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Abstract

Organization Justice refers to the feelings and perceptions of fairness or unfairness that employees experience in the workplace. This perception differs significantly based on gender. Women employees experience justice far more differently than men, often facing discrimination, bias, and harassment. This study examines perceptions of organizational justice using four scales of dimensional justice including: Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal and Informational Justice. The study indicates a differing perception among working women to the individual items of the construct. The findings show that working women find a certain degree of fairness in Distributive justice, though an unsatisfactory perception remains with respect to outcomes reflecting efforts. Procedural Justice shows a drastically unfair picture, pointing to the discrimination and procedural mishaps resulting in gender discrimination. Women have experienced Interpersonal Justice which reflects that they are treated with respect and dignity. Information Justice too reflects a favourable perception among the respondents except for the fact that information sharing was not perceived as candid.
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Introduction

Due to the amount of time a person spends at work, organizations become a second home to the employees. In fact, they tend to spend more time at work than at their homes. In this scenario, it is important for the management teams of various organizations to provide a conducive environment for their employees to work as well as ensure fair and just treatment. Employees are concerned about their work environment and how the organizations take care of them. The positive or negative perception about the workplace is dependent on how organizations and supervisors or leaders treat them. The relationship between organizations and employees is based on reciprocity as they ascertain events and decisions happening within the organization as fair or unfair and that moulds their views. Since the employees invest their time and energy at their respective organizations, it is reasonable to seek fairness from the organization. These expectations obviously place great responsibility on organizations to focus on the perceived fairness by the workers (Patrick, 2012).
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The central idea of this concept has been in circulation for a long time, but it gathered momentum with the Social Exchange theory of Homans in 1961 and the Equity theory of Adams in 1965. In an attempt to bring the fairness literature under a common umbrella, Greenberg used the term ‘Organization Justice’ to make fairness and its role understood in the context of organizations (Greenberg, 1990). Organization Justice examines the understanding of employees’ perceptions of being treated fairly or not, and how such an understanding determines organizational outcomes for them (Moorman, 1991). Recently, research focusing on this area has garnered significant interest among researchers as perception about justice is related to the overall organizational procedures, rules and policies employees perceive about their jobs.

Many studies focusing on this area have established a strong relationship between Organization Justice and organizational outcomes. Perceptions of employee fairness have led to results such as commitment, citizenship concerns, job satisfaction, and performance (Greenberg, 1993; Colquitt et al., 2001; Tatum et al., 2002). Further, it has promoted leadership, organizational commitment, trust, customer satisfaction, job performance and leader-member exchange (Cohen and Spector, 2001) and has averted turnover intentions and absenteeism (Colquitt et al., 2001). Parallel perceptions of unfairness have led to negative outcomes such as lower performance, higher turnover intentions, theft, low citizenship, low organizational commitment (Greenberg, 1990; Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Folger and Cropanzano, 1998). Additionally, it has resulted in frustration, low self-image and moral outrage (Greenberg, 1990), low job performance (Greenberg, 1988), poor work ethics (Cowherd and Levine, 1992) and low co-operation among co-workers (Pfeffer and Langton, 1993).

Dimensions of Organizational Justice

Distributive Justice

The earliest understanding of perceptions of fairness can be traced back to the theoretical contributions of Homans (1961) and Adams (1965). Employees make comparisons with the efforts they put in and the returns they get. Further, they make comparisons with other employees to judge whether they have received their returns fairly. The returns include wages, benefits, allowances, promotions and other such rewards for contributions rendered to the organization. Moorman (1991) referred to fairness as outcomes received in the form of pay and promotion. Distributive justice was perceived as an outcome in the form of benefits and punishments, and how these were allotted to the employees.

Procedural Justice

Procedural Justice referred to rules and policies related to the allocation of outcomes such as pay, benefits, promotions and increments. Employees are more concerned about the procedures applied in the distribution of rewards and outcomes (Nowakowski–Conlon, 2005) made by supervisors and are keen to know whether these decisions were taken by a controlled process (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). Procedural Justice affects employee outcomes and affects their perceptions of fairness. Leventhal (1980) listed a) Consistency b) Bias-Suppression c) Accuracy d) Correctability e) Representativeness and f) Ethicality as the rules to ensure Procedural Justice in organizations.

Interactional Justice – The third dimension of justice was highlighted by Bies and Moag (1986) as they stated that justice perceptions are understood by individual beyond formal procedures.
They stated that the employees are concerned about the interpersonal interactions with their supervisor and how procedural and distributive justice is perceived by the superiors. Bies et al. (1998) emphasized that organization justice perceptions can be improved if decisions taken on employees’ outcomes are transparent and explained adequately. Further, they stated that perceptions can be positively improved if employees are treated with respect, dignity and courtesy. Greenberg (1993) stated that Interactional Justice can be seen from two dimensions, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice in order to clearly understand the nuances. Colquitt et al. (2001) recommended the use of the four dimensional justice scale of Colquitt to measure Organization Justice.

a) Interpersonal Justice: Interpersonal Justice is understood as the regard and concern during the allocation of distributive outcomes (Greenberg, 1993). It refers to a sense of propriety displayed while treating another individual (Greenberg, 1993). The authors emphasize on the humane treatment during the allotment of distributive and procedural justice. This dimension is often a reflection of the behaviour of supervisors and managers.

b) Informational Justice: Informational Justice refers to providing the right information about processes and procedures to people out of concern. (Greenberg, 1993). Informational Justice is perceived by employees as the right to information and whether it was provided to the satisfaction of the individuals concerned. Employees do not bother much about outcomes if proper information and explanations are provided to them about the procedures that were followed when decisions were taken.

Women, Gender Diversity and Justice Perceptions

Due to globalization, the world has undergone dynamic changes over the last few decades. This has influenced the corporate sector by increasing competition among firms, expanding consumer markets and promoting growth in the financial sectors. This has led to diversity of operations, thereby, bringing in a divergent workforce in various organizations. Diversity among the workforce is often seen as differences in terms of gender, age, race, ethnicity and culture.

Firms today are witnessing an increased number of women entering the corporate sector who are breaking the glass ceiling and also taking higher responsibilities at the board level. There is a gradual increase in the percentage of women graduates which has led to a rising number of women participating in decision making roles and also breaking gender stereotypes by entering professions traditionally held by men. This has added to the diversification of the corporate sector by moving from a male dominated sector towards a gender neutral structure. However, the reality is far from the ideal scenario as only a few corporates have consciously put in effort to bring in diversity. A majority of them are still struggling, though they value the manifold talent and multiple perspectives that diversity brings in.

Firms have failed to bring about a gender-neutral environment and female-friendly policies and practices that can make women feel welcomed and comfortable. Male dominated and male centric policies and practices have deterred young women and often alienated them, thereby, resulting in poor work attitudes, absenteeism, high turnover and unproductive outcomes. Women experience lower positive attitudes, involvement and engagement due to a biased work environment (Ensher et al., 2001). It has been stated by several studies that overt and covert gender discrimination have dampening effects which affects women employees at work, leading...
to unequal wages and salary, unfavourable job evaluations, poor perceptions of organization justice and sexual harassment (Nieva and Gutek, 1980; Powell, 1986, Stewart and Gudykunst, 1982).

With an increase of women in the workforce, perceived injustices and discrimination have been researched widely as these factors have been associated with negative outcomes, such as procedural injustice resulting in anger against the organization (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997), distributive injustice leading to employee theft (Greenberg, 1990) and gender discrimination leading to work conflicts (Gutek et al., 1996).

Gender discrimination has been associated with distributive and procedural justice (Foley et al., 2002). Gender discrimination is said to take place when employee-related decisions are based upon gender characteristics rather than on the job performance (Gutek et al., 1996). Employees’ perceived discrimination is based on one’s understanding of having been unfairly judged based on the group or memberships to a group which could include age, gender, ethnicity and similar demographic factors (Sanchez and Brock, 1996; Ensher et al., 2001). When decisions are based on group identities and characteristics, employees feel that they have been classified on purpose (Gutek et al., 1996). Comparisons based on salary, rewards, increments and promotions with others reveal the outcomes (Major, 1994) and if this feeling is collectively felt as representative of the group to which one belongs, it can lead to dissatisfaction and disappointment (Crosby, 1982). Women employees who felt discrimination expressed that it affected their self-efficacy and performance (Gutek et al., 1996).

Growth in the corporate sector is often a result of commitment, engagement and focus on career along with other factors (Cabrera and Thomas-Hunt, 2007). Promotions are often granted to those who demonstrate higher commitment and engagement (Cannings and Montmarquette, 1991) and rarely quit their jobs (Hunt and Morgan, 1994). Women are no exception in demonstrating these characteristics, but social norms and societal mind set often perceives working women with children as having household responsibilities who cannot be serious about their career and would be less committed (Cabrera and Thomas-Hunt, 2007). Working women with family responsibilities often have to juggle in order to create a better work-life balance, and when it comes to family responsibilities, it is often women who happily step down from their jobs temporarily to focus on their children and cater to household needs or, if situation demands, could quit their jobs permanently.

Organization Justice is the perceived feeling of fairness related to distributive outcomes such as wages, salary, promotions, rewards, and increments and such other emoluments provided to the employee. It also relates to procedural outcomes based on the manner in which the distributions were made following set rules and procedures. Justice is also perceived in terms of interpersonal relationships and understood in terms of whether the recipients were treated with respect and dignity. Information justice is understood by employees when they perceive whether information and redressal was provided to the employees when decisions affecting them were taken.

Pay is often seen as a stronger indicator of justice and the pay equity relationship is moderated by gender differences (Berkowitz et al., 1987; Greenberg and McCarty, 1990). Men and women have a different sense of justice, and their responses do vary as women tend to be more dissatisfied with pay discrimination than men (Brockner and Adsit, 1986). Women understand their fairness experiences through the procedural justice framework, whereas men do the same using the distributive justice framework. The gender differences too vary with responses of men and women as women put group interests above men, who give self-interest
greater importance (Leventhal and Lane, 1970). In addition, women tend to get paid less compared to men (Major and Adams, 1983; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997), and women participate in formal bidding processes more than men in securing promotions strengthening the notion that women prefer procedural justice (Cannings and Montmarquette, 1991). Due to the patriarchal privileges experienced by men they react more strongly to distributive injustice experiences than women, showing keen interest in distributive justice. (Brockner and Adsit, 1986; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997).

Objective of the study
To study women’s perception of Organization Justice and evaluate it on the basis of Colquitt’s four Justice Dimensions: Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal, and Informational Justice.

Research Methodology
The study involved women professionals chosen through convenience sampling. One hundred and fifty, self-administered questionnaires were distributed, and 132 responses were collected for analysis with a response rate of 67%. The questionnaire had two parts: Part A contained questions related to demographic information and work profile of white collared professionals. Part B contained questions from Colquitt et al. (2001)—a 20-items scale, measuring the four Justice dimensions. Distributive Justice had 4 items, Procedural Justice had 7 items, Interpersonal Justice had 4 items while 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).
Table 1: Data analysis
Demographic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 and Above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Management</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Insurance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/ITES</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Level</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managerial Level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience in Current Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 Years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and above</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Comparison of mean scores for Distributive Justice perceptions among women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcomes reflect effort</th>
<th>Outcomes appropriate for completed work</th>
<th>Outcomes reflect contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes justify performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9394</td>
<td>3.0530</td>
<td>3.1515</td>
<td>3.1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.10348</td>
<td>1.02871</td>
<td>1.17535</td>
<td>1.15129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

Comparison of mean values for Distributive Justice indicates that women respondents agreeing to outcomes justifying performance had a mean value of 3.18, followed by Outcomes reflecting contribution at 3.15 and Outcomes appropriate to completed work at 3.05.
Table 3: Comparison of mean scores for Procedural Justice perceptions among women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Express views and feelings during procedures</th>
<th>Influence over outcomes</th>
<th>Procedures applied consistently</th>
<th>Procedures free of bias</th>
<th>Procedures based on information</th>
<th>Appeal outcomes arrived by procedures</th>
<th>Procedures ethical and moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9697</td>
<td>3.1212</td>
<td>2.8939</td>
<td>3.1061</td>
<td>2.9091</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>2.9924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.15209</td>
<td>1.09147</td>
<td>1.08605</td>
<td>1.22479</td>
<td>1.16209</td>
<td>1.02668</td>
<td>1.15578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation
Comparison of mean values for Procedural Justice shows a value of 3.12 for respondents having an influence over outcomes, mean score of 2.99 for procedures following ethics and morals and mean score of 2.96 for respondents being able to express their views and feelings.

Table 4: Comparison of mean scores for Interpersonal Justice perceptions among women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treated politely</th>
<th>Treated with dignity</th>
<th>Treated with respect</th>
<th>Refrained from improper remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.4015</td>
<td>3.4167</td>
<td>3.2576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.17653</td>
<td>1.14492</td>
<td>1.11917</td>
<td>1.23326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation
Comparison of mean scores for Interpersonal Justice perception shows a mean score of 3.41 for respondents been treated with respect, a mean score of 3.40 for respondents been treated with dignity. Respondents been refrained from improper remarks showed a comparative value of 3.25.

Table 5: Comparison of mean scores for Informational Justice perceptions among women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Procedures explained thoroughly</th>
<th>Procedures reasonably</th>
<th>Communicated timely</th>
<th>Communicated to specific needs</th>
<th>Candid in communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3939</td>
<td>3.8409</td>
<td>3.2273</td>
<td>3.3030</td>
<td>2.9870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.07546</td>
<td>5.01422</td>
<td>1.03813</td>
<td>1.22281</td>
<td>.81013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation

Comparison of mean scores for Information Justice shows a 3.84 mean value for procedures been reasonably applied, followed by a mean value of 3.39 for procedures explained thoroughly and 3.30 for information been communicated specifically.

Table 6: Profession and distributive justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes reflect effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.477</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>1.768</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>147.038</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.515</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes appropriate for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>136.897</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138.629</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes reflect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>20.631</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>160.338</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180.970</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes justify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>169.996</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173.636</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The F value for Outcomes reflecting efforts is 1.768 and the P value for the same is .111 which is statistically higher than the .05 alpha value, showing that there is a difference in means. Outcomes appropriate for completed work has a F Value .264 and the P value .953, showing a value higher than .05, indicating that there is a difference in the means. For Outcomes reflecting contribution, the F Value is 2.681 and the P Value is .018, which is lesser than .05 stating that the there is no difference in the means for this variable. Outcomes justifying performance has a F value of .446 and the P value is .847, which is greater than .05, indicating that there is a difference in means. The means for Profession and Distributive Justice shows a significant difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Express views and feelings during procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>172.867</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173.879</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>155.192</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156.061</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence over outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>152.776</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154.515</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures applied consistently</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>192.611</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196.515</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures free of bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.893</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>172.017</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176.909</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures based on information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>132.263</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138.083</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal outcomes arrived by procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.381</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>3.244</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>166.611</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174.992</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

The table showing the difference in reporting supervisor and Procedural Justice has a F Value of .378, .361, .734, 1.307, 1.835, 2.838, 3.244 for expressing views and feelings, Influence over outcomes, Procedures applied consistently, Procedures free of bias, Procedures based on
Information, Appeal outcome arrived by procedures and Procedures that are ethical and moral respectively.

Except for Procedures followed are ethical and moral, which has a P Value of .042, shows that there is no difference in means of all the other variables that have a P Value higher than 0.05 indicating that there is a significant difference between the Reporting Supervisor and Procedural Justice.

Table 8: Overall experience and interpersonal justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated politely</td>
<td>24.184</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.046</td>
<td>4.886</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157.149</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181.333</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.669</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.417</td>
<td>4.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with dignity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>150.051</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171.720</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.480</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.370</td>
<td>4.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>142.603</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164.083</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.918</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>2.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrained from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improper remarks</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>182.325</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.242</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The table for Overall Work experience and Interpersonal Justice shows a F Value of 4.886 for respondents been treated politely with a P Value of .001, F Value of 4.585 for being treated with dignity with a P Value of .002, F Value of 4.782 for respondents been treated with respect with a P Value of .001 and an F Value of 2.946 with a P Value of .023 for respondents being refrained for improper remarks by their supervisors. Since the P Values are lower than the alpha value 0.05, it can be accepted that there is no difference in Overall work experience and Interpersonal Justice.
Table 9: Designation and informational justice

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has candid communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>17.786</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.929</td>
<td>4.669</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>162.548</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180.333</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures explained thoroughly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.914</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.971</td>
<td>7.996</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127.601</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151.515</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures reasonably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>445.734</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148.578</td>
<td>6.678</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2847.925</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3293.659</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>26.912</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.971</td>
<td>10.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>114.270</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141.182</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated to specific needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>187.628</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195.879</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The ANOVA table for Designation and Informational Justice shows a F Value of 4.669 with a significant .004 showing candid communication with subordinates, respondents’ views for Procedures explained thoroughly has a F Value of 7.996 and a P Value of .000, respondents’ perceptions for reasonable procedures has a F Value of 6.678 with a P Value of .000, respondents’ perceptions for receiving timely communication has a F Value of 10.049 and a P value of .000 and for respondent perceptions that specific needs to be communicated has F Value of 1.876 with a P Value of .137. Except for perceptions that specific needs were properly communicated, all other variables have a P Value lesser that than 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference between Designation of the respondents and Informational Justice.
Findings and discussion

Organization Justice has gained importance in recent years as many employees are educated and, hence, are in a better position to understand whether the outcomes they receive for their inputs are equal or higher than the outputs. Every result or benefit is seen from an equity of justice point of view. At present, the workforce is comprised of an increased number of women workers whose understanding of Justice is often not highlighted or considered. Gender discrimination with respect to various aspects of professional life is common, be it in wages and salaries received, facilities and benefits offered in comparison to men, allocation of work, distribution of responsibilities, promotions, appraisals rewards and benefits and so on. Organization Justice is understood using the cohorts of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Informational Justice. This empirical study conducted among working women in Bangalore city for Distributive Justice revealed that women value outcomes that justify their performances, outcomes that reflect contribution and outcomes appropriate to completed work as significant. Women hold distributive justice dearer as it is an indication of how their contributions are perceived by supervisors and organizations.

Procedural Justice is also understood by women as it reflects them in their day to day work. Except for items that asked women whether they had influence over outcomes and procedures free of bias, all other items showed a poor reflection of how women perceive procedural justice. A lower perception was revealed for items where women were asked whether they were able to express their views and feelings, whether procedures were consistently applied at work, whether the procedures were based on information, whether appeal outcomes came out of following procedures, and, finally, whether procedures were followed applying ethical and moral principles. The findings reveal that women are at the receiving end as far as procedural justice is concerned.

From the findings of the study, Interpersonal Justice received a higher favour among women respondents who answered favourably when asked whether they were treated politely, treated with dignity and respect and whether supervisors refrained from the use of improper remarks, revealing that the dignity of women workers seemed to be in place in organizations. Barring a few incidents of harassment, work environment and culture seems to be conducive to women workers. Information Justice too received a good perception among women workers as majority of them seem to agree and opine positively with respect to the Interpersonal Justice dimensions that procedures were explained thoroughly, procedures were reasonable and communicated in a timely manner, communication about specific needs too was shared to the satisfaction of women employees. Only the item about whether the communication by the organization was candid, received a lower perceptual opinion.

Overall the study reveals that women employees are aware of their position in organizations and do not wish to be treated as inferior to men in any respect. The women who were part of the study have revealed their understanding about what Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal and Informational Justice. Except for procedural Justice, all three forms of Justice received favourable perceptions, but it is only a little close to 50% indicating that organizations have much to do in increasing their Justice perceptions among employees, especially women. The work environment and culture of the organizations need to be evaluated and modified to see how policies and rules can ensure that Justice is common for both men and women and it should specifically overcome the unconscious bias of treating men differently than women. Significant measures to actively engage women employees in decision making, soliciting their views, feeling and opinions will ensure that unfairness in any form can be reduced and eventually removed.
Justice based work environment can be developed gradually through a consistent planned approach that takes into account all the stakeholders. The organizations need to ensure that Justice will be upheld at all times and any incidents or cases of unfairness need to be investigated, and corrective measures need to be implemented for everyone in the firm to experience fairness and develop a sense of belonging.
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