

# **THE PERCEPTION ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ITS IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG THE EMPLOYEES OF AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES**

<sup>1</sup>ASNA ALBHINA A, <sup>2</sup>SABARIRAJAN K

Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University,  
Tamilnadu, India.

Asso. Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu,  
India.

---

## **ABSTRACT**

Organizational justice is the representatives' impression of reasonableness with which they have been treated by an association. The current review was pointed perception organization justice and its impact on organizational commitment among the employees of automobile industries. An accommodation test comprising of one hundred and 44 representatives working in auto industry took an interest in the review. Poll technique was utilized for information assortment. Factual strategies including mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, connection investigation and relapse were utilized to break down the information. This study fosters a comprehension of the components of authoritative equity and its relationship with hierarchical responsibility. The aftereffects of the review uncovered that interactional equity will incredibly affect hierarchical responsibility.

**Catchphrases:** Distributive equity, Interactional equity, Organizational responsibility, Organizational equity, Procedural equity

## **PRESENTATION**

Authoritative equity alludes to representatives' view of reasonableness with which they have been treated by an association. It is how much fair methodology and cycles exist and are stuck to in an association, and the degree to which people see their chiefs as being fair and earnest and having rationale or levelheaded for what they do. Greenberg (1990) clarified authoritative equity as a writing "developed around endeavors to depict and clarify the job of reasonableness as a thought in the working environment".

Authoritative equity writing at first centered around the distributive equity, which depicts the apparent decency of results that workers get. Over the long haul, researchers began to consider the procedural equity or the apparent reasonableness of methodology to decide the results (Folger and Greenberg, 1985) and interactional equity or the nature of the connections between people in association (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998) as the third type of equity. Accordingly, by and large, three aspects are considered for authoritative equity, for example distributive equity, procedural equity and interactional equity (Bies and Moag, 1986).

Distributive equity alludes to the apparent reasonableness in regards to an individual's apparent info versus the prize acquired (Adams, 1963). Specialists have focused on that numerous representatives see pay designation choices to be unjustifiable which might clarify the point of failure between genuine compensation and execution. Procedural equity suggests the discernment with respect to the interaction followed to show up at a specific result (Leventhal, 1976). Interactional equity is connected with the nature of connections between people inside associations (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

In interactional equity, leaders' treatment of those impacted by choices is critical in light of the fact that people distinguish mentalities as marks of equity inside the association. It alludes to discernments concerning the manner in which specialists treat their subordinates, and how these subordinates react to these insights (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001).

Meyer at al., (1997) portrays responsibility as a mental condition of representative's relationship with their association and an affinity to proceed with the relationship with the association. Full of feeling responsibility is the principal part of responsibility, which alludes to a worker's passionate connection to, recognizable proof with and contribution in an association (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Continuation responsibility is the second part of Meyer and Allen model, which alludes to a worker's apparent expenses of leaving an association. Regulating responsibility is the third part, which alludes to a representative's sensations of commitment to stay in their association

### **AUDIT OF LITERATURE**

Arif Hassan(2002)examined how view of value and equity assumed a significant part in representatives' obligation to the association and goal to leave. The example comprised of 181

center and lower level supervisors from the banking and money, creation and assembling, and administration areas. The outcomes speculated that both interior and outer value discernments are decidedly connected with responsibility and adversely connected with purpose to leave. Among every one of the aspects, value advancement gave off an impression of being the main indicator. Both distributive and procedural equity factors made huge commitments to representatives' hierarchical responsibility and purpose to leave.

Nazim Ali and Shahid Jan (2012) researched the connection between hierarchical equity, authoritative responsibility and turnover expectation. Information were gathered from 223 clinical delegates of drug organizations of Pakistan. Factual Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for discovering the connection between hierarchical equity, authoritative responsibility and turnover expectation. The outcomes showed that both distributive equity insight and procedural equity discernment had a critical relationship with authoritative responsibility and turnover goals among Medical Representatives of Pharmaceuticals Companies working in Pakistan.

Akanbi et al (2013) inspected the job of authoritative equity on hierarchical responsibility in Nestle Nigeria PLC Agbara, Lagos State Nigeria. The destinations of the review were to inspect the connection between distributive equity and saw hierarchical responsibility. Likewise, the review determined the primary and cooperation impact of distributive equity and procedural equity on authoritative responsibility. The review utilized overview research utilizing survey to gather information from all classes of laborers in the worldwide assembling organization. 200 and fifteen representatives of the organization reacted to the survey. Results showed that authoritative equity as estimated by procedural equity and distributive equity can fundamentally affect the hierarchical responsibility. The discoveries from the concentrate additionally showed that there was a critical connection between distributive equity and saw hierarchical responsibility.

Fariba Rafei-Dehkordi, Sardar Mohammadi and Mozafar Yektayar (2013) analyzed the connection between hierarchical equity and its relationship with authoritative responsibility of the staff in Directorate of Youth and Sport of Chahar Mahal va Bakhtiari. 150 staff utilized in the Office of Youth and Sports in Chahar Mahal va Bakhtiari were chosen as test. To gather information, poll of authoritative equity (Nihoof and Moorman 1993) and hierarchical responsibility survey (Allen and Meyer, 1991) were utilized. Results showed that every one of the

parts of the authoritative equity distributive equity, procedural equity and interactional equity impact hierarchical responsibility and there is immediate and critical connection between hierarchical equity and its aspects with authoritative responsibility.

### **OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The current review was pointed toward concentrating on the impression of reasonableness (distributive equity, procedural equity, and interactional equity) and its effect on hierarchical responsibility (emotional responsibility, continuation responsibility and standardizing responsibility) among the representatives of auto industry.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

A comfort test comprising of one 44 representatives working in vehicle industry partook in the review. Survey technique was utilized for information assortment. The gathered information was dissected with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, connection and relapse tests.

### **MEASURES**

The view of distributive equity were estimated with a 5-thing scale created by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). Respondents showed the degree of their arrangement or conflict with everything on a scale from 1 (unequivocally deviate) to 5 (firmly concur). The view of procedural equity were estimated with a 6-thing scale created by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). The view of interactional equity were estimated with 11-things estimating how much representatives felt their requirements were thought of, and sufficient clarifications were settled on for work choices (Neihoff and Moorman, 1993). Authoritative Commitment scale created by Meyer and Allen (1991) was utilized. Every responsibility has 8 items. The respondent was approached to rate every one of the 24 things on the accompanying 5-point Likert scale-1 (Strongly deviate) to 5 (Strongly concur).

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This segment presents the examination of the information gathered from the respondents.

**(Sympathetically allude Table 1)**

Among the 144 respondents, 77 (53.5%) have a place with 20-30 years age bunch; 77 (53.5%) are female; 88

(61.1%) are hitched; 87 (60.4%) are post graduates; 51 (35.4%) have a place with over 8 years experience bunch; and 71 (49.3 %) have a place with over 25000 pay bunch.

**Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the Sample**

Demographic Factors	Classification	Number of Respondents	Percent
Age (in years)	20-30	77	53.5
	31-40	39	27.1
	41-50	18	12.5
	Above 50	10	6.9
Gender	Male	67	46.5
	Female	77	53.5
Marital Status	Married	88	61.1
	Single	56	38.9
Education	UG	57	39.6
	PG	87	60.4
Experience (in years)	Below 2	43	29.9
	2-5	34	23.6
	5-8	16	11.1
	Above 8	51	35.4
Monthly Income (Rs)	Below 15000	29	20.1
	15000-20000	13	9.0
	20001-25000	31	21.5
	Above 25000	71	49.3

**(Generously allude Table 2)**

A more elevated level of authoritative equity (Mean= 103.13) was seen among the respondents old enough gathering 20-30. A more elevated level of authoritative responsibility (Mean= 81.56) was seen among the respondents old enough gathering 41-50.

**Table 2 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of research variables in different age groups.**

Age		Organization aljustice	Organizational commitment
20-30	Mean	103.13	76.61
	N	77	77
	Std.Deviation	22.278	6.442
31-40	Mean	96.49	80.87
	N	39	39
	Std.Deviation	22.531	8.007
41-50	Mean	99.39	81.56
	N	18	18
	Std.Deviation	24.786	7.294
> 50	Mean	79.40	79.80
	N	10	10
	Std.Deviation	19.033	4.917
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std.Deviation	23.071	7.189

**(Compassionately allude Table 3)**

A more significant level of authoritative equity (Mean= 103.13) was seen among the female respondents.

A more significant level of authoritative responsibility (Mean= 81.56) was seen among the female respondents.

**Table 3 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of exploration factors among the male and female respondents.**

Gender		Organizational justice	Organizational commitment
Male	Mean	98.25	76.13
	N	67	67
	Std.Deviation	21.590	5.841
Female	Mean	100.05	80.75
	N	77	77
	Std.Deviation	24.396	7.587
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std. Deviation	23.071	7.189

**(Sympathetically allude Table 4)**

A more significant level of authoritative equity (Mean= 107.36) was seen among the respondents who are single. A more significant level of authoritative responsibility (Mean= 79.33) was seen among the respondents who are hitched.

**Table 4 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of exploration factors among the wedded and unmarried respondents**

Marital status		Organizational justice	Organizational commitment
Married	Mean	94.03	79.33
	N	88	88
	Std.Deviation	22.45	7.65
Single	Mean	107.36	77.46
	N	56	56
	Std.Deviation	21.81	6.28
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std.Deviation	23.07	7.18

(Generously allude Table 5)

A more elevated level of authoritative equity (Mean= 100.18) was seen among the post graduates. A more elevated level of authoritative responsibility (Mean= 80.07) was seen among the respondents who are under graduates

**Table 5 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of exploration factors in various Education gatherings.**

Education		Organizational justice	Organizational commitment
UG	Mean	97.74	80.07
	N	57	57
	Std.Deviation	24.599	8.426
PG	Mean	100.18	77.64
	N	87	87
	Std.Deviation	22.104	6.111
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std.Deviation	23.071	7.189

(Sympathetically allude Table 6)

A more significant level of hierarchical equity (Mean=109.79) was seen among the respondents of involvement bunch under 2 years. A more significant level of hierarchical responsibility (Mean=81.81) was seen among the respondents of involvement 5-8 years.

**Table 6 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of exploration factors in various Experience gatherings.**

Experience		Organizational justice	Organizational commitment
< 2	Mean	109.79	77.86
	N	43	43
	Std.Deviation	20.599	5.922
2-5	Mean	97.65	74.85
	N	34	34
	Std.Deviation	21.720	5.842
5-8	Mean	94.44	81.81
	N	16	16
	Std.Deviation	27.164	8.448
>8	Mean	92.84	80.73
	N	51	51
	Std.Deviation	22.058	7.516
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std.Deviation	23.071	7.189

(Generously allude Table 7)

A more elevated level of authoritative equity (Mean=112.17) was seen among the respondents of pay bunch underneath under 15000. A more elevated level of authoritative responsibility (Mean=79.92) was seen among the respondents of pay 15001-20000.

**Table 7 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of examination factors in various Income gatherings.**

Income		Organizational justice	Organizational commitment
< 15000	Mean	112.17	79.21
	N	29	29
	Std.Deviation	22.854	6.673
15001-20000	Mean	110.54	79.92
	N	13	13
	Std.Deviation	24.768	5.090
20001-25000	Mean	100.23	79.84
	N	31	31
	Std.Deviation	21.844	6.548
>25000	Mean	91.41	77.58
	N	71	71
	Std.Deviation	20.325	7.920
Total	Mean	99.22	78.60
	N	144	144
	Std.Deviation	23.071	7.189

(Compassionately allude Table 8)



There was a huge contrast in procedural equity ( $F=16.504, p < .01$ ); interactional equity ( $F=9.757, p < .01$ ); hierarchical equity ( $F=3.562, p < .05$ ); full of feeling responsibility ( $F=6.594, p < .01$ ); continuation responsibility ( $F=4.235, p < .01$ ); and authoritative responsibility ( $F=4.712, p < .01$ ) among the respondents of various age gatherings.

**Table 8 Showing the aftereffects of ANOVA trial of Research factors according to Age**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Distributive justice	Between Groups	25.047	3	8.349	1.152	.330
	Within Groups	1014.509	140	7.246		
	Total	1039.556	143			
Procedural justice	Between Groups	475.615	3	158.538	16.504	.000
	Within Groups	1344.823	140	9.606		
	Total	1820.437	143			
Interactional justice	Between Groups	874.008	3	291.336	9.757	.000
	Within Groups	4180.319	140	29.859		
	Total	5054.326	143			
Organizational	Between	5397.204	3	1799.068	3.562	.016

justice	Groups					
	Within Groups	70715.123	140	505.108		
	Total	76112.326	143			
Affective commitment	Between Groups	271.098	3	90.366	6.594	.000
	Within Groups	1918.652	140	13.705		
	Total	2189.750	143			
Continuance commitment	Between Groups	143.882	3	47.961	4.235	.007
	Within Groups	1585.611	140	11.326		
	Total	1729.493	143			
Normative commitment	Between Groups	9.492	3	3.164	.304	.822
	Within Groups	1456.480	140	10.403		
	Total	1465.972	143			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	677.722	3	225.907	4.712	.004
	Within Groups	6712.715	140	47.948		
	Total	7390.438	143			

**(Benevolently allude Table 9)**

There was a critical distinction in distributive equity ( $F=2.970, p < .05$ ); interactional equity ( $F=4.426, p < .01$ ); authoritative equity ( $F=4.972, p < .01$ ); emotional responsibility ( $F=5.263, p < .01$ ); continuation responsibility ( $F=2.751, p < .05$ ); standardizing responsibility ( $F=4.759, p < .01$ ); and hierarchical responsibility ( $F=6.442, p < .01$ ) among the respondents of various experience gatherings.

**Table 9 Showing the consequences of ANOVA trial of Research factors and Experience bunch**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Distributive justice	Between Groups	62.196	3	20.732	2.970	.034
	Within Groups	977.359	140	6.981		
	Total	1039.556	143			
Procedural justice	Between Groups	41.871	3	13.957	1.099	.352
	Within Groups	1778.566	140	12.704		
	Total	1820.438	143			
Interactional justice	Between Groups	437.807	3	145.936	4.426	.005
	Within Groups	4616.520	140	32.975		
	Total	5054.326	143			
Organizational justice	Between Groups	7328.763	3	2442.921	4.972	.003
	Within Groups	68783.564	140	491.311		
	Total	76112.326	143			
Affective commitment	Between Groups	221.943	3	73.981	5.263	.002
	Within Groups	1967.807	140	14.056		
	Total	2189.750	143			
Continuance commitment	Between Groups	96.267	3	32.089	2.751	.045
	Within Groups	1633.226	140	11.666		
	Total	1729.493	143			
Normative commitment	Between Groups	135.652	3	45.217	4.759	.003
	Within Groups	1330.320	140	9.502		
	Total	1465.972	143			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	896.416	3	298.805	6.442	.000
	Within Groups	6494.022	140	46.386		
	Total	7390.437	143			

**(Benevolently allude Table 10)**

There was a critical distinction in distributive equity ( $F=3.701, p < .05$ ); procedural equity ( $F=3.467, p < .05$ ); interactional equity ( $F=7.702, p < .01$ ); and hierarchical equity ( $F=7.795, p < .01$ ) among the respondents of various pay gatherings.

**Table 10 Showing the consequences of ANOVA trial of Research factors and Income gatherings**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Distributive justice	Between Groups	76.393	3	25.464	3.701	.013
	Within Groups	963.163	140	6.880		
	Total	1039.556	143			
Procedural justice	Between Groups	125.907	3	41.969	3.467	.018
	Within Groups	1694.530	140	12.104		
	Total	1820.437	143			
Interactional justice	Between Groups	716.018	3	238.673	7.702	.000
	Within Groups	4338.309	140	30.988		
	Total	5054.326	143			
Organizational justice	Between Groups	10894.383	3	3631.461	7.795	.000
	Within Groups	65217.943	140	465.842		
	Total	76112.326	143			
Affective commitment	Between Groups	45.809	3	15.270	.997	.396
	Within Groups	2143.941	140	15.314		
	Total	2189.750	143			
Continuance commitment	Between Groups	45.027	3	15.009	1.247	.295
	Within Groups	1684.466	140	12.032		
	Total	1729.493	143			
Normative commitment	Between Groups	39.516	3	13.172	1.293	.279
	Within Groups	1426.457	140	10.189		
	Total	1465.972	143			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	155.238	3	51.746	1.001	.394
	Within Groups	7235.199	140	51.680		
	Total	7390.437	143			

**(Benevolently allude Table 11)**

There was a critical positive relationship between's distributive equity and procedural equity ( $r=0.397, p<.01$ ); distributive equity and interactional equity ( $r=0.307, p<.01$ ); distributive equity and full of feeling commitment( $r=0.306, p<.01$ ); procedural equity and interactional equity ( $r=0.570, p<.01$ ); interactional equity and emotional responsibility ( $r=0.229, p<.01$ ); interactional equity and duration responsibility ( $r=0.219, p<.01$ ); and interactional equity and regularizing responsibility ( $r=0.211, p<.05$ ).

**Table 11 Showing the connection among research factors**

		<b>Distributive justice</b>	<b>Procedural justice</b>	<b>Interactional justice</b>	<b>Affective commitment</b>	<b>Continuance commitment</b>	<b>Normative commitment</b>
--	--	-----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Distributive justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.397**	.307*	.306**	.103	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.221	.595
	N		144	144	144	144	144
Procedural justice	Pearson Correlation		1	.570*	.038	.141	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.000	.653	.092	.693
	N			144	144	144	144
Interactional justice	Pearson Correlation			1	.229**	.219**	.211*
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.006	.008	.011
	N				144	144	144
Affective commitment	Pearson Correlation				1	.361**	.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.000	.381
	N					144	144
Continuance commitment	Pearson Correlation					1	.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.209
	N						144
Normative commitment	Pearson Correlation						1
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N						

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**(Mercifully allude Table 12)**

Relapse examination was led to explore the connection between the three components of authoritative equity - distributive equity, procedural equity, interactional equity, and the three elements of hierarchical responsibility i.e., full of feeling responsibility, duration responsibility, standardizing responsibility. F-Test was genuinely critical ( $F=7.201$  &  $p<.01$ ), and that implies that the model was measurably huge. The R-Square was .234 which implies that roughly 23% of the difference in authoritative responsibility was clarified by the indicator factors, that is, distributive equity, procedural equity, and interactional equity.

**Table 12 Showing the relapse examination with work fulfillment as reliant variable Model Summary**

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
1	.366 <sup>a</sup>	.234	.215	6.763

a. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional justice, Distributive justice, Procedural justice

<b>Model</b>		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1	Regression	987.936	3	329.312	7.201	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	6402.502	140	45.732		
	Total	7390.437	143			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional justice, Distributive justice, Procedural justice

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment

**Conclusion**

Organizational justice alludes to representatives' view of decency in the work environment. Hierarchical responsibility is a mental express that describes the representative's relationship with

the association, and has suggestions for the choice to proceed with participation in the association. The reason for this study was to inspect the connection between hierarchical equity and authoritative responsibility among the workers auto industry. The example comprised of 144 representatives. The devices utilized for investigation were rate examination, mean and standard deviation, ANOVA, relationship and relapse. The aftereffects of this examination uncovered that there is a huge connection between interactional equity and authoritative responsibility. Interactional equity centers around the nature of the relational treatment individuals get during the execution of methods and results. It was observed that interactional equity will significantly affect authoritative responsibility. 23% of the difference in authoritative responsibility was clarified by distributive equity, procedural equity, and interactional equity.

### References:

1. Greenberg J (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: the hidden cost of pay cuts, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 561-568.
2. Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. M. Rowland & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3, 141-183.
3. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resources Management*. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.
4. Bies & Moag, 1986. Bies, R & Moag, J (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In Lewicki, R, Bazerman M & Sheppard B, (Eds), *Research on negotiation in organizations*: 43-55. Greenwich, CT : JAI Press.
5. Adams, J.S (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
6. Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 91-131.
7. Cohen-Charash, Y & Spector, P E (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A Meta analysis, *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 86: 278-321.
8. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications*.
9. Meyer J.P and Allen N.J (1991). A three component conceptualization of Organizational commitment, *Human resource management review*, 1(1): 61-89.
10. Arif Hassan (2002). Organisational Justice as a Determinant of Organisational Commitment and Intention to Leave. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 7(2), 55–66.
11. Nazim Ali & Shahid Jan (2012). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions amongst Medical Representatives of Pharmaceuticals Companies of Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, Vol.VI (2), 201-212.

12. Akanbi et al (2013). Impact of Perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment of a Food and Beverage Firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol.3 (14), 207-218.
13. Fariba Rafei-Dehkordi, Sardar Mohammadi and Mozafar Yektayar (2013). Relationship of organizational justice and organizational commitment of the staff in general directorate of youth and sports in Chahar Mahal Va Bakhtiari Province. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3 (3), 696-700.