employee benefits. However, a weak link was found between procedural justice regarding benefits and benefits satisfaction (Martin & Bennett, 1996).

In terms of the interpersonal justice perception and job satisfaction the findings suggested a strong correlation. In terms of the informational aspect of interpersonal justice the results of this study supports the job satisfaction literature that organisational characteristics such as proper communication channels have been found, by the current study to be related to job satisfaction (Veeran & Katz, 2002).

In terms of the correlation between communication satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction, the academic context in which the current study was undertaken must be considered. It must be noted that academics are seldom highly regarded in terms of monetary compensation and there are often limited resources available to them. It is
therefore argued that employees who choose to work in an academic environment are more likely to draw substantially from the intrinsic satisfying aspects of an academic’s job and may therefore, as suggested by the results of the current study, be enhanced by the provision of adequate information concerning monetary outcomes. Intrinsic job satisfaction within such an academic context may also be derived from the status and prestige that academia confers on employees at an organisation. It follows that the provision of adequate information may affirm the academics sense of social standing with the organisation, in the sense that they may feel that the organisation respects and values them enough to keep them informed. This is in accordance with the group value theory that the correlation between communication, satisfaction and job satisfaction could be explained as a perception on the part of employees that adequate provision of information by the organisation is evidence of their social standing in the organisations (Veeran & Katz, 2002).

The findings also indicate that the provision of adequate information is positively correlated with the extrinsic job satisfaction of employees. This may be due to the fact that the colleges are characterised by a traditional organisational hierarchy in which employees at lower levels often have to rely on information that filters down from management to the heads of department and then to lecturers. This type of organisational hierarchy can be frustrating particularly when employees at all levels of the hierarchy need to be aware how they will be affected by current or changing information that will affect them. Satisfaction with the information provided by management can therefore enhance job satisfaction (Veeran & Katz, 2002).
Perceptions of interpersonal justice exhibited by the organisation are also found to be correlated with overall job satisfaction. This is in accordance with the group value theory (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Employees want to belong to a group and be part of an organisation’s setting. Management should therefore recognise employees’ needs and feelings since groups reinforce the employee’s needs and feelings since groups reinforce the employee’s self-identity and extent to which they feel accepted, held in high regard and respected (Tyler, 1989). Such feelings of belonging enhance the employees’ overall experience of their job since fair interpersonal treatment signals to the employee that the organisation does value them and hold them in high regard (Maslow, 1954).

Perceptions of the degree of social sensitivity shown by the organisation are also shown to correlate with intrinsic job satisfaction. This is in accordance with the literature since intrinsic job satisfaction includes feelings of accomplishment, self-actualisation and identity (Naumann, 1993). Such feelings of accomplishment and self-actualisation may be inferred by socially sensitive treatment from management since a climate that fosters respect for the contributions, value and dignity of employees promotes self-actualisation and identity development of these employees and reinforces their accomplishments (Maslow, 1965; Naumann, 1993).

The correlation between perceptions of socially sensitive treatment and extrinsic job satisfaction may also be explained in a similar way. Organisations that encourage socially
sensitive treatment of their employees in the form of recognition and rewards for employees’ hard work by management, supervisors and colleagues contribute to the degree of extrinsic job satisfaction experienced by their employees (Veeran & Katz, 2002).

The organisational justice literature indicates that when employees experience perceptions of interpersonal injustice in organisational settings, the results may be moral outrage that manifest in negative outcomes such as theft, sabotage among other behaviours (Folger & Cropanzana, 1998; Greenberg, 1990b). Conversely the results of the current study have shown that employees who perceive fair interpersonal treatment by their organisation may experience positive outcomes such as high job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983, Greenberg, 1990b; Morrison, 1997).

5.5.1 FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Wiedmer (2006) informs that many studies have been performed to determine the variables that affect job satisfaction. Some have looked at factors such as organisational involvement, locus of control, age, identification with role, dual career families and commitment to organisation (Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996). Others have zoomed into the influence of organisational justice on job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Dailey & Delaney, 1992; Greenberg, 1990b; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Mc Farlin & Sweeney 1992).
Furthermore, Wesolowski and Mossholder (1997) highlights that demographic group identity may bias judgments about the fairness concerns as fundamental to many work-related phenomena. Procedural justice is seen as a very important determinant to job satisfaction. If decision makers are courteous, give feedback and opportunities for self-expression and discuss decision-making procedures with employees, then employees are going to be more satisfied with their jobs. If managers do not exhibit these types of interpersonal treatment because of demographic differences, there exist a greater potential for subordinates to develop perceptions of unfair treatment. Employees who continue in uncomfortable dyadic relationships with their managers may feel trapped in emotionally exhausting exchanges and emotional exhaustion is a primary indicator of burnout.

The above is supported by the study at Wal-Mart, Supercentre in St. Joseph, Missouri. Participants who thought that they were treated equal by their managers tended to be more satisfied with their jobs. This supports the idea that procedural justice is a strong predictor of job satisfaction (Wiedmer, 2006).

Research also indicates that those with Type A personality is hard driving, persistent, involved in their work and possesses an enhanced sense of time urgency. Type B employees have a relative absence of these characteristics and do not tend to suffer from the same type of stressors as the Type A employees. These personalities combined with demographic data, work stressors, coping strategies used and locus of control were examined (Bogg & Cooper, 1994). It was reported that females exhibited Type A
behaviour and used coping strategies more than males. Female employees reported
greater levels of job pressure from management, relationships at work and home/work
interface. No differences were reported between male employees and female employees’
internal and external locus of control (Wiedmer, 2006).

In the study at Wal-Mart it was found that female employees were significantly more
satisfied than male employees in their job. Perhaps the Type A behaviour is beneficial to
women working at Wal-Mart, or perhaps male employees were not satisfied because they
did not use coping strategies as often as female employees (Wiedmer, 2006).

Nel et al. (2006), identify two factors namely personal factors and organisational factors
to contribute to job satisfaction. Personal factors refer to personality, status, seniority,
general life satisfaction and the extent to which the job characteristics are congruent with
personal characteristics. Organisational factors refer to:

**Pay and benefits.** Employees perceive their remuneration as an indication of what they
are worth to the organisation. The principle of equity is important. Employees compare
what they put into the organisation to what they get out and to what other employees put
in and get out. Negative inequity leads to job dissatisfaction.

**The work itself.** Employees have a preference for interesting and challenging work that
provides opportunity for self-actualisation and recognition.
The supervisor. Nel et al. (2006), posit the view that that job satisfaction is influenced by the amount of technical and social support extended by the supervisor.

Relationship with co-workers. The above three factors have a strong influence on job satisfaction, the relationship an employee has with co-workers only influence job satisfaction moderately. Employees with a strong career orientation may place less emphasis on social relations.

Working conditions. Employees become dissatisfied if they work in an over-crowded, dark, dirty or noisy place (Nel et al., 2006).

5.5.2 CORRELATES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Bogg and Cooper, 1994 are of the opinion that low levels of control, poor management and low levels of participation in decision making were all determinants of job satisfaction. Furthermore, that male employees did not use coping strategies as often as females employees and this influenced male employees satisfaction along with their mental health. Personality characteristics played a more important in determining stress outcomes in male employees than in female employees. Generally, female employees were more dissatisfied with their jobs and had lower mental and physical well-being scores than their make counterparts.
According to Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996, job satisfaction is enhanced by the value placed on employees professional role and identification with that role, but negatively affected by choosing the job because rewards are extrinsic (higher pay or promotion) rather than intrinsic. Younger women were more satisfied with their jobs when they were part of a dual career family. Older women considered their career more important were more organisationally involved, but extrinsic reasons for taking the job and length of tenure presented a negative influence on them. Internal locus of control, achievement motivation, work environment and self image all predicted organisational involvement in men.

A study at Wal-Mart, Supercentre in St. Joseph, Missouri, found that age was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction (Wiedmer, 2006). Only three variables were significant predictors of job satisfaction: equal treatment of co-workers by a manager, sex and seeing a future in that job. Females were reported to be more satisfied than overall men overall.

5.5.3 ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE IN PAY AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND ITS EFFECTS ON WORK ATTITUDES

Although a large number of taxonomies have been proposed, it seems that pay satisfaction is linked to distributive justice perceptions ((Berkowitz et al., 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Hendrix et al., 1998; Martin & Bennett, 1996). Greenberg (1986a) has shown that the theory of equity can apply to a range of elements. Williams (1995) found
a positive relationship between benefit standard comparisons and benefit satisfaction. Employees who rated their current level of benefit coverage as being better than the coverage of others were more satisfied. Evidence suggests that employees perceptions of distributive justice are important predictors of benefit satisfaction (Davis & Ward, 1995). Martin and Bennett (1996) observed a significant causal link between distributive justice and benefit satisfaction.

Early studies testing the effect of process components in the field of compensation showed that perceptions of procedural justice explained a large portion of the variance in pay satisfaction (Dyer & Théiault, 1976). Jenkins and Lawler (1981) found a link between involvement in compensation decisions and pay satisfaction. Folger and Konovsky (1989) also found a link between satisfaction and the existence of an appeal process in the determination of pay increases. However, Martin and Bennett (1996) found a weak relationship between procedural justice regarding pay and pay satisfaction.

Links between procedural justice and employee benefit satisfaction have been evaluated (Martin & Bennett, 1996). The possibility of appealing pay-related decisions and consultancy in the application of pay policies were positively linked to employee benefit satisfaction Mulvey (1992). Tremblay et al., (2000) established a link between the level of involvement in decisions (procedural justice) and benefit satisfaction and that employee benefit satisfaction was based more on an accurate benefit communication program (interpersonal justice) than on involvement in decisions and the choice of
employee benefits. However, a weak link was found between procedural justice regarding benefits and benefits satisfaction (Martin & Bennet, 1996).

All the above studies conclude that organisational justice perceptions derive not only from the level of involvement in the process but also from the degree of control over making the decisions that produce results. Allowing employees to choose their mode of compensation increases their sense of control and the likelihood of meeting their needs, thereby raising the level of satisfaction (Farh et al., 1991). It is therefore possible to conclude that a sense of procedural justice has an influence on pay satisfaction and benefit satisfaction.

When comparing the relative potency of distributive and procedural justice as a predictor of compensation, studies have shown that distributive justice is a more potent antecedent of outcome satisfaction than procedural justice in judicial settings (Tyler et al., 1985). Studies on employees’ reactions to organisational pay systems found distributive justice to be a stronger predictor of pay satisfaction than procedural justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992).

The group-value model of procedural justice can be used to predict the relationship between justice and benefits satisfaction (Lind & Tyler, 1998). According to the group-value model, employees join groups to obtain both economic resources and psychological rewards associated with group rewards associated with group affiliation (Cropanzano & Greenberg 1997). Employee benefits are considered group membership rewards that are
designed to strengthen an employee’s relationship to the organisation (McCaffery, 1992, cited in Tremblay, 2000). For example, many employee benefits become more valuable over time such as vacation time, the right to sabbaticals, or retirement plans. As the employees invest more time in the organisation, these benefits increase in value, rewarding the employees for their loyalty to the company.

\section*{5.5.4 THE CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND COMPENSATION SATISFACTION}

Justice perceptions with regard to pay have consequences on other elements in the work relationship. Pay equity can increase employment and job satisfaction (Moorman, 1991; Sweeny & McFarlin, 1997) and satisfaction with the organisation (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987).

Additional research has led to the conclusion that procedural justice regarding pay provides a better explanation of satisfaction with institutions and loyal behaviour than distributive justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Scarpello & Jones, 1996; Sweeny & McFarlin, 1997). More specifically, confidence in management and authorities appear to be based more on process justice than on results justice.

Studies that have concentrated on the relationship between procedural justice perceptions and job satisfaction have produced divergent conclusions. Research has shown that job
satisfaction is better explained by process justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Moorman, 1991; & Sweeney & McFarlin 1997). Other studies found a closer relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction (Dailey & Delaney, 1992). One study revealed that process fairness has a significant and direct effect on organisational commitment and this effect is stronger than distributive fairness (Martin & Bennett 1996). Because employee benefit policies, also referred to as organisational membership rewards, are designed to promote long-term attitudes and behaviour (such as, faithfulness, loyalty and assiduity) rather than short term outcomes (such as, work performance), it is possible that a strong sense of justice with regard to employee benefits has a greater influence over attitudes toward the employer and work than the perception of pay equity. According to the group-value model of procedural justice, when a procedure is viewed as indicating a positive, high-status relationship, it is judged as fair (Tyler & Degoey, 1995).

Employees value procedural indications that let them know that they have a positive standing within an organisation (Tyler & Lind, 1992). Procedural justice regarding benefits suggests that an employee’s experience of being a respected member of the group or organisation results in stronger attachment to the organisation.

In a study investigating the relationship between perceived fairness, work attitudes and intent to turnover it was found that job satisfaction was significantly sensitive to fairness perceptions (Kirk & Delaney, 1992). Figure 5.8 provides a framework within which to assess and understand the job satisfaction-organisational justice relationship.
Figure 5.8: Model indicating Job Satisfaction-Organisational Justice Relationship
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5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the present study has made a contribution to the body of knowledge on job satisfaction processes and organisational justice, a number of limitations are worth noting.

The first limitation pertains to the fact that the study utilised a non-probability sampling method in the form of convenience sampling. As a result, certain groups may have been under-represented. From the sample, 7% was younger than 30 years, 34% was female, 75% of the sample occupied non-managerial positions and 46% had an educational level of at least an Honours degree. Furthermore the sample comprised largely of employees with a service record of 57% having worked for the organisation between 6 and 15 years. As a result, selection bias has been introduced, which reduces the extent to which the results may be generalisable to the entire population to which the research hypotheses apply.

Furthermore, although the sample size of seventy (70) employees was deemed large enough to be representative of the approximately one hundred and thirty five (135) population under study, a larger sample would, nevertheless, have increased the generalisability of the research findings. The above shortcomings threaten the external validity of the study. Consequently, caution needs to be exercised when interpreting the
research results since the generalisability thereof to the entire population under investigation has been reduced.

In addition to the above factors, potential extraneous variables raise doubts with regards to the internal validity of the study. That is, possible confounding variables such as social sensitivity, leadership style, organisational climate and organisational commitment, which were not controlled for, may have impacted on the job satisfaction-organisational justice relationship. The fact that these variables may have played a role reduces the confidence with which conclusions may be drawn with regards to the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

In order to counter the above-mentioned problems, it is recommended that future studies increase internal validity by utilising research designs that allow for the control of possible confounding variables such as the aforementioned which have been found to have an impact on job satisfaction and organisational justice. Improving internal validity in this manner will make it possible to test the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice with greater certainty.

It is further recommended that external validity be enhanced by the selection of a larger sample as well as through the utilisation of a probability sampling design. By drawing a stratified sample of participants from the population, selection bias will be reduced (Sekaran, 2003). Subsequently, the sample will be more representative of the population
under, allowing for greater generalisability of the research findings. It is further suggested that future studies raise ecological validity by focusing on the selection of samples that are representative of a variety of higher educational institutions, service and industrial organisations in the country. Following such an approach will increase the scope of the applicability of the research findings by allowing for greater generalisability (Welman et al., 2008).

On the basis of the present study, a number of suggestions may also be made with regards to future research that may prove fruitful. Firstly, the present study indicated that employee satisfaction with pay, promotion and rewards significantly predicts organisational justice. On the basis hereof, it is suggested that future research help to clarify this relationship by examining how aspects of the work itself, such as challenge and responsibility affect job satisfaction.
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APPENDIX 1

Dear Participant

I am a student at the University of the Western Cape currently conducting a national study in partial fulfillment of my Masters Degree in Industrial Psychology.

The present research study is aimed at analysing the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice amongst academics in Agricultural Colleges in South Africa.

In recent years there has been a proliferation in publications linking organisational justice to job satisfaction. Organisational justice is considered to be one of the key variables that impact on job satisfaction.

Spector (1997) describes job satisfaction as the degree to which people like their jobs and the different aspects of their jobs. Greenberg (1986) states that organisational justice can be described as the just and fair manner in which organisations treat their employees and have shown to have an impact on organisational outcomes.

It is proposed that this study which analyses the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice will generate possible strategies to address this phenomenon.

Please note that NO reporting or feedback provided in respect of the present research study will refer to individuals. All information provided will be handled as strictly confidential.

I thank you for agreeing to participate in the research study.

RESEARCHER: Desiree Hamman-Fisher
Department of Industrial Psychology
University of the Western Cape
APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

The information received in this questionnaire is strictly confidential and will be treated as such.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine whether there is a relationship between job satisfaction and organisational justice.

SECTION A – BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

Please mark the block that is applicable to you.

1. Gender

   Male  Female

2. Age

   Younger than 30  30-40  41-50  51-60  Older than 60

3. Years of service/Tenure

   0 – 5  6 – 10  11 – 15  16 – 20  20 +

4. Current Marital status

   Single  Married/Living with partner  Divorced  Widow/Widower
5. Current position/job level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Please indicate with an X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director/Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal/ Vice Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Please indicate with an X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Salary level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Levels</th>
<th>Salary Notches Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38,610 – 43,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43,245 – 48,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49,665 – 57,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58,290 – 67,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68,995 – 80,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85,362 – 99,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>106,335 – 124,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>132,054 – 153,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>157,686 – 190,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>196,815 – 228,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>311,358 – 360,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>369,000 – 427,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Think about your work/job over the last six (6) months.

Please circle OR cross the number which is closest to reflecting your opinion about each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Disagree Very Much</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately Much</th>
<th>Agree Very Much Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Raises are too few and far between ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I am unappreciated by the organisation when I think about what they pay me ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion satisfaction items</th>
<th>Disagree Very Much</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately Much</th>
<th>Agree Very Much Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 There is really too little chance for promotion on my job ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I am satisfied with my chances for promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision satisfaction items</th>
<th>Disagree Very Much</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately Much</th>
<th>Agree Very Much Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 My supervisor is unfair to me (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings if subordinates ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I like my supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits satisfaction items</th>
<th>Disagree Very Much</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately Much</th>
<th>Agree Very Much Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 The benefit packages we have is equitable ( R )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards Satisfaction items</strong></td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating procedure satisfaction items</strong></td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to much to do at work (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have too much paperwork (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-worker satisfaction items</strong></td>
<td>I like the people I work with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy my co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work itself satisfaction items</strong></td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My job is enjoyable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication satisfaction items</strong></td>
<td>Communications seem good within this organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The goals of this organisation are not clear to me (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organisation (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Work assignments are often not fully explained (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please circle OR cross the number which is closest to reflecting your opinion about each statement

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Distributive justice items** | | | | | | | |
| 44 | My work schedule is fair | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45 | I think my level of pay is fair | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46 | I consider my workload to be quite fair | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47 | Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48 | I feel that my job responsibilities are fair | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

<p>| Strongly Disagree | | | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <strong>Formal procedures items</strong> | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Job decisions are made by the manager in an unbiased manner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50 | My manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 51 | To make formal job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 52 | My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 53 | All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 54 | Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions made by the manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Interactive justice**

55. When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and consideration  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

56. When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with respect and dignity  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

57. When decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal needs.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

58. When decisions are made about my job, the manager deals with me in a truthful manner.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

59. When decisions are made about my job, the manager shows concern for my rights as an employee.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

60. Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses the implication of the decisions with me.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

61. The manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

62. When making decisions about my job, the manager offers explanations that make sense to me.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

63. My manager explains very clearly any decision made about my job.  
   [1 2 3 4 5 6 7]

*End of questionnaire*

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!