'Measurement of Organization Justice Scale and its Dimensions on White Collared Professionals – An Empirical Analysis'

Prof. Stephen Deepak
Assistant Professor and Research Scholar
Faculty- School of Management
Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru

Dr. Syed Khalid Perwez
Associate Professor and Research Guide
VIT Business School,
VIT University Vellore

ABSTRACT

The dynamics of the world are ever changing and more so in the corporate world. Nothing is stable and nothing is permanent. The only goal driving is profits. Organizations around the world evolve, exist and endure to stay relevant. Goals, structure and people co-operate in seamless ways to deliver stakeholder promises. The people hired who form the core of the firm respond differently unlike other resources. For every action of the organization there is a reaction, which is perceived as Fair or Unfair. In this context is where this study focuses on checking the reliability of the scale on white collared professionals. The study was conducted on a sample of white collared professionals (N=188) in Bangalore using a self administered questionnaire adapting Colquitt's (2001) scale of Organization Justice, (COJS). The study hypothesized that Colquitt's (2001) COJS scale is a reliable scale of measurement in the Indian context. The findings of the study prove the hypothesis that Colquitt (2001) scale (COJS) is a reliable measurement scale in the Indian context for empirical studies.

Keywords: Distributive justice, Interpersonal Justice, Informational Justice, Procedural Justice, Organization Justice

Introduction

Organization Justice has been a very interesting area of study since the last 40 years. Justice is considered as one among the many values that an organization wants to promote. Employees working in organizations perceive actions or responses as Just and Unjust and it varies subjectively. Employee's attitude and behavior at work is largely affected by the judgement of what is fair? Or What is unfair? (Lind, 1997) (1). Employees judge fairness of procedures and mechanisms, tasks, rewards and behavior towards them in the organization and they develop an attitude towards the organization in view of their judgment (Greenberg, 1990: 399) (2). Justice as a matter of fact is of concern for the employee. 'Justice keeps people together whereas Injustice can pull them apart' (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998,p XII) (3).

Perceptions of Organization Justice have been linked to various Organizational outcomes such as Absenteeism (BoBoer et.al, 2002), Trust in the supervisor (Tyler-Lind, 1992), Organizational Citizenship (Gurbuz, 2007) turnover intention (Aquino – Hom, 1997) employee theft (Greenberg, 1993) Job Satisfaction (Warner et.al, 2005) and Organizational Commitment

(Martin – Bennet, 1996)(4). Greenberg (1987) introduced the concept of organizational justice. "Organizational justice is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs

and the ways in which those determinations influence other work-related variables" (Moorman, 1991, p. 845)(5).

The study of Organization Justice has emerged as a popular area of study with the pioneering work of many researchers such as Colquitt, Greenberg, Thibaut & Walker, Bies & Moag and so on. These studies have shown that the perceptions of fairness are different from the feelings of outcome or satisfaction from these outcomes (Cohen –Charash & Spector, 2001, Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Hutchinson, 2003) (6). These Justice studies have proved that perceptions of fairness or unfairness can explain the outcomes relating to employee Attitudes and Behavior, Organizational commitment, Citizenship behavior, Counter productive work behavior and task performance.

1.1. Dimensions of Organizational Justice:

1.1.1. Distributive Justice - The origins of the Justice perception can be traced to works of Homans (1961) and Adams (1965) wherein employees measured their outputs received to the ratio of inputs put by them and making a comparison with others which was propounded in the Equity Theory. If these ratios matched, the employee felt fairness or equity and if it did not match felt unfairness or Inequity. As this was mostly seen in terms of outcomes received by an employee in terms of pay, promotion and other organizational outputs distributed. (Moorman, 1991) explained distributive Justice as fairness concerned with the outcomes an employee receives in terms of pay and promotion . Distributive Justice refers to the fairness of outcomes which included benefits and punishments and how these were understood after allocations (Greenberg, 1990) (7).

1.1.2. Procedural Justice :

Authors studying justice found that allocations of outcomes alone do not matter but the rules and procedures involved and followed would create justice perceptions. Employees concern for the procedures than the distribution made the distributive justice inadequate (Nowakovski – Conlon, 2005) (8). Procedural Justice refers to the employee's perceptions on the decisions made by supervisors and whether these outcomes were made through a controlled process (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) (9). Just as Distributive Justice, procedural justice also affects employee outcomes (Ambrose, 2002). Leventhal and his colleagues(1980) further studied beyond . Leventhal (1980) brought out rules to state that procedural justice had to fulfill these a) Consistency b) Bias-Suppression c) Accuracy d) Correctability e) Representativeness and f) Ethicality(10).

1.1.3. Interactional Justice:

Bies & Moag (1986) brought out a third dimension to Justice. They argued that Justice Perceptions are influenced by factors that are beyond formal procedures (11). According to them the Interpersonal relationship that is engaged in the process of executing distributive and procedural outcomes affects employee perceptions. According to (Bies, Shapiro & Cumming, 1998) Organizational Justice perceptions can be increased if the reasons behind the decisions taken are explained and clearly, truthfully and adequately (12). (Bies & Moag, 1986) further added that positive organizational Justice perceptions can be seen if employees are treated with courtesy, dignity and respect (13). Further (Greenberg, 1993) said that Interactional Justice may be seen from two sub-dimensions. Some authors measuring Organizational justice recommended the use of a four dimensional construct to differentiate between the two measures (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter) (14).

1.1.3.1: Interpersonal Justice:

Interpersonal Justice means 'showing concern for individuals regarding the distributive outcomes they receive'(Greenberg, 1993) (p-85).This dimension refers to perceptions of respect and propriety in one's treatment (Greenberg, 1993) . It is not enough if outcomes have been distributed fairly or if procedures are followed properly, but whether the employees receive them with dignity matters. It reflects on the role of the supervisor or manager executing these outcomes.

1.1.3.2: Informational Justice:

Informational Justice means 'providing knowledge about the procedures that demonstrate regards for people's concern'. (Greenberg, 1993) (p-84) (15). This dimension measures the satisfaction with respect to the information conveyed and whether explanations were provided adequately to the employees in the outcome delivering process. It refers to whether supervisors and managers provide explanations about why certain procedures were followed or not and why certain individuals got more or why they got less and other matters needed to be conveyed much to the satisfaction of the employees.

1.2: Interrelationship of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice:

Many researchers have studied the Interrelationship of these, specifically ascertaining which dimension has a stronger influence on outcomes. Distributive Justice predicts pay level, pay increments and employee benefits much better than Procedural justice. Procedural Justice determines Pay structure and administration better over Distributive Justice (Heneman & Judge, 2000). (16). Some studies show relationships between the two dimensions and some others show differences. (Folger, 1986). Justice dimensions also do affect outcomes differently. Distributive justice influences attitudes regarding pay satisfaction whereas procedural justice influences employees to have strong global attitudes on institutions and trust in authorities (Lind& Tyler, 1988) (17). Clay-Warner et al. (2005) stated that the personal outcomes model assumes that 'workers focus upon distributive fairness in order to maximize their personal outcomes, because they believe that fair distributions will result in favorable distributions' (p. 394) (18).

Justice dimensions also have counter effects. Low distributive justice can result in employees quitting their job to end the inequity experienced by them (Hom,Griffeth and Sellaro, 1984) (19). Unhappiness regarding distributive outcomes has links with turnover. In a field study, (Fuller & Hester, 2001) found that Interactional Justice was stronger than procedural justice with the perceived support of the workers Union (20). In another study (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 2000) found that Interactional Justice perceptions affected supervisor related outcomes through leader member exchange and procedural justice perceptions affected organizational related outcomes through perceived organizational support(21).

Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001) through their meta-analysis of 190 studies published on justice in the workplace found that the three Justice dimensions had distinct constructs and differed in their associations. They suggest a distinction in their dimensions (22). Two other studies (Cole.M, Cole. L 1999) and (Folger, Konovsky, 2010) show that there exists a high correlation between distributive justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction. It is seen that employees have perceptions of procedural justice if supervisors provide sufficient information regarding the procedures used in decision making (Greenberg, 1987) (23). (Mikula et. al, 1990) found that employees perceive Interactional Justice more than distributive and procedural justice, referring to their Interpersonal treatment during communication and meetings (24). (Mohyeldin & Tahire, 2007) state that perceptions of fairness affects their relationships between peers, subordinates and supervisors (25).

Based on the social exchange theory employees expect polite, frank and sincere treatments from their peers and supervisors. Those who perceive righteous treatments are shown to exhibit positive organizational performances in the form of positive work attitudes, commitment towards goals, exhibit Organization citizenship behaviors, improved job performance, job satisfaction and lower turnovers (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001) (26)

In summary it can be seen that employees perceive Distributive and procedural justice perceptions on organizational outcomes and Interactional Justice perceptions – Interpersonal and Informational from a supervisor – subordinate or Leader – Member exchange relationship.

1.3: White Collared professionals and Organizational Justice perceptions:

White collared professionals are those who perform professional, managerial and administrative work in an office, cubicle or an administrative setting. Van Horn, Carl; Schaffner, Herbert (2003) (27). The term originated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in factories in the west where the managerial cadre wore white shirts and the factory workers wore blue. Hence the distinction. Another internet source explains white collared workers as person who are paid a monthly salary, they are college educated graduates and highly skilled in their respective jobs or professions. The White collared professionals list includes – Teachers, Lawyers, Doctors, sales representatives, corporate executives, financial analysts, pharmacists, bankers, biologists etc.

Developed and Developing countries are today relying on Industrial advancement leading to the emergence of the white collared workers or the knowledge workers in the Information based Knowledge economy. White collared professionals who hitherto worked in factories are today working in Knowledge enabled Industries. (Castells, 1996) says that Industrial economies are so advanced that they are on a fast paced growth mode of information development . Advancement in this area in terms of productivity and growth depends on the generation of Knowledge (28). Knowledge creation and Knowledge adaptation to work is increasing. Knowledge workers are enabling firms gain competitive advantage. Occupations with a high knowledge content are increasingly been demanded, not only are they central to the economic activity but also a source for the firm's competitive advantage (Flood et.al 2001) (29). This has led to an increase in the demand for knowledge workers as economies have shifted from production centric to service and knowledge centric. Demand for knowledge based white collared workers and increasing availability in Asian countries like India has led to their exploitation resulting in higher levels of Inequity and Organizational Injustice.

In an article titled 'How India exploits millions of White collared workers'(Payal Chawla) summarizes that white collared workers need to be treated well, and says that contrary to popular belief white collared workers are abused and exploited since there is no law to safeguard their interests. She highlights that the origin of the abuse or in our terms Injustice is in the legal contractual relationship of the employment contracts which do not provide enough bargaining teeth to the employees and they are at the receiving end of employers (30). Adams (1965) equity theory suggests that when individuals do not see a match between effort (Inputs) and rewards (outcomes) they see it as an exchange of Inequity (31). (Flood et.al, 2001) in a paper titled psychological contracts among knowledge workers studied the moderating role of psychological contracts (32). (Rousseau, 1995) defined psychological contract as 'an individuals belief regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange relationship between the focal person and another party (33).

The psychological contract establishes a contractual ongoing relationship between the employer and the employee where promises made are expected to be received according to the conditions and context of the contract. This can further be explained in the context of Organization Justice, if the psychological contract is intact perceived Organization Justice is greater or positive, if it is not kept or breached, or in other words the employee experiences Inequity, it can lead to intentions to quit (Lee et.al, 2012). These experiences can result in white collared workers turning counterproductive and showing lesser degrees of Organizational commitment. Studies have shown the influence of different dimensions of organizational Justice on Organizational commitment (Patrick, 2012) (34), (Bakshi et al, 2009) (35)

In their study (Ramamurthy, Flood, 2004) say that one area where inequity is seen is in the earnings gap between men and women (36). Several studies have also related inequity among women to glass ceiling, glass wall effects, non-supportive environment and access discrimination. (Schneer,Reitman, 1994) say that such differences exists across occupations and Industries (37). Similar results were seen on lawyers (wood, Corcoran & Courant, 1993) and in the private sector (Gerhart, Milkovich, 1998). (Chauvin & Ash, 1994) stated that

differences were not just in base pay but also in performance based pay. In this study it is seen that women experience lower distributive justice in terms of outcomes (38, 39, 40). Greenberg (1990) studied employee theft as an outcome of organizational Injustice. In the same study it was proved when reasons for pay cuts were communicated to the respondents in the experimental group, there was a reduction in employee theft (41). White collar abuse is in the form of psychological stereotyping - Gender, Pregnancy, Age, Caste, Religion, Sexual Orientation or Disability. Employers individually or to a group subject them to various forms of harassment which could include long hours of work, inequitable pay, non-recognition, bullying, favoritism, unfair demands, public humiliation and intrusive electronic surveillance. (Chawla) There is enough evidence that can show that white collared professionals too undergo various forms of experiences resulting in them perceiving justice as positive or negative. These perceptions can result in varied forms of Organizational outcomes.

1.4: Measurement scales of Organizational Justice:

Any theory developed has to be measured to conduct field research to discover new findings. Without measurement such theorizing remains just that: theoretical. Measuring the Justice variables and expressing them in numbers can enable researchers conduct empirical tests to prove theoretical concepts, and further contribute to Justice literature. (Colquitt, Rodell). Many measurement scales have been developed in the past (e.g., Earley & Lind, 1987; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkran, 1979; Tyler, Rasinski & Spodick, 1985) and as new research contributions developed new constructs with new items have been added to existing scales measuring Justice. (Moorman, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Blader & Tyler, 2003; Colquitt, 2001; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). (42). The widely used measure in many empirical Justice researches was measures developed by Moorman. (Moorman,1991) (43). In 1986 Bies and Moag introduced, Interactional Justice dimension to the existing Distributive and Procedural. They claimed that Interactional Justice consisted of rules of respect, propriety, truthfulness and justification, which were different measures compared to procedural justice rules put forth by (Thibaut and Walker1975, Leventhal, 1980) and in a later research Bies and Moag stated that the interactional items represented the Interpersonal aspect of Procedural justice, which was later proved in other researches. (Tyler & Bies, 1990; see also Folger & Bies, 1989; Greenberg, Bies, & Eskew, 1991). (44)

Later Moorman's (1991) measurement scale introduced a two dimensional procedural justice scale called formal procedures that measured Organizational related outcomes and Interactional Justice that measured supervisor related outcomes. The scales in later researches of (Bies, 2001; Bobocel & Holmvall, 2001) overlapped with formal procedures covering Bies and Moag's Justification rules and Interactional Justice covering process control rule (Thibaut and Walker, 1975) and suppression rule bias of (Leventhals,1980) procedural justice (45). Later studies using this scale felt to need to separate these dimensions. Hence Colquitt(2001) introduced a new scale to address these issues. He created a new scale to measure Organizational Justice with procedural justice items based on (Thibaut and Walker,1975) and Leventhal (1980) procedural rules. The Interactional Justice items were from Bies and Moag's (1986) rules (46). Colquitt further using the work of Greenberg(1993b) further divided the Interactional Justice construct into Interpersonal which covered respect and propriety items and Informational Justice construct that measured truthfulness and Justification.

Studies using adapting the Colquitt (2001) scale (COJS) have shown factor analytical support for studying the Interactional Justice dimension separately. (e.g., Ambrose, Hess, & Ganesan, 2007; Bell, Wiechmann, & Ryan, 2006; Camerman, Cropanzano, & Vandenberghe, 2007; Choi, 2008; Cole, Bernerth, Walter, & Holt, 2010; Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; El Akremi, Vandenberghe, & Camerman, 2010; Hausknecht, Sturman, & Roberson, 2011) . Whether a three dimensional construct (Moorman, 1991) is used or a four dimensional construct

(Colquitt, 2001) is used the choice of measurement scale must be guided by the research questions and the operating variables. (Colquitt, Rodell). The developed scale based on research contribution lays down specific and actionable principles to measure Justice. The measurement scales do not stop with measuring outcomes but also lays rules for correction for Organization's that want to become procedurally Just (Colquitt,2001, Moorman, 1993) (Colquitt, Rodell) (47).

2. Objectives of the study:

The purpose of the research was two folds:-

i. To measure the (Colquitt, 2001) scale of Organization Justice (COJS) and its four dimensions -
Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal, and Informational Justice.

ii. To study the perceptions of white collared professionals on the four dimensions of Organization Justice.

Many studies have validated the scale in the western context, Indian context offers a different setting – a) The diverse workforce and many sub-cultural groups perceive Justice differently b) The ever demanding increase in the quantity and quality of white collared professionals due to increased outsourcing offers a researchable context.

3. Research Methodology:

The study was conducted among white collared professionals chosen through Convenience sampling. 200 self administered questionnaires were distributed. 188 responses were collected for analysis with a response rate of 94%. The questionnaire had two parts – Part – A contained information pertaining to the Demographic and Work Profile of white collared professionals. Part – B contained questions from Colquitt's (2001) 20 item scale measuring the four Justice dimensions. Distributive Justice had 4 items, Procedural Justice had 7 items, and Interpersonal had 4 items. Informational Justice had 5 items. The responses were measured on a 5 point Likert's rating scale (1 – Measuring to a very small extent and 5 – Measuring to a very large extent).

3.1. Hypothesis:

H1 – Colquitt (2001) scale of Organization Justice is a Reliable and Valid scale in the Indian context.

4: Analysis and Interpretation:

4.1:Demographic and occupational profile of white collared professionals

Table -1: Age of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	18-25	46	24.5	24.5	24.5
	26-32	78	41.5	41.5	66.0
	33-40	44	23.4	23.4	89.4
Valid	41-47	14	7.4	7.4	96.8
	48 and above	6	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – From the above table it can be seen that 41.5% of the respondents are in the age group of 26 – 32, followed by 24.5% in 18 – 25 and 23.4% between 33 – 40 years of age. This data shows that the more than 60% of the respondents have work experience, given the age brackets that they fall into.

Table -2: Gender of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	male	107	56.9	56.9	56.9
Valid	Female	81	43.1	43.1	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – From the table it can be seen that 56.9% of the respondents were Men and 43.1% were women. The Gender represents an almost equal opinion of Organization justice, as it is well represented by both Male and Female

Table – 3: Educational Qualifications of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Graduate	99	52.7	52.7	52.7
Valid	Post Graduate	78	41.5	41.5	94.1
	Ph.D	10	5.3	5.3	99.5
					100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 52.7% of the respondents were Graduates followed by 41.5% Post Graduates. The respondent sample is an educated sample, hence it can be ascertained that they are individually and voluntarily aware and can respond to Justice Contexts within the firm

Table-4: Profession of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Business/Management	36	19.1	19.1	19.1
	Education	28	14.9	14.9	34.0
	Consulting	10	5.3	5.3	39.4
Valid	Legal	7	3.7	3.7	43.1
	Healthcare	11	5.9	5.9	48.9
	Banking/Insurance	13	6.9	6.9	55.9
	others	83	44.1	44.1	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 55.9% of the respondents were in the fields of Business/Management, Education, and Consulting and so on. 44.1% of the respondents belonged to the IT/ITES, Hospitality, Retail sectors.

Table – 5: Designation level of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Junior level	68	36.2	36.2	36.2
	Senior level	73	38.8	38.8	75.0
	Managerial level	30	16.0	16.0	91.0
	Senior Managerial level	13	6.9	6.9	97.9
	Owner/MD/CEO	4	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 38.8% and 36.2% of the respondents belonged to the Senior and Junior level respectively, followed by minorities in managerial, senior managerial level. 50% and more respondents are in the senior and Managerial level, presenting a good understanding and experience of Justice Contexts.

Table – 6: Reporting supervisor of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	135	71.8	71.8	71.8
	Female	52	27.7	27.7	99.5
	4.00	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 71.8% of the respondents reported to a Male supervisor. 27.7% reported to a Female supervisor.

Table – 7: Work experience in current organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than a year	27	14.4	14.4	14.4
	1-2 years	66	35.1	35.1	49.5
	2-4 years	45	23.9	23.9	73.4
	4 and above	50	26.6	26.6	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 85.6% of the respondents had worked in the current organization ranging from a minimum of one to four and above years. More than 50% of the respondents have more than two years of work experience in the current organization. Hence the data gathered shows that respondents have spent a fairly good time in the current organization and the findings are well supported.

Table – 8: Respondents overall work experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-5 years	87	46.3	46.3	46.3
	6-10 years	55	29.3	29.3	75.5
	11-15 years	23	12.2	12.2	87.8
	16-20 years	13	6.9	6.9	94.7
	21-25 years	5	2.7	2.7	97.3
	25 years and above	5	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation – 46.3% of the respondents had overall work experience of 0-5 years followed by 29.3% of the respondents who had a 6-10 years of overall work experience. The overall work experience of the respondents have experiences ranging from 1 to 20 years forming the majority. This finding proves that the respondents have encountered many organizational Justice instances to make a good judgement of the questions asked in the scale.

Table – 9: Number of organization's that respondents have worked

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	46	24.5	24.5	24.5
	1-3	106	56.4	56.4	80.9
	4-6	31	16.5	16.5	97.3
	6 and above	3	1.6	1.6	98.9
	6.00	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	188	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation - It is seen from the table that 56.4% of the respondents had worked in 1 to 3 organizations and 24.5 % of the respondents were working in their first organization, followed by 16.5% in 4 to 6 organizations. More than 70% of the respondents have worked in more than one organization proves that their opinions of justice are not merely one organization based.

4.2: Reliability Test of the Organizational Justice dimensions

SL.NO	ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE DIMENSIONS/CONSTRUCTS	CRONBACH ALPHA VALUES
1.	DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE	.896
2.	PROCEDURAL JUSTICE	.834
3.	INTERPERSONAL JUSTICE	.560
4.	INFORMATIONAL JUSTICE	.636
5.	OVERALL ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE	.891

Colquitt (2001) developed a scale based on Greenberg's (1993) validity of the four factor structure. He conducted two independent studies one in a University setting and another in a field setting where he compared multiple factor structures, including one- factor, two-factor, three factor, and four-factor concepts. Through a confirmatory analysis he was able to prove that the best model to measure Organizational Justice was a four factor model.

Colquitt's (2001) findings of reliability in the University and field samples for Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice measured the sub

scales having reliability indices of .92, .78, .79 and .79 in the University setting and .92, .93, .92 and .90 in the field setting (57). The four factor model to measure Organization Justice is used in more in the western English speaking countries (Maharee-Lawler, Rodwell, & Noblet, 2010) (48).

In the research article titled 'Spanish version of Colquitt's Organization Justice Scales',(Gracia, Barbaranelli, Jiménez, 2014) the authors adapted Colquitt's (2001) (COJS) scale in the Spanish context and tested its reliability and validity. COJS was translated into Spanish and tested on a sample of 460 Spanish employees working in service sector. The Cronbach alpha values in this study were .88 for Procedural Justice, .95 for Distributive Justice, .91 for Interpersonal Justice and .94 for Informational Justice (49). In a paper titled 'Multiple Dimensions of Organizational Justice and Work-Related Outcomes among Health-Care Professionals' (Srivastava, U.R, 2015) published in the American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 2015 adapted Colquitt's (2001)(COJS) 4 item scale for Distributive Justice and 5 items scale developed by Bies and Moag and Shapiro, Buttner and Barry. The author in this study had reported Cronbach alpha co-efficients of 0.92 for the Distributive scale and 0.79 for Informational Justice scale in the Indian context (50).

In another study titled 'Determinants of Organization Justice, A survey conducted in Pakistan', published in the International Review for Management and Business research, Kamran Iqbal (2013) adapted Colquitt's (2001) and Mohyeldin & Tahire (2007) for a study to research the relationship between the Organization Justice dimensions and Job Justice reported a Cronbach Alpha Co-efficient values of .749 for Procedural Justice, .546 for Distributive Justice and .738 for Interactional Justice (51). In another study titled ' Test of the Construct and

Criteria Validity of a German measure of Organizational Justice' the authors (Streicher et.al, 2007) used Colquitt's (2001)(COJS) adapted scale reporting an Alpha value between .79 to .93 for the Organizational Justice scales (52).

5: Findings:

From the research findings that it can be seen that Colquitt's (2001)(COJS) scale is reliable and can be used in the Indian context for conducting empirical research. Scores of .896 and .834 for Distributive Justice and Procedural justice respectively shows that the scale is reliable in measuring these two justice dimensions, and white collared professionals have expressed a positive perception for their experiences in terms of outcomes received and procedures followed in determining these outcomes. This is also consistent with similar results for the same in the Spanish setting where procedural justice showed an Alpha value of .88 and distributive justice showed .95, and in the Pakistan setting it showed a value .749 for Procedural Justice and .546 for Distributive Justice and in the German context showed an alpha value of .79 and above. From the analysis it can be seen that white collared professionals receive better outcomes in comparison to their Pakistani or German counterparts. But this is lesser in comparison to the western setting where Colquitt's (2001) findings in the University and field setting shows values higher than .92 and above indicating that the Justice context is different between the West and the East. The East is slightly lesser but shows certain signs of improving and catching up with the west.

From the findings in this study Interpersonal Justice showed a lower alpha value at .560 showing a lesser perception white collared professionals have in the Interpersonal dimension. This is lesser in comparison to the alpha value in the Spanish setting at .91, values from another Indian study showed a value of .79, values in the Pakistan setting showed values at .73. The western setting value from Colquitt's (2001) finding is at .79 and .92. It can be interpreted that the scale shows a higher value in western settings and lesser in the Asian setting. A low value of .560 in this study can be interpreted as the relationship outcome with the supervisor, it shows in the Interpersonal Justice dimension the employees are not securing justice reflecting a situation of impoliteness, lack of respect and dignity or been subjected to improper remarks or comments.

The reliability score from the study for Informational Justice is .636 showing a value better than Interpersonal. Comparative studies for the same in German setting shows a value of .94, Indian setting shows a value of .79, .73 in the Pakistan setting. In the western setting the scores were .79 for the University setting sample and .90 for the field setting, showing that in the west employees have higher and positive perceptions in the workplace as proved in the field study (Colquitt, 2001). In the Asian settings a lesser value indicates that employees perceive lesser in the Informational Justice dimension, indicating that the supervisor related interactions determine this perception. This can also be attributed to the traditional organizational structures, power and authority and a top down approach that is still prevalent in India and many Asian countries, proving why white collared professionals are positive and happy with distributive and procedural but are less positive about Interpersonal and Informational Justice. With the overall organizational Justice dimension proving a Cronbach Alpha value of .891, the Colquitt scale is reliable and can be adapted in the Indian context as proved by this study. Hence the hypothesis is proved that Colquitt's (2001) (COJS) scale of Organization Justice is a Reliable and Valid scale in the Indian context.

6: Conclusion:

The study of Organizational Justice evokes enough curiosity as people's perception of fairness or unfairness is multifaceted. Employee perception to Organization justice affects the work attitudes of employees (McFarlin and Sweeney(1992). It is rather important to understand Justice and its varied outcomes on employee behavior. It is justified for employees to expect a fair and just treatment at work (Deutsch, 1985). Ignoring Organizational Justice would prove difficult for firms to motivate their employees (Lambert et.al, 2005).

The present study measuring Colquitt's (2001) scale on white collared professionals in the Indian context shows that though there is positive perception and satisfaction regarding distributive and procedural justice but Interpersonal and Informational Justice dimensions score low, revealing that the Organizations must focus on the Interpersonal relationship treating employees with politeness, dignity and respect. Perceptions on Informational Justice can be improved when firms explain how information is conveyed and why outcomes were distributed in a certain manner. Nevertheless the study proves that the COJS is reliable and can be used in the Indian context.

References:

1. Lind, E. A., Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (1997). Procedural context and culture: Variation in the antecedents of procedural justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73, 767- 780.

2. Greenberg, J. (1990a). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16, 399–432.

3. Folger, R. and Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management, Sage

4. Cohen-Charash, Y. and Spector, P. (2001), "The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 278-321

5. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors:Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 845-855.

6. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 425–445.

7. Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource

8. Nowakowski, J.M & Conlon, D.E (2005). Organizational justice: looking back, looking forward. The International Journal of Conflict Management , Vol. 16, No, l,pp,4-29. Pages 1152-1165, Taylor & Francis.

9. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Volume 34, Issue 2, Academic Press

10. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg & R. Willis (Eds.),

Social exchange: Advances in theory and research: 27–55. New York: Plenum.

11. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

12. Bies, R.J., Shapiro, D.L., & Cummings, L.L. (1988). Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: Is it enough to say it's not my fault? Communication Research 15, 381-399.

13. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

14. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 425–445.

15. Greenberg, J. (1993b). Th e social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management (pp. 79–103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

16. Heneman, H. G., & Judge, T. A. (2000). Incentives and motivation. In S. Rynes & B. Gerhart (Eds.), Compensation in organizations: Progress and prospects (pp. 61–103). San Francisco, CA: New Lexington Press.

17. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. New York: Plenum..

18. Jody Clay-Warner, Jeremy Reynolds, Paul Roman, Organizational justice and job satisfaction: A test of three competing models, 2005/12/1, Journal Social Justice Research, Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers, Journal Academy of Management.

19. Hom, P.W., Griffeth, R.W., & Sellaro, C.L. (1984). The validity of Mobley's 1977 model of employee turnover. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34, 141–174

20. Fuller, J. B., Jr., & Hester, K. (2001). A closer look at the relationship between justice perceptions and union participation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(6)

21. Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 738–748.

22. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 278–321.

23. Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12, 9–22.

24. Mikula et al. (1990). What People Regard as Unjust: types and structures of everydayexperiences of injustice. European journal of Social Psychology , 20 (2), 49-133

25. Mohyeldin, A., & Tahire, S. (2007). Links between justice,satisfaction and performance in the workplace. Journal of Management Development , 26 (4), 294-311

26. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 278–321.

27. Van Horn, Carl; Schaffner, Herbert (2003). *Work in America: M-Z.* CA, USA: ABC-Clio Ltd.p. 597. ISBN 9781576076767, http://www.ehow.com/list_6465814_list-white-collar-

jobs.html.

28. Castells, M. (1996). _The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Volume I_. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

29. Flood, P., T. Turner, N. Ramamoorthy and J. Pearson (2001). 'Causes and consequences of psychological contract among knowledge workers in the high technology and financial services industries', The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12, pp. 1152–1165.

30. MANAGING MANAGERS - How India exploits millions of white-collar workers http://qz.com/334759/how-india-exploits-millions-of-white-collar-workers/ - Author – Payal Chawla.

31. Adams, J. S. (1965).Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social

32. Patrick C Flood, Thomas Turner, Nagarajan Ramamoorthy, Jill Pearson, Causes and consequences of psychological contracts among knowledge workers in the high technology and financial services industries, 2001/1/1, Journal International Journal of Human Resource Management, Volume 12 Issue 7

33. Denise Rousseau, Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements, 1995/5/18, Sage Publications.

34. Commitment of Information TechnologyEmployees in Relation to Perceived Organizational Justice, Harold Andrew Patrick*/2012/IUP.

35. Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. International Journal of Business and Management, 4, (9), 145-154

36. Nagarajan Ramamoorthy, Patrick C Flood, Gender and employee attitudes: The role of organizational justice perceptions, 2004/9/1, Journal British Journal of Management, Volume 15, Issue 3 Pages 247-258.

37. Schneer, J. A. and F. Reitman: 1990, 'Effects of Employment Gaps on the Careers of M.B.A.s: More Damaging for Men than for Women?', Academy of Management Journal 33, 391–406.

38. Wood Robert G., Corcoran Mary E., Courant Paul N. 1993. "Pay Differences among the Highly Paid: The Male-Female Earnings Gap in Lawyers' Salaries." Journal of Labor

39. Barry Gerhart, George T Milkovich, Organizational differences in managerial compensation and financial performance, 1990/12/1, Journal Academy of Management journal, Volume 33 Issue 4, Academy of Management

40. Chauvin, K., & Ash, R. (1994). Gender earnings differentials in total pay, base pay, and contingent pay. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 47, 634–649.

41. Greenberg, J. (1990a). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: Th e hidden cost of paycuts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 561–568.

42. (Earley & Lind, 1987; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkran, 1979; Tyler, Rasinski & Spodick, 1985), (Moorman, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Blader & Tyler, 2003; Colquitt, 2001; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002) referenced in the Meta analysis of Colquitt, J., Scott, B., Rodell, J., Long, D., Zapata, C., Conlon, D., & Wesson, M. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A metaanalytic test of social

exchange and affect-based perspectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98, 199-236.

43. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 845-855.

44. Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In B.H. Sheppard, R.J. Lewicki, & M.H. Bazerman (Eds.), Research on negotiations in organizations (pp. 83-99). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

45. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, and R. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research (pp. 27–55). New York: Plenum Press.

46. Colquitt JA (2001) On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. J Appl Psychol 86, 386–400.

47. Colquitt, J., Scott, B., Rodell, J., Long, D., Zapata, C., Conlon, D., & Wesson, M. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A metaanalytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98, 199-236.

48. Maharee-Lawler, S., Rodwell, J., & Noblet, A. (2010). A step toward a common measure of organizational justice. Psychological Reports, 106, 407- 418.

49. Liliana Díaz-Gracia1, Claudio Barbaranelli and Bernardo Moreno-Jiménez,Spanish version of Colquitt's Organizational Justice Scale, Psicothema 2014, Vol. 26, No. 4, 538-544, ISSN 0214 - 9915 CODEN PSOTEG Copyright © 2014 Psicothema

50. Srivastava, U.R, 2015, 'Multiple Dimensions of Organizational Justice and Work-Related Outcomes among Health-Care Professionals' published in the American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 2015

51. Kamran Iqbal, Determinants of Organizational Justice(A survey conducted in Pakistan), International Review of Management and Business Research Vol. 2 Issue, 2013.

52. Bernhard Streicher, Eva Jonas, Günter W. Maier, Dieter Frey, Ralph Woschée and Bettina, Waßmer Test of the Construct and Criteria Validity of a German measure of Organizational Justice, , European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 2007