

Organizational Justice Perceptions in the Process of Nominations to Training Programs

M. Srimannarayana

This study assesses the extent of organizational justice perceptions of employees in the nomination process to training programs. The sample consisted of 150 executives working in different organizations in India. It was found that there was favorable justice perception among the respondents in the training nomination process. The construct of interpersonal justice was predominantly associated with training nominations. Levels of management in their organizational hierarchy and their experience were associated with justice perception. There were no significant differences in justice perception of executives based on their nominations to functional or behavioral programs, duration of the programs and in-house or outstation programs. There was positive correlation between perception of organizational justice and training outcomes such as satisfaction with training.

M. Srimannarayana is from XLRI, Jamshedpur.
Email: sriman@xlri.ac.in

Introduction

A manager who deals with his or her employees confront issues of fairness and perceived injustice in the workplace. Any decision a manager takes with respect to the employees is subjected to scrutiny of employees in terms of fairness of the outcomes they receive, be it workload distribution, performance evaluation, nominations for training programs, promotions, transfers, disciplinary actions, grievance handling, pay related matters or any employee benefits and services. Therefore, justice perception of employees has become increasingly visible in human resource management research. There is research work undertaken to explain the impact of justice on organizational functioning under the concept of organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990). It is an effective tool to reduce the feelings of uncertainty and alleviate the level of discomfort (Thau et al., 2007; Judge & Cloquitt, 2004). Initial focus of researchers (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976) is on distributive justice. Gradually the research moved to procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980) and then interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986). This paper attempts to find out or-

ganizational justice perceptions of employees in the process of their nominations to various training programs.

Literature Review

Organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness in organizations. It describes the individual's (or group's) perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organization and their behavioral reaction to such perceptions (James, 1993). These perceptions are increasingly being viewed as having both a cognitive and an affective component. They describe and explain the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace. Fairness has been demonstrated to have effects on various attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Perceptions of unfair treatment lead to lower job performance (Greenberg, 1988), lower morale, higher turnover (Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1992), and greater retaliatory behavior towards the organization (Greenberg, 1990). Perceptions of fair treatment, in contrast, lead to higher satisfaction and commitment, reduced intention to quit, and increased the nature of helping behavior in organizations (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

Organizational justice has taken many forms over the years. Greenberg (1993) has developed a taxonomy that has proven empirically sound and highly useful. Part of Greenberg's taxonomy categorizes organizational justice into "structural justice" and "social justice". Structural justice refers to the employ-

ees' involvement in the decision-making process and the employer provides a fair distribution of outcomes; whereas social justice refers to the employees perceiving that the organization shares information openly with them, and they believe that the employer cares about their welfare. The structural and social justice distinction incorporates both distributive and procedural justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). It also adds an important element of interpersonal interaction - how people are treated on an interpersonal level when an organization institutes its policies and procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986). Organizational justice is rooted in the social exchange theory that assumes that social relationships are considered as exchange processes in which employees make contributions against which outcomes are expected; and that employees estimate the fairness of these exchanges based on the information they get through social interactions (Mowday, 1991). Organizational justice is viewed from three dimensions, namely: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. The dimension, interactional justice is made up of two components: interpersonal justice and informational justice (Greenberg, 1993).

Distributive Justice: Before 1975, the study of justice was primarily concerned with distributive justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). Much of this research is based on Adams (1965) social exchange theory framework. Adam's theory proposes the use of an equity rule to determine fairness. Gradually many other allocation rules have also been identified. Distributive justice refers to the per-

ceived fairness of the amount of outcome employees receive (Greenberg, 1990). It is a reflection of how valuable rewards, benefits and compensation (Chou, 2009; Clay- Warner et al., 2005; Folger & Konovsky, 1989) are present in organizations. Employees determine the fairness of distributed outcomes by comparing their own outcomes with those of other employees. When employees receive organizational outcomes, they use principles of distributive justice such as equity (outcomes allocated based on inputs such as effort) or equality (outcomes allocated equally to all regardless of inputs) to establish the justice or injustice of the outcome.

Employees determine the fairness of distributed outcomes by comparing their own outcomes with those of other employees.

Procedural Justice: Thibaut & Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice primarily focusing on disputant reactions to legal procedures. Leventhal (1980) extended this concept to organizational setting. This concept relates to an employee's judgment about the fairness of the process of making outcome allocation decisions (Greenberg, 1990). It focuses on the process that leads to the results. A number of procedural justice criterion has been outlined such as opportunities for control of the process and the outcomes, ability to voice one's point of view, and the use of accurate information following ethical norms and lack of bias. The four-component model highlights two types of procedural

justice, namely, quality of the decision-making process, quality of treatment and sources of justice such as formal official rules and procedures, and informal sources, namely, experiences people have with the specific authorities who manage their work lives (Blader & Tyler, 2003).

Interactional Justice: Bies & Moag (1986) introduced the concept of interactional justice. It is a unique perception of fairness in the interpersonal treatment of employees by an organization. It is concerned with how individuals in charge of allocating resources and rewards in the workplace behave towards the recipients (Chou, 2009). Interactional justice is the quality of treatment that the employee receives inside the workplace. It is most likely to occur when decision makers (a) treat individuals with interpersonal dignity (Bies & Moag, 1986) and (b) provide subordinates with justifications or explanations (Bies, 1989; Shapiro et.al., 1994; Sitkin & Bies, 1993).

When compared to distributive justice and procedural justice, interactional justice is an especially efficacious predictor of reactions to supervisors and to the immediate work environment (Masterson et. al., 2000). It consists of two specific types of interpersonal treatment (Greenberg, 1990; 1993). The first one is named as interpersonal justice, which reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity and respect by the authority in executing procedures or determining outcomes. The second one is informational justice. It focuses on the explanations provided to

employees that convey information about why procedures are used in a certain way, or outcomes that are distributed in a certain fashion. It is concerned with the perception of fairness based on the clarification of performance expectations, feedback received and justification of decisions. Distributive and procedural justice involves daily encounters between leaders and subordinates. These occur regardless of any resource-allocation decisions being made, whereas interpersonal and informational justice is closely bound in the context of resource exchanges (Bies, 2005). Interpersonal justice and informational justice are usually given by leaders as discretion to their subordinates. Their perception of justice reflects whether the leaders have followed or violated the rules of justice (Folger, 2001; Scott et al., 2009).

Measuring Organizational Justice

Many measurement efforts are plagued by measures that attempt to assess one type of justice, but that is seen more applicable to another (Greenberg, 1993). Thus there is confusion about measuring all dimensions of organizational justice. There is little attention devoted to constancy of measurement (Lind & Tyler, 1988). A sure sign of the immaturity of the field of organizational justice is the lack of a standardized instrument with which to measure justice perceptions (Greenberg, 1993). Having reviewed the situation with respect to justice measurement, Colquitt (2001) created and validated a measure. He has investigated the theoretical dimensionality of organizational justice and gener-

ated items by following the seminal works in this field. He has compared multiple priori factor structures, including one-factor, two-factor, three-factor and four-factor conceptualizations of organizational justice. The measure consisted of items to measure procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Leventhal, 1980), distributive justice (Leventhal, 1976), interpersonal justice (Bies & Moag, 1986) and informational justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Shapiro et al., 1994). He has examined outcomes associated with the justice constructs to place them in a larger nomological network and to demonstrate predictive validity. Finally, the measure is validated in two separate studies. Confirmatory factor analysis supported a four-factor structure of organizational justice, with distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice as distinct dimensions of organizational justice.

The Present Study

There are several research studies carried out investigating the relationship between organizational justice and organizational outcomes (for example, Nielsen, 2015; Lam et. al, 2002; Schaubroeck & Aryee, 2002; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), as well as organizational justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction (for example, Till & Karren, 2011; Day, 2011). The relationship between organizational justice and conflict style (Tatum & Eberlin, 2008), the role of corporate communication and perception of justice during organizational change process (Saruhan, 2014), career development and organizational justice

(Wooten & Cobb, 1999) were also ascertained. However, no research studies are found associating training nominations and organizational justice. The employee and his/her supervisor are generally involved in training nominations. In some cases, in addition to employee and his supervisor, the manager (process/department head) is also involved in the process. In some other cases, supervisor and head, in consultation with human resource/training department nominate people for training programs. Generally, training needs and personal requests of employees are the basis for nominating employees. In some situations, the supervisor nominates employees based on the training programs attended/not attended by the employees. The other criteria for nominations include relevance to the job, suitable qualifications, who the supervisor can spare at that particular point of time, and by way of favor done by the supervisor. Thus the criteria for nomination do not indicate any particular pattern or procedure. It ranges from personal request to nominating employees whom the supervisors can spare (Srimannarayana, 2010). This practice may create the issue of unfairness and injustice perception among the employees with respect to their training nominations.

Objectives of the Study

In the context mentioned above, the overall objective of the present study is to find out justice perception of employees in the process of nominating them for training programs. The specific objectives are as follows:

1. To identify the extent of perception of organizational justice and the predominant constructs of it in the process of training nominations.
2. To assess the association between the employees' demographic factors such as level of management, experience, gender, and justice perceptions while getting nominated to training programs.
3. To examine the association between training factors such as the nature of programs (functional and behavioral) attended, its duration, and its location (in-house and outstation programs) and justice perception.
4. To ascertain the association between learning outcomes such as satisfaction with training and learning during training, and justice perception while getting nominated to training programs.
5. To assess the association between employees' perception on learning and development expenditure of the employees' company and justice perception.
6. To identify the association between the employees' perception on the firm's financial performance and justice perception.

The Instrument & Procedure

The instrument developed by Colquitt (2001) was used for this study. It consisted of 20 items covering the constructs such as procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational justice. All items were tailored to training nomination situ-

ations. The authority figure in the items is the supervisor/nominating authority for training programs. The following are a few examples of the items included in the questionnaire:

1. I have been able to express my views and feelings to my supervisor/nominating authority during the discussions for training nominations (procedural justice item)
2. My nomination for training reflected the efforts I put into my work (distributive justice item)
3. My supervisor/nominating authority treated me in a polite manner while discussing training nomination (interpersonal justice item)
4. My supervisor/nominating authority is candid in communicating with me about the training nomination (informational justice)

The employees who attended, at least, one training program in the recent past were eligible to participate in this survey. They were requested to recollect the nomination process for the training program they had attended in the recent past. Keeping in view the process carried out while getting nominated to the training program, they were requested to answer the items using a four-point scale with anchors of 1 = not at all and 4 = to a great extent. Along with the instrument of justice measures, the questionnaire consisted of items relating to the participants' demographic factors, their organizational details and the details of the training program which they referred to while filling the instrument.

Participants

The size of the participants of this study was 150 executives working in a variety of industries in India. Based on the nature of business, 34% of respondents represented manufacturing organizations (e.g., automobiles, construction, engineering, fast moving consumer products, healthcare products, oil and gas, power products, and pharmaceuticals). 33.33% respondents worked in service organizations (e.g., banking, consulting, insurance, investment and financial services, logistics, media and retail services). The remaining 32.67% of them belonged to information technology (IT) and IT enabled services (ITES). They were into different functional areas such as administration, finance, operations, sales and marketing, supply chain and support functions. They were distributed among junior (20.67%), middle (64.67%), and senior (14.67%) levels of management in their respective organizations. The work experience of respondents ranged from 3 years to 27 years with an average experience of 9.82 years. 82.67% of the respondents were men. A majority (84.67%) of them were graduates. At the time of data collection, all of them were undergoing an executive program in general management in a distance mode. The data was collected from them when they attended their contact classes in the campus.

Data Analysis

The data collected was subjected to reliability test. Overall reliability was .911 (Cronbach's alpha value). Descrip-

tive statistics such as frequency distributions, percentages were used for the analysis of demographic information of the respondents. Mean scores, standard deviations, and paired t-tests and regression tests were employed. ANOVA, Tukey's HSD tests were used for multiple comparisons among the items.

Organizational Justice Perception

It seems that, overall, there is a favorable justice perception among the respondents of the study while their nominations were taking place for training programs as the overall mean score was calculated as 3.07 on a four-point scale. It is evident from Table 1 that, construct wise, interpersonal justice has secured the highest mean score when compared to other constructs of organizational justice. This might be because the nominating authorities concerned would have treated the executives with dignity and respect and in a polite manner. This was followed by distributive justice and informational justice. Procedural justice secured relatively the lowest mean score. This might be because of the situation where there might have been no provision for appeal in the nomination procedure, if an employee is not happy with the nomination. The employee concerned would have had not much of a role to play in the nomination discussions. Also there might have been issues with regard to consistency in the nomination procedure.

There is a favorable justice perception among the respondents of the study

Table 1 Mean Scores of Organizational Justice Constructs

Constructs of Organizational Justice	Mean	SD
Procedural justice	2.87	0.30
Distributive justice	3.00	0.07
Interpersonal justice	3.42	0.18
Informational justice	2.98	0.07
Overall	3.07	0.16

Level of Management & Justice Perception

The respondents of the study were distributed among junior (20.67%), middle (64.67%), and senior (14.67%) levels of management in their respective organizations. This study has made an attempt to find out the association between levels of management and justice perception while getting nominated to training programs. As shown in Table 2, multiple comparisons test established statistically a significant level of difference in the perception of organizational justice across senior level employees and junior level employees. It was found that the higher the level in organizational hierarchy, the greater has been the justice perception in the process of training nominations. The difference in justice perception is more significant between the lower and higher levels, as compared to lower and middle, or middle and higher levels of hierarchy. It is generally believed that the people at the higher levels in the organizational hierarchy are generally in a better position to understand the management viewpoint and its constraints in the day-to-day operations. They are close to organizational realities and perceive better organizational justice.

Hence it is possible that the higher the level of management of the participants, the higher the perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations.

Table 2 Level of Management & Justice Perception

(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Lower Level	Middle Level	-3.30595	1.99763	.226
	Higher Level	-6.87390*	2.69913	.032
Middle Level	Lower Level	3.30595	1.99763	.226
	Higher Level	-3.56795	2.28641	.266
Higher Level	Lower Level	6.87390*	2.69913	.032
	Middle Level	3.56795	2.28641	.266

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Experience & Justice Perception

The work experience of respondents ranged from 3 years to 27 years with an average of 9.82 years. It can be seen from Table 3 that Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances has established a significant difference in the perception of organizational justice between employees with higher experience, as compared to ones with lower experience. Employees with higher experience have a greater perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations. Also, there is a significant positive correlation between experience and justice perception. Experience brings with it a maturity which would help in under-

standing the realities in a different perspective. The experienced person might not easily conclude that some injustice is done. The person might look at the situation from different perspectives before judging it. Therefore, it may be stated that the higher the experience of the participants, the higher is the perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations.

Employees with higher experience have a greater perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations.

Table 3 Experience & Justice Perception

Organizational Justice	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	7.908	.006	-4.822	148	.000
Equal variances not assumed			-4.909	145.303	.000

Table 4 Model Summary

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
.222 ^a	.049	.043

a. Predictors: (Constant), Experience

Gender & Justice Perception

82.67% of the respondents were men and the remaining were women employees. As shown in Table 5, the results of Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances

indicated that gender does not play any significant role in the perception of organizational justice. The mean perception of organizational justice was slightly higher in female employees than in male employees. However, such a difference

Gender does not play any significant role in the perception of organizational justice.

is not really significant to arrive at a conclusion.

Table 5 Gender & Justice Perception

Organizational Justice	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	3.024	.084	-1.145	148	.254
Equal variances not assumed			-1.288	41.535	.205

Nature of Training Programs & Justice Perception

66.67% of the respondents rated the items of organizational justice based on their nomination experience for functional/technical programs. The remaining 33.33% rated the items of organizational justice based on their nomination experience for behavioral programs. The results of Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances, as presented in Table 6, indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of organizational justice between participants nominated for functional and behavioral programs. Generally, the performance of

employees who are nominated to functional training programs is better on the job if they learn the content of the training program and implement the learning on the job. Hence it is assumed that justice perception of the employees may be more favorable when they are nominated for functional training programs. This study, however, found that any differences between the two groups could only be by a chance factor and that the difference is not statistically significant. These findings indicate that the outcome expected by the participants of either functional or behavioral programs would be the same without making any difference.

Table 6 Nomination to Functional & Behavioral Programs: Justice Perception

Organizational Justice	Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	t	Df.	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Df.	Df.Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	2.484	.117	-1.92	147	.057	-3.24	1.69	-6.58	.092
Equal variances not assumed			-2.04	115.11	.044	-3.24	1.59	-6.40	-.088

Program Duration & Justice Perception

The duration of the training programs attended by the respondents of the study ranged from less than a week to more than a week. 70.67% of the respondents attended the programs which were less than a week's duration; 20.67% attended

the programs with a duration of a week and the remaining attended long duration programs of more than a week. As indicated in Table 7, the multiple comparisons revealed that there is no significant association between the duration of the program for which the employees were nominated and justice perception.

Table 7 Duration of the Program & Justice Perception

(I) Duration	(J) Duration	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than a week	Week	-1.05904	1.99619	.856
	More than a week	-5.42380	2.87293	.146
A week	Less than a week	1.05904	1.99619	.856
	More than a week	-4.36476	3.23035	.369
More than a week	Less than a week	5.42380	2.87293	.146
	Week	4.36476	3.23035	.369

In-house - Outstation Programs & Justice Perception

66.67% of the respondents rated the criteria of organizational justice based on their training nomination experience for outstation programs. The remaining group's rating was based on their nomination experience for in-house training programs. Generally, it is believed that outstation training programs are better in terms of their expertise in the content, delivery and administration of the programs. Hence it is assumed that the employees perceive more favorable organizational justice when they are nominated to outstation programs. However, as indicated in Table 8, the results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of organizational justice between participants nominated for outstation programs and in-house programs. Whatever little

There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of organizational justice between participants nominated for outstation programs and in-house programs.

difference that may be present in the justice perception between the two groups could only be by a chance factor and that the difference is not statistically significant. However, when an attempt was made to find out 'which construct of organizational justice has more association with nomination for in-house and outstation programs', the results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that perception of interpersonal justice is slightly higher among those executives who were nominated for outstation training programs. This is possible because sometimes nominations to outstation programs are based on interpersonal rela-

tionships between the nominating officer and the employees. At times, these nominations are considered as a reward for good performance.

Table 8 Nomination to In-house & Outstation Programs: Justice Perception

Organizational Justice	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	Df.	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Df.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	2.674	.104	-1.212	148	.227	-2.06	1.69	-5.42	1.30
Equal variances not assumed			-1.286	114.99	.201	-2.06	1.60	-5.23	1.11

Satisfaction with Training & Justice Perception

The satisfaction of the respondents with the program they attended was measured on a four-point scale. 28% of them mentioned that they were satisfied with the program 'to a great extent' and 57.33% were satisfied with the program to 'a moderate extent'. The mean score of this item was calculated as 3.12 on a four-point scale. The regression test, as presented in Table 9 shows that there is a positive correlation between perception of organizational justice and the extent of satisfaction with training programs (43%) i.e., both perception of high organizational justice and high satisfaction with the training programs co-exist. Also, the perception of organizational justice can significantly predict satisfaction with the training program. If an employee has better justice perception in the process of training nomination, he or she is happy to attend the

training program to which he or she is nominated with an interest to learn from the program. This in turn leads to satisfaction with the program to which the employee is nominated. Hence it may be stated that a favorable justice perception in the process of nominating an employee for a training program leads to a higher level of satisfaction with the program. An attempt has been made here to find out the correlation between satisfaction with training and constructive justice perceptions with the help of Spearman's rho test. It is found that there is a significant correlation between all dimensions of justice perceptions while getting nominated to a training program and satisfaction with the training program. Procedural justice has the highest association followed by distributive justice, informational justice and interpersonal justice at 0 .01 level, thereby indicating that higher satisfaction in training programs coexist with higher perceptions of justice.

Table 9 Satisfaction with the Program and Justice Perception

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.434 ^a	.188	.183	.59528

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice on level of satisfaction

Learning During Training

The learning of the respondents during the program they attended was measured on a four-point scale. 24% of them stated that they learned from the program ‘to a great extent’ and 62% of them learned to ‘a moderate extent’. The mean score of this item was calculated as 3.1 on a four-point scale. This study has made an attempt to find out the association between learning during training and justice perception. As indicated in Table 10, regression analysis established a positive correlation between perception of organizational justice and extent of learning in training programs (36%) i.e., both perception of high organizational justice and high satisfaction in training programs co-exist. Also, perception of organizational justice can significantly predict learning in training programs. If an employee feels that his or her nomination for a training program is fair, there is a possibility of higher levels of learning during the program. The employee considers that he or she is nominated for the program based on the justified training needs with which he or she is in agreement. When the nomination takes place

in a justified manner to the satisfaction of employees, they may take ownership for learning during training. Hence it can be stated that a favorable justice perception in nomination process leads to a higher level of learning during training. When the correlation between learning during training and construct-wise justice perception is examined with the help of Spearman’s rho test it is found that there is a significant correlation between all dimensions of justice perception while getting nominated to a training program and learning during the program. Procedural justice has the highest association followed by distributive justice, and interpersonal justice at 0.01 level. However informational justice is found to be significant at 0.05 level.

Spending on Learning & Development

With respect to spending on learning and development, 42.67% of the respondents asserted that their organizations spend on this activity on par with their competitors. 30% of the respondents mentioned that their companies’ expenses are higher than the expenses of their com-

Table 10 Learning During Training & Justice Perception

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.357 ^a	.127	.122	.57202

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice on level of learning

petitors. But the remaining 27.33% of them alleged that their companies' expenses were lower than their competitors. Multiple comparisons test indicated that there is a significant difference in the perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations between the respondents of the organizations that spend higher than their competitors, lower than their competitors, and at par with their competitors (Table 11). Employees who worked in organizations, which spend 'higher' or 'at par with their competitors' on learning and development have perceived significantly higher organizational justice compared to the employees who work for the organizations which spend lower than their competitors. If an organization is able to spend

higher-than-average budget compared to its competitors, it can have a fair policy and procedure for nominating its employees for various training programs, as the budget might not be a constraint for nominating employees for training programs. Therefore, it is possible that the employees who work in the organizations that spend higher-than-average on learning and development have higher levels of justice perception.

The employees who work in the organizations that spend higher-than-average on learning and development have higher levels of justice perception.

Table 11 Spending on Learning & Development and Justice Perception

(I) Spending record	(J) spending record	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
At par with competitors	Lower than competitors	6.96723*	1.86688	.001
	Higher than competitors	-.74931	1.81561	.910
Lower than competitors	At par with competitors	-6.96723*	1.86688	.001
	Higher than competitors	-7.71653*	2.01491	.001
Higher than competitors	At par with competitors	.74931	1.81561	.910
	Lower than competitors	7.71653*	2.01491	.001

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Firm's Financial Performance & Justice Perception

An attempt is made in this study to find out the association between justice perception in the process of training nominations and the firm's financial performance. It is interesting to note that 45.33% of the respondent stated that their companies perform better in financial performance as compared to their competitors. 42.67% mentioned that

their organizations are as good as their competitors. However, the remaining 12% felt that their organizations' financial performance was worse than their competitors. ANNOVA multiple comparisons, as presented in Table 12, revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of organizational justice among the employees based on the financial performance of their organizations. The difference in justice perception among different em-

employees cannot be significantly related to financial performance of the organizations. Any such correlation could only be present by a chance factor.

Table 12 Firm's Financial Performance & Justice Perception

(I) Financial Performance	(J) Financial Performance	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than competitors	As good as competitors	-2.27778	2.62356	.661
	Better than competitors	-.07190	2.60657	1.000
As good as competitors	Less than competitors	2.27778	2.62356	.661
	Better than competitors	2.20588	1.71259	.404
Better than competitors	Less than competitors	.07190	2.60657	1.000
	As good as competitors	-2.20588	1.71259	.404

Summary & Conclusion

It may be concluded that there is a favorable justice perception among the respondents while their nominations take place for training programs. The construct of interpersonal justice is predominately associated with training nominations, whereas demonstration of procedural justice is the issue of concern. It is found that the higher the level in organizational hierarchy, the greater is the justice perception in the process of training nominations. The difference in justice perception is more significant between lower and higher levels of management, when compared to lower and middle, or middle and higher levels of hierarchy. Similarly, employees with higher experience have greater perception of organizational justice in the process of training nominations when compared to the less experienced employees. Though the mean perception of organizational justice is slightly higher in female employees than in male employees, such difference is not really significant to arrive at a conclusion. As far as factors related to training programs and justice perception is concerned, it may be concluded that there is no statistically sig-

nificant difference in the perception of organizational justice between participants nominated for functional or behavioral programs and in-house or outstation programs. The duration of the program also does not make any significant difference in the justice perception. With regard to training outcomes such as satisfaction with training and learning during training, there is a positive correlation between perception of organizational justice and training outcomes. It is found that the higher the justice perception, the higher is the satisfaction with the program and consequently higher is the learning during training. It may be further concluded that procedural justice has the highest association with satisfaction and learning. With respect to learning and development expenditure of the organizations and justice perception, the higher the expenditure on learning by the organizations, the higher is the justice perception in the process of training nominations. However, no statistically significant difference is found in justice perception among the executives based on the financial performance of their organizations. Finally, satisfaction with training and learning during training are associated with justice perception irrespective of the firms'

financial performance. The employees who are satisfied with training and learned the content of training may apply the new learning on the job and perform better, which may help organizations to perform better financially and thereby improve the overall the organization performance.

References

- Adams, J.S. (1965), "Inequity in Social Exchange", in L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol.2), New York, Academic Press.
- Bies, R.J. (2005), "Are Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice Conceptually Distinct?" in Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J.A (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, (85-112), NJ: Erlbaum, Mahwah.
- Bies, R. J. & Moag, J. S. (1986), "Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness", in R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard & M. Z. Bazerman (Eds), *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.
- Blader, S.L, & Tyler, T. R. (2003), "What Constitutes Fairness in Work Settings? A Four-Component Model of Procedural Justice", *Human Resource Management Review*, 13: 107-26.
- Chou, R.I.A. (2009), "Organizational Justice and Turnover Intention: A Study of Direct Care Workers in Assisted Living Facilities for Older Adults in the United States", *Social Development Issues*, 31: 69-85.
- 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.
- Clay-Warner, J., Reynolds, J. & Roman, P. (2005), "Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: A Set of Three Competing Models", *Social Justice Research*, 18: 391-409.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001), "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Christopher, O. L. H. P. & Ng, K. Y. (2001), "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 425-45.
- Day, N. E. (2011), "Perceived Pay Communication, Justice and Pay Satisfaction", *Employee Relations*, 33:476-97
- Deutsch, M. (1975), "Equity, Equality, and Need: What Determines which Value Will be Used as the Basis for Distributive Justice?" *Journal of Social Sciences issues*.31:137 -49.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A.(1989), "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions", *Academy of Management Journal*, 32:115-30.
- James, K. (1993), "The Social Context of Organizational Justice: Cultural Inter-group and Structural Effects", in Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace*, NJ: Erlbaum, Hillsdale.
- Greenberg, J. (1988), "Equity and Workplace Status: A Field Experiment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73: 606-13.
- Greenberg, J. (1990), "Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow", *Journal of Management*, 16: 399 -432.
- Greenberg, J. (1993), "The Intellectual Adolescence of Organizational Justice: You've Come a Long Way, May be", *Social Justice Research*, 6: 135-48.
- Judge, T.A., Colquitt, J.A. (2004), "Organizational Justice and Stress: The Mediating Role of Work - Family Conflict", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89:395-404.
- Lam, S. S. K., Schaubroeck, J. & Aryee, S. (2002), "Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross-national Study", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 1-18.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1976), "The Distribution of Rewards and Resources in Groups and Organizations", in Berkowitz & W. Walster (Ed), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (vol.9), New York, Academic Press
- 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*, New York, Plenum.
- Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T. R. (1988), *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, New York, Plenum Press.
- McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. (1992), "Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes", *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: 626-37
- 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 of Work Relationships", *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 738-48.
- Mowday, R. (1991), "Equity Theory Predictions of Behavior in Organizations", in Steers, R. and Porter, L. (Eds), *Motivation and Work Behavior*, New York, McGraw-Hill,
- Nielsen, S. K. (2015), "Support or Fairness? Differential Effects of Social Support and Organizational Justice on Work Outcomes", *American Journal of Management*, 15: 26-38
- Pfeffer, J., A. Davis-Blake (1992), "Salary Dispersion, Location in the Salary Distribution and Turnover among College Administrators", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 45: 753-63
- Saruhan, N. (2014), "The Role of Corporate Communication and Perception of Justice during Organizational Change Process", *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 5: 143-66
- Scott, B.A., Colquitt, J.A. & Paddock, E.L. (2009), "An Actor-focused Model of Justice Rule Adherence and Violation: the Role of Managerial Motives and Discretion", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 756-69.
- Shapiro, D. L., Buttner, E. H. & Barry, B. (1994), "Explanations for Rejection Decisions: What Factors Enhance their Perceived Adequacy and Moderate their Enhancement of Justice Perceptions?" *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58: 346-68.
- Sitkin, S. B. & Bies, R. J. (1993), "Social Accounts in Conflict Situations: Using Explanations to Manage Conflict", *Human Relations*, 46: 349-70.
- Srimannarayana, M. (2010), "Training and Development Practices in India", *Indian Journal of Training and Development*, XXXX: 34 -42.
- Thau S., Aquino K. & Wittek R. (2007), "An Extension of Uncertainty Management Theory to the Self: The Relationship between Justice, Social Comparison Orientation, and Antisocial Work Behaviors", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 250-58.
- Till, R. E. & Karren, R. (2011), "Organizational Justice Perceptions and Pay Level Satisfaction", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26:42-57
- Tatum, B. C. & Eberlin, R. J. (2008), "The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Conflict Style", *Business Strategy Series*, 9: 297-305.
- Wooten, K. C. & Cobb, A. T. (1999), "Career Development and Organizational Justice: Practice and Research Implications", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10: 173-79.